Modern edition | Plain English

Books III and IV

The Will to Power

Friedrich Nietzsche

Read and listen to this book on SUN.

Open the book page

sunapp.ai/books/the-will-to-power-by-friedrich-nietzsche

Full text, credits and source notices follow.

SUN | sunapp.ai

FRIEDRICH
NIETZSCHE

The Will to Power



sun | *Intelligent Audio*



sunapp.ai/download

The Will to Power, Books III and IV

Friedrich Nietzsche

Plain modern English

Plain-English adaptation by Blue Energy People, Inc. (SUN), using Claude Opus 5.5.

Based on the English translation by Anthony M. Ludovici.

Project Gutenberg ebook #52915

Contents

The Basic Ideas Behind a New Way of Judging Values 16
Training and Strict Self-Control, and Raising a Stronger Kind of People 268

THE

DRIVE FOR POWER

AN ATTEMPT AT

TURNING ALL VALUES UPSIDE DOWN

By

FRIEDRICH NIETZSCHE

TRANSLATED BY

ANTHONY M. LUDOVICI

VOLUME 2

BOOKS 3 AND 4

T.N. FOULIS

13 & 15 FREDERICK STREET

EDINBURGH AND LONDON

1913

WHAT IS IN VOLUME 2

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

BOOK THREE. THE BASIC IDEAS OF A NEW WAY OF VALUING THINGS.

1. THE DRIVE FOR POWER IN SCIENCE

(a) How to Investigate. (b) Where the Study of Knowledge Begins. (c) The Belief in the Self, the 'I', and in the Doer Behind Actions. (d) The Biology of the Instinct to Know, and Seeing from a Point of View. (e) Where Reason and Logic Come From. (f) Consciousness. (g) Judgment: True and False. (h) Against the Idea of Cause and Result. (i) A Thing as It Is Apart from Us, and the World as It Seems. (k) Our Need for Something Beyond Nature. (l) How Knowledge Helps Living Things Survive. (m) Science.

2. THE DRIVE FOR POWER IN NATURE

1. Explaining the World as a Machine. 2. The Drive for Power as Life: (a) The Process of Living Things, (b) Human Beings. 3. The Theory of the Drive for Power and of How We Value Things.

3. THE DRIVE FOR POWER AS SEEN IN

SOCIETY AND IN THE INDIVIDUAL

1. Society and the State. 2. The Individual.

4. THE DRIVE FOR POWER IN ART

BOOK FOUR. TRAINING AND STRICT SELF-CONTROL, AND RAISING A STRONGER KIND OF PEOPLE.

1. THE RANKING OF PEOPLE BY WORTH

1. The Teaching About Ranking People by Worth. 2. Strong and Weak People. 3. The Noble, High-Minded Person. 4. The Future Rulers of the World. 5. The Great Person. 6. The Highest Person as One Who Sets New Values for the Future.

2. DIONYSUS, GREEK GOD OF WINE AND JOY

3. EVERYTHING COMING BACK FOREVER

TRANSLATOR'S INTRODUCTION

If you want to know the history of the writings that make up this volume, please look at my introduction to Books 1 and 2 of "The Drive for Power." There you will also find a short explanation of the real title of the whole work.

In the two books in this volume, Nietzsche boldly pushes his main idea even further, into the different areas of human life. He is not afraid to show how it applies even to science, to art, and to big questions about what lies beyond nature.

All through Part 1 of Book Three, he works very hard to make one point clear to us. He says science is just as much based on choice as art is in the way it works. He says that what a scientist knows is only the result of his unstoppable drive for power. That drive explains facts in terms of what helps the scientist's own type of people survive. In

sections 515 and 516, which are typical of nearly all the ideas in Part 1, Nietzsche says plainly: "The goal is not 'to know,' but to arrange things into patterns. The goal is to force as much order and shape onto chaos as our practical needs call for."

Things we don't know, constant change, and not being able to predict what might happen are all sources of great danger. So, if we want to master and control Nature, everything must be explained. Everything must be made to fit with what we already know, and made into something we can count and calculate.

We have to invent ways of explaining what happens in the world. These explanations do not have to be absolutely true or impossible to disprove. But they must help the kind of people who invent them to survive and keep going. So explaining things becomes the most important thing of all. Facts drop down to being just raw material. They must first be given some shape, some meaning, always a human-centered meaning, before they become useful.

Nietzsche even shows, again and again, that reason and logic grew out of something physical: digestion. When a living thing digests, it first has to make things "like" itself, to "take them in and make them similar," before it can absorb them (section 510). He also denies that hunger can be the first reason behind anything (sections 651 to 656). Instead, he shows that the tiny one-celled creature called the amoeba stretches out its arm-like parts because of its drive for power, looking for things it can grab. Once it has wrapped itself around what it grabbed, it absorbs it by making it similar to itself. So, by this line of thinking, reason itself is admitted to be just one more form of that same basic drive.

Nietzsche's argument leads to an interesting result, one that could not have been avoided. In section 516 he says that even the fact that we

cannot both deny and accept the very same thing is not something necessary at all. It is only a sign that we are not able to do it.

The whole argument of Part 1 keeps pulling science closer and closer to art. Of course, this does not apply when science is only about checking and recording facts. The argument tries to prove that science, just like art, is nothing more than a way of getting some grip, some place to stand, on the slippery ground of a world that never stops flowing and changing.

In the rush and wild confusion of constant change, people need some fixed markers, like milestones on a road, so they can find their way. In the flood of changes that never stop, pillars must be set up so a person can hold on tight to them for a while and gather his thoughts. Science, like art, does this for us. And it is our drive for power that "creates the feeling of fixed, unchanging existence out of constant change" (section 517).

So, from this point of view, consciousness, our awareness, is also just a tool that serves the drive for power. It grows or shrinks depending on what we need (section 524). It could disappear completely (section 523). Or, on the other hand, it could grow and make our lives even more complicated than they are now. But we should be careful not to treat it as the ultimate thing behind all constant change, just because it happens to be the highest and newest thing that evolution has produced (section 709). If we had done that with every new feature we gained, then even eyesight, which developed fairly recently, would have had to be worshipped as a god.

Pantheism, which says God is everything, Theism, which says there is a personal God, Unitarianism, which says God is one being, and in fact every religion that worships a god who is aware and thinking: Nietzsche sorts them all, quite fittingly, into one group. He says they all come from the same human wish. People take something that is

only a new and wonderful tool of their drive for power, namely their consciousness. Then they want to raise it to the top place in an imagined world beyond this one, as an everlasting soul. They even want to make it into God himself, a God who knows everything.

When it comes to the question of truth, Nietzsche is just as ready to defend his main idea as he is with every other question. He says openly that "the test of truth is whether it increases the feeling of power" (section 534). This puts him completely against the English thinker Spencer, who says the test of truth is being forced, or not being able to think otherwise. (See Spencer's book "Principles of Psychology," new edition, chapter 9, where he says: "If we cannot even imagine the opposite of a statement, that is the final proof that the statement is true.")

Nietzsche's view may seem strange and self-contradicting. But we will find that experience actually backs it up. Our senses really do convince us more or less, depending on how strongly they are stirred. For example, imagine we walked for a long time around a totally dark room, and everything we touched gave way, even just a little, under our hands. We would not be at all convinced that we were in a room. This would be even more true if, to imagine something still more impossible, the floor gave way too. So whatever makes the tips of our fingers react strongly also makes us feel that something is true.

From this point, Nietzsche goes on to argue something more. He says that whatever stirs up the strongest feelings in us also seems true to us. And when it comes to thinking, what seems true is "whatever gives our thinking the strongest feeling of strength" (Aphorism 533).

So the sign of truth becomes this: does something stir up strong emotion? And strong emotion means a state where the body has more power than usual. It is a very striking fact that two well-known English thinkers came close to admitting this at the very end of their

careers. They did so even though all their earlier philosophy had been built on a completely different belief. I mean, of course, Spencer and Buckle. Both of them held that in any system of thought, the emotional side matters most of all.

From all this, it follows that lies and false teachings could very well turn out to help a species survive even better than the truth does. We have already met this idea in the opening aphorisms of the book Beyond Good and Evil. But in Aphorism 538 of this book, Nietzsche explains it further. He usefully shows that "the easier way of thinking always wins over the harder way." He also shows that logic, because it made it easier to sort things and think in an orderly way, ended up "acting as if it were truth."

Part I is far too big to cover fully. But before we leave it, we should say a word or two about Nietzsche's views on the belief in "cause and result." In The Genealogy of Morals (First Essay, Aphorism 13), we have already seen an early hint of his fuller opinions on this question. It would be helpful to read that aphorism alongside the discussion of this topic found in this book (Aphorisms 545 to 555).

All of Nietzsche's criticism, though, comes down to one point. The idea of cause starts by needlessly doubling everything that happens. This scientific superstition grows out of language, which began among people who had no training in thoughts and ideas. Nietzsche traces how it developed from an ancient, primitive urge: the urge to always find a "doer" behind every deed. People wanted to find someone responsible. Once that someone was known, the strange event that needed explaining felt less strange. As Nietzsche puts it, "The so-called instinct for cause, which Kant talks about so confidently, is nothing more than fear of the unfamiliar."

In Aphorism 585 (A), we get a very clear explanation, and so a very valuable one, of much in Nietzsche's view that may still seem hard to

grasp. We could almost treat this aphorism as the key to how The Drive for Power deals with knowledge. Here the "urge to find truth" is defined simply as "the longing for a stable world." Once we see this, we have the main theme running through all of Nietzsche's thinking in Part I. Most of what comes after is clearly just a working-out of this one idea.

In Part II, Nietzsche shows that he is completely against every view that explains the universe as a machine or as mere matter. He raises up the spirit. He rejects the idea that pressure from outside alone, that is, bare surroundings, should be held responsible (and often blamed!) for everything that materialist science pins on it. Darwin once again gets a lot of sharp criticism. For readers who know how Nietzsche disagreed with this naturalist, aphorisms such as numbers 643, 647, 649, 651, 684 and 685 will be especially interesting. Nietzsche's attack on Darwin's view is completely sincere and deeply serious. It ought to make all English people think hard about one very important question, especially those who may have accepted too eagerly the conclusions of their own British school of evolution. The question is this: how far were Malthus, and later his follower Darwin, perhaps shaped in how they studied nature by ideas they already held? Those ideas may have come from the constant pressure and crowding in the busy, industrial, heavily populated country where both of them lived.

It is hard to defend Darwin against Nietzsche's basic attack, which strikes at the very root of his teaching. That attack is about one question: what drives all of life's struggle? If you assume that the drive is always a "struggle for existence," you must also assume two conditions are always present: scarcity and too many living things. This assumption has never been proven at all. It also gives all living things a strangely mean and cowardly look. That picture is not backed up by the facts, and the struggle for power is completely free of it.

Part III is fairly easy going all the way through, and Aphorism 786 probably holds its most important statements. Here morality is shown to be only a tool, but this time it is a tool of the crowd's drive for power. In the last paragraph of this aphorism, Nietzsche shows that he is strongly against Determinism, the belief that everything is fixed in advance. He opposes it because it is closely tied to, and grew out of, the view of the universe as a machine. But we must always keep one thing in mind. Nietzsche hands out beliefs the way other people hand out gifts: according to the needs of the people he has in mind. So we must never assume that a belief he rejects for one kind of person should, in his view, also be taken away from another kind.

This is certainly hard to keep in mind. Still, we should remember that he speaks almost all the time to exceptional people. The teachings and creeds he condemns for them are ones he would naturally praise for people who are in a different position and made in a different way. Christianity is a good example (see The Drive for Power, volume 1, Aphorism 132).

Now we come to Part IV. This may be the most important part of all, because it deals with the questions that concerned Nietzsche most steadily, ever since he wrote his first book.

According to Nietzsche, the world as we now see and know it was created by our own minds, which give things their value. That includes everything in it that, from a human point of view, is beautiful, ugly, or neither. Perhaps only a few people helped shape this world of values. Maybe you could count them on the fingers of two hands. But what Nietzsche insists on is that this world comes from humans. Our whole outlook, everything that brings us joy or pain, must at some point have been given its value for us by someone. And when we keep holding on to these values, we, as the crowd that has grown used to them, owe a debt. We owe it to our artists, to our exceptional people,

and to everyone in history who at some point dared to stand up and say firmly that this was ugly and that was beautiful, and then to fight for that opinion, and to die for it if they had to.

Religion, morality, and philosophy all claim to be aiming at a so-called universal Truth. But in doing so, they tend to make life seem less valuable in the eyes of exceptional people. It is true that they set up what counts as "beautiful" for ordinary people, and in that way they make life seem more valuable to them. But they clash with the values of exceptional people, and by doing this they destroy those people's innocent trust in the world. Because the real question here is not "Which value is true?" The real question is "Which value best helps the highest kind of human life on earth?"

Nietzsche would gladly put the whole job of setting values onto the wild, life-loving (like the god Dionysus) artist. This is the artist who talks about this world out of the love and the overflowing power he feels in his own heart. Because he is so healthy inside, he cannot look at life without changing how it looks, making it holy, blessing it, and making it seem better, bigger, and more beautiful. And in this view Nietzsche is completely consistent. If we have to accept his conclusion that our values are decided for us by our exceptional people, then it becomes extremely important that these people who set values are made in such a way that their values are a gift to the rest of humanity, and not a curse.

Sadly, far too often, and especially in the nineteenth century, people who lacked this wild, life-loving (like the god Dionysus) spirit have stood up and judged the value of the world. It is against these people that Nietzsche protests. He would gladly clear away the bad air they have spread, meaning the gloomy, unhealthy mood they left behind.

As for what art means to the artist himself, apart from the effect it actually has on the world, Nietzsche would say that it is a way of

letting out his drive for power. The artist tries to press his opinion about what is worth wanting, and about what is beautiful or ugly, onto the people of his own time and onto the future. It is in this setting of values that his urge to win and dominate finds its highest form. That is why artists, by instinct, save their energy when it comes to sex. Sex is exactly the area where other people go when their urge to dominate pushes them to act. Of course, Nietzsche did not deny that artists have a strong physical, sensual side (Aphorism 815). All he wanted to make clear was this: an artist who was not moderate in matters of love and sex while he was working on his task should be strongly suspected.

In the Fourth Book, Nietzsche is truly at his very best. Here, when he discusses questions like "The Ranking of People by Worth," he is so completely in his own special territory that almost every line, even if you pulled it out on its own and took it away from the rest of the text, would clearly show who wrote it. The idea expressed in Aphorism 871 shows a point of view that is as new as it is needed. We have become so used to writing and making laws for the masses that we have forgotten a rule that holds even in our own navy: a fleet can only go as fast as its slowest ship.

By the same rule, since all our philosophies and moral systems so far have been aimed at the masses and at the mob, we find that how high they can rise is bound to be decided by the lowest people. So all strong passions are banned, because low, common people do not know how to put them to good use. People who are masters of themselves and of others, people who understand how to manage passion and the right to have it, become the most hated of all in such ways of thinking. This is because they are mixed up with people who are wicked and lack all self-control. And so the speed at which humanity rises comes to be set by humanity's slowest ships.

Aphorisms 881, 882, and 886 fully explain the points made above. In Aphorisms 912, 916, 943, and 951 we find plans for a positive, building-up teaching, which the rest of Part I works out in detail.

And now, if we follow Nietzsche carefully through Part II (Dionysus, Greek god of wine and joy), what conclusion can we not escape from everything we have read? Many people may now think that this study of all the world's values, and his claim that they come from a certain "drive for power," is just a very thorough attempt to give things new names, and not much more. In fact, it is far more than that. Through it, Nietzsche wants to show humanity how much has been in human power, and how much still is. He pointed to everything and told people that it was human will that had created it. In this way Nietzsche wanted to give people the courage to use this will, and a clear conscience while using it. Because it was exactly this drive for power that, up to Nietzsche's time, had been hated and badmouthed the most by everyone.

For a long time, people were afraid to say that even one of their happiest thoughts came from this hated basic will. So they gave credit for all their values and all their highest inspirations to something outside themselves, whether that something was a God, a principle, or the idea of Truth. But Nietzsche wanted to show people how human, all too human, the values that have appeared so far have been. He wanted to prove that for the rare people who shape values like sculptors, the world, despite its past, is still an open field of soft clay that can be shaped. By pointing to what the drive for power has done up to now, Nietzsche hints to these future sculptors what could still be done. But this is only possible if they fear nothing, and if they have the same innocence and deep faith in this basic will that others until now have had in God, Natural Laws, Truth, and other comforting made-up ideas with nice-sounding names.

Nietzsche gave so much importance to the teaching of everything coming back forever that it can almost be seen as the inspiration that led to his great work, Thus Spoke Zarathustra. This teaching should be understood as a belief meant purely for training and strict self-control, and for humbling a person. In one of the works published after his death, Nietzsche says: "The question you must answer before every single thing you do, 'Is this something I am ready to do countless times over?', is the best ballast." In other words, it keeps you steady, the way heavy weight keeps a ship steady. So it is clear that Nietzsche felt his teaching needed something to take the place of the spiritual, beyond-this-world ideas of older beliefs, and he used the teaching of everything coming back forever for this purpose. However, even among Nietzsche's own followers there is a lot of doubt about how much this teaching is really worth as a guiding belief. So there seems to be no need here to go into the scientific proof he claims for it. It is enough to say that, with what we know today, the claim that the world will come back forever, in small things as well as in great ones, is still a rather bold guess. But it would have been a fully justified guess if its value for training and self-control had been as great as its boldness.

ANTHONY M. LUDOVICI.

Book Three

The Basic Ideas Behind a New Way of Judging Values

I.

The Drive for Power in Science

(a) How We Investigate Things

466.

What really sets our nineteenth century apart is not that science won. It is that the scientific method won, even over science itself.

467.

Auguste Comte thought that the history of scientific methods was almost the same thing as philosophy itself.

468.

The great thinkers about method were Aristotle, Bacon, Descartes, and Auguste Comte.

469.

The most valuable knowledge is always the last to be discovered. And the most valuable knowledge of all is knowledge of methods, of how to find things out.

For centuries, people looked down with the deepest scorn on all the methods and all the guesses that today's science rests on. Because of them, a person used to be shut out from the company of "respectable" people. He was seen as an "enemy of God," someone who insulted the highest ideal, a madman.

All the deep feelings of humanity were against us. Our idea of what "truth" should be, of what serving the truth should mean, our way of staying neutral, our method, our calm, careful and suspicious manner, all of this was seen as utterly contemptible.... Deep down, what held people back most was a matter of taste, a love of beauty. They believed truth should look grand and striking, like a painting. What they wanted from the scientist was that he should powerfully stir their imagination.

From what I just said, it might almost look as if the exact opposite had been reached, as if humanity had made a sudden leap. In fact, it was different. The training people got from the exaggerated demands of morality slowly prepared the way for a gentler, quieter kind of passion. In the end, that quieter passion took living form in the scientist....

Being careful and honest even in small things, the way a religious person controls himself, was a kind of training school for the scientific character. Another training school, and a very important one, was the attitude that makes a person take problems seriously, no matter whether he gains anything from them personally....

(b) Where the Theory of Knowledge Begins

470.

There is a deep unwillingness to stop, once and for all, at any one shared picture of the world. The opposite point of view has its own appeal: we refuse to give up the thrill that comes from mysteries.

471.

Some people assume that, at bottom, the world runs in such a moral and fair way that human reason has to be right. This is just a kindly, naive kind of trust. It comes from believing that God is truthful, and that God is the Creator of everything. These ideas are something we inherited from an earlier time, when people lived for a world beyond this one.

472.

The so-called "facts of consciousness" contradict themselves. Looking inside ourselves is a thousand times harder than it seems. Error may actually be a necessary condition for any observation at all.

473.

The mind cannot judge itself. One reason is simple: it cannot be compared with any other kind of mind. Another reason is that its power to know could only show itself when faced with "real reality." In other words, to judge the mind, we would have to be higher beings with "perfect knowledge." That would mean there has to be something out there, a thing as it is apart from us, separate from every way of seeing things from a point of view and from all our sensing and thinking. But when we look at where our belief in "things" comes from in our own minds, we see that we have no right to talk about "things as they are apart from us."

474.

Some people think that the knower and the thing known match each other well, and that an object is something which, if you could see it from the inside, would itself be a knower. This is a well-meant invention, and I believe its best days are over. How much we are aware of depends completely on the rough, practical usefulness of being aware at all. Our awareness is like a tiny attic window with a narrow view. How could such a little window give us the right to say anything about "knower" and "known" that has any connection to reality!

475.

A criticism of modern philosophy: it starts from a wrong point. It acts as if there were such things as "facts of consciousness," and as if, when we look inside ourselves, we were not also seeing mere appearances.

476.

"Consciousness": how shallow is it, really? Take an idea we think, or the idea of wanting something, or the idea of a feeling, which only we ourselves know. To what degree are these just surface? Our inner world is also only "appearance."

477.

I am convinced that our inner life is also only appearance. Everything that reaches our awareness has been completely adjusted, simplified, fitted into patterns, and interpreted. What really happens when we "perceive" things inside us is fully hidden from us. So is the real link of causes between thoughts, feelings and desires, and between the knower and the thing known. These links may even be purely imagined. We handle this "inner world as it seems" in exactly the same

ways and with the same tools as the "outer" world. We never come across a single real "fact." Even pleasure and pain are things the mind developed fairly recently....

Cause and result slip away from us. Logic assumes that one thought directly causes the next. But that comes from the roughest and clumsiest kind of observation. All sorts of passions can come in between two thoughts. But they act too fast. That is why we do not notice them, and that is why we even deny that they exist....

"Thinking," in the sense that theorists of knowledge mean it, never happens at all. It is a completely groundless invention. It was made by picking out one part of the whole process and throwing away all the rest. It is an artificial tidying-up, done so that we can understand things more easily....

Then there is the "mind," seen as something that thinks, and sometimes even as "the pure and perfect mind." This idea is a later, secondhand result of looking inside ourselves wrongly, of believing in "thinking." First, people imagine an act that does not really happen at all, namely "thinking." Second, they imagine a doer behind actions, a base underneath, from which every bit of this thinking comes, and nothing else. In other words, both the action and the doer are made up.

478.

We must not look for mere appearance in the wrong place. Nothing is more a matter of appearance, or, to put it more exactly, nothing is so much a trick and a deception, as this inner world that we watch with our so-called "inner sense."

Our belief that the will is a cause was so strong that, based on our personal experience in general, we read a cause into everything that

happens. That is, we assume some kind of motive is behind every event.

We believe that the thoughts that follow one after another in our minds are linked by some kind of cause and result. The logician especially talks about many "facts" that no one has ever once seen in reality. He has grown used to the prejudice that thoughts are the cause of other thoughts.

We believe that pleasure and pain cause our reactions, and even our philosophers still believe this. We think the whole point of pleasure and pain is to make us react. For hundreds of years, pleasure and pain have been described as the *reasons* behind every action. But if we think it over, we have to admit something. Everything would have happened in exactly the same way, in exactly the same chain of cause and result, even if the feelings of "pleasure" and "pain" had not been there at all. We are simply fooled when we believe that they actually cause anything. They are things that *come along with* the process, side effects. Their purpose is something quite different from setting off reactions. They are themselves results, part of the reaction that is already taking place.

To put it briefly: everything that we become aware of is a last step, an end point, and it causes nothing. The way things follow one another in our awareness is made of completely separate pieces, each standing alone. And yet we tried to understand the universe from the *opposite* point of view, as if nothing were real or had any effect except thinking, feeling and wanting!

479.

Our inner life is also only appearance! The order in time gets flipped around, so that the cause reaches our awareness as if it were the result. We know that pain is felt in a certain part of the body even though it is not

really located there. We have learned that all the sensations we innocently thought came from the outside world actually come from the inner world. We have learned that the real action of the outside world never happens in a way we can be aware of. The bit of the outside world that we become aware of is created only after the outside world has already had its effect on us and that effect has been registered. Only afterward is that bit explained as the "cause" of the effect.

Because our inner life is also only appearance, the time order of cause and result gets turned backward. The basic fact about "inner experience" is this: we imagine the cause only after the result has already been registered. The same is true of the way one thought follows another. We look for the reason behind a thought before the thought has reached our awareness. Then the reason reaches our awareness first, and the thought, its result, follows after it. All our dreams are attempts to explain our combined feelings, to find what might have caused them. And it works like this: a feeling only becomes conscious once the supposed cause behind it has reached our awareness.[1]

All of "inner experience" rests on this. Some stirring happens in our nerve centers, and we look for a cause and imagine one that explains it. Only the cause we find in this way reaches our awareness. This cause may have nothing at all to do with the real cause. It is a kind of feeling around in the dark, helped by earlier "inner experiences," that is, by memory. But memory keeps the habits of old explanations, which means it keeps old mistaken ideas about causes. So "inner experience" carries inside it all the results of earlier made-up and mistaken causes. The "outside world" as we picture it at every moment is tied up, and cannot be pulled apart, from the old mistake about causes. We explain everything by using the ready-made pattern of "the thing," and other patterns like it.

"Inner experience" only enters our awareness once it has found a language the person can *understand*. That means it has been translated from some state into states the person already *knows well*. To "understand" simply means this: to be able to say something new in terms of something old and familiar. Take the sentence "I feel unwell." A statement like that requires the observer to be *very calm and detached, and this is a very new ability.* A simple person always says, "This or that is making me feel unwell." He only starts to be clear about his illness after he has found a reason for it. This is what I call *not knowing how to read carefully, like a scholar of texts*. To be able to read a text *just as it is*, without reading your own explanation into it, is the newest form of "inner experience." It may be a form that is barely possible at all.

[Translator's note 1: When we hear a bell ringing or someone knocking at our door while we are dreaming, we almost never wake up before we have already explained the sound in terms of the dream world we were in.]

480.

There are no such things as "mind," reason, thought, consciousness, soul, will, or truth. They all belong to fiction, to things made up, and they serve no purpose. The real question is not about "subject and object," about a knower and a thing known. It is about one particular kind of animal that can only thrive if it takes in what it perceives with a certain *exactness*, or better, with a certain *regularity*, so that it can build up experience and make use of it like stored-up wealth.

Knowledge works as a *tool* of power. So it is clear that knowledge grows every time power grows.

What is knowledge for? Here, just as with the ideas of "good" or "beautiful," we must look at the idea strictly and narrowly from a human-centered and biological point of view. For a particular kind of

creature to keep and grow its power, its picture of reality must contain enough things that are predictable and steady to let it make a plan for how to act. What drives the growth of the organs of knowledge is *how useful they are for survival, not* some abstract or theoretical need to avoid being fooled. These organs develop in such a way that what they observe is enough to keep us alive. In other words, the *amount* of hunger for knowledge depends on how much the *drive for power* grows in a certain kind of creature. A kind of creature takes hold of a certain amount of reality *in order to master it, in order to put that amount to work for itself.*

(c) The Belief in the Self, the 'I'. The Doer Behind Actions.

481.

Positivism stops at what we observe and says, "These are just *facts* and nothing more." Against this I would say: No, facts are exactly what we do not have. Everything that exists is made of *interpretations*, of ways of explaining things. We cannot prove any fact "in itself," apart from us. It may even be nonsense to want to do that. You say, "Everything is *subjective*," meaning it all depends on the person. But that itself is an *interpretation*. The doer behind actions is not something given to us. It is something added on by imagination, something slipped in behind. Do we really need to put an interpreter behind the interpretation we already have? Even that would be fantasy, a guess.

To the extent that knowledge means anything at all, the world can be known. But it can be explained in *different* ways. There is not one meaning behind it, but hundreds of meanings. This is "seeing from a point of view."

It is our needs that *explain the world*: our instincts, with their pushes toward some things and against others. Every instinct is a kind of

thirst for power. Each one has its own point of view, and it would like to force that view on all the other instincts as their rule.

482.

At the place where our ignorance truly begins, the point beyond which we cannot see any further, we put a word. For example, the word "I," the word "do," the word "suffer." These ideas may be the horizon lines of our knowledge, the edges where our view ends, but they are not "truths."

483.

Because thinking happens, people take the self, the 'I', for granted. Up to now, everyone has believed, just like ordinary people do, that the idea "I think" holds something completely certain. They also believed that, just as we understand every other case of cause and result, this "I" was the obvious *cause* of the thinking. This made-up idea may now be very familiar, and we may not be able to do without it. But that proves nothing against the fact that it was imagined in the first place. A belief can help us survive and *still* be *false*.

484.

"Something is thought, so there must be something that thinks": this is really all that Descartes' argument comes down to. But saying this means treating our belief in the idea of "*substance*" (some solid thing underneath) as a truth we know before any experience. The claim that there must be something "that thinks" whenever we think is just a habit of grammar put into words. Our grammar gives a doer to every action. In short, Descartes is already making a big assumption about reality and logic here. He is not *simply stating a fact*.... Following

Descartes' path, we reach nothing completely certain. We only reach the fact of a very strong faith.

Suppose we cut the statement down to "Something is thought, so there are thoughts." Then all we get is a statement that just repeats itself. And the one thing actually in question, whether thought is truly *real*, is not touched at all. So in this form, we cannot rule out that thought is only a kind of ghostly appearance. What Descartes *wanted* to prove was that thought does not just *seem real*, but is real in an absolute way.

485.

The idea of *substance* comes from the idea of a *doer behind actions,* not the other way around! If we give up the idea of the soul, of the doer behind actions, then the very ground for the idea of "substance" is missing. We are left with *degrees of fixed, unchanging existence*, but fixed, unchanging existence itself is lost.

A criticism of "*reality*": where does the idea of "*more or less reality*" lead us? Where does this ranking of levels of existence, which we believe in, come from?

How strongly we feel *alive* and *powerful* (the logic and links of the life we have already lived) is what gives us our measure of "fixed, unchanging existence," of "reality," of what is "not just appearance."

The doer behind actions: this is the name we give to our belief that one single thing lies underneath all the different moments when we feel reality most strongly. We treat this belief as the result of a cause. And we believe in our belief so much that, because of it alone, we dream up "truth," "reality," and "solid substance." A "doer behind actions" is a made-up idea that tries to make us believe that several similar states all come from one thing lying underneath them. But it was we

ourselves who first *created* the "sameness" of these states. The fact is that we made them alike and adjusted them to fit, *not* that they really are alike. In fact, their sameness should rather be denied.

486.

To be able to *decide* whether this or that is real (for example, "the facts of our awareness"), we would first have to know what *fixed, unchanging existence* is. We would also need to know what *certainty* and *knowledge* are, and so on. But since we do *not* know these things, it makes no sense to put our power of knowing on trial. How can a tool judge itself, when it is the very tool doing the judging? It cannot even define itself!

487.

Shouldn't all philosophy in the end reveal the basic starting points that our reasoning depends on? That is, our *belief* in the self, the 'I', as a solid substance, as the only reality, the one thing that lets us call anything else real? The oldest belief in reality finally comes out into the open. It does so at the same moment that people realize their whole religious history is nothing more than a history of superstitions about the soul. *Here we hit a wall.* Our very thinking itself contains this belief, with all its divisions: substance and its passing features, action and doer, and so on. To give it up would mean we could no longer think at all.

But a belief, however useful it may be for keeping a species alive, has nothing to do with truth. We can see this from the fact that we *must* believe in time, space, and motion, and yet we do not feel forced to treat them as absolutely real.

488.

Where our belief in reason comes from in the mind. The ideas of "reality" and "fixed, unchanging existence" come from our feeling of being a *doer behind actions*.

We understand the "doer behind actions" by looking at ourselves, so that the self, the 'I', can stand as a solid substance, as the cause of action, as the *doer.*

The big assumptions of metaphysics and logic, the belief in substance, in passing features, in qualities, and so on, get their power to convince us from one habit: we see all our actions as the result of our will. In this way, the self, as a solid substance, does not disappear among all the many changes. *But there is no such thing as will.* We have no categories of thought that let us separate "a world of things as they are apart from us" from "the world as it seems." All our *categories of reason* come from the senses. They are conclusions drawn from the world we experience. Look at "the soul" and "the self, the 'I'": the history of these ideas shows that here, too, the oldest distinction still holds, the one between "breath" ("*spiritus*") and "life"....

If there is nothing made of matter, then there can be nothing that is not made of matter either. The idea no longer *means* anything.

There are no "atoms" of selves, no tiny fixed doers. The reach of a doer keeps *growing* or *shrinking* without stopping. The center of the system keeps *shifting*. If the system can no longer organize all the material it has taken in, it splits in two. On the other hand, it can take a weaker doer and, without destroying it, turn it into one of its own servants. To some degree, it can form a new unit together with it. This is not a "substance." It is rather something that, by its very nature, strives to become stronger. It wants to "keep itself alive" only in a roundabout way. What it really wants is to *go beyond* itself.

489.

Everything that reaches our awareness as a single unit is already hugely complicated. All we ever have is the *look of a single unit*.

The *body* is the richer, clearer, and more touchable thing to study. It should be put first, step by step, as our method. And nothing should be said about its final meaning.

490.

Perhaps we do not need to assume there is *just one doer* inside us. It may be just as fair to assume many doers, whose working together and fighting lie underneath our thinking and our awareness in general. Maybe a kind of *aristocracy*, a ruling group, of "cells" holds the power? Of course, an aristocracy of equals, who are used to ruling together and know how to give orders?

My hypotheses. The doer is really many. Pain is a matter of the mind: it depends on judging something harmful, and it is projected outward. The effect is always "unconscious": the cause that we guess and imagine is projected, and it *comes after* the event. Pleasure is a kind of pain. The only kind of power that exists is the same kind as the power of will: giving orders to other doers, which then change themselves. The doer keeps passing away and changing without rest. A "soul that dies." *Number* as a way of seeing from a point of view.

491.

Belief in the body runs deeper than belief in the soul. The belief in the soul came from watching, in an unscientific way, the body's death struggles. (People thought something leaves the body. It came from the belief that *dreams are true*.)

492.

Why should we start from the body and from physiology, the science of how the body works? Because then we get a correct picture of what our "self" really is. It is not a "soul" or a "life-force." It is more like a group of rulers at the head of a community. We also see how these rulers depend on the ones they rule. We see how they depend on a ranking system and on a sharing out of the work, because these are what keep each part, and the whole, alive. We also get a correct picture of how living things keep on being born and dying, and we see that the "self" cannot last forever. We realize that the struggle shows itself in obeying as well as in giving orders. And we realize that the limits of each one's power are always shifting, and that this shifting is part of life. The ruler is kept fairly ignorant of what each member of the community is doing, and even of the troubles going on inside it. This ignorance is also one of the conditions that make governing possible at all. In short, we learn to value even not knowing things. We learn to value seeing things only roughly, as a whole. We learn to value simplifying, making things simpler than they are, and seeing from a point of view. But the most important thing is this: we see the ruler and the ruled as being of the same kind. All of them feel, want, and think. And wherever we see, or suspect, movement in a body, we conclude that there is hidden, invisible life there, made up of many doers working together. Movement is a sign for the eye. It tells us that something has been felt, wanted, or thought.

There is a danger in asking the self directly about the self, and in every kind of looking inward with the mind. The danger is this: it may be that the self can only do its work if it explains itself to itself wrongly. That is why we turn to the body instead, and set aside what our sharpened senses tell us. Or else we try to see whether the many small doers inside us can somehow get in touch with us themselves.

(d) The Biology of the Urge to Know. Seeing from a Point of View.

493.

Truth is the kind of mistake without which a certain kind of living thing could not survive. In the end, what decides everything is its value for life.

494.

Our "knowledge" probably does not reach any further than exactly what we need to stay alive. The study of how living bodies are built shows us something about this. It shows that the senses, the nerves, and the brain grow more developed as finding food becomes harder.

495.

Suppose the moral rule "You must not lie" is proven wrong. Then our feeling for truth will have to defend itself in front of a different court. It will have to show that it is a way of keeping humans alive, that it is a form of the drive for power.

The same goes for our love of beauty. It too is the will to create. These two feelings stand side by side. Our feeling for truth is the tool we use to take power over things and shape them to our own taste. The love of shaping and changing things is a love as old as life itself! We can only really know a world that we ourselves have made.

496.

On the many forms that knowledge can take. Knowing something means tracing how it relates to many other things, or how it relates to things of its kind. So how could "knowledge" ever be knowledge of something completely different? The way we know and investigate is itself one of the conditions of our life. That is why it would be far too

hasty to conclude that there could be no other kind of mind, for us, than the kind that helps us stay alive. The way things actually are now may be only a matter of chance. It may not be essential at all.

The equipment we use to gain knowledge was not built for knowing the truth.

497.

In my view, the "truths" that people trust most strongly as known in advance, before any experience, are really just guesses waiting to be checked further. Take the law of cause and result. It is a belief we have practiced so long and absorbed so completely that if we stopped believing in it, our kind would be ruined. But does that make it true? What a strange conclusion that would be! As if something were proved true just because humans manage to survive by it!

498.

How far is our mind, our intellect, also a product of the conditions we live under? We would not have it if we did not need it. And we would not have it in the form we have it, if we did not need it in exactly the way we need it. In other words, it would be different if we could live in some other way.

499.

At the most basic level, in non-living things, "thinking" means holding on to a fixed shape, the way a crystal keeps its form. In our own thinking, the key thing is fitting new material into old patterns. This is like Procrustes' bed in the Greek myth, where guests were stretched or cut to fit the bed. Our thinking takes in what is unfamiliar and makes it like what we already know.

500.

What our senses pick up gets projected outward, onto the world. So we speak of "inside" and "outside." Is it the body that is giving the orders here?

The same power that makes things equal and puts them in order inside the living cell's basic material also works when we take in the outside world. What our senses report is already the result of this process of adjusting and fitting things together, shaped by everything we have been through in the past. Our sense perceptions do not come straight from the "impression" that hits us.

501.

All thinking, judging, and perceiving can be seen as acts of comparing. [2] And comparing first requires treating things as equal. Even before that comes the act of making things equal. This making equal is the same thing an amoeba does when it takes in food and turns it into part of itself.

"Memory" comes late, at the point where the instinct to make everything equal seems to have been held back, so that differences are kept. Memory is a process of sorting things into groups and placing them side by side. It is active. But who is doing it?

[Translator's note 2: The German word "vergleichen," which means "to compare," contains the root word "gleich," meaning "equal." This link cannot be shown in English.]

502.

When it comes to memory, we have to unlearn a lot. Here we are most tempted to believe in a "soul," something that stands outside time and keeps bringing things back and recognizing them again and

again, and so on. Yet what I have lived through goes on living "in my memory." I have no part in it when a memory "comes." My will does nothing about it, just as with a thought that comes and goes. Something happens, and I become aware of it. Then something similar comes up. Who called it up? Who woke it?

503.

Our whole system for knowing things is a machine for pulling out the general and making things simple. It is not aimed at knowledge. It is aimed at grabbing hold of things and making them our own. Ideas like "goal" and "means" are just as foreign to how this machine really works as "concepts" are. With "goal" and "means" we get a grip on a process. In fact, we invent a process that we are able to grasp. With "concepts," we get a grip on the "things" that make up that process.

504.

Consciousness starts on the outside, as the organizing and noticing of impressions. At first it sits at the point farthest from the living center of the individual. But it is a process that goes deeper. It tends more and more to become an inner function, always moving closer to the center.

505.

Our perceptions, as we understand them, are the total of all the perceptions that it was useful and necessary for us to be aware of. They were useful to us and to the whole chain of living processes that came before us. So they do not include every possible perception. For example, they do not include electrical ones. In other words, we have senses only for a certain selection of perceptions: the ones that matter to us for staying alive. Consciousness reaches only as far as it is

useful. There is no doubt that all our sense perceptions are completely soaked through with judgments of value: useful or harmful, and so pleasant or painful. Every single color, besides being a color, also says something about value to us. We rarely admit this. Or we notice it only after one color has worked on us alone for a long time, as happens with prisoners in jail or with people who are mentally ill. Insects also react differently to different colors. Some like one shade, others like another. Ants are an example of this.

506.

First come images. We would need to explain how images arise in the mind. Then come words, attached to images. Finally come concepts, which are only possible once there are words. A concept gathers several pictures into one whole, which is meant not for the eye but for the ear, as a word. The word stirs up a small amount of feeling. That is, the sight of similar pictures, which share one word, stirs up a little feeling. This simple feeling is what they all have in common, and it is the basis of a concept. The basic fact is that weak feelings are all treated as alike, as the same. So when we notice and pin down these feelings, two closely linked feelings get mixed up. But who is doing the noticing? Belief is the very first step in every sense impression. A kind of saying yes to life is the first act of the mind! It begins with "taking something to be true." So our task would be to explain how this "taking something to be true" came about! What feeling lies underneath the label "true"?

507.

The heart of "truth" is a judgment of value: "I believe that this or that is so." Every judgment of value expresses what we need in order to survive and to grow. All our organs and senses for knowing have developed only with survival and growth in mind. Our trust in reason

and its basic categories, our trust in logical argument, and the high value we place on logic only prove one thing: experience has taught us that these things are useful for life. They do not prove that these things are "true." What every living thing needs in order to live is this: a great deal of belief, the ability to make firm judgments about things, and no doubt at all about the values that really matter. So what is needed is that something be taken as true, not that it actually is true.

"The so-called true world beyond this one, and the world as it seems." I trace this contrast back to how we rank values. We have taken the conditions we need in order to exist and treated them as if they were the features of reality in general. Because we must hold steady in our beliefs in order to thrive, we came up with the idea that the "true" world does not change or develop. We imagined it as a world of fixed, unchanging existence.

(e) Where Reason and Logic Came From

508.

In the beginning, our ideas were in chaos. The ideas that could exist side by side with each other survived. Most of them died out, and they are still dying out.

509.

Logic grew out of a world of desires, with the herd instinct working in the background. The first condition for believing in "similar souls" is assuming that facts are similar. This served the purpose of understanding one another and of ruling.

510.

About where logic comes from. We have a basic tendency to treat different things as the same and to see them as the same. This tendency

gets changed and held in check by thinking about what helps us and what harms us. In other words, it is shaped by what works. It then adjusts itself so that it can be satisfied in a gentler way, without turning against life or putting life in danger. This whole process matches exactly an outer, physical process, which stands as its symbol. That is the way living matter, the protoplasm, keeps taking in whatever it grabs, making it like itself, and arranging it to fit its own shapes and needs.

511.

Sameness and Likeness.

1. The rougher and cruder a sense organ is, the more things it sees as alike.

2. The mind wants likeness. That means it wants to match each new thing it senses with others it has already felt before. It does this just as the body takes in lifeless matter and turns it into part of itself.

How to understand logic:

The urge to see sameness everywhere is the drive for power. When we believe that something is this way or that way, which is the heart of any judgment, that belief comes from an urge that would love to make things as alike as possible.

512.

Logic depends on one condition: it assumes that cases which are exactly the same really exist. In fact, before anyone can think and draw conclusions logically, this condition has to be taken for granted first. In other words, the wish for logical truth can only be fulfilled after we have already assumed a basic making things simpler than they are, applied to everything we experience. So it follows that an instinct is in

charge here, and it can use two tools: first, making things simpler than they are; and second, pushing through its own point of view. Logic does not grow out of an urge to find truth.

513.

The inventive power that came up with our basic categories of thought was working to meet our need for safety and for quick understanding. It did this through signs, sounds, and shortcuts. Words like "substance," "the doer behind actions," "object," "fixed, unchanging existence," and "constant change" are not deep truths about the world. It was the powerful who turned the names of things into law. And among the powerful, it was the greatest artists of abstract thinking who created these categories.

514.

Take a morality. That is, a way of living that long experience and testing have shown to work well. In the end it enters our awareness as a law, as something in charge. Then a whole group of connected values and conditions becomes attached to it. It becomes respected, untouchable, holy, true. A necessary step in its growth is that people forget where it came from. That is a sign that it has taken control. Exactly the same thing might have happened with the categories of reason. After a lot of feeling around in the dark and many trials, they may have proved true simply because they were fairly useful. Then a point was reached where people grasped them as a whole, and they spoke to the mind as a whole. Belief in them was ordered. In other words, they acted as if they were giving orders. From then on, they were treated as coming before experience, as being beyond experience, as impossible to disprove. And maybe they were nothing more than the expression of a certain practical usefulness that served the

goals of one race and one species. Their usefulness alone is their "truth."

515.

The goal is not "to know." The goal is to sort things into patterns, to force as much order and shape onto chaos as our practical needs demand. When reason, logic, and the categories were formed, the deciding force was a need inside us. It was not a need "to know." It was a need to sort and to pattern things so that we could understand them and calculate with them. (Adjusting and interpreting everything that is similar or the same is the very same process that every sense impression goes through. That is how reason develops!) No "idea" that existed beforehand had anything to do with it. What mattered was usefulness. Usefulness teaches us that we can only count on things and handle them when we look at them roughly as the same. The sense of purpose we find in reason is a result, not a cause. Life goes downhill with every other kind of reason, even though people keep trying to reach those other kinds. That is because life would then become too murky and too uneven.

The categories are "truths" only in the sense that they are conditions we need in order to exist. In the same way, Euclid's idea of space is a "truth" only under certain conditions. (Just between us: since no one will claim that humans absolutely have to exist, reason and Euclid's space both turn out to be just a quirk of one particular kind of animal, one quirk among many others.)

What stops us from contradicting ourselves here is a pressure from inside us, a biological pressure. The instinct that makes us see how useful it is to reason the way we do is in our blood. We almost are this instinct. But how naive it is to try to conclude from this that we

own an absolute truth! Being unable to contradict something proves weakness, not "truth."

516.

We cannot say yes and no to one and the same thing. That is a rule we find in our own personal experience. It is not "necessary" at all. It only shows that we are unable to do otherwise.

Aristotle says the rule against contradiction is the most certain of all rules. If it truly is the most basic of all, and the foundation of every proof, and if every other basic rule is contained within it, then we should examine it all the more strictly, to find out how many assumptions are already hidden at its root. There are two possibilities. Either it assumes something about reality and fixed, unchanging existence, as though we had learned about these somewhere else, meaning it would be impossible to give them opposite qualities. Or the rule means that we should not give them opposite qualities. In that case, logic would be a command. It would not be aimed at knowing the truth. It would be aimed at adjusting and pinning down a world that has to seem true to us.

In short, the question is open to debate. Do the basic rules of logic match reality? Or are they the measuring tools and methods that are the only way we can create realities, or even the idea of "reality"? To claim the first answer, though, we would need, as we have seen, to already know fixed, unchanging existence beforehand. And we certainly do not. So the rule gives us no test for truth. Instead, it gives us a command about what should count as true.

Every rule of logic, and of math too, takes for granted that a thing called A is always exactly the same as itself. But suppose there is no such thing. Suppose A is itself only an appearance. Then logic would rest, from the very start, on nothing more than the world as it seems.

In fact, we do believe that A stays the same as itself. We believe it because of endless everyday experience, which seems to prove it to us every single minute. What really lies underneath A is the "thing." Our belief in things is the first condition for our trust in logic. The A of logic, like the atom, is a copy we built of the idea of a thing. People don't understand this. Instead, they turn logic into a test for what really exists. And by doing that, we are already on the way to treating a whole list of made-up ideas as real: substance, quality, object, the doer behind actions, action, and so on. In other words, we end up imagining a world beyond physics, a so-called true world beyond this one. But that, once again, is just the world as it seems.

Take the most basic acts of thinking: saying yes and saying no, calling something true and calling something false. These acts are more than mere habit. They also assume that we have the right to call anything true or false at all. And so, from the start, they are ruled by a belief: the belief that we really can know things, and that our judgments can really hit on the truth. In short, logic never doubts that it can say something about truth itself. That is, it never doubts that if a thing is truly something, then it cannot also have opposite qualities.

Behind this belief sits a crude prejudice that comes from our senses. It is the idea that our feelings and sensations teach us truths about things. For example, the idea that I can't say of one and the same thing, at the same moment, that it is both hard and soft. (The gut-level proof people give, "I can't feel two opposite sensations at once," is very crude, and it is false.)

Why are we forbidden to have any contradiction in our concepts? Because we believe we are able to form concepts, and that a concept doesn't just describe a thing but actually captures what the thing really is. In truth, logic, like geometry and arithmetic, only works for made-up things that we ourselves have created and assumed to exist.

Logic is our attempt to understand the real world using a plan of fixed, unchanging existence that we invented ourselves. Or, to put it more exactly, it is our attempt to make the real world easier to count, measure and put into formulas, so that it serves our own purposes.

517.

To think and to draw conclusions, we have to accept that some things exist and stay put. Logic only deals with formulas for things that stay constant. That is exactly why accepting this proves nothing at all about what is real. "What is" is just part of the way we look at things, like a lens we see through. Think of how we treat the self, the 'I': we see it as fixed, unchanging existence, untouched by constant change or by development.

We need this imagined world of the doer behind actions, of substance, of reason, and so on. There is a power inside us that adjusts things, simplifies them, makes things simpler than they are, and cuts them apart artificially. What we call "truth" is the urge to take control of the many, many sensations that reach our mind. It is the urge to sort what we see into clear, fixed categories. And so we begin by believing that things have a "true nature." In other words, we treat what appears to us as if it were real.

A world caught up in constant change cannot be put into formulas. By the standards of logic it is "false," and it "contradicts itself." Knowledge and the process of development shut each other out. So knowledge must be something different. Before it can exist, there must first be an urge to make things knowable. Some kind of constant change must itself create the illusion of fixed, unchanging existence.

518.

Suppose our self, the 'I', is the only kind of fixed, unchanging existence we have, and we use it as the model for making and understanding everything else that exists. Very well! In that case it would be quite right to ask whether an illusion of point of view is at work here. It's like how things far away on the horizon look like one single line, though they aren't. If we take the body as our guide instead, we face a huge and staggering variety of parts. So, as a matter of method, it is fair to use the richer thing, the one that is easier to study, as a key to understanding the poorer thing.

Finally: if we accept that everything is constant change, then knowledge is only possible if it rests on a belief in fixed, unchanging existence.

519.

Suppose there is "only one kind of fixed existence, the self, the 'I'," and every other kind of existence is made in its likeness. Suppose, in short, that belief in the self, along with belief in logic, stands or falls with whether the categories of reason are truly, deeply real. And suppose, on top of that, it turns out that the self is itself something that keeps changing and developing. Then....

520.

Things are always shifting from one into another, and this makes it impossible to talk about "the individual" and such things. Even the "number" of beings keeps changing. We would know nothing about time or movement if we didn't roughly believe that we see things "standing still" behind or in front of the things that move. In the same way, we would know just as little about cause and result. And without the mistaken idea of "empty space," we would never have come up

with the idea of space at all. The rule that a thing is the same as itself rests on how things appear: that some things look alike. Strictly speaking, a world that keeps developing cannot be "understood" or "known." What we call "knowledge" exists only because the mind that "understands" and "knows" already finds a rough, adjusted world ready for it. That world is built out of a crowd of mere appearances. These appearances became fixed only to the degree that they helped keep life going. Only to that degree is "knowledge" possible. In other words, knowledge is just measuring older mistakes and newer mistakes against each other.

521.

About the way logic makes things look. The idea of an "individual" and the idea of a "species" are both false. They only seem true. "Species" only means that a great many similar creatures appear at the same time, and that for a long time their further growth and change has slowed down so much that we can hardly notice it. So the real, small changes and the growth that do happen don't seem to count at all. This is a stage of development where the developing itself can't be seen. Because of that, not only does it look as if a balance has been reached, but the way is also opened for a mistake: the idea that a real goal has been reached, and that development had a goal all along.

A form seems to be something lasting, and so something valuable. But we ourselves invented the idea of form. And no matter how often people say "the same form has been reached," that doesn't mean it really is the same form, because something new always shows up. It is only we, the ones doing the comparing, who count the new thing together with the old one, to the extent that it looks like the old one. Then we join the two together into a single "form." It is as if a set type had to be reached, and as if the processes that shape things were actually aiming at it.

Form, species, law, idea, purpose: with all of these ideas we make the same mistake. We treat a made-up story as if it were something real. It is as if every event in the world were filled with some kind of obedient spirit that follows orders. Here we draw a fake line between the thing that acts and the thing that guides the action. But both of these are only set up so that they fit our deep-rooted beliefs about logic and what lies behind the world. They are not facts.

Inside us there is a pressure, a need, to imagine ideas, species, forms, purposes, and laws, that is, "a world where the same cases repeat." We should not explain this pressure as if it meant we could build a so-called true world beyond this one. Instead, we should see it as a pressure to shape a world in a way that keeps us alive. By doing this, we make a world that is, for us, easy to pin down, simplified, understandable, and so on.

This very same pressure is at work in how our senses function, and our senses support our reasoning. They do this by simplifying things, making them rougher, highlighting some parts, and interpreting them. All "recognizing" depends on this, and so does our whole ability to make ourselves understood. Our needs have made our senses so exact that "the same world as it seems" keeps coming back again and again. Because of that, it has taken on the look of being real.

We feel forced, from within, to believe in logic. But this only shows one thing: long before we were ever aware of logic, we were already doing nothing but putting its basic rules into the nature of things. Now we find those rules all around us. We can't help it anymore. And now we would gladly believe that this pressure proves something is "true." It was we who created the "thing," the "same thing," the doer behind actions, the quality, the action, the object, the substance, and the form. We did this after we had gone as far as we could in treating different things as the same, roughing them up, and simplifying them.

The world seems logical to us because we have already made it logical.

522.

Basic answer. We believe in reason. But this is a philosophy of dull, lifeless ideas. Language itself is built on the most childish, simple-minded assumptions.

So now we see conflicts and problems inside things, because we can only think in the shape of language. We also believe in the "eternal truth" of so-called "wisdom," for example the idea of a doer behind actions, a quality, and so on.

If we refuse to think under the control of language, we simply stop thinking. The most we can do is reach a state of doubt about whether this limit really is a limit.

Thinking with reason is a way of interpreting things according to a pattern that we are unable to throw away.

(f) Consciousness

523.

There is no bigger mistake than treating mental events and physical events as two sides, two outward forms, of one and the same underlying substance. This explains nothing at all. The idea of "substance" is completely useless for explaining anything. Consciousness, our awareness, can be seen as something secondary, almost unimportant and unnecessary. It is probably bound to disappear one day and be replaced by complete automatic action.

When we look at what goes on in our minds, we are like deaf people who cannot speak, who guess the spoken words they cannot hear by watching the speaker's lips move. From what the inner mind looks

like on the surface, we draw conclusions about other things that we cannot see. We could actually check those things if our powers of observation were good enough.

We have no sharper tools for seeing this inner world. That is why something a thousand times complicated reaches our awareness as one simple thing. Then we invent a chain of causes inside it, even though we cannot see any cause for the movement or the change. The order in which thoughts and feelings follow one another is nothing more than the order in which they become visible to our awareness. There is no good reason to believe that this order has anything to do with a chain of causes. Our awareness never shows us a single example of cause and result.

524.

The role that "consciousness" plays. It is very important not to misunderstand the role that consciousness plays. Consciousness is our link to the outer world, and it was the outer world that made it develop. On the other hand, the real steering inside us does not show up in our consciousness. By steering I mean the care and caution that look after how the body's functions work together. Nor does the mind's work of storing things away show up in our consciousness. There can be no doubt that some higher controlling force is at work in all this. It is a sort of steering committee, where our various leading desires cast their votes and make their power felt. "Pleasure" and "pain" are signals that reach us from this hidden area. So are acts of will, and so are ideas.

In short: whatever becomes conscious is linked to causes that are completely and totally hidden from our knowledge. Thoughts, feelings, and ideas follow one another in our consciousness, but that does not mean the order they come in is an order of cause and result. Still,

sun | *Intelligent Audio*



sunapp.ai/download

it very strongly looks that way. We have built our whole idea of intellect, reason, logic, and so on, on this thing that only looks true. In fact, none of these things exist; they are imagined combinations and imagined things. And then we pushed these imagined things into all things, and even behind all things!

Usually consciousness itself is thought of as the place where all our senses meet and as the highest ruling center. But really it is only a means of communication. It grew out of dealings with others and the world, and it grew to serve the needs of those dealings. Here "dealings" means "relation." It is meant to include the way the outer world acts on us, the way we must respond to it, and also the way we actually affect the outer world. Consciousness is not the force that steers us. It is only a tool of that force.

525.

Here is my principle, squeezed into a formula that smells of the ancient world, of Christianity, of medieval school philosophy, and of other such heavy perfumes: in the idea "God is spirit," God as perfection is "denied..."

526.

Whenever people have noticed some kind of unity in the way things are arranged, they have always thought that spirit, or mind, was the cause of this order. But there are no reasons at all for this guess. Why should the idea of a complicated fact be one of the conditions for that fact to happen? Or why should the thought of a complicated fact have to come before it, as its cause?

We must be careful not to explain purpose and design in nature by pointing to the mind. There is no reason at all to give the mind some special power to organize and arrange things. The nervous system

covers a much larger area, and consciousness is just added on top of it. In the whole shared process of adapting and organizing, consciousness plays no part at all.

527.

Scientists who study the body, like philosophers, believe that consciousness becomes more valuable the clearer it gets. They think the clearest consciousness and the most logical, coldest thinking are of the highest rank. But by what measure is this value decided? When it comes to putting willpower into action, the most surface-level and simplest thought is the most useful. So it might be, and so on and so on (because such a thought leaves few other motives behind to get in the way).

Being exact and sure in action stands against the far-seeing and often unsure judgments of caution. Caution is guided by the deeper instinct.

528.

The main mistake of psychologists is this: they think an unclear idea is of a lower kind than a clear one. But something that stays far away from our consciousness, and is therefore dim to us, may for that very reason be perfectly clear in itself. Whether a thing looks dim depends on the angle from which consciousness sees it.

529.

The great misunderstandings:

(1) The foolish overrating of consciousness, raising it up into a real thing of its own: "a spirit," "a soul," something that feels, thinks, and wants;

(2) The mind seen as a cause, especially wherever purpose, order, and arrangement show up;

(3) Consciousness ranked as the highest form anything can reach, as the very best kind of being, as "God";

(4) A will brought in to explain things wherever results are seen;

(5) The so-called true world beyond this one seen as the spiritual world, which we can reach through the facts of consciousness;

(6) Perfect knowledge seen as the power of consciousness, wherever knowledge exists at all.

What follows from this:

Every step forward is a step forward in consciousness. Every step backward is a step into unconsciousness. (Unconsciousness was seen as falling back on the passions and the senses, as a state of being like an animal...)

People come closer to reality and true existence through step-by-step reasoning and argument. People move away from them through instincts, senses, and automatic behavior...

To turn a human being into pure spirit would mean making a god out of him: spirit, will, goodness are all one and the same.

All goodness must have its roots in the life of the mind and must be a fact of consciousness.

Every step toward something better can only be a step forward in consciousness.

(g) Judgment. True and false.

530.

Kant was ruled, guided, and steered by his religious leanings, by beliefs he held without noticing, and by his moral way of seeing things.

The first big mistake, the false starting point, is this: how is the fact of knowledge possible? Is knowledge even a fact at all? What is knowledge? If we do not know what knowledge is, we cannot possibly answer the question, "Is there such a thing as knowledge?" Very nice! But if I do not already "know" whether there is, or can be, such a thing as knowledge, then I cannot sensibly ask the question, "What is knowledge?" Kant believes in the fact of knowledge. What he asks for is something quite naive: knowledge about knowledge!

"Knowledge is judgment." But a judgment is a belief that something is this way or that way! It is not knowledge! "All knowledge is made up of judgments that join ideas together." These judgments are said to be true everywhere: the fact is like this in every case and never changes. And they are said to be necessary: we cannot even imagine the opposite being true.

People always assume that belief in knowledge is valid. They also assume that the feelings our conscience tells us to have are valid. Here the ruling bias is a moral view of what really exists.

So the conclusion goes like this: (1) there are statements that we believe are true everywhere and necessary.

(2) This quality of being true everywhere and necessary cannot come from experience.

(3) So it must rest on no experience at all, but on something else. It must come from some other source of knowledge!

Kant concludes: (1) that there are some statements that hold true only under one condition; (2) this condition is that they do not come from experience, but from pure reason.

So the question is: where do we get our reasons for believing that such statements are true? No, the real question is: what causes our belief? But where a belief comes from, where a strong conviction comes from, is a question about the mind. And very small, narrow experience often produces exactly such a belief! This way of thinking already takes for granted that there is not only knowledge that comes after experience, "data a posteriori," but also knowledge that comes before it, "data a priori" — that is, "prior to experience." Truth that is necessary and holds everywhere cannot come from experience. So is it really so obvious that it must have reached us without any experience at all?

There is no such thing as a judgment that stands alone!

A judgment on its own is never "true." It is never knowledge. Only when it is linked to many other judgments, and fits together with them, do we get any guarantee that it is true.

What is the difference between a true belief and a false one? What is knowledge? He "knows" it — how heavenly! Truth that is necessary and holds everywhere cannot come from experience! So it must be independent of experience, of all experience! A view that comes completely a priori, before and apart from all experience, simply out of reason — that is "pure knowledge"!

"The basic rules of logic — the rule that a thing is the same as itself, and the rule that something cannot both be and not be — are examples of pure knowledge, because they come before all experience." But these rules are not knowledge at all. They are articles of faith that we use to guide and order our thinking.

To prove that the basic truths of mathematics come before experience — that they come from pure reason alone — space has to be thought of as a form that belongs to pure reason itself.

Hume had said that there are no judgments that both add new knowledge and come before experience. Kant says there are — the ones in mathematics! And if there are such judgments, then maybe there can also be metaphysics, a knowledge of the deepest nature of things, reached through pure reason alone!

Mathematics is possible under conditions that metaphysics is not allowed to have. All human knowledge is either experience or mathematics.

A judgment is called "synthetic" when it brings different ideas together and links them. It is called "a priori" when this linking is true everywhere and necessarily, and when we reach it not through the senses but through pure reason.

If there really are judgments that come before experience, then reason must be able to link things together. And linking things together is a form, a shape we give to things. So reason must have a power to give shape.

531.

Judging is our oldest faith. It is our habit of believing that this is true or that is false, of saying yes or no, our certainty that something is this way and not some other way, our belief that we really "know." So what is it that we believe to be true in every judgment?

What are qualities, the properties we say things have? We did not see the changes happening inside us simply as changes. Instead we treated them as "things as they are apart from us," things foreign to us that we merely "notice." We did not count them as appearances, but as

fixed, unchanging existence, as "qualities." And on top of that, we made up a creature for these qualities to belong to. In other words, we turned the result into the cause that does the work, and then we turned that cause into fixed, unchanging existence. But even in this simple account, the idea of a "result" is made up. Take the changes that happen inside us which we are sure we did not cause ourselves. We still argue that they must be results of something. This follows the belief that "every change must have someone who made it." But that belief is already a myth, because it splits the doer off from the doing. When I say "the lightning flashes," I count the flash twice: once as an action, and a second time as a doer that performs the action. So we invent a thing and stick it onto an event. This thing is not the same as the event; it is something stable, something that just is, and does not "happen." To make the event into the cause that does the work, and to make the result into a thing — into fixed, unchanging existence: that is the double mistake, or double interpretation, that we are guilty of.

532.

A judgment is a belief that says: "This and this is so." So every judgment admits that we have come across a case that is "the same" as another one. That means it takes some kind of comparison for granted, made with the help of memory. The judgment does not create the idea that a same case seems to be there. Rather, it believes it actually sees such a case. It works on the assumption that there really are cases that are the same. But what do we call that much older activity, which must have been at work much earlier, and which takes cases that are different and makes them alike? What do we call the second activity, built on top of the first one, and so on? "Whatever gives us the same sensations as another thing is equal to that thing" — but what do we call the thing that makes sensations equal, that treats

them as equal? There could be no judgments at all unless some kind of process of making things equal were at work inside all our sensations. Memory is only possible because everything we have already lived through and learned gets underlined, marked and reinforced. Before a judgment can be made, the process of absorbing and matching things must already be finished. So even here we can see a mental activity that does not come into our awareness at all in the way that the pain of a wound does. Most likely, the events of the mind match all the functions of a living body — that is, they consist of taking in, pushing out, growing, and so on.

The key thing is to start from the body and use it as our main guide. The body is by far the richer thing to study, and it can be observed much more exactly. Belief in the body rests on much firmer ground than belief in the spirit.

"No matter how strongly something is believed, how strongly it is believed does not prove that it is true." But what is truth? Maybe truth is a kind of faith that has become something we need in order to live? If so, then strength of belief would certainly be a test of truth — for example, when it comes to our belief in cause and result.

533.

Logical exactness and clearness are treated as the test of truth. As Descartes put it in Latin: "Everything is true that is seen clearly and distinctly." In this way, the idea that the world works like a machine becomes attractive and believable.

But this is a crude muddle, like the old Latin saying "simplicity is the mark of truth." How do we know that the real nature of things relates to our mind in this particular way? Couldn't it be different? Couldn't it be that the theory which gives our mind the strongest feeling of power and safety is the one we prefer, the one we value, and the one

we label as true? The mind takes its own freest and strongest power and skill and makes it the measure of what is most valuable — and so, of what is true....

From the point of view of feeling, "true" means whatever stirs up the most feeling in us, in the self, the 'I';

from the point of view of thinking, "true" means whatever gives thinking the strongest feeling of strength;

from the point of view of touch, sight, and hearing, "true" means whatever pushes back against us the hardest.

So it is the *highest levels of activity* that make us believe in the *object*, in its "reality." The feelings of strength, struggle and resistance convince the doer behind actions that there really is something out there that is being pushed against.

534.

The test of whether something is true lies in whether it makes the feeling of power grow stronger.

535.

The way I see it, "truth" does not have to mean the opposite of error. In the most basic cases, it simply means how different errors stand in relation to each other. One error might be older and deeper than another, maybe impossible to ever root out, an error that living creatures like us could not survive without. Other errors might not rule over us that strongly as things we need in order to live. When we measure them against those other "tyrants," those weaker errors could even be put aside and "proved wrong." But why should an idea that cannot be disproved have to be "true"? This question may infuriate the logicians, who set limits on *things* based on the limits they find in

themselves. But I declared war on this hopeful faith of the logicians a long time ago.

536.

Everything simple is simply made up in our minds, but it is not "true." What is real and true, though, is neither one single thing nor something that can be boiled down to one single thing.

537.

What is truth? It is laziness of the mind. It is *that* guess which makes us feel satisfied, the one that costs the least mental effort, and so on.

538.

First point. The *easier* way of thinking always wins over the harder way. Put as a rule people repeat without question, it goes: "Simplicity is the stamp of truth." *I say*: to think that being *clear* proves something is true is pure childishness. . . .

Second point. The teaching of fixed, unchanging existence, of things, and of all those things that stay the same, is a *hundred times easier* than the teaching of *constant change* and of development over time. . .

Third point. Logic was meant to be a way of making thinking *easier*: a *way of expressing things*, not truth itself. . . . Later on it started to *behave* as if it were truth. . . .

539.

The ancient Greek thinker Parmenides said: "You cannot form an idea of something that does not exist." We stand at the opposite end and say: "Anything we can form an idea of is surely made up."

540.

There are many kinds of eyes. Even the Sphinx has eyes. So there must be many kinds of "truths," and that means there can be no single truth.

541.

Signs to hang over the entrance of a modern madhouse.

"Whatever must be true in thinking must also be true in morality." These are the words of HERBERT SPENCER.

"The final test of whether a statement is true is that we cannot even imagine its opposite." These are also the words of HERBERT SPENCER.

542.

What if existence itself were, by its nature, false? And that could be possible. Then what would truth be, all of our truth? ... A careless making things simpler than they are, done to what is already false? An even higher level of falseness? ...

543.

In a world that was false at its core, being truthful would be a *tendency that goes against nature*. Its only purpose would be to offer a way of reaching an *even higher level of falseness*. To fake a world of truth and of fixed, unchanging existence, you would first have to create the truthful person (and of course he would have to believe that he himself is "truthful").

Such a person is simple, see-through, never in conflict with himself, lasting, always the same to himself, free from flaws, sudden changes,

pretending, and outward show. A man like this imagines a world of fixed, unchanging existence and calls it "*God*," made in his own image.

For truthfulness to be possible, the whole world a person moves in has to be very neat, small and respectable. The truthful person must have the advantage in every way. Lies, tricks and pretending would have to come as a shock.

544.

"*Pretending*" grows the higher you climb in the ranking of people by worth, and of all living beings. In the non-living world it seems to be completely missing. There, force simply clashes against force in a crude way. *Trickery* begins in the world of living things, and plants are already experts at it. The greatest men, like Caesar and Napoleon (see Stendhal's remark about Napoleon),[3] and also the higher peoples (the Italians), and the Greeks (think of the crafty Odysseus): the very highest cunning belongs to the very *heart* of what lifts humans higher. ... The problem of the actor. My wild, life-loving (like the god Dionysus) ideal.... The way all the body's functions see things, the way all the strongest life instincts see things: the power that *wants* error in all of life, error as the very first rule of thinking itself. Before "thinking" can happen, "imagination" must first have done its job. *Picturing* cases as being the same, the *appearance* of sameness, is older and more basic than actually knowing that things are the same.

[Footnote 3: The mention of Stendhal here seems to point to a passage in his *Life of Napoleon* (Preface, page xv), which Nietzsche had noted down somewhere else. In French it says: "One belief I hold almost by instinct is that every powerful man lies when he speaks, and even more so when he writes."]

(h) Against the Idea of Cause

545.

I believe in absolute space as the ground on which force rests, and I believe force is limited and has a shape. Time I believe is eternal. But space and time as things as they are apart from us do not exist. "Changes" are only appearances, or simply processes of our senses as they seem to us. If we notice that changes repeat, however regularly, that proves nothing except that it has always happened that way. The feeling that "it came after this, so it was caused by this" is easy to explain as a misunderstanding; we can see why people fall for it. But appearances cannot be "causes"!

546.

When we explain something that happens *either* as an action *or* as someone putting up with an action (meaning that every action also involves someone being on the receiving end of it), it comes down to this: every change, every difference, assumes that there is a doer and someone being acted on, someone *who* gets "changed."

547.

Here is the history, in the mind, of the idea of the doer behind actions. The body, the thing, the "whole" that the eye sees, gives rise to the thought of separating an action from a doer. The idea that the doer causes the action was polished again and again, and in the end what was left over was the "doer behind actions."

548.

We have a silly habit of treating a simple memory aid or shorthand label as if it were a real, separate being, and in the end as a *cause*. For example, we say of lightning that "it flashes," as if the lightning were something apart from the flash. Even the little word "I" works this

way. It is a kind of double vision in seeing, which turns seeing into the *cause of seeing itself*. That was the trick behind inventing the "doer behind actions," the self, the 'I'.

549.

"Doer," "object," "quality": these distinctions were *invented*, and now they are used like ready-made patterns laid over every fact as it appears to us. The basic mistake in what we observe is this: I believe that it is I who does something, I who suffers something, I who "owns" something, I who "has" a quality.

550.

Every judgment we make carries the whole belief in a doer, a quality, or cause and result. This takes the form of assuming that every result comes from some activity, and that all activity needs a doer. And even this last belief is only one example of the first. So the belief that stays the most basic of all is this: there really are such things as doers behind actions, and everything that happens is linked, as a quality, to some kind of doer.

I notice something, and I try to find the reason for it. In the beginning, this meant: I look for an intention behind it. Above all, I look for someone who has an intention—a doer behind actions, a doer. Every event is treated as an action. In earlier times, people saw intentions behind every single event. This is our oldest habit. Do animals have this habit too? As a living creature, isn't an animal also forced to explain things by comparing them to itself? The question "why?" is always a question about the final purpose, the "causa finalis," the overall "purpose" of things. We have no real sense of the "cause that makes things happen." On this point the philosopher Hume is quite right: habit (and not just the habit of one single person) lets us expect

that one process, which we have often seen, will follow another one—but nothing more than that! What gives us such an extremely firm belief in cause and result is not the simple habit of watching one process follow another. It is our inability to explain an event in any way other than as the result of a plan. It is the belief that living, thinking beings are the only things that cause anything. It is the belief in will, in planning—the belief that all events are actions, and that every action needs a doer. It is the belief in the doer behind actions. Isn't this belief in the ideas of "subject" and "object" complete nonsense?

Question: Is the plan the cause of an event? Or is that an illusion too? Isn't the plan just part of the event itself?

551.

A criticism of the idea of "cause." We have no experience at all of a cause. Looking at it from the point of view of the mind, we get the whole idea from our personal feeling that we ourselves are causes—that is, that we make our arm move.... But that is a mistake. We separate ourselves, the doers, from the action, and we use this pattern everywhere: we try to find a doer behind every event. What have we done? We have misunderstood a feeling of power, of tension, of pushing against something—a feeling in our muscles, which is already the start of the action—and we have set it up as a cause. Or we have taken the wish to do this or that as a cause, simply because the action comes after it. There is no such thing as a "cause." In the few cases where a cause seemed to be there, and where we projected it out of ourselves in order to understand an event, it has turned out to be an illusion. Our way of understanding an event was to invent a doer who was responsible for something happening and for the way it happened. Into our idea of "cause" we have packed our feeling of will, our feeling of "freedom," our feeling of responsibility, and our plan to

do an action. The "cause that makes things happen" and the "cause that is the purpose"—the causa efficiens and the causa finalis—are at bottom the same thing.

We believed we had explained a result when we could point to some earlier state that already contained it. In fact, we invent all causes by copying the pattern of the result, because the result is what we actually know.... On the other hand, we cannot say about any particular thing how it will "act." The thing, the doer, the will, the plan—all of these are packed into the idea of "cause." We try to discover "things" in order to explain why something has changed. Even the "atom" is one of these made-up inventions, just like the "thing" and the "original doer."...

At last we understand that things—and so also atoms—cause nothing, because they do not exist. And we understand that the idea of cause and result is completely useless. Just because states follow one another in a necessary order, it does not follow that one causes the next. (That would be like carrying their active force over from step 1 to step 2, to 3, to 4, to 5.) There is no such thing as a cause or a result. Because of the way our language works, we don't know how to get rid of these words. But that doesn't matter. If I picture a muscle cut off from its "effects," from what it does, then I have denied that the muscle exists at all....

In short: an event is neither caused by something nor able to cause anything. A "cause" is an imagined power to make something happen, which we add on, in our fantasy, to what happens....

Explaining things by cause and result is an illusion.... A "thing" is the total of its effects, bundled together into one by an idea, a mental picture. In fact, science has stripped the idea of cause and result of all its meaning. It has kept it only as a figure of speech, a handy formula, and this has made it unimportant whether you put the cause on this

side or that side. What science claims is that, between two complicated states (two centres of force), the amount of energy stays the same.

We can predict an event not because a rule is followed, or a necessity is obeyed, or because we have projected a law of cause and result into every event. We can predict it because "identical cases" come back again and again.

There is no such thing as a built-in sense of cause and result, as the philosopher Kant wants us to believe. We are shocked, we feel unsafe, and we want something familiar, something we can rely on.... As soon as someone shows us that there is something old inside a new thing, we calm down. The so-called instinct for causes is nothing more than fear of the unfamiliar, and an attempt to find something in it that we already know. It is not a search for causes, but a search for the familiar.

552.

Fighting against determinism and the belief in built-in purposes. Something may happen regularly, and we may be able to count on it happening. But that does not mean it happens because it must. Suppose a certain amount of force acts in the same way every single time. That does not prove that it has "no free will." "Mechanical necessity," the idea that things are forced to happen like a machine, is not a proven fact. It was we who first read it into everything that happens. We found that we could describe events with formulas, and we took this to mean that necessary laws rule over all that exists. But just because I do a certain thing, it does not follow that I am forced to do it. No one can show that there is any force making things happen. All that a rule proves is this: one and the same event is not some other event. Because we imagined that there are doers behind actions inside

things, "doers," we came up with the idea that every event is the result of a force pushing on the doer behind actions. Pushed by whom? Once again, by a "doer." The idea of "cause and result" is a dangerous one, as long as people believe in something that causes and something that is caused.

(a) Necessity is not a proven fact. It is only a way of explaining things.

***

(b) Once we understand that the "doer behind actions" does not really act, and is only something we imagine, a great deal follows from that.

We took the doer behind actions as our model, and only then did we invent the idea of "things." We then read that idea into the wild jumble of our sensations. If we stop believing in a doer who acts, then other beliefs fall to pieces too: the belief in things that act, in things acting on each other, and in cause and result between the events we call things.

If that happens, the world of acting atoms also disappears. That world is always assumed to exist only because we have already decided in advance that there must be doers behind actions.

In the end, of course, "a thing as it is apart from us" also disappears. Deep down, that idea is just the idea of a "doer as it is apart from us." But we have seen that the doer behind actions is something imaginary. So the contrast between "a thing as it is apart from us" and "appearance" cannot hold up. And because of this, the idea of "appearance" also disappears.

***

(c) If we give up the idea of a doer who acts, we also give up the idea of an object that is acted upon. Lasting over time, staying the same as itself, fixed, unchanging existence: none of these truly belong either to

what we call the doer or to what we call the object. Both are complicated events. Compared with other events, they only seem to last. We can tell them apart, for example, by the different speeds at which they happen. Think of pairs like rest and movement, or fixed and loose. These opposites do not really exist on their own. They only express differences of degree, of more or less. Still, from a certain narrow point of view, they look like true opposites. In fact, there are no true opposites. We get our idea of opposites from logic, and starting from logic's point of view, we spread this mistake over everything.

***

(d) If we give up the ideas of "doer" and "object," then we must also give up the idea of "substance," the solid stuff things are supposed to be made of. And so we must give up its various forms too, for example "matter," "spirit," and other made-up things, along with "the eternity and unchangeableness of matter," and so on. Then we are free of the idea of material stuff altogether.

***

Judged by morality, the world is false. But morality itself is part of this world, so morality is false too. The urge to find truth is really a process of making things firm. It is a process of making things true and lasting, of wiping out their false character completely, of turning it into fixed, unchanging existence. So "truth" is not something already there, waiting to be found and discovered. It is something that has to be created. It is the name we give to a process, or better still, to the will to overpower, which in itself has no goal. Bringing in truth is an endless process, an active act of shaping and deciding. It is not a matter of becoming aware of something that is already fixed and settled on its own. "Truth" is just another word for "the drive for power."

Life rests on the assumption that we can believe in things that are stable and that come back regularly. The more powerful a life is, the bigger its world of knowledge has to be, and the bigger the world it calls fixed and real. Making things logical, reasonable and orderly helps us survive. These are tools for staying alive.

Human beings throw their instinct for truth, their "goal," out beyond themselves, to some extent. They picture it as a higher world of fixed, unchanging existence, as "a thing as it is apart from us," as a world already there and ready. Because people need to create, they invent the world they work in ahead of time. They imagine it in advance. And this imagining in advance, this faith in truth, is what holds them up.

***

All events, all movement, all constant change, seen as the setting up of relations of degree and of strength, as a struggle....

***

Suppose we imagine that someone is to blame for the fact that we are the way we are, and so on, whether God or Nature. Suppose we credit that someone with our existence, our happiness, our misery, our fate. As soon as we do that, we spoil, for ourselves, the world's freedom from guilt. We then have someone who wants to reach some goal by using us and through us.

***

The "good of the individual" is just as imaginary as the "good of the species." The individual is not sacrificed for the species. Seen from far away, the species is just as changing and fluid as the individual. "Keeping the species alive" is only a result of the species growing. In other words, it is a result of the species going beyond itself on the way to a stronger kind.

***

Main points: Things in nature seem to be cleverly fitted to their purposes, "fitted far better than anything human skill could make." But this seeming fit is only the result of the drive for power, which shows itself in everything that happens. Becoming stronger involves putting things in order, and this ordering can easily be mistaken for an effort to fit means to purposes. The purposes we seem to see were never intended. What happens is this: a stronger power wins out over a weaker one, and the weaker one starts working as a part of the stronger. Then a ranking is set up, an organization. And that organization is bound to make us think there is a plan of means and purposes.

Against the seeming "necessity":

This is only a way of saying that a certain power is not also something else.

Against the seeming fit of means to purposes:

This seeming fit is only a way of expressing the order among different areas of power and how they act on one another.

(i) A Thing as It Is Apart from Us, and Appearance

553.

The ugly flaw in Kant's critical philosophy has finally become clear, even to people who notice very little. Kant had no right to split the world into "the world as it seems" and "a thing as it is apart from us." In his own writings he had already taken away his right to make this old, worn-out distinction. Why? Because he had said it was not allowed to start from an appearance and draw conclusions about what caused it. He said this because of his idea of cause and result, which he thought only worked inside the world of appearances. And yet, at the same time, this very idea already assumes that distinction

between appearance and the thing as it is apart from us. It acts as if "a thing as it is apart from us" were not just guessed at, but actually handed to us.

554.

It is clear that neither things as they are apart from us nor appearances can be linked to each other as cause and result. From this it follows that the idea of "cause and result" cannot be used in a philosophy that believes in things as they are apart from us and in appearances. Kant's mistake... In fact, if we look at it from the point of view of psychology, the idea of "cause and result" comes from a certain way of thinking. This way of thinking believes it sees one will acting on another will everywhere. It believes only in living things, and deep down only in souls, not in things. Inside the mechanical picture of the world, which is just logic applied to space and time, this idea shrinks down to a math formula. And with that formula, and this can never be stressed enough, nothing is ever really understood. Things are only defined, and in being defined, they are bent out of shape.

555.

The biggest of all made-up stories is the one about knowledge. People want to know what things are like as they are in themselves. But look: there are no things as they are apart from us! And even if there were such an "in-itself," a thing that depends on nothing, then for that very reason it could not be known! Something that depends on nothing cannot be known, because if it could, it would no longer depend on nothing! Knowing, after all, always means "coming into a relationship with something." Yet by this idea, the person seeking knowledge wants the thing he is trying to know to mean nothing to him, and to mean nothing to anyone at all. This leads to a contradiction. First, there is a clash between this wish to know and the demand that the

thing to be known should mean nothing to him. If so, why bother knowing it at all? Second, something that means nothing to anybody does not even exist, and so it cannot be known. Knowing means "putting yourself in a relationship with something." It means feeling that you are shaped by something, and that you shape it in return, in every case. So knowing is a process of making things stable and fixed, of defining them, of becoming aware of the conditions around them. It is not a process of measuring the depths of things, creatures, or objects as they are in themselves.

556.

A "thing as it is apart from us" makes as little sense as a "sense in itself" or a "meaning in itself." There is no such thing as a "fact in itself," because something must always be given a meaning before it can become a fact.

When we answer the question "What is that?", we are fixing a meaning from some point of view. The "essence," the "essential part" of a thing, is something we only see as a whole from a certain angle, and it rests on a base made of many different things. At bottom, the real question is: "What is that for me?" Or for us, or for every living thing, and so on.

A thing would only be fully defined once every creature had asked and answered the question "What is that?" about it. If even one single creature, with its own relationships and point of view toward all things, were left out, that thing would still not be fully defined.

In short: the essence of a thing is really only an opinion about that "thing." Or, to put it even better: when we say "it is" or "that is," what we really mean is "it is worth."

We are not allowed to ask: "Then who is doing the interpreting?" Because interpreting itself is a form of the drive for power. It shows itself as a passion, and not as fixed, unchanging existence, but as a process, as constant change.

"Things" come entirely from the doer behind actions, the one who imagines ideals, thinks, wants, and feels. This is true of the idea of a thing and of all its features. Even "the doer behind actions" is a creation of this same kind, a "thing" like all the others. It is a simplification. It tries to name the power that fixes, invents, and thinks, as a single power, separate from each single act of fixing, inventing, and thinking. So it is a single ability, defined as separate from all the other individual abilities. Deep down, it is action pictured as a whole, together with all the action still to come: action, plus the likelihood of more action like it.

557.

The qualities of a thing are the effects it has on other "things."

If you imagine that no other "things" exist, then a thing has no qualities at all.

In other words: nothing exists without other things.

In other words: there is no "thing as it is apart from us."

558.

The idea of a thing as it is apart from us is nonsense. If I take away in my mind all the "relationships," all the "qualities," and all the "activities" of a thing, the thing itself does not remain. That is because the idea of "being a thing" was just made up by us, out of our imagination, to meet certain needs of logic. That is, we invented it so we could

define and grasp things, so we could tie together that huge crowd of relationships, qualities, and activities.

559.

"Things that have a nature of their own, in themselves" is a rigid, unquestioned belief, and it must be given up completely.

560.

The idea that things have a nature of their own, completely apart from interpretation and from a personal point of view, is an empty and useless guess. It would assume that interpreting and seeing from a personal point of view are not essential. It would assume that a thing cut off from all its relationships could still be a thing.

Or, turning it around: the way things seem to be objective, real on their own, could that simply come from differences of degree inside the one who is perceiving? Could it be that whatever changes slowly strikes us as objective, as lasting, as fixed, unchanging existence, as "in itself"? Could the objective view be just a mistaken way of seeing things, a contrast that exists only inside the one who perceives?

561.

What if all unity were only the unity of something organized? But the "thing" we believe in was invented only as a base to hold up its various features. When we say the thing "acts," what we mean is this: we treat all the other qualities that are present, but hidden for the moment, as the cause of one single quality stepping forward. In other words, we take the sum of its qualities, call it x, as the cause of the quality x. And that is obviously completely absurd and foolish!

Every unity is a unity only as an organization, as many parts acting together. It is like a human community, which is a unity in the sense

that it is the opposite of a chaos of separate, lawless pieces. So it is like a nation or a political body: it stands for one thing, but it is not really one thing.

562.

"At some point as thinking developed, people must have realized something: what they called the qualities of a thing were really just the feelings of the person sensing it. From then on, the qualities no longer belonged to the thing itself." What was left over was "a thing as it is apart from us." The difference between a thing as it is apart from us and a thing as it is for us comes from an older, simple-minded way of looking, which wanted to give things their own energy. But careful study showed that even force was only given to things by our imagination, and the same goes for substance, the solid stuff we think things are made of. "The thing affects a doer behind actions?" So the idea of substance has its roots in language, not in things outside us! A thing as it is apart from us is not a problem at all!

Fixed, unchanging existence will have to be thought of as a sensation, one that no longer rests on something completely without sensation.

Movement does not give feeling any new meaning. What simply is cannot be what movement is made of. So it is a form of fixed, unchanging existence.

Note: First, we can try to explain life through mental pictures of things that come before it, that is, purposes.

Second, we can try to explain it through mental pictures of things that come after it, that is, the explanation of math and physics.

These two should not be mixed up. Here is why. The physical explanation turns the world into symbols using feeling and thought. So it cannot, on its own, make feeling and thinking arise again and show

where they came from. Instead, physics must build up the world of feeling step by step, always without feeling or purpose, all the way up to the highest human being. And the study of purposes is only a history of purposes. It is never physics.

563.

Our way of getting "knowledge" comes down to measuring amounts. But we cannot help feeling differences in amount as differences in kind, or quality. Quality is only a relative truth, true for us. It is not a thing as it is apart from us.

Our senses have a certain fixed middle range, and they work within its limits. In other words, we notice what is big and what is small based on what we need to survive. If our senses became ten times sharper or ten times duller, we would die. So we feel even proportions as qualities, measured against what lets us stay alive.

564.

But couldn't all amounts simply be signs of qualities? Greater power must go along with a different awareness and a different range of desires, in fact with a different point of view. Growth itself expresses a desire to become more. The desire for a bigger amount comes from a certain quality, a certain "what-it-is-like." In a world made only of amounts, everything would be dead, stiff, and still. Trying to boil all qualities down to amounts is nonsense. We find that the two can only exist together, as a kind of matching pair.

565.

Qualities are walls we cannot climb over. We simply cannot help feeling mere differences in amount as something completely different from amount, that is, as qualities, which we can no longer turn back

into amounts. But everything that the word "knowledge" makes any sense for belongs to the world of counting, weighing, and measuring, the world of amount. On the other hand, all our judgments of value, which means our sensations, belong exactly to the world of qualities. That is, they belong to truths that are ours alone, tied to our point of view, and that can never be "known." Clearly, each of us, being different creatures, must feel different qualities, and so each must live in a world different from everyone else's. Qualities are a quirk that belongs to human nature. And the demand that these human readings and values of ours should count for everyone, or even be real values, is one of the inherited madnesses of human pride.

566.

The "so-called true world beyond this one," in whatever form people have imagined it until now, has always just been the world as it seems, all over again.

567.

The world as it seems is a world seen in the light of values. It is put in order and picked out according to values. And in this case, that means according to what is useful for keeping a certain kind of animal alive and increasing its power.

So it is the point of view that explains why things are "appearance." As if any world could still be left over once you took away the point of view! That way you would also take away relativity itself!

Every center of energy has its own point of view on all the rest of the world. That means it has its own exact way of valuing, its own way of acting, and its own way of resisting. So "the world as it seems" comes down to one particular kind of action on the world, coming out from a center.

But there is no other kind of action. And "the world" is just a word for the combined play of all these actions. Reality is exactly this: each separate part acting and reacting in its own way against the whole.

There is no longer even a shadow of a right to talk about "appearance" here. ...

Each particular way of reacting is the only way of reacting. We do not know how many kinds there are, or what they are like.

But there is no "other" world, no "real" one, no hidden true nature. To say there were would be to describe a world without action and reaction....

So the contrast between "the world as it seems" and "the so-called true world beyond this one" comes down to the contrast between "world" and "nothing at all."

568.

A criticism of the idea of a "true world and a world as it seems." Of these two, the first is pure fiction, made up out of a crowd of imaginary things.

Appearance itself is part of reality. It is one way reality exists. In other words, in a world where nothing has fixed, unchanging existence, appearance must first create a predictable world of cases that count as the same. It must create a pace slow enough that observing and comparing become possible, and so on.

"Appearance" is a world that has been adjusted and simplified, a world our practical instincts have worked on. For us it is completely true, because we live in it and we are able to live in it. As far as we are concerned, that is the proof that it is true....

Now take the world apart from the fact that we have to live in it. Take the world that we have not shaped to fit our nature, our logic, and our mental biases. That world does not exist as a world "in itself." At heart it is a world of relationships. Depending on circumstances, it looks different from every different point it is seen from. It presses against every point, and every point pushes back. And these combined relationships never match up with each other in any case.

The amount of power decides which being has the other amount of power: in what form, with what force, or under what pressure it acts or resists.

Our own case is interesting enough. We have created an idea so that we can live in a world, so that we notice just enough to be able to bear living in that world....

569.

The way we see things with our minds is shaped by the fact that...

(1) First, we need to share things with each other. And for sharing to be possible, something has to stay steady, be made simple, and be able to be said exactly (most of all in what we call the "same" case, where two things count as identical). For something to be shareable, it has to feel like something already sorted and fitted to us, something we can "recognise." So the raw material our senses take in is arranged by our mind. It is cut down to a few rough main features. It is made to look like other things, and it is filed together with things of its kind. In this way, the vagueness and chaos of what our senses pick up is, so to speak, turned into something logical.

(2) The world as it seems to us is this sorted, fitted world, and it is the one we believe is real. Its "realness" comes from the way similar, familiar, and connected things keep coming back again and again. It

comes from the fact that this world has been made reasonable and orderly. And it comes from our belief that here we can count on things, work them out, and pin them down.

(3) The opposite of this world as it seems is not "the so-called true world beyond this one." Its opposite is a shapeless world that cannot be sorted or fitted to us, a world made of nothing but a chaos of sensations. In other words, it is just another kind of world as it seems, one that we cannot know.

(4) Someone may ask: what are things like as they are apart from us, leaving out our senses and the work of our minds? The answer has to be another question: how did we ever come to know that things existed at all? The idea of "things" is something we made up ourselves. The real question is whether there might be many other ways of creating a world as it seems like ours. And maybe this very creating, ordering, fitting, and making things simpler than they are is itself the most certain reality there is. In short, the question is whether the thing that "decides what things mean" is the only reality. And whether the "effect our surroundings have on us" is really just the result of other doers like us, each using their own will. Other "creatures" act on us. Our sorted world as it seems is a way of arranging their actions and getting the upper hand over them. It is a kind of self-defence. Only the doer behind actions can be shown to exist. So one could suggest the idea that doers are all there is. Maybe what we call an "object" is just one way that one doer acts on another doer. An object would then be simply a mode, a way of being, of the doer.

(k) The Need for Something Beyond This World

570.

If you are like all the philosophers who came before, you cannot see what has been and what will be. You see only what "is." But since

there is no such thing as fixed, unchanging existence, all that philosophers ever had to work with was a crowd of daydreams. That was their "world."

571.

Kant claimed that a whole set of things exists, things we know nothing about, just because it is useful for us not to be able to know anything about them. This was a naive move on his part. It came from a kind of backlash of certain needs, especially needs in the areas of morality and of ideas about what lies beyond this world.

572.

An artist cannot stand reality. He turns away from it or turns back from it. He seriously believes that what makes a thing worth something is the misty leftover you get from it through colour, shape, sound, and thought. He believes that the finer, thinner, and more airy a thing or a person becomes, the more valuable they become. The less real, the greater the worth. This is the thinking of Plato. But Plato dared to go even further in flipping things around. He measured how real something was by how valuable it was. He said: the more something is an "idea," the more it truly exists. He twisted the meaning of "reality" around and said: "What you think is real is a mistake. The closer we get to the 'idea,' the closer we get to 'truth.'" Do you see what this means? It was the biggest renaming of all time. And because Christianity took it over, we no longer notice how shocking it is. Deep down, Plato, being the artist he was, put appearance ahead of real existence! And so he put lies and made-up stories ahead of truth, and the unreal ahead of what actually is! Yet he was so sure of how valuable appearance was that he gave it the qualities of "real existence," "being a cause," "goodness," and "truth." In short, he gave it everything that goes along with value.

The idea of value itself was treated as a cause: that was the first step.

The ideal was given every good quality, as a way of honouring it: that was the second step.

573.

The idea of the "so-called true world beyond this one," or of "God" as completely spiritual, mental, and good, is an emergency measure. People reach for it to the degree that the instincts fighting against it are all-powerful....

How moderate and how human people are shows up exactly in how human they make their gods. The Greeks of their strongest period were not afraid of themselves at all. On the contrary, they were pleased with themselves. So they gave their gods all of their own emotions.

So turning the idea of God into pure spirit is very far from being a sign of progress. You feel this strongly when you read Goethe. In his works, the way God fades into a kind of mist made of virtue and spirit is felt as something on a lower level.

574.

All metaphysics, the study of what lies beyond the physical world, is shown to be nonsense, because it tries to explain the limited, dependent things around us as coming out of something unlimited and dependent on nothing.

It is in the nature of thinking to add the unlimited to the limited, to invent it. In the same way, thinking invented "the self, the 'I'," to cover up the many different things going on inside it. Thinking measures the world using a crowd of measuring tools it made up itself. It measures by its basic made-up ideas: "the unlimited," "goals and means,"

"things," "substances." And it measures by the rules of logic, by shapes, and by forms.

There would be nothing we could call knowledge if thinking did not first rebuild the world into "things" made in its own image. Untruth exists only because of thinking.

We cannot trace where thinking comes from, any more than we can trace where feelings come from. But that does not prove that thinking was there from the very beginning or that it is absolute. It only shows that we cannot get behind it, because thinking and feeling are all we have.

575.

To know something is to point back to past experience. By its nature, this means going back step by step forever, without end. Whatever stops along the way, in front of a so-called "first cause" or the unlimited and so on, is just laziness and tiredness.

576.

About the psychology behind metaphysics: the influence of fear. The things people have feared most, the things that caused the greatest suffering, like the lust for power and sexual pleasure, have been treated by people with the most hostility. They have been removed from the "so-called true world beyond this one." In this way the passions were crossed out, one step at a time. God was set up as the opposite of evil. That is, true reality was imagined as the denial of the passions and emotions, which really means as nothing at all.

These people also hated what is irrational, what is done on impulse, and what happens by chance, because they saw these as causes of suffering that could not be predicted. So they denied that this element

existed in the absolute. They explained the absolute as perfect "reason" and as "everything fitting its purpose."

They also feared change and the fact that things pass away. This fear reveals a crushed soul, full of distrust and painful experiences. That was the case with Spinoza. A person built differently would have seen this very change as something charming.

A nature that is overflowing with energy and playing with it would call exactly these things good, in the sense of bringing happiness: the passions, the irrational, and change. It would also call their results good: danger, contrast, ruin, and so on.

577.

Against the value of what always stays the same (remember how naive Spinoza was, and Descartes too), I set the value of what is shortest and passes away fastest: the tempting flash of gold on the belly of the snake called life----

578.

Moral values hidden inside the theory of knowledge itself:--

The faith in reason: why not distrust it instead?

The "so-called true world beyond this one" is supposed to be the good world. Why?

Appearance, change, contradiction, and struggle are seen as immoral. Behind this is the wish for a world that knows nothing of such things.

A world beyond experience was "discovered" so that there would be a place left for "moral freedom." This is what Kant did.

Logical debate was treated as the road to virtue. Plato and Socrates did this, probably because tricky, clever arguing was seen as the road to immorality.

Another example: time and space are only in our minds. Therefore, it is said, everything is one at its core. Therefore there is no sin, no evil, no imperfection. And this becomes a way of defending God.

Epicurus denied that real knowledge is possible, so that moral values, especially the values of pleasure, could stay at the very top.

Augustine did the same, and later Pascal did too, with his idea of "corrupted reason." They did it to support Christian values.

Descartes looked down on everything that changes. So did Spinoza.

579.

About the psychology behind metaphysics. People argue like this. This world only seems real, so there must be a truly real world. This world is limited and dependent, so there must be an unlimited world. This world is full of contradiction, so there must be a world free of contradiction. This world keeps changing and developing, so somewhere there must be a world that stays still. These are a crowd of false conclusions. They come from a blind faith in reason: the belief that if A exists, its opposite B must exist too. Pain is what inspires these conclusions. Deep down, they are wishes that such a world might exist. The hatred of a world that brings suffering also shows in the fact that people imagine another, better world. Here the metaphysician's resentment against reality is what creates.

The second set of questions is: why do we suffer? ... And from this, people draw a conclusion about how the true world relates to our world, which seems, changes, suffers, and contradicts itself. First: suffering is the result of error. Then how is error possible? Second:

suffering is the result of guilt. Then how is guilt possible? (These are many experiences taken from nature or society, stretched to cover everything and made absolute.) But if the limited world is caused by the unlimited world, then the freedom to make mistakes and to sin must also come from that same place. And once again the question comes up: for what purpose? ... So the world as it seems, the world of constant change, of contradiction, of suffering, must have been wanted. For what purpose?

Here is the mistake in these conclusions. Two opposite ideas are formed. And because one of them matches something real, people think the other one "must" also match something real. "Where else," they ask, "would the opposite idea come from?" So reason is treated as a source that reveals the absolute to us.

But these opposite ideas do not have to come from some supernatural source of reason. It is enough to point to how these ideas really came about. They grew out of practical life, out of what is useful. That is why people trust them so strongly. If your conclusions do not agree with this kind of reason, you are in danger of ruin. But that fact is no "proof" that what this reason says is true.

The way metaphysicians are obsessed with pain is quite naive. "Eternal bliss" is psychological nonsense. Brave and creative people never make pleasure and pain the final questions. For them these are side conditions. If you want to achieve something, you must want both of them. It is a sign of tiredness and sickness in these metaphysicians and religious people that they push questions of pleasure and pain to the front. Even morality, in their eyes, gets its great importance only because they see it as a necessary condition for getting rid of pain.

The same is true of their obsession with appearance and error as the cause of pain. It is a superstition that happiness and truth belong

together. They mix the two up: happiness is found in "certainty," in "faith."

580.

How far are the different positions on knowledge, such as materialism, the view that we know only through the senses, and idealism, really the results of what people value? The source of our highest feelings of pleasure, our "feelings of value," may also be what decides the question of what is real!

How much actual, proven knowledge a people has does not matter at all here. It is beside the point. Look at how thought developed in India, for example.

The Buddhist denial of reality as a whole, which treats the world as it seems as pain, is completely consistent. It points out that an "absolute world" cannot be proven, cannot be reached, and cannot be described with any of our categories of thought. But it goes further: it also sees the mistaken steps by which people arrived at the whole idea in the first place. "Absolute reality" and "fixed, unchanging existence in itself" are contradictions. In a world of constant change, "reality" is only a simplification we make for practical purposes. Or it is a trick that comes from the crudeness of certain sense organs. Or it is just a difference in the speed of constant change.

Logically denying the world, and the belief that nothing has meaning, come from this: we feel we must set fixed, unchanging existence against nothingness, and so constant change gets denied. (Yet "something" does change and become.)

581.

Fixed, unchanging existence and constant change. What we call "reason" grew up on a basis of the senses, on the prejudices of the senses.

In other words, it grew up with the belief that what the senses tell us is true.

The idea of "being," of fixed, unchanging existence, is a stretched-out, general form of the idea of "life" (which first meant breath). It comes from "to be alive," "to want," "to act on something," "to become."

The opposite of this is: "to be lifeless," "not to become," "not to want." So "being" is not the opposite of "not-being" or of "appearance." And it is not the opposite of death either, because only something that can live can be dead.

The "soul" and the self, the 'I', are set up as basic facts that were there from the very beginning. And they are brought in everywhere that there is constant change.

582.

Fixed, unchanging existence: we have no idea of it except the one we take from "being alive." So how can anything that is dead "be" at all?

583.

A.

I am amazed to see that science today accepts, as its fate, being limited to the world as it seems. It says we certainly have no organ of knowledge for the so-called true world beyond this one, whatever that world may be.

Here we have every right to ask: with what organ of knowledge, then, did science work out this contrast between the two worlds?...

A world we can reach with our organs is also understood to depend on those organs. We understand the world as shaped by the one who sees it. But neither of these facts proves that an objective world, a

world apart from us, is even possible. And who is pushing us to believe that this subjective side is real, or the essential thing?

The idea of the "absolute" is actually absurd. An "absolute way of existing" is nonsense. The ideas of "being" and of a "thing" are always relative to us.

The trouble is this. Because of the old contrast between "apparent" and "real," two matching judgments of value have spread everywhere: what is apparent is "of little value," and what is real is "absolutely valuable."

The world as it seems does not strike us as a "valuable" world. Appearance is placed lower than the highest value. Only a "real" world, we think, can be absolutely "valuable"....

This is the prejudice of all prejudices! It is quite possible that the true nature of things is so unfriendly, so much against the basic conditions of life, that appearance is needed just to make life possible.... This is surely the case in many situations, for example in marriage.

So the world we experience would be shaped by the instinct to stay alive, even in the limits of what we can know. We call good, valuable and true whatever helps our species survive....

(a) We have no categories of thought that let us tell a real world apart from an apparent one. (At most, there could be some world of appearance, but it would not be our world of appearance.)

(b) Even if we assume there is a real world, it might still be the less valuable one for us. The amount of illusion in our world might be extremely high in value, because illusion helps keep us alive. (Unless just being an appearance is enough to condemn something?)

(c) Some claim that degrees of value match degrees of reality, so that the highest values would also be the most real. This is a metaphysical

claim. It starts from the assumption that we know the ranking of values by worth, and that this ranking is a moral one. Only if you assume this does truth become necessary as a mark of everything of higher value.

B.

It is absolutely essential that the so-called true world beyond this one be done away with. It is the strongest source of doubt about the world that we ourselves are, and it robs that world of its value. Until now it has been our most dangerous attempt to kill life itself.

We must wage war against every assumption on which people have imagined a so-called true world beyond this one. The idea that moral values are the highest values is one of those assumptions.

The claim that moral judgments stand highest would be disproved if it could be shown that they come from an immoral judgment, from a particular case of real immorality. Then morality would turn out to be only an appearance itself. And as an appearance, it would lose any right to condemn appearance.

C.

Next, the "urge to find truth" would have to be studied in psychological terms. It is not a moral force. It is a form of the drive for power. This could be proved by the fact that it uses every immoral means available, and above all the means of the metaphysicians, the thinkers about things beyond this world.

Right now we face the need to test the assumption that moral values are the highest values. A real method of research is only reached once all moral prejudices have been overcome. Such a method is a victory over morality....

584.

The mistakes of philosophy come from this. Logic and the categories of reason are really only tools for arranging the world for useful purposes; in particular, they are a useful way of making things simpler than they are. But instead of seeing them that way, philosophers took them as the test of truth, and especially of what is real. In fact, the "test of truth" was only this: it is biologically useful to make things simpler than they are in a regular, systematic way. And since a species of animal knows nothing more important than its own survival, it was actually fair to call this "truth." Where the naivety came in was in taking this human quirk as the measuring stick for all things, as the rule for telling the "real" from the "unreal." In short, they turned something relative into something absolute. And suddenly, look, the world split into two halves, the "real" and the "apparent." And the very world that human reason had set up so that people could live and make a home in it was the one that got discredited. These forms of thought should have been used only as tools for making the world manageable and something we can calculate. Instead, the wild imagination of philosophers stepped in. They thought these categories gave them the idea of another world, one that does not match the world people actually live in.... The tools were mistaken for measures of value, and were even used to condemn the very purpose they were made for....

The purpose was to fool ourselves in a useful way. The means to do that was inventing forms and signs. With their help, the confusing variety of life could be boiled down to a plan that was useful and easy to handle.

But here is the disaster: a moral idea was now brought into the game. People said no creature would fool itself, no creature is allowed to fool

itself. So, they concluded, there is only an urge to find truth. But what is "truth"?

The rule that a thing cannot contradict itself gave them the pattern. The so-called true world beyond this one, the world they were trying to find their way to, could not contradict itself. It could not change, could not develop, and had no beginning and no end.

That is the biggest mistake ever made, the truly deadly mistake of the world. People believed that the forms of reason gave them a test for what is real. In fact, the only purpose of those forms was to get control over reality by cleverly misunderstanding it....

And look what happened: the world came to be seen as false exactly because of the qualities that make it real, namely change, growth, variety, contrast, contradiction, and war. From then on, the whole disaster was in place.

1. How do you get rid of the false world, the one that only seems to be? (Yet it was the real world, and the only one.)

2. How do you make yourself as far removed as possible from the world as it seems? (This led to the idea of the perfect being as the opposite of the real being; or, to put it even more accurately, as the very opposite of life....)

The whole direction of values was aimed at running life down and speaking badly of it. People knowingly mixed up rigid beliefs about ideals with knowledge in general. As a result, the people on the other side also began to turn away from science in horror.

So the road to science was blocked twice over. First, it was blocked by the belief in the so-called true world beyond this one. Second, it was blocked by the enemies of that belief. Natural science and psychology suffered in two ways: (1) the very things they studied were condemned, and (2) they lost their simple, innocent openness....

In the real world, everything is so completely tied to and connected with everything else that to condemn anything, or to imagine it away, means to condemn and imagine away the whole. Words like "this should not be" and "this ought not to be" are a joke.... If you think through the results, you would destroy the very source of life by holding down everything that is in any way dangerous or destructive. The study of the body proves this far better!

We can see how morality (a) poisons our whole idea of the world, (b) blocks the road to science, and (c) scatters and weakens all real instincts, by teaching that their roots are immoral.

So we see a terrible tool of decline and decay at work. It manages to stay protected from attack thanks to the holy names and holy poses it takes on.

585.

Our awareness is coming back, and it is a frightening awakening. This is not the awakening of one person, but of the whole human race. Let us think it over. Let us think back. Let us follow both the narrow path and the broad highway.

A.

Humans look for "the truth." By that they mean a world that does not contradict itself, does not deceive, does not change, a real world, a world without suffering. For they see contradiction, deception, and change as the causes of suffering! They do not doubt that a world as it ought to be really exists, and they would love to find a road to it. (Indian thinkers went further in their criticism: even the self, the 'I', only seems to exist and is not real.)

Where do humans get the idea of reality from? Why do they treat change, deception, and contradiction as the source of their suffering? Why not as the source of their happiness instead? ...

There is contempt and hatred for everything that dies, changes, and varies. Where does this high value placed on stability come from? Clearly, the urge to find truth is nothing more than the longing for a stable world.

The senses deceive us, and reason corrects their mistakes. From this, people concluded that reason must be the road to a fixed, unmoving state, and that the most spiritual ideas must be closest to the so-called true world beyond this one. The greatest number of misfortunes come from the senses, they said; the senses are cheats, tricksters, and destroyers.

Only fixed, unchanging existence can promise happiness, they believed: change and happiness cannot go together. So the highest wish is to become one with fixed, unchanging existence. That is the formula for the way to happiness.

In short: the world as it ought to be really exists. This world we live in is a mistake. This world of ours should not exist.

The belief in fixed, unchanging existence is only a result. The real first cause, the thing that sets it all moving, is disbelief in constant change, distrust of constant change, scorn for all constant change....

What kind of person thinks this way? A barren, suffering kind of person, a kind that is tired of the world. If we try to picture the opposite kind of person, we get an image of someone who would not need the belief in fixed, unchanging existence. Instead, that person would look down on it as dead, dull, and meaningless....

The belief that the world as it ought to be is already here and really exists belongs to barren people, who do not want to create a world as

it should be themselves. They assume it is already there, and they look for ways and means to reach it. "The urge to find truth" is really the weakness of the will to create.

Recognizing that something is this way or that way, versus acting so that something will become this way or that way: these two stand against each other, and the difference shows how much energy different kinds of people have.

People make up a world that matches their wishes. They use mental tricks and interpretations designed to connect everything they honor and find pleasant with this so-called true world beyond this one.

At this stage, "the urge to find truth" is basically the art of interpretation. And this includes the kind of interpretation that still has strength in it.

Take that same kind of person, grown one step poorer, no longer having the power to interpret and to invent stories, and you get the people who believe that nothing has meaning. Such a person says of the world as it is that it ought not to exist, and says of the world as it ought to be that it does not exist. By this view, existence, meaning acting, suffering, wanting, and feeling, has no point. The deep feeling of "it's all in vain" is this person's strong emotion. And as a strong emotion, it actually contradicts that person's own belief that nothing matters.

Someone who cannot put their own will into things, a person with neither will nor energy, at least gives things some meaning. That is, they believe a will is already inside things.

You can measure how much willpower a person has by how well they can do without meaning in things, by how well they can stand a world without meaning. They can do this because they themselves give order to a small part of it.

So the philosopher's detached, "objective" way of looking at things may be a sign of weak will and low energy. That is because energy organizes what is nearest and closest at hand. The "scientists," who only want to find out what exists, are people who cannot arrange things as they ought to be.

The artists are a kind in between. They at least set up a symbol of what should exist. They are creative in that they really change and transform things, unlike the scientists, who leave everything as it is.

The link between philosophers and the gloomy, world-rejecting religions: they are the same kind of people. They give the highest degree of reality to the things they value most.

How philosophers are connected to moral people and to the way moral people judge things. (They read the world in a moral way and treat that as the meaning of the world. This happened after the religious meaning of the world fell apart.)

How philosophers get overcome: by destroying the idea of a fixed, unchanging existence. Then comes an in-between period of belief that nothing has meaning. This lasts until there is enough strength to turn all values upside down, and to make the world of constant change, the world as it seems, the only world. That would be the only world we treat as holy and call good.

B.

The belief that nothing has meaning, as a normal thing, can be a sign of growing strength or a sign of growing weakness:

On one side, it can happen because the strength to create and the strength to want things has grown so much. It no longer needs a shared explanation of the world, or a meaning handed to it from outside (like "your duties right now," the state, and so on).

On the other side, it can happen because even the creative power needed to invent a meaning is getting weaker, and disappointment becomes the normal mood. Being unable to believe in any meaning then turns into "unbelief."

So what does science mean when we look at these two possibilities?

(1) Science is a sign of strength and self-control. It shows that people are able to do without comforting, soothing make-believe worlds that heal their pain.

(2) But science can also wear things down, cut them apart, let people down, and make them weaker.

C.

The belief in truth, the need to hold on to something we think is true. Look at it from a psychological point of view, setting aside all the values people have held so far. Underneath, it comes down to fear and laziness.

Unbelief can be traced back in the same way. But how does unbelief gain a new value if there is no so-called true world beyond this one at all? (Because then our ability to give value, which until now has been wasted on the fixed, unchanging existence, becomes free again.)

586.

The so-called true world and the world as it seems

A.

The mistaken ideas that come out of this idea are of three kinds:

(a) An unknown world. We are adventurers, we are curious, and what we already know makes us tired. (The danger of this idea is that it hints that we already know "this" world...)

(b) Another world, where things are different. Something in us starts comparing, and so our calm acceptance and our quiet patience lose their value. Maybe everything will turn out for the best, maybe we have not hoped for nothing... A world where things are different. Who knows? Maybe a world where we ourselves will be different...

(c) A true world. This is the strangest blow and attack we have ever suffered. So many things have stuck to the word "true," like crust on a pot, that without meaning to we hand them all over to the so-called true world beyond this one. The true world must also be an honest world, one that would never trick us or make fools of us. To believe in it like this is almost to be forced to believe. (It is out of habit, the way we trust people who seem trustworthy.)

***

The idea of "the unknown world" hints that we already know this world, and that it is boring.

The idea of "the other world" hints that this world could be different. It pushes away the idea of necessity and fate. It suggests there is no point in accepting this world and fitting ourselves to it.

The idea of "the true world" hints that this world is untruthful, tricky, dishonest, fake, and not the real thing. So it hints that this world is not made to be useful to us. It suggests it is unwise to fit ourselves to it, and better to fight against it.

***

So we run away from "this" world in three different ways:

(a) With our curiosity, as if the interesting part were somewhere else;

(b) With our acceptance, as if we did not need to accept it, as if this world were not something we finally cannot escape;

(c) With our warm feelings and respect, as if this world did not deserve them, as if it treated us in a low and dishonest way...

In short: we have become rebels in three different ways. We have turned an unknown x into our criticism of the "known world."

B.

The first step toward good sense: to see how much we have been led astray. For the truth might be exactly the opposite:

(a) The unknown world might be made in such a way that it would make us like "this" world better. It might be a duller and lower kind of life.

(b) The other world, far from caring about the wishes we never got to fulfill here, might be part of all the things that this world itself makes possible for us. Getting to know this world could be a way to satisfy us.

(c) The true world: but who actually says that the world as it seems must be worth less than the true world? Don't our instincts disagree with that judgment? Isn't mankind always busy creating imaginary worlds because it wants a better world than reality? To begin with, how do we know that our world is not the true world? ... It could be that the other world is the world of "appearance." (In fact, the Greeks, for example, really did imagine a land of shadows, a life of mere appearance, next to real existence.) And finally, what right do we have to set up levels of reality, so to speak? That is something different from an unknown world. That is already the wish to know something about the unknown. The "other" world, the "unknown" world, fine! But to talk about a "true world" is the same as claiming to know something about it. And that is the opposite of assuming a world x, a world we know nothing about...

In short, world x might in every way be more boring, less human, and less worthy than this one.

It would be a completely different matter if people assumed there were several x-worlds, meaning every possible kind of world besides our own. But this has never been assumed...

C.

The problem: why has the picture of the other world always made "this" world look worse? Why has it always worked as a criticism of this world? What does that point to?

A people who are proud of themselves, and who are on life's upward path, always picture any other kind of existence as lower and worth less than their own. They see the strange, unknown world as their enemy, as their opposite. They feel no curiosity about what is strange to them, but rather disgust... A group like that would never admit that some other people were the "true people"...

The very fact that such a split is possible, that this world gets called the world as it seems and the other gets called the true world, is a sign of something deeper.

Where the idea of "another world" comes from:

The philosopher who invents a world of reason, where reason and logic are good enough to explain everything. This is the root of the "true" world.

The religious person who invents a "divine world." This is the root of the world that is stripped of nature and set against nature.

The moral person who invents a "free world." This is the root of the good, perfect, fair, and holy world.

What these three starting points have in common is a mistake in how the mind works, and a mix-up in how the body feels.

What features mark the "other world" as it has actually shown up in history? It carries the scars and brands of prejudices from philosophy, religion, and morality.

Seen in the light of these facts, the "other world" means the same thing as not existing, as not living, as the wish not to live....

The big picture: it was the instinct of being tired of living, not the instinct of life, that made up the "other world."

The result: philosophy, religion, and morality are signs of decline, decay.

(l) How Knowledge Serves Life

587.

It might look as if I had dodged the question about "certainty." The opposite is true. But while I was raising the question of how we can tell what is certain, I wanted to find out what scales and measures people have used to weigh things up until now. And I wanted to show that the question about certainty already *depends* on something else. It is a second-level question, not the main one.

588.

The question of values is more *basic* than the question of certainty. The question of certainty only becomes serious once the question of values has been answered.

If we look at fixed, unchanging existence and appearance from the point of view of psychology, we do not find any "existence in itself." We find no test for what is real. We find only degrees of appearance,

and these are measured by how strongly we feel drawn to the appearance.

Ideas and observations do not fight to stay alive. They fight only to be on top. The idea that loses is *not destroyed*. It is only *pushed into the background* or *made to serve another idea*. *In the world of the mind, nothing is ever wiped out*.

589.

"Goal and means." "Cause and result." "The doer behind actions and the object." "Acting and being acted upon." "A thing as it is apart from us, and the world as it seems."

Take all of these as interpretations, *not* as established facts. And in what way were they perhaps necessary interpretations? Perhaps as "ways of keeping ourselves alive." All of this must be understood in terms of a drive for power.

590.

We read our own values *into the very heart* of things.

So is there any *meaning* in the absolute, apart from any viewer?

Isn't meaning always *meaning for someone*, always tied to a point of view?

All meaning is a drive for power. All meanings that depend on a point of view can be seen as the same thing as that drive.

591.

The longing for "established facts" and the study of how we know things: how much gloom and pessimism is hidden in them!

592.

There is a clash between the "true world," as pessimists describe it, and a world in which a person could actually live. To judge this clash, we must test what right *truth* has to rule. We need to measure all these "ideal forces" by the standard of life, so we can understand what this clash really is. It is the fight of sick, desperate life, which clings to a world beyond, against healthier life, which is more foolish, more false, richer, and fresher. So it is not "truth" fighting against life. It is *one* kind of life fighting another kind. But the sick kind would like to be seen as the *higher* kind! Here we must prove that some ranking is needed. We must show that the first problem is *the ranking of the different kinds of life by worth.*

593.

The belief "It *is* like this and like this" must be changed into the will "It *shall be* like this and like this."

(m) Science

594.

Up to now, science has been a way of getting rid of the mess of things by using theories that "explain everything." In other words, it came from the mind's disgust at chaos. I feel the same disgust when I look at *myself*. I would like to make some kind of picture of my inner world for myself, using a *system*, and so overcome the confusion in my mind. Morality was a simplification of this kind: it taught us to see man as *figured out*, as *known*. Now we have destroyed morality, and we have become *completely dark* to ourselves again! I know that I know nothing *about myself*. *Physics* turns out to be a *gift* for the mind. Once morality has been put aside, science, as the road to *knowledge*, gains a new charm. And *because* this is the only place where we find things that

hold together, we must *arrange* our lives to fit it, so that it can help us *keep* that consistency. This leads to a kind of *practical thinking* about *what we need in order to live* as researchers.

595.

Our first principles: there is no God; there is no purpose; energy is limited. We will be very careful *not* to work out and lay down the thoughts that ordinary people are supposed to think.

596.

Humanity does not need a "*moral* education." What it needs is a *strict training school of scientific mistakes*. This is because truth disgusts people and makes them dislike life. That is, unless a person is already set on his *path* with no turning back, and carries the results of his honest view of things with tragic pride.

597.

The first principle of *scientific work* is faith that scientific work is connected and that it goes on. Then each person can choose to work on any spot, no matter how small, and feel sure that his effort *will not be wasted*.

There is one great force that freezes us: working *for nothing*, struggling *for nothing*.

***

There are periods of *saving up*, when energy and power are stored so that later periods can use them. *Science* is a *rest stop halfway along the road*. There, the average beings, who are more mixed and more complicated, find their most natural satisfaction and their way of express-

ing themselves. These are all the people who do well to stay away from *action*.

598.

A philosopher gets his strength back in his own special way and by other means. For example, he does it with the belief that nothing has meaning. The belief *that there is no such thing as truth*, which is this kind of belief, is a huge relief for someone who, as a soldier of knowledge, is fighting nonstop against a crowd of hateful truths. For truth is ugly.

599.

Take the belief that "nothing that happens has any purpose." People hold it because they think that all interpretations so far have been false. It is a sweeping conclusion that comes from discouragement and weakness. It is not a belief we are forced to hold.

How arrogant man is! When he cannot see a purpose, he *denies* that there could be one!

600.

There are endless ways of interpreting the world. Every interpretation is a sign either of growth or of decline.

The wish for one single explanation of everything, called monism, comes from laziness. Having many interpretations is a sign of strength. We should not *want to take away* the world's unsettling and puzzling nature.

601.

I am against the wish to make everything agree and to keep the peace. Every attempt at monism, at explaining everything by one single thing, belongs to this wish too.

602.

This world that depends on us, this world for the eye, the touch, and the ear, is very false. It would still be false even if we had much more sensitive senses. But its being easy to understand, its clearness, its usefulness, and its beauty will start to *come to an end* if we make our senses *sharper*. In the same way, beauty stops existing when we think about how it came about step by step. Even the idea that things are arranged toward a *goal* is itself an illusion. Let it be enough to say this: the more roughly and the more on the surface the world is understood, the *more valuable*, the clearer, the more beautiful and important it seems. The more deeply we look into it, the further our sense of value fades out of sight. *Meaninglessness comes closer!* It is we who created the only world that has any value! Once we know this, we also see that respect for truth is itself *the result of an illusion*. And we see that it is much more important to value the power that shapes, simplifies, molds, and makes up stories.

"Everything is false, so everything is allowed!"

The beautiful and the "valuable" only show up because our sight is somewhat dull and because we want things to be simple. In itself, it is pure fantasy.

603.

We know that destroying an illusion does not always give us a truth. It only gives us one more piece of *not knowing*. It makes our "empty space" bigger and adds to our "wasteland."

604.

What is the only thing that knowledge can be made of? It is "interpretation": putting a meaning into things. It is not "explanation." In most cases, it is a new interpretation of an old interpretation, one that has become impossible to understand and is now little more than a sign. There is no such thing as a fixed, settled fact. Everything shifts. Everything is impossible to grab hold of, and everything gives way. In the end, the things that last longest of all are our opinions.

605.

Working out what is "true" and "untrue," and working out facts in general, is completely different from what lies at the root of philosophy. Philosophy is about creating: placing, shaping, molding, taming, and willing. To give things a meaning is a job that always remains to be done, as long as there is no meaning already inside them. The same goes for sounds, and also for the fate of nations. They can all be interpreted and turned in many different ways, for different purposes.

An even higher job is to set a goal and shape the facts to fit it. That means interpreting through action, and not just turning ideas upside down.

606.

In the end, people find nothing in things except what they themselves have put there. This process of finding it again is science. The actual

process of putting a meaning into things is art, religion, love, and pride. In both of these, even if they are only a child's game, we should keep up our courage and push ahead. On one side, there is finding again. On the other side, and we belong to that other side, there is putting a meaning into things.

607.

Science has two sides:

First, how it relates to the single person.

Second, how it relates to a whole culture ("levels of culture").

These two sides are valued in opposite ways.

608.

As science develops, it keeps turning what we know into what we do not know. Yet its goal is the opposite. It begins with the instinct to trace what is unknown back to what is known.

In short, science is building a road toward a ruling, total ignorance. It leads to the feeling that "knowledge" does not exist at all, and that it was just a kind of arrogance to dream of such a thing. It also leads to the feeling that we do not have even the smallest idea that would let us count knowledge as something possible, and that "knowledge" is an idea that contradicts itself. We carry an ancient myth, a piece of human vanity, over into the world of hard facts. We can no more accept the idea of a thing as it is apart from us than we can accept "knowledge as it is in itself." Think of how "numbers and logic" mislead us, and how "laws" mislead us.

Wisdom is an attempt to get past the values we hold from our own point of view, that is, to get past the "drive for power." It is a principle that is hostile to life, and it is a sign of decline, decay. You can see this

symptom among the people of India, and elsewhere. It shows a weakness in the power to take things in and make them your own.

609.

It is not enough for you to see how much ignorance humans and animals live in today. You must also have, and learn to have, the wish to be ignorant. You need to understand that without this kind of ignorance, life itself would be impossible. Ignorance is one of the conditions of life. Only under it can a living thing keep itself alive and do well. A great, solid belt of ignorance must surround you.

610.

Science is turning nature into ideas so that we can control nature. That belongs under the heading of "means," or tools.

But the purpose and will of humankind must grow in the same way, along with its intention for the whole.

611.

Thinking is the strongest function in every stage of life, and the one used most constantly. It is at work in every act of seeing, and in everything we seem to experience. Clearly it soon becomes the most powerful and most demanding of all functions. Over time it bullies and rules over the other powers. In the end it becomes "passion itself."

612.

The researcher must win back the right to have great passion. Putting yourself aside, and worshipping "objectivity," have created a false ranking of people by worth in this area. This mistake reached its peak when Schopenhauer taught that the road to "truth" and knowledge lay

only in being freed from passion and from will. He believed that a mind freed from will could not help but see the true, real nature of things. The same mistake shows up in art: as if everything became beautiful the moment you looked at it without wanting anything.

613.

The passions fight one another to be on top, and one of the passions rules over the mind.

614.

To "make the world human" means to feel more and more that we are the masters on earth.

615.

Among a higher kind of beings, knowledge will also take on new forms that are not needed yet.

616.

These teachings are scattered all through my works. The value of the world lies in how we interpret it. Perhaps other interpretations are possible somewhere, besides human ones. The interpretations made so far were values seen from a point of view, and they helped us survive in life, that is, in the drive for power and in the growth of power. Every time humans rise higher, they must leave behind narrower interpretations. Every higher level of strength or power that is reached brings new views with it, and teaches us to believe in new horizons. The world that matters to us at all is false. That is, it is not a fact. It is a made-up story, a piece of human sculpture, shaped from a small amount of observation. It is "always flowing." It is something that keeps changing and developing, a huge lie that keeps turning and

moving forward, yet never comes any closer to truth, because there is no such thing as "truth."

617.

Summing up:

To stamp constant change with the look of fixed, unchanging existence: this is the highest drive for power.

There is a double making of things simpler than they are. The senses do it on one side, and the mind does it on the other. The aim is to keep up a world of fixed existence, of rest, of cases that are all the same, and so on.

The idea that everything comes back forever is the closest a world of constant change can come to a world of fixed, unchanging existence. It is the peak of reflection.

Once such a world of fixed, unchanging existence had been invented, the values given to it led people to condemn constant change and to be unhappy with it.

Fixed, unchanging existence has taken on many shapes: the body, God, ideas, laws of nature, formulas, and so on.

"Fixed existence" as mere appearance, and the turning around of values: it was appearance that gave things their value.

In a world of constant change, knowledge as it is in itself is impossible. So how can there be knowledge at all? Only as a way of fooling ourselves, as a drive for power, as an urge to deceive.

Constant change is inventing, willing, denying yourself, and beating your own limits. There is no doer behind it, only an action. It places things, it creates, and it has no "causes and results."

Art is the will to overcome constant change. It is a way of making things last forever. But it is short-sighted. It always works from a point of view, and it repeats, on a small scale, the direction of the whole.

What all life shows should be seen as a shortened formula for the overall direction of things. That is why we get the new definition of "life" as "drive for power."

Instead of "cause and result," there is a struggle between changing forces. Often the result is that one swallows up its opponent. There is no fixed number for constant change.

Old ideals are useless for explaining everything that happens, once we have seen that they came from animal roots and served animal needs. On top of that, they are all hostile to life.

The mechanical theory is useless too. It makes it look as if there can be no purpose at all.

All of humanity's idealism up to now is about to turn into the belief that nothing has meaning. It can be shown to be a belief that things are completely worthless, which means completely without purpose.

The ideals are destroyed. A new empty desert lies ahead. And we will need new arts to help us bear it. We are like amphibians, creatures who can live in two very different worlds!

First rules: be brave, be patient, never step back, and do not be too eager to push to the front. (Note: Zarathustra keeps mocking all past values, because his energy is overflowing.)

II.

THE DRIVE FOR POWER IN NATURE.

1. Seeing the World as a Machine.

618.

Of all the ways people have tried to explain the world so far, the mechanical one, which treats the world like a machine, seems to stand out most today. It seems to have a clear conscience on its side. That is because no science deep down believes it can make progress and succeed unless it uses mechanical methods. Everyone knows these methods. "Reason" and "purpose" are left out of the picture as much as possible. People show that, if enough time passes, anything can develop out of anything else. And no one bothers to hide their spiteful pleasure when the "apparent plan" behind what happens to a plant, or to the yolk of an egg, can be traced back to mere pushing and pressing. In short, people are truly glad to honor this rule of the deepest stupidity, if I may make a playful remark about such serious matters. Meanwhile, among the very best minds in this movement, you can notice a sense that something is wrong, a kind of worry. It is as if the theory had a tear in it, which sooner or later might finish it off. I mean the kind of tear that marks the end of every balloon blown up with theories like this one.

Pushing and pressing themselves cannot be "explained." Nor can anyone get rid of "action at a distance," where one thing affects another without touching it. People have now even lost their belief that things can be explained at all. They grumpily admit that we can only describe, not explain. They also admit that the dynamic view of the world, which denies "empty space" and speaks of little clumps of

atoms, will soon win over the physicists. Yet in this view, force, which the Greeks called Dynamis, is certainly given an inner quality.

619.

The winning idea of "energy," with which our physicists built both God and the world, still needs to be completed. It must be given an inner will, which I call the "drive for power." By this I mean an endless hunger to show power, or the use and exercise of power as a creative instinct, and so on. Physicists cannot get rid of "action at a distance" in their basic ideas, any more than they can get rid of a pushing-away force, or a pulling-together one. There is no way around it. All movements, all "appearances," all "laws" must be understood as signs of something happening on the inside. And to do this, we must compare things to human beings. It is possible to trace all the instincts of an animal back to the drive for power, and also all the workings of living things back to this one source.

620.

Has anyone ever been able to witness a force? No. People have only witnessed effects, and these have been put into a completely foreign language. Because things always happen in the same regular order, we have been so spoiled that we no longer marvel at this marvelous process.

621.

A force we cannot picture in any way is just an empty word. It should have no right to live in the city of science, as if it were a citizen there. The same goes for the purely mechanical powers of pulling together and pushing apart. With them we can form a picture of the world, and nothing more!

622.

Squeezing and kicking are something extremely recent. They developed over time and were not there from the very start. They take for granted that there is something that holds together and is able to press and strike! But how could that something hold together?

623.

Nothing in chemistry is truly unchangeable. That only seems so; it is just a prejudice learned in school. It was we who brought the idea of the unchangeable into chemistry, borrowing it as usual from philosophy about what lies beyond nature, Mr. Chemist. It is a shallow judgment to say that diamond, graphite and carbon are the same thing. Why do people say it? Simply because the scales show no loss of material! Well then, at least they have something in common. But the work done by the molecules as they change from one form to another is something we can neither see nor weigh. And that is exactly what makes one material into something different, with qualities of its own kind.

624.

Against the atom of physics. To understand the world, we must be able to count it up and calculate it. To calculate it, we need causes that stay the same. But since we find no such unchanging causes in reality, we make them up for ourselves and call them atoms. That is where atomic theory comes from.

Being able to calculate the world, being able to express everything that happens in formulas: is that really "understanding"? What would we understand about a piece of music if we added up everything in it that could be calculated and put into formulas? So "unchanging

causes," things, substances, something "that depends on nothing else" were made up. But what has been gained by doing this?

625.

The mechanical idea of "movement" is already a translation of what really happens into a language of signs made for the eye and the sense of touch.

The idea of the atom, and the split between "the place where a moving force sits and the force itself," is a language of signs taken from our world of logic and our physical world.

We do not have the power to change the ways we express things. But we can understand how far they are only signs of something else. To demand a way of expressing things that fully matches them is nonsense. It is the very nature of a language, of any means of communication, to express only relationships between things. The idea of "truth" goes against common sense. The whole area of truth and falseness applies only to the relationships between beings, not to anything "absolute." There is no such thing as a "being in itself," because relationships are what make up being in the first place. And in the same way there can be no "knowledge in itself."

626.

Someone says: "The feeling of force cannot come from movement. Feeling in general cannot come from movement."

The same voice goes on: "Even the evidence for this is only an apparent experience. In a substance, the brain, feeling is produced by motion passed along to it, that is, by stimuli. But is it really produced? Would this show that the feeling did not exist there at all before? So that its appearance must be seen as something created by the go-between, the motion? The idea that this substance has no feel-

ing is only a guess! It is not something we have experienced! So feeling is a quality of the substance itself: there really are substances that feel."

Someone says: "Do we learn from certain substances that they have no feeling? No, we simply can't tell whether they have any. It is impossible to look for where feeling comes from in a substance that doesn't feel." My answer: Oh, what a rushed conclusion!

627.

To talk about things "attracting" and "repelling" each other in a purely mechanical way is pure make-believe. It is just a word. We cannot picture an attraction that has no purpose behind it. We do "understand" two things: the wish to take hold of something and make it your own, and the wish to protect yourself from something or push it away. That would be an explanation we could actually use.

In short, we feel we must believe in causes because we cannot picture any process that has no purpose. But of course, this tells us nothing about whether that belief is true or false, or whether it is justified! The belief in causes falls apart together with the belief in purposes, or goals. (This is aimed against Spinoza and his whole way of explaining everything by causes.)

628.

It is a false idea to think we "know" something when all we have is a math formula for what has happened. With a formula, the thing is only labeled and described. Nothing more!

629.

Suppose I take something that happens again and again in a regular way and put it into a formula. Then I have made it easier and quicker

to describe the whole event, and so on. But I have not found a "law" by doing that. I have only answered the question: How is it that something keeps happening here? It is just a guess that the formula matches a tangle of forces that we really don't know, along with the way those forces are released. And it is pure myth to think that these forces obey a law, so that, because they obey, we get the same event every time.

630.

I am careful not to talk about chemical "laws." Talking that way has a smell of morality about it. It is much more a matter of power relations being settled. The stronger thing becomes master of the weaker one, to the extent that the weaker one cannot keep its own level of independence. Here there is no pity, no mercy, and even less any following of a "law."

631.

When certain events always follow one another in the same order, that does not prove any "law." It shows a power relation between two or more forces. Someone may say, "But it is exactly this relation that stays the same!" Saying that is no better than saying, "One and the same force cannot be a different force." The point is not that one thing follows another. The point is that the things depend on each other. It is a process in which the moments that follow one another do not decide each other in the way of cause and result....

Think of how we split the "action" from the "doer." We split an event from the one who makes it happen. We split a process from something that is not a process but lasts: a substance, a thing, a body, a soul, and so on. We try to understand life as a kind of moving of things around and changing of places, as a kind of "being," a stable,

solid object. This ancient myth is what created the belief in "cause and result," once it had settled into a lasting form in the workings of language and grammar.

632.

When we say a series of events is "regular," we are only using a figure of speech. It is not a fact. We talk *as if* some rule were being followed! The same goes for saying things "obey laws." We come up with a formula to describe a kind of sequence of events that keeps happening again and again. But that does not prove we have *found a law*. Still less does it prove we have found some force that causes the same results to keep coming back. The fact that something always happens this way or that way gets explained as if some creature always acted this way or that way because it was obeying a law, or obeying one who sets the rules. And the idea is that without the "law," it would be free to act differently. But that very inability to act otherwise might come from inside the creature itself. Maybe it did not act this way or that way because a law told it to, but simply because that is how it is made. That would just mean that something cannot also be something else. It cannot be one thing first and then something completely different. It is neither free nor unfree. It is simply this way or that way. *The mistake is that we imagine a doer behind actions living inside things.*

633.

Take two states that come one after the other. It is wrong to call the first the "cause" and the second the "result." The first state cannot make anything happen. And nothing has been done to the second state.

What is really going on is a struggle between two forces that are not equally strong. A new balance is reached, depending on how much

power each one has. The second state is something basically different from the first. It is not the first one's result. What matters is this: the forces that take part in the struggle come out of it with different amounts of power.

634.

A criticism of materialism. Let us throw out two common ideas from this picture: "necessity" and "law." The first brings a false kind of force or pressure into the world. The second brings a false kind of freedom. "Things" do not act in a regular way. They follow no *rule*. In fact, there are no things at all; that is something we made up. Nor do they act because something forces them to. Nobody is obeying anything here. The fact that *something is* the way it is, strong or weak, does not come from obeying, or from a rule, or from being forced....

How much something resists, and how much stronger power something has over it: this is the question that every event turns on. If we can put this into formulas and "laws" for our own uses and calculations, good for us! But that does not mean we have put any "morality" into the world just because we pictured the world as obedient.

There are no laws. Every power goes all the way to its final result at every single moment. We can calculate how things will go exactly because there is no way they could be any different from how they are.

An amount of power is defined by the effect it has and by the pressure it pushes back against. A neutral, in-between state, where it does nothing either way, could be imagined in theory, but it simply does not exist. At its core, this power is an urge to use force and an urge to defend itself against force. It is not just about keeping itself alive. Every atom has an influence on the whole of existence. If you imagine this outflow of will-power taken away, you have imagined the atom out of existence. That is why I call it an amount of "*drive for power*."

This phrase lets us describe a quality that cannot be removed in our minds from the mechanical order of things without removing that order itself in our minds too.

The idea of "movement" is how we turn the world of effects into a world we can *see*, a world made for the eye. In this idea it is always assumed that *something* has been moved. It might be the made-up idea of a tiny ball-shaped atom, or even the more abstract version of it, the "energy atom." Either way, we always picture something that has an effect. In other words, we have not yet broken the habit that our senses and our language tricked us into. Subject and object, a doer behind the action, the action split off from what does it: we must remember that all of this is nothing more than a system of signs, and nothing real. Mechanics, as a science of *movement*, is already a translation of events into the language of human senses.

635.

We need "units" in order to be able to count and calculate. But that is no reason to think that "units" really *exist*. We took the idea of a "unit" from our idea of the self, the 'I.' That is our very oldest belief. If we did not believe that each of us is a single unit, we would never have come up with the idea of a "thing." Now, rather late in the day, we are completely convinced that our idea of the self, the 'I,' gives no guarantee at all that a real single being exists. If we want to keep the mechanical explanation of the world as a theory, we must always add the warning that we are working with made-up ideas. The idea of *movement* comes from the language of our senses. The idea of the *atom*, meaning a single solid unit, comes from our inner experience. Both rest on a *bias of the senses* and a *bias of the mind*.

Mechanics describes events that follow one another. It does this through signs, in the terms of our senses and our mind: it assumes

that every influence is *movement*, and that wherever there is movement, something is there doing the moving. It does not touch the question of what force actually causes things.

The *mechanical* world is pictured the way only the eye and the sense of touch could picture a world: as something "moved." It is pictured so that it can be calculated, and so that it seems to contain causes, "things" (atoms), whose effect never changes. Here the false idea of a doer behind actions has been carried over into the idea of the atom.

We mix together several ideas: the idea of numbers; the idea of a thing (which is really the idea of a doer behind actions); the idea of activity (splitting what causes from its result); and the idea of movement. All of these belong to how things seem to us. Our eye and our *way of thinking* are still mixed up in all of it.

If we take away these extras, nothing is left but amounts of active energy, each one in a state of tension with all the others. What they are lies in their relation to all other amounts, in the "influence" they have on them. The drive for power is the most basic fact. It is not fixed, unchanging existence, and not constant change, but a *pathos*, a kind of feeling or urge. From this, constant change and influence come about first....

636.

Physicists believe in a "true world" of their own kind. For them it is a fixed system of atoms that make the movements they have to make, and this holds the same for all living things. So, in their view, "the world as it seems" comes down to a general kind of existence that everyone needs and that everyone can reach in his own way (reach, and also bend to fit himself, making it "subjective"). But here they are wrong. The atom they assume exists is something they reached by following the logic of how our consciousness sees things. So the atom is

itself a made-up idea that comes from us. The picture of the world they put forward is not really different from our everyday personal picture. The only difference is that it is built with senses stretched further, but they are still certainly our senses.... And in the end, without knowing it, they left something out of the whole picture. They left out exactly the thing that cannot be missing: the factor of seeing from a point of view. Through it, every center of power, and not only humans, builds the rest of the world from where it stands. That is, it measures the world, feels it, and shapes it according to how strong it is.... They forgot to count this power that fixes a point of view as part of "true existence," or, as the schools call it, the existence of the doer behind actions. They think this power "developed" later and was added on. But even the chemist needs it. It is in fact the particular, specific existence of a thing, which decides how it acts and reacts depending on the situation.

Seeing from a point of view is only a complicated form of being a specific, particular thing. My idea is this: every particular body tries to become master of all space, to spread its power (its drive for power), and to push back everything that resists it. But it keeps running into other bodies that are trying to do the same. So in the end it comes to terms with those that are close enough in kind to it. It "combines" with them, and so they work together, plotting for power. And the process goes on.

637.

Even in the non-living world, all an atom of energy cares about is what is right next to it. Forces that are far away cancel each other out. This is the root of seeing from a point of view, and it explains why a living creature is "selfish" right to its core.

638.

Suppose the world has a fixed amount of force. Then clearly any shift of force to any place would affect the whole system. So besides cause and result happening one after another, there would also be dependence, things touching side by side, and things happening at the same time.

639.

The only possible way to keep the idea of "God" meaningful would be this: to make Him not the force that drives things, but the state of highest power, a stage in time. He would be a point in the further growth of the drive for power. Through that point we could explain both what developed afterwards and what developed before, up to Him.

Seen as a machine, the energy of all constant change together stays the same. Seen from the point of view of how it is spent and managed, it climbs to its highest point and then falls back from there, so that it keeps turning in a circle forever. This "drive for power" shows itself in the way strength is used, in how it is interpreted. Energy is turned into life, and from then on "life at its greatest power" appears as the goal. The same amount of energy means different things at different stages of development.

What decides growth in life is a way of managing that becomes more and more thrifty and orderly, one that gets more and more done with less and less energy.... The ideal is the rule of spending as little as possible....

The only thing that has been proved is that the world is not moving toward a state of rest and balance. So its highest point must not be pictured as a state of perfect balance....

In the world, the same things happen by hard necessity, just as in everything else. But this is not some eternal fate ruling over everything that happens. It only says that the impossible is not possible. A given force cannot be anything other than that force. A given amount of resisting force shows itself only in a way that matches how strong it is. So to call events "necessary" is just saying the same thing twice.

2. The Drive for Power as Life

(a) How Living Things Work

640.

Man pictures himself as if he had been there when the living world was born. He asks: what could be seen with the eyes and felt with the hands about these processes? How much of it can be put into round numbers? What rules can be noticed in the movements? So man would love to arrange everything that happens as if it were meant for the eye and for touch, as if it were all just forms of movement. He wants to find formulas to simplify the huge, clumsy mass of these experiences.

Everything that happens gets cut down to the level of humans, with their senses and their mathematics. It is a matter of making a list of human experiences, as if humans, or rather the human eye and the human ability to form ideas, had always been there to witness everything.

641.

When many forces are tied together by a shared process of feeding, we call that "life." All so-called feeling, thinking, and imagining belong to this feeding process as tools. They work in three ways: first, by

fighting other forces; second, by fitting other forces into a shape and a rhythm; and third, by judging what to take in and what to throw out.

642.

The link between the non-living and the living world must lie in the pushing-away power that every atom of energy uses. "Life" could be defined as a lasting form of processes that set up and settle forces, in which the different competing forces grow unevenly. How far does fighting back still exist even inside obeying? By obeying, one's own power is not given up at all. In the same way, giving orders includes admitting that the opponent's full power has not been beaten, swallowed up, or wiped out. "Obeying" and "commanding" are both moves in the game of war.

643.

The drive for power interprets. (An organ that is still forming has to be interpreted.) It defines things, and it settles levels and differences of power. Plain differences of power could not notice each other as such. There has to be something that wants to grow, and that judges all other things wanting the same according to their worth. In truth, all interpretation is simply a way to become master of something. (Constant interpretation is the first rule of how living things work.)

644.

Suppose perfection means greater complexity, sharp differences between parts, developed organs and functions placed right next to each other, and the disappearance of the in-between parts. If that is perfection, then a drive for power shows itself in how living things work. Through its forces of ruling, shaping, and commanding, it keeps

widening the area of its power and keeps simplifying things inside that area. It grows, and it does so as a command it cannot refuse.

"Mind" is only a means and a tool serving a higher life, serving the raising up of life.

645.

"Heredity" is something we don't understand at all, so it can't be used to explain anything. It can only be used as a name, a label that points to a problem. The same is true of "adaptability." In fact, the study of the shapes and structures of living things, even if it were complete, explains nothing. It only describes a huge fact. It does not explain how a certain organ comes to be used for a certain purpose. Saying that things happen for the sake of a goal explains these matters just as little as saying that things happen because something pushed them. The idea of "cause" is only a way of speaking, nothing more. It is just a way of naming a thing.

646.

They are comparisons. For example, our own memory may hint at another kind of memory, one that shows itself in heredity, in growth, and in the shapes of living things. Our own power to invent and to experiment may hint at another kind of inventiveness, one that puts tools to new uses, and so on.

What we call our "consciousness" has nothing to do with any of the main processes that keep us alive and make us grow. And no human brain could ever be clever enough to build anything more than a machine. Every living process is far, far beyond any machine.

647.

Against Darwinism. The fact that an organ is used does not explain how it came to exist. Quite the opposite! For most of the time it takes for a certain feature to form, that feature does not help the individual survive. It is of no use to him, and especially not in his fight against the world around him and against his enemies.

What, in the end, is "useful"? We have to ask: "Useful for what?"

For example, something that helps an individual last a long time might be bad for his strength or his beauty. Something that keeps him alive might also freeze him in place and keep him from changing as he develops. On the other hand, a lack of something, or a state of decay, might be extremely useful, because it pushes other organs to work harder. In the same way, being in need might be a condition for staying alive. That is because it limits the individual to just enough resources to hold himself together, without letting him waste his strength. The individual himself is really a struggle among his parts, fighting for food, space, and so on. As he develops, some parts win and take over, while other parts waste away or get turned into organs that serve the winners.

Darwin gives the "environment" far too much importance, to the point of nonsense. The key thing in the process of life is exactly that huge inner power to shape and to create forms. That power simply uses and takes advantage of the "environment."

The new forms that this inner power builds are not made with any goal in mind. But in the struggle between the parts, a new form does not last long without becoming tied to some kind of half-usefulness. Then, depending on how it is used, it develops more and more fully.

648.

Being "useful" for speeding up evolution is a different kind of usefulness from being useful for making the evolved creature as stable and long-lasting as possible.

649.

In Darwin's biology, "useful" means whatever helps a thing in its struggle against others. But in my view, real progress is the feeling of overflowing, the feeling that comes with growing stronger, quite apart from whether it helps in the struggle. It is from these feelings that the urge to fight first comes.

650.

Scientists who study the body should think twice before calling the instinct to stay alive the most important instinct of a living thing. Above all, a living thing wants to let out its strength, to use it. "Staying alive" is only one of the results of that. Let's be careful not to bring in unnecessary ideas about things having a purpose! The whole idea of "self-preservation" is one of those unnecessary ideas.[4]

[Footnote 4: See Beyond Good and Evil, in this edition, section 13.]

651.

The most basic and most ancient activity of the simplest living matter cannot be explained by a wish to stay alive. That is because it takes in far more material than it needs to survive, so much that it is ridiculous. What's more, it does not "keep itself alive" in doing this. It actually breaks apart. The instinct at work here must explain why the living thing has no wish at all to keep itself alive. Hunger is already an interpretation, based on watching living things that are more or less

complex. Hunger is a specialized, later form of the instinct. It comes from a system where different parts do different jobs, all serving a higher instinct that rules the whole.

652.

It is just as impossible to see hunger as the first driving force as it is to see self-preservation that way. Hunger, seen as the result of not getting enough food, really means hunger as the result of a drive for power that can no longer dominate. It is not about replacing something that was lost. Only later, after parts of the organism split up their jobs, and after the drive for power has found other, very different ways of satisfying itself, does the organism's greedy urge to take things get shrunk down to hunger. Only then does it become the need to replace what has been lost.

653.

We can only laugh at the false "selflessness" that biologists talk about. When amoebas reproduce, it looks like they are throwing off extra cargo, and that this benefits them. It is just getting rid of useless material.

654.

Simple living matter splits in two when its power is no longer strong enough to control the material it has taken in. Reproduction is the result of weakness.

In cases where males look for females and join with them, reproduction is the result of hunger.

655.

The weaker one is pushed toward the stronger one because it needs food. It wants to get underneath the stronger one, and if possible to become one with it. The stronger one, on the other hand, protects itself from others. It refuses to be destroyed that way. Instead, as it grows, it would rather split itself into two or more parts. We can conclude that the stronger the urge to become one with something else, the more some kind of weakness is present. And the stronger the tendency toward variety, difference, and inner breaking apart, the more strength is actually there.

The instinct to hold on to something and the instinct to push something away are what tie everything together, in non-living things just as in living things. The whole idea of separating living from non-living is a rushed judgment.

It is more accurate to say this: in every combination of forces, the drive for power defends itself against what is stronger and comes down without mercy on what is weaker.

Note: All processes can be seen as "beings."

656.

The drive for power can only show itself when it runs up against *obstacles*. So it goes looking for whatever pushes back against it. This is the most basic habit of protoplasm, the simple living jelly of cells, when it stretches out its *pseudopodia*, its little false feet, and feels around itself. When a living thing grabs something and absorbs it, this comes above all from a desire to overpower. It is a process of shaping, of adding on, of building and rebuilding, until in the end the conquered creature has become completely part of the stronger creature's area of power, and has made that stronger creature bigger. If

this taking-in does not succeed, then the whole living thing falls apart. And this *splitting* also happens because of the drive for power: to stop what has been conquered from escaping, the drive for power divides into two wills. In some cases it does this without even fully giving up its connection to both of them.

"Hunger" is just a narrower, more specialized form of this. It appears once the basic instinct for power has gained a more general kind of power.

657.

What does it mean to be "passive"?

It means being blocked when you reach outward to grab something. So being passive is really an act of pushing back and reacting.

What does it mean to be "active"?

It means reaching out for power.

"Feeding"...

This is only something that grew out of something deeper. Its original form was the urge to stuff everything inside your own skin.

"Reproduction"...

This too grew out of something deeper. Originally, it happened in cases where one will could not organize the whole mass it had taken over. Then an *opposing will* gained power. After a struggle with the original will, this opposing will took on the job of splitting off and setting up a new center of organization.

"Pleasure"...

This is a feeling of power. It assumes that pain already exists.

658.

(1) The functions of living bodies can be shown to be nothing but forms of the basic will, the drive for power, and buds growing from it.

(2) The drive for power takes on special forms: the urge to feed, to own things, to have *tools*, to have servants who obey, and to have rulers. The body is an example of this. The stronger will directs the weaker one. There is no other kind of cause and result except one will acting on another will. It cannot be explained as if it were a machine.

(3) Thinking, feeling, and wanting are found in all living things. What is a desire, if not this: an obstacle stirs up the feeling of power (or even better, a rhythm of obstacles and resisting forces), so that the feeling of power surges through and past it? So in all pleasure, pain is included. If the pleasure is going to be very great, the pain before it must have lasted a very long time. The whole bow of life must have been pulled back as far as it can go, like a bow stretched to its limit before the arrow flies.

(4) The functions of the mind. The urge to shape, to form, to make things alike, and so on.

(b) Human Beings

659.

Using the body as our guide. Let us grant that the "*soul*" was only an attractive and mysterious idea, one that philosophers were right to leave behind, even though they did so unwillingly. Even so, what they have since learned to put in its place is perhaps even more attractive and even more mysterious. Think of the human *body*. In it, the whole past of all living things, the most distant and the most recent, comes alive again and takes on flesh. The body seems to flow through this past and right over it, like a huge, silent river. The body is a more

wonderful idea than the old "soul." In every age, people have believed in the body more seriously than in the spirit (or the "soul," or "the doer behind actions," as school language now calls it). They have treated the body as what they truly own, as the surest thing about themselves, in short, as the self, the 'I'. Nobody has ever thought of his stomach as a strange stomach or a godly stomach. But people do tend, and like, to see all their thoughts as "inspired," all their values as "given to them by a God," and all their instincts as something dawning in them from outside. Every age in human history proves this. Even now, especially among artists, you can often notice a kind of wonder, and a respectful hesitation to decide, when they ask themselves how they managed to create their best work and from what world the creative idea came down to them. When they ask this, they are filled with a feeling of innocence and childlike shyness. They do not dare to say: "That came from me. It was my hand that threw those dice." On the other hand, there were philosophers and theologians whose logic and religious devotion gave them the strongest reasons for seeing their body as a trick, even as a trick they had already beaten and gotten rid of. Yet even they could not help admitting the silly fact that the body was still there. The most surprising proofs of this can be found partly in the teachings of Saint Paul and partly in the Vedanta philosophy of India. But what does *strength of faith* really mean in the end? Nothing! A strong faith could also be a foolish faith! That is something worth thinking about.

And suppose that our belief in the body were, in the end, only the result of reasoning. Suppose it were a wrong conclusion, as the idealists claim it is. Would that not raise some doubt about whether we can trust the spirit itself, since it is the spirit that leads us to such wrong conclusions?

Suppose that the existence of many separate things, and space, and time, and motion (and whatever else forms the basic starting points

of believing in the body) were all mistakes. What suspicions would that not raise against the spirit that led us to accept such starting points? It is enough to say this: belief in the body is, at least for now, a much stronger belief than belief in the spirit. And whoever wants to tear down belief in the body is, by doing so, attacking the authority of the spirit most completely of all!

660.

The Body as an Empire

Inside the body there is a kind of ruling class, made up of many rulers. (Think of the struggle that goes on between the cells and the tissues.)

Slavery and the splitting up of work: a higher type of being is only possible when the lower parts are made to serve, each one tied to a single job.

Pleasure and pain are not opposites. Then there is the feeling of power.

What we call "feeding" is only a result of the drive for power and its endless hunger to take things over and make them its own.

What we call "reproduction" is the breaking apart that happens when the ruling cells are too weak to organize all the material they have taken in.

It is the shaping force that wants a steady supply of new material, which means more "force." Look at the masterful way a whole living creature is built up out of an egg.

"The mechanical explanation" only counts amounts. But the real energy lies in the kind of thing, its quality. So mechanics can only describe what happens. It cannot explain it.

"Purpose." We should begin by looking at the "cleverness" of plants.

The idea of things getting "better" does not only mean getting more complicated. It means getting more powerful. And that does not have to mean simply getting bigger.

What this tells us about how humans develop: the road to perfection is to produce the most powerful individuals. The great masses would then be turned into mere tools for their use, but tools that are as intelligent and flexible as possible.

661.

Why does every activity, even just using one of our senses, come with pleasure? Because before the activity could happen, some obstacle or burden had to be removed. Or, better put, because every action is a kind of overcoming, of becoming master of something, and of increasing the feeling of power? Think of the pleasure of thinking. In the end it is not only the feeling of power. It is also the pleasure of creating something and of looking at what you have created. For every activity reaches our awareness in the form of "works," of finished things we have made.

662.

To create is to choose something and then to finish what you have chosen. (This is the key part of every act of will.)

663.

Everything that happens because of an intention can be traced back to one intention: the intention to increase power.

664.

When we do something, we are aware of a feeling of strength. Often we feel it even before we act, while we are only picturing what we will do. For example, we feel it when we see an enemy or an obstacle that we feel strong enough to handle. This feeling always comes along with the action. By instinct, we believe this feeling of strength causes the action, that it is the "driving force." Our belief in cause and result is really a belief in force and what it does. It is a copy of our own experience, in which we treat force and the feeling of force as the same thing. But force never actually moves anything. The strength we are aware of "does not set the muscles moving." "We have no experience of such a process, and no idea of it." "We know as little about force as a driving power as we know about whether a movement had to happen." And yet force is supposed to be the thing that compels! "All we know is that one thing comes after another. We know nothing about whether the second is forced to follow the first, or whether it just happens to." Cause and result are first invented when we imagine compulsion inside a series of events. What we get from this is a kind of "understanding" of the thing. In other words, we make the process a little more human, a little more "familiar." And what is familiar to us is the well-known, everyday fact of a person forcing something, together with the feeling of force that goes with it.

665.

Say I intend to stretch out my arm. Let us assume I know as little about how the human body works, and about the mechanical laws of its movements, as the ordinary person on the street. Then what could be vaguer, emptier, more uncertain than this intention, compared with what actually happens next? And suppose I were the smartest expert in mechanics, and knew all the formulas that apply here. I still could not stretch out my arm one bit better. In this case, our "know-

ing" and our "doing" stand coldly apart, as if they lived in two different places. Here is another example. Napoleon carries out a war plan. What does that really mean? Here, everything about how the campaign is carried out is known, because everything has to be done through spoken orders. But even here, it is taken for granted that there are officers under him who take the general plan and adjust it to each sudden situation, to how strong the forces are, and so on.

666.

For ages we have judged the worth of an action, a character, or a whole life by the intention behind it, by the purpose it was done for or lived for. This ancient habit of taste finally becomes dangerous once people become more and more aware that the things that happen in the world have no intention and no purpose. Along with that awareness, it seems that everything is about to lose its value: "Nothing makes sense." This gloomy saying really means: "All meaning lies in the intention. So if there is no intention at all, there can be no meaning either." Because people judged things this way, they were forced to place the value of life somewhere else: in a life after death, or in the steady progress of ideas, or of humanity, or of a nation, or of humans rising to the higher human to come. But this way, purpose was pushed endlessly forward, without ever stopping. In the end, people had to find themselves a spot in the overall process of the world. (And from a gloomy, unhappy point of view, perhaps that process was one that led to nothingness.)

On this point, the idea of "purpose" needs a harsher examination. We should admit the following. First, an action is never caused by a purpose. Second, a goal and the means to reach it are interpretations. With them, we pick out and highlight a few points in an event, and we ignore other points, which are far more numerous. Third, every time something is done for a purpose, something completely different

happens as well, and other things too. Fourth, an action done for a purpose is like the so-called purposefulness of the heat that the sun gives off: most of it is wasted, and only a tiny part, hardly worth counting, has a "purpose" or "meaning." Fifth, an "end" together with its "means" is a ridiculously vague description. It may work as a command, as "will," but it assumes a whole system of obedient, trained tools. These tools replace the vague goal with a crowd of exact, definite steps. In other words, we picture a system of clever but narrow-minded minds that set up ends and means, just so that we can give our one known "end" the role of "cause of the action." But we have no right to do this. It is like solving a problem by putting its answer in an unreachable world that we cannot observe.

Finally, why couldn't an "end," a goal, be just something that comes along with the action? It could be one feature in the chain of changes among the active forces that actually bring the action about. It would be like a faint shorthand sign, sketched out in our mind ahead of time. It would act as a guide to what happens, even as a sign of what happens, but *not* as its cause. But if we think this way, we are questioning the *will* itself. Isn't it a trick of the mind to treat whatever shows up in our awareness as willpower, as a cause? Aren't all the things we are aware of only end results? Aren't they the missing links of a longer chain, which only seem to cause one another as they follow each other in our mind? That might be an illusion.

667.

Science does *not* ask what pushes us to want something. On the contrary, it *denies* that any wanting or willing happens at all. It assumes that something quite different has taken place. In short, it holds that the belief in "will" and in "goals" is an illusion. Science does not look into the *motives* behind an action, as if these motives had been sitting in our mind before the action. Instead, it first breaks the

action down into a group of events. Then it looks for what came before this mechanical movement. But it does *not* do this in terms of feeling, sensing, and thinking. It can never accept an explanation coming from that side, because sensing is exactly the thing science studies, *the thing that needs explaining*. The job of science is precisely to explain the world *without* treating our sensations as the cause. Doing that would mean treating *sensations* as the *cause* of sensations. The task of science is far from finished.

So it comes to this: either there is *no* such thing as will, which is what science assumes, or the will is *free*. The second idea is the common feeling that we can't shake off, even if what science assumes were *proved* true.

The everyday belief in cause and result rests on the idea that free will *is the cause of every result*. Only in this way do we get the feeling that one thing causes another. Along with this comes the feeling that every cause is *not* itself a result, but always only a cause, if the will is the cause. "Our acts of will are *not forced*": this is built into the very *idea of* "*will*." The result must come *after* the cause: that is what we feel. It is only a *guess* that even our willing is forced every single time.

668.

"To will" is not the same as "to desire," to try for something, or to hope for it. What makes it different is the *passion for giving orders*.

There is no such thing as just "willing." There is only the willing of *something*. The *goal* must not be cut off from the state of willing, the way the thinkers who study knowledge cut it off. "Willing" in their sense is no more possible than plain "thinking" with nothing being thought. It is a pure invention.

Willing always means that something is being *ordered*. But that doesn't mean the order actually gets carried out.

The general *state of tension,* in which some force is trying to let itself out, is not "willing."

669.

"Pain" and "pleasure" are the most ridiculous *ways of expressing* judgments. Of course, that does not mean the judgments expressed this way must be ridiculous too. Pain and pleasure are this: all reasons and logic stripped away; a simple yes or no, boiled down to a strong urge to grab something or push it away; a short, commanding signal whose usefulness can't be denied. They start in the central part of the mind. They depend on an extremely fast process of sensing, sorting, connecting, calculating, and drawing conclusions. Pleasure and pain are always end results. They are never causes.

What causes pain and what causes pleasure depends on *how much power* is present. The same thing, when it meets only a small amount of power, may seem like a danger and may call for a quick defence. But when it meets a sense of greater power, it may be an exciting thrill and may bring a feeling of pleasure.

Every feeling of pleasure or pain assumes that someone has *measured the overall usefulness* and *the overall harm* of something. So it assumes a setting where some object or condition is wanted and where the means to get it are being chosen. Pleasure and pain are never "basic, starting facts."

The feelings of pleasure and pain are *reactions of the will*, that is, emotions. In them, the thinking centre sets the worth of certain changes that come along, treating them as one overall value, and also as the start of actions that push the other way.

670.

The belief in "*emotions*." Emotions are something the mind makes up. They are an invention of *causes* that don't really exist. All the general *body feelings* we don't understand get an explanation from the mind. That means we look for a *reason* why we feel this way or that way around certain people or in certain experiences. So we assume something harmful, dangerous, or strange is out there, as if it were the cause of our feeling unwell. In fact, that thing just gets *added on* to the bad feeling, so that we can make sense of our condition. A strong rush of blood to the head, along with a feeling of choking, gets *explained* as anger. The people and things that make us angry are a way of letting off our physical state. Later, after long habit, certain events and certain body feelings become linked so regularly that just seeing those events brings on that body feeling. It causes blood vessels to swell, the release of sexual fluid, and so on. Then we say the "emotion is caused by being near" something.

Pleasure and pain already contain *judgments*. Things that stir us get sorted by whether they raise or lower our feeling of power.

The belief in willing. To believe that a thought can cause a physical movement is to believe in miracles. If science is going to be *consistent*, then once we have made the world *understandable* to ourselves through pictures, we must also make the emotions, the desires, the will, and so on *understandable*. That means we must *deny* them and treat them as *mistakes of the mind*.

671.

Free will or no free will? There is *no such thing* as "*Will*." That is only a simplified idea made up by our understanding, like the idea of "matter."

Every action must first be prepared and made possible mechanically, in the body, before it can be willed. Or, *in most cases*, the "*goal*" of an action only enters the brain after everything is already set up for doing it. The goal is an inner "trigger," nothing *more*.

672.

The step right before an action is connected to that action. But *further back* there is a whole earlier history of preparation that covers *a much wider area*. The single action is only one part of a much larger fact, one that also *continues after* it. Neither the shorter nor the longer processes show up in our awareness.

673.

The theory of *chance*: the soul is a being that chooses and feeds itself. It is always extremely clever and creative. (This *creative* power is usually overlooked! People think the soul is merely passive.)

I saw the *active*, creative *power* inside what seems accidental. An accident in itself is nothing more than *creative urges crashing into each other*.

674.

A living body has a huge number of things going on inside it. Out of all of them, only a small part ever reaches our awareness, and that part is only a tool. Things like a little bit of "virtue," "giving up the self," and other made-up ideas are completely contradicted by everything else that goes on in the body. We would do well to study our body as it really is, with all its lack of morality....

In fact, the body's animal functions are a million times more important than all the lovely moods of the soul and the high points of awareness. Those lovely moods are just extra, an overflow, unless they are needed as tools to serve the animal functions. So take the whole of

our conscious life: the mind and the soul, the heart, goodness, and virtue. Whom does all of it work for? It works to make the tools as perfect as possible, the tools for getting food and getting ahead, which serve the basic animal functions. Above all, it serves the upward climb of life.

What we call "flesh" and "body" is so much more important, beyond all measuring, that everything else is just a small add-on. The task is to keep the chain of life going, so that it grows more and more powerful.

But now look at how the heart, the soul, virtue, and the mind all team up, as if on purpose, to block this goal. They act as if they themselves were the point of all our effort! ... The decline of life comes mainly from the fact that our awareness makes mistakes so very easily. Our instincts do almost nothing to keep it in check, and so it makes the biggest and deepest errors.

Could anyone imagine a crazier piece of vanity than judging the worth of life by the pleasant or unpleasant feelings of this awareness? Awareness is clearly just a tool. And pleasant or unpleasant feelings are also nothing more than tools.

So by what standard do we measure real, objective worth? Only by how much power has grown and how much better organized that power has become.

675.

The worth of all judging of worth.--What I want is to see the doer joined once more with the action. Action has lost all its meaning because, in our thinking, we pulled it apart from the doer. I would like to see the idea of doing something, the idea of a "purpose," an "inten-

tion," a goal, put back into the action. Action has become unimportant because it was artificially cut off from these things.

All "goals," "purposes," and "meanings" are just ways of expressing, and changed shapes of, the one will that is inside everything that happens: the drive for power. To have a goal, a purpose, or an intention, in fact to want anything at all, is the same as wanting more strength, fuller growth, and on top of that, the means to get them.

This is the most common and basic instinct in all our acting and wanting. And for that very reason, it is the one we know least about and the one most hidden from us. In real life we always obey its orders, for the simple reason that we ourselves are its orders....

All judgments of worth are only the results of this one will, and the narrow viewpoints that serve it. Judging worth, in itself, is nothing but this: the drive for power.

To criticize life from the point of view of any one of these values is complete nonsense and a mistake. Even if some value leads to destruction, even then that destruction is serving this will.

"Judging the worth of life itself!" But life is this very judging of worth! And even when we say "no" to life, we are still doing what we are.

We should now see how ridiculous it is to pretend to judge life. Instead, we should try to find out what is really happening when someone does it. Such judging is a symptom, a sign of something else.

676.

Where Our Judgments of Worth Come From

We can study our body piece by piece, and when we do, we see it the same way we see the system of the stars. The difference between liv-

ing and non-living things fades away. In the past, people explained the movements of the stars as the work of beings who were aiming at a goal on purpose. That explanation is no longer needed. And when it comes to the movements and changes of the body too, people long ago gave up the belief that they can be explained by some awareness that has a fixed purpose. By far most of the body's movements have nothing to do with awareness at all, and nothing to do with feeling either. Feelings and thoughts are extremely rare and unimportant things compared with the countless events happening inside us every second.

On the other hand, we believe that even the very smallest event in the body is ruled by a kind of fitting of means to goals, which even our deepest science cannot understand. There is a sort of carefulness, choosing, teamwork, repairing, and so on. In short, we are looking at an activity that we would have to credit with a mind far higher and far wider, beyond all measuring, than the mind we know. We learn to think less of everything that is conscious. We stop the habit of holding ourselves responsible for ourselves, because as aware beings who set goals, we are only the smallest part of ourselves.

Of the many influences working on us every second, such as the air or electricity, we feel almost nothing at all. There might be many forces that we never notice, yet they affect us all the time. Pleasure and pain are very rare and thin compared with the countless signals that one cell or organ sends to another cell or organ.

This is the stage where awareness learns to be humble. In the end, we can see the aware self, the 'I', as just a tool serving that higher and wider mind. And then we may ask whether all conscious wanting, all conscious goals, all judgments of worth, might only be tools used to reach something quite different from what our awareness believes. We think it is all about our pleasure and pain. But pleasure and pain

might be the means that get us to do something that lies outside our awareness.

The point here is to show how very shallow everything we are aware of really is. It shows how different an action is from our picture of it. It shows how little we know about what comes before an action. It shows how made-up our feelings are, along with "free will" and "cause and result." It shows that thoughts and images, just like words, are only signs pointing to thoughts. It shows that we can never find the real reasons for any action, and that all praise and blame are shallow. It shows how much of our conscious life is made of imaginings and illusions. It shows that all our words only stand for imaginings (and our emotions do too), and that what holds people together depends on passing these imaginings along and keeping them going. Meanwhile, deep down, the real bond between people, which comes through having children, goes its own unknown way. Does this belief in imaginings that people share really change humankind? Or is the whole set of ideas and values just an outward sign of changes we cannot see? Do things like will, purposes, thoughts and values really exist at all? Is all of our conscious life perhaps nothing more than a mirage? Even when values seem to decide what a person does, they are in fact doing something quite different! In short, suppose we could show that nature fits means to ends in its workings without needing some ruling self, some 'I', behind it. Then could it not be that our idea of purposes, our will, and so on, are only a kind of code language standing for something quite different, something that does not will and is not conscious? Could they be only the thinnest outer look of that natural fitting of means to ends in living things, and not different from it in any way?

Put briefly, maybe the whole growth of the mind is really about the body. Maybe it is the history, written down in our awareness, of the fact that a higher kind of body is taking shape. Living things are

climbing to higher levels. Our longing to understand Nature is a tool the body uses to reach perfection. Or, better still: hundreds of thousands of experiments are being made to change how the body is fed and how it lives. The body's awareness and its values, its kinds of pleasure and pain, are signs of these changes and experiments. In the end, this is not really about humans at all, because humans must be surpassed.

677.

How Far Every View of the World Is a Sign of a Ruling Instinct

The artist's way of looking at the world is to sit in front of the world and take it all in. But something is missing here: a close look at how we enjoy beauty, how that enjoyment can be traced back to cruelty, its feeling of being safe, its attitude of judging from a distance, and so on. We must also look at the artist himself and how his mind works. That means examining his urge to play as a way of letting off energy, his love of change, his love of bringing his soul into contact with strange things, his total selfishness as an artist, and so on. Which instincts does he turn into something higher?

The scientist's way of looking at the world calls for a critical look at the inner longing for science. This is the wish to make everything understandable, and the wish to make everything practical, useful and something that can be exploited. We must ask how far this goes against beauty and art. In this view, only the kind of value that can be counted in numbers matters. We must ask how it comes about that, under the influence of science, the average kind of person comes to dominate. It would be terrible if even history were taken over in this way, since history is the realm of superior minds and of judgment. Which instincts are being turned into something higher here!

The religious way of looking at the world calls for a critical look at the religious person. We should not take the moral person as the model. Instead we should take the person who has extreme feelings of being lifted up and of sinking into deep gloom. He reads the high moments either with thanks or with suspicion, but he never looks for where they come from inside himself, and he does not do so for the low moments either. This is the person who, at his core, feels anything but free, and who turns his conditions and moods of giving in into something higher.

The moral way of looking at the world. Here, the feelings that belong to certain levels of society are projected onto the whole universe. Stability, law, putting things in order, and making things alike are searched for in the highest places, because these are what people value most, above everything or behind everything.

What all of these have in common is this: the ruling instincts want to be seen as the highest values of all, and even as the powers that create and rule. Of course, these instincts either fight against each other or defeat each other. They may join together into a mix, or take turns holding power. But the deep conflict between them is so great that when all of them demand to be satisfied at once, the result is a thoroughly average person.

678.

We can ask whether what we seem to "know" might also grow out of our older values. These old values have become so much a part of us that they now sit at the very base of our nature. If so, then only our newer needs are actually fighting. And what they are fighting against is what our oldest needs produced.

We see, feel, and explain the world in a certain fixed way. We do this so that living things can survive by explaining the world in exactly

that way. A human being is not only a single person. A human is also the next link in the whole of life, carried forward along one particular line. The fact that humans survive shows that a certain kind of explaining the world has also survived, even if new things keep being added to it. It shows that, as a whole system, this way of explaining things has not changed. This is what people call "adaptation."

Our "dissatisfaction," our "ideals," and things like that may be the result of this way of explaining the world that has become part of us, of our particular point of view. In the end, living things might even die out because of it. It would be like the way different parts of a body share out the work: if one part dries up or grows weak, that sharing can bring down the whole body. The destruction of life, even of its highest form, must follow the same rules as the death of a single person.

679.

Look at it from the point of view of the theory that living things come from earlier living things. Seen this way, becoming separate individuals means one thing constantly splitting into two. It also means individuals are constantly being wiped out for the sake of a few individuals, the ones that evolution carries forward. The larger mass always dies off. That mass is like "the body."

Here are the basic facts: countless individuals are sacrificed for the sake of a few, so that the few can exist at all. We must not let ourselves be fooled. The same is true of peoples and races. They make up the "body" that gives birth to rare and valuable individuals, and these individuals carry the great process forward.

680.

I disagree with the idea that a person looks after the interests of the species, or of future generations, at the cost of his own good. All of that only looks true on the surface.

A person gives the sex drive enormous importance. But this is not because the sex drive matters so much to the species. Having children is something the individual himself actually does. It is his greatest interest. So it is his highest way of showing his power. This is not judged by what he is aware of, but from the very center of who he is.

681.

The basic mistakes of the biologists so far: what matters is not the species but raising stronger individuals. The many are only a means to that.

Life is not a matter of constantly fitting what goes on inside a creature to what goes on outside it. Life is the drive for power. This drive starts from inside, and it conquers and takes in more and more of the "outside" world.

These biologists keep carrying on the old moral values. They believe that putting others first is always worth more. They are against the desire to rule, against war, against everything that is not useful, and against every ranking of people by worth and every division into classes.

682.

In natural science, people still look down on the self, the 'I', for moral reasons, and at the same time they think far too highly of the species. But the species is just as much an illusion as the self, the 'I'. A false line has been drawn between them. The self, the 'I', is a hundred

times more than just one link in a chain of living things. It is the whole chain itself, in every possible way. The species is only an idea we make up, because we see many of these chains and notice that they are partly alike. People often say the individual is sacrificed to the species. But that is not a fact at all. It is only an example of explaining things wrongly.

683.

Here is how a famous scientist who studies the brain states the superstition of "progress":

"An animal never makes progress as a species. Only man makes progress as a species."

No.

684.

Against Darwin. Taming humans, making them domestic: what real value can that have? Or does taming in itself have a real value? There are reasons to say it does not.

Darwin's followers certainly work very hard to convince us of the opposite. They would love to prove that taming can change creatures deeply, at their very roots. For now, we stand firm right where we stood before. So far, taming has been shown to cause nothing except very surface-level changes, or decline. And anything that escapes from human control and training goes back almost at once to its original natural state. The type stays the same. Man cannot "un-nature nature."

Biologists count on the struggle to survive. They count on the weaker creature dying and the toughest, most talented fighter living on. Because of this, they imagine that all creatures keep getting more and

more perfect. We, on the other hand, have convinced ourselves of something else. In the struggle to survive, chance helps the weak just as much as the strong. Cleverness often makes up for a lack of strength, and does it well. And how many young a species has is linked in a striking way to how likely that species is to be destroyed....

Natural selection is also said to have the power to bring about endless changes in form, slowly. People believe that every advantage is passed down to the young and grows stronger over the generations. Yet we know that passing traits down is so unpredictable that... People also think that when certain creatures fit very special living conditions perfectly, this is caused by the things around them. But nowhere can you find examples of selection that happens without anyone choosing. Absolutely nowhere. The most different individuals mate with one another, and the extremes get lost in the crowd. Each creature competes with the others to keep its own kind going. Creatures whose looks protect them from certain dangers do not change those looks when they live somewhere with no danger at all.... If they live in places where their fur or skin does not hide them, they do not adjust to their surroundings in any way.

The idea that the most beautiful creatures get chosen as mates has been blown up so far that it goes well beyond the sense of beauty even in our own human race! In fact, the most beautiful creature often mates with the lowest, and the biggest with the smallest. Almost always we see males and females making use of the first chance meeting they get, without showing any taste or choosiness at all. There are changes caused by climate and food, but in fact they do not matter much.

There are no in-between forms.

People take it for granted that creatures keep developing further. There are no reasons at all for this belief. Every type has its limits, and evolution cannot carry it past them.

My overall view. First claim: man as a species is not making progress. Higher examples of humans do appear, but they do not last. The general level of the species does not rise.

Second point: Humans as a species are not any kind of step forward compared with any other animal. The whole world of animals and plants does not develop from lower to higher. Instead, it all develops at the same time, by chance, in a jumble, and in conflict with itself. The richest and most complicated forms die out more easily. And the phrase "higher type" means nothing more than that: richer and more complicated. Only the lowest forms manage to keep up their look of lasting forever. The higher forms are rarely reached, and they hold on to their top position only with difficulty. The lower forms make up for it by having huge numbers of offspring. It is the same with human beings. The best examples, the lucky successes of evolution, are the first to die out as luck swings for them and against them. They are open to every kind of decline and decay. They are extreme, and that alone already makes them examples of decline, decay. Beauty, genius, and a ruler like Caesar last only a short time, and this is something unique to them: such things are not passed down to children. What gets passed down is the type, and there is nothing extreme or especially "lucky" about a type. This is not some special fate, or Nature having an "evil will." It simply comes from what a "higher type" is. A higher type is far, far more complicated. It is a bigger collection of parts that must all work together. But for that very reason, the danger of falling apart becomes a thousand times greater. "Genius" is the finest machine there is, and that is exactly why it is the easiest to break.

Third point: The taming of humans, which we call culture, does not go very deep. When it does go far below the surface, it at once turns into decline (the example: the Christian). The wild person, or, in the language of morality, the evil person, is a return to Nature. In a certain way, he stands for a recovery, a cure from what "culture" has done to us.

685.

Against Darwin. When I look over the great fates of humankind as a whole, what surprises me most is that I always see the opposite of what Darwin and his followers see today, or insist on seeing. They see nature choosing the stronger and the better built, and the species moving forward. But the very opposite is staring us in the face. The lucky successes get crushed. The finer, more highly built types turn out to be useless. The average always ends up in charge, and so do those who are even below average. Unless someone shows me why humans should be an exception among living things, I tend to believe that Darwin's school is wrong everywhere. The drive for power, which I see as the deepest reason and nature of all change, explains why nature never chooses in favor of the exceptions and the lucky successes. The strongest and happiest natures are weak when they face a majority that is organized by the herd instinct and gripped by the fear that rules weak people. My overall view of human values shows this: in the highest values that now steer the fate of humanity, it is not the lucky cases, the chosen best examples, that win. It is the examples of decline, decay. Maybe there is nothing more interesting in the world than this unpleasant sight.

Strange as it sounds, strong people always have to be protected against weak people. The well-built must be protected against the badly built, and the healthy against the sick and the bodily failed and weak. If we took our morals straight from what really happens, they

would say this: the average are worth more than the exceptional, and the declining are worth more than the average. The wish for nothingness wins out over the wish to live. And today the general goal, in the words of Christians, Buddhists, and the philosopher Schopenhauer, is: "It is better not to exist than to exist."

I protest against turning what really happens into a moral rule. And I hate Christianity with a deadly hatred, because it invented grand words and lofty poses in order to dress up a disgusting truth in the cheap glitter of justice, virtue, and holiness.

I see all philosophers and all of science kneeling before a reality that is the opposite of "the struggle for life" as Darwin and his school understood it. In other words, wherever I look, I see the winners and survivors are those who cast doubt and suspicion on life and on the worth of life. The mistake of the Darwinian school became a puzzle for me: how can anyone be so blind as to make this mistake?

The claim that species tend to climb upward is the most ridiculous claim ever made. Up to now, they have only shown a flat, unchanging level. There is no proof at all that higher living things developed out of lower ones. What I see is that the lower ones are now on top because of their great numbers, their cunning, and their tricks. And I cannot find a single case where a chance change gives an advantage, at least not over a very long time. For that, we would need to find some reason why a chance change should become so very powerful.

I do indeed find the "cruelty of Nature" that people talk about so often, but in a different place. Nature is cruel, but she is cruel to her lucky and well-built children. The lowly ones she protects, shelters, and loves.

In short, a species may grow in power because its especially well-built and strong members win out. But it is perhaps more likely that it

grows in power because its average and lower members win out. The lower ones have many offspring and last a long time. The strong ones face greater dangers all around them, they are used up faster, and their numbers are cut down more quickly.

686.

Humans as they have been up to now are the unborn seed of the human of the future. All the shaping forces that will create that future human are already inside today's human. And because these forces are enormous, the more promise for the future a modern person carries, the more suffering comes to him. This is the deepest idea of suffering: the shaping forces crash into each other. We should not be fooled by how alone each person seems. In fact, some unbroken current really does flow through all people and so ties them together. The very fact that they feel alone is the strongest push that drives them to set themselves the highest goals. Their search for happiness is the thing that holds these shaping forces together, calms them down, and stops them from destroying each other.

687.

A mind with too much strength sets new goals for itself. It is not at all satisfied with commanding and leading the lower world, or with keeping the body alive, or with keeping the "individual" going.

We are more than the individual. We are the whole chain itself, and we carry inside us the tasks of every possible future of that chain.

3. Theory of the Drive for Power and of Values

688.

One single view of the mind. We are used to thinking that a huge number of different forms can all grow out of one single origin.

My theory would be this: the drive for power is the basic, original force that moves things, and all other motives have grown out of it.

It makes things much clearer to put the word power in place of personal "happiness," which every living creature is supposed to be chasing. So we should say: "It strives for power, for more power." Happiness is only a sign that a feeling of power has been reached. It is an awareness of a difference, of being more than before. A living thing does not chase happiness. Instead, happiness shows up once it reaches the goal it was striving for. Happiness comes along with the action; it is not what drives the action.

All force that moves things is the drive for power. There is no other force, whether physical, mechanical, or mental.

In our science, the idea of cause and result has been boiled down to a perfect balance. Science would like to find the same amount of force on both sides, in the cause and in the result. Because of this, any idea of a force that actually drives things is missing. We only grasp results, and we call them equal because they hold the same amount of force....

We simply know from experience that change never stops. But deep down we have no reason at all to assume that one particular change has to follow another particular change. In fact, it is the opposite. Any state that has been reached would seem almost forced to keep itself just as it is, unless it had inside itself some ability to not want to stay the same.... The philosopher Spinoza claimed that everything strives for "self-preservation," to keep itself as it is. If that were true, it really ought to bring all change to a halt. But that claim is false, and the opposite is true. In every living thing we can clearly see that it does everything it can, not to stay as it is, but to become greater....

689.

The drive for power and cause and result. Seen from the point of view of the mind, our idea of a "cause" is really our feeling of power when we do what we call willing something. And our idea of a result is a superstition: the belief that this feeling of power is itself the force that moves things....

Here is what happens. A state of mind that comes along with an event, and is already a result of that event, gets treated as the "full cause" of that event. Then there is the tense connection between our feeling of power, which is what pleasure is, and an obstacle being overcome. Are these things just illusions?

Let us take the idea of "cause" back to the only area we actually know, the area where we got the idea from in the first place, our own willing. If we do that, we cannot picture any change at all that does not have the drive for power inside it. We have no way to explain any change except as one power pushing into and taking over the ground of another.

Mechanics, the science of moving bodies, only shows us the results, and even then only in pictures. Talking about "movement" is just a figure of speech. Gravity itself has no mechanical cause, because gravity is itself the first cause of all mechanical results.

The urge to pile up force is found only in living things: in feeding, in having offspring, in passing traits on, in society, in nations, in customs, and in authority. But shouldn't we be allowed to suppose that this same urge is also the driving force behind chemistry? And behind the order of the whole universe?

It is not only that energy is kept and not lost, but also that as little as possible is wasted. So the only real thing is this: every center of power wants to become stronger. It is not about keeping yourself as you are.

It is the desire to take over, to become master, to become more, to become stronger.

Does the fact that science is possible prove the rule of cause and result? Does it prove sayings like "The same causes bring the same results," or "There is a permanent law of things," or "There is an order that never changes"? Just because something can be calculated, does that mean it has to happen that way?

If something happens in one way, and only in that way, that does not show a "principle," a "law," or an "order" at work. What really happens is that certain amounts of power start to act, and their very nature is to use their power over all the other amounts of power. Can we imagine a striving for power without any feeling of pleasure and pain, that is, without sensing that power is growing or shrinking? Is the whole mechanical picture of the world just a sign language, a code, for a hidden fact: a world of amounts of willpower fighting and conquering each other? All the basic ideas of mechanics, like matter, atoms, weight, pressure, and pushing apart, are not facts on their own. They are interpretations, and we arrived at them with the help of made-up ideas taken from our own minds.

Life is the form of existence we know best, and life is completely a "drive to pile up strength." Every process of life depends on this. Everything aims, not at keeping what it has, but at growing and building up more. Take life as one example, and this idea could be applied to all existence. Life strives for the greatest possible feeling of power. At its core, life is a striving for more power. Striving itself is nothing but straining toward more power. The deepest and most basic thing of all is this drive. (Mechanics is just a set of signs that describes the results.)

690.

Whatever causes development to exist cannot be found, when we look into it, sitting above development. It should not be seen as something that is developing, nor as something that has already developed.... The drive for power cannot have developed out of something else.

691.

How does the whole process of living things relate to the rest of nature? Here the basic drive shows itself.

692.

Is the drive for power one kind of will, or is it the same thing as the idea of will itself? Is it the same as wanting, or as giving orders? Is it the will that the philosopher Schopenhauer says is the true nature of all things?

My claim is this. The "will" that psychologists have talked about until now has been an unfair, too-broad generalization, and no such will really exists. People did not treat it as a fact that one will develops into many forms. Instead, they emptied will of its character by taking away its content, its "where to," the thing it is aimed at. Schopenhauer did this more than anyone: what he calls "will" is just an empty word. The idea of a "will to live" is even less believable. Life is just one of the ways the drive for power shows itself. It is completely random and ridiculous to claim that everything is striving to get into this one particular form of the drive for power.

693.

Suppose the deepest nature of existence is the drive for power. Suppose happiness is every growth of power, and unhappiness is the feel-

ing of not being able to resist, of not being able to become master. Then may we not take happiness and pain as basic, central facts? Can there be any will without these two swings back and forth, between yes and no? But who is it that feels happiness? ... Who wants power? ... What a nonsense question! It is nonsense if the nature of all things is itself the drive for power, and so also the ability to feel pleasure and pain! Even so: contrasts and obstacles are necessary, and so, relatively speaking, there must also be separate units that push into one another's ground.

694.

A force looks for obstacles so it can overcome them. The bigger the obstacles it takes on, the more failure and disaster it will run into along the way. And since every force can only show itself by pushing against something that resists it, some unhappiness is always built into every action. But this pain works as an even stronger push toward life, and it makes the drive for power grow.

695.

Suppose pleasure and pain are connected to the feeling of power. Then life would have to bring such a rise in power that the difference, the "extra," would have to be noticed by our mind. If power just stayed flat at one level, it could only measure its happiness against drops below that level. In other words, it would measure itself against moments of unhappiness, not moments of happiness.... The wish to grow is part of what happiness is: power gets bigger, and we become aware of that difference.

In a state of decline, decay, after a while the opposite difference becomes noticeable, which is shrinking. The memory of earlier strong

moments drags down whatever happiness we feel now. In this state, comparing makes us less happy.

696.

Happiness does not come from the will getting what it wants. I am especially against this shallow theory, this silly, fake psychology about the simplest things. Instead, happiness comes from the will always trying to beat whatever stands in its way. The feeling of happiness lies exactly in the will's restlessness, in the fact that it is never satisfied unless it has opponents and obstacles. "The happy man" is an ideal of the crowd.

697.

Our instincts are normally restless and unsatisfied. Think of hunger, sex, or the need to move. There is nothing in this restlessness that brings us down by itself. Instead, it makes us feel alive. No matter what the pessimists tell us, it makes us stronger, just like any steady beat of small, annoying jolts does. This restlessness does not make us sick of life. It is actually the great push toward life.

(Maybe pleasure could even be described as a steady beat of small, painful jolts.)

698.

Kant says: "I agree with complete certainty with these lines by Count Verri, from his book of 1781 on pleasure and pain: 'The only thing that moves a human being is pain. Pain comes before every pleasure. Pleasure is not something real in itself.'"[5]

[Translator's note 5: The book's title means On the Nature of Pleasure and Pain. The quoted lines mean: "The only motive force of man is pain. Pain precedes every pleasure. Pleasure is not a positive thing."]

699.

Pain is something different from pleasure. I mean that it is not pleasure's opposite.

Let's say the core of pleasure has been well described as the feeling of growing power. That is a feeling of difference, which means it depends on comparing. But that still does not explain what pain is. Ordinary people believe in false opposites, and so their language does too. These false opposites are always dangerous chains that hold back the progress of truth. There are even cases where a kind of pleasure depends on a steady series of small, painful jolts. This way, the feeling of power and the feeling of pleasure grow very quickly. This happens, for example, with tickling, and also with the sexual tickling that comes with sex. Here we see pain working as an ingredient of happiness. It seems to be a small block that is overcome, then right away another small block that is overcome again. This game of resistance and beating resistance is the strongest trigger of that full feeling of overflowing, extra power, which is what happiness really is.

The reverse does not exist. Pain does not grow stronger when small pleasant jolts are mixed into it. So pleasure and pain are not opposites.

Pain is clearly a process of the mind that contains a judgment. That judgment is "harmful," and it sums up a long history of experience. There is no such thing as pain by itself. It is not the wound that hurts. What speaks to us so powerfully, and what we call pain, is the experience of the harmful effects a wound might have on the whole body. (Some dangers were unknown to early humans, for example those that come from new mixtures of poisonous chemicals. With these, pain gives us no warning, and we are lost.)

What is truly special about pain is the long-lasting disturbance, the trembling that follows a terrible shock in the nerve centers. In fact, nobody suffers from the cause of the pain, such as an injury. They suffer from the long upset of their balance that comes after the shock. Pain is a sickness of the brain's centers. Pleasure is not a sickness at all.

It looks as if pain causes our reflexes, and even the bias of philosophers supports this idea. But in very sudden accidents, if we watch closely, we see that the reflex happens noticeably before we feel the pain. When I trip, I would be in trouble if I had to wait for the news to ring the bell of my awareness, and then wait for instructions to be sent back to me like a telegram. Instead, what I notice very clearly is this. First, my foot reacts by reflex so I don't fall. Then, after a short time that could be measured, a kind of wave of pain suddenly hits my forehead. So nobody reacts to pain. Pain is only afterward sent out to the hurt spot. But even then, this local pain is not really a report from the wound itself. It is just a local signal, and its strength and type match how bad the wound is, as noted by the nerve centers. Yes, after such a shock, the body's muscle strength drops a lot. But that does not prove at all that pain is basically a drop in the feeling of power.

Let me say it once more: nobody reacts to pain. Pain is not a "cause" of action. Pain is itself a reaction. The reflex movement is a different process that happens earlier. The two start at different places....

700.

What pain is telling us: pain by itself does not report what part has just been damaged. Instead, it reports what that damage means for the whole person.

Should we believe that there are some pains that "the species" as a whole feels, but that the single person does not feel?

701.

People say: "The total of unhappiness is bigger than the total of happiness, so it would be better if the world did not exist." Or they say: "Looked at sensibly, the world is something that would be better off not existing, because it causes more pain than pleasure to the one who feels it." This pointless chatter now calls itself pessimism!

Pleasure and pain come along with things; they are not causes. They are second-rate judgments of value that come from a deeper, ruling value. They are the same as the feeling that something is "useful" or "harmful," and so they are completely passing and relative. After all, whenever we ask whether something is useful or harmful, there are a hundred different ways to ask "useful for what?"

I look down on this kind of pessimism that comes from being overly sensitive. It is itself a sign that life has become deeply poor and weak.

702.

Humans do not chase happiness, and they do not run away from unhappiness. Everyone knows the famous beliefs I am going against here. Pleasure and pain are only results, only things that come along on the side. What every person wants, and what every tiny bit of a living body wants, is more power. While striving for this, we run into pleasure and pain. It is because of this drive that a living thing goes looking for opposition and needs something standing in its way.... So pain, as something that blocks its drive for power, is a normal part, a natural ingredient, of everything that lives. People do not avoid it. On the contrary, they constantly need it. Every victory, every feeling of pleasure, every event depends on some obstacle that has been overcome.

Let us take the simplest example: the most basic kind of feeding. The living jelly of a cell, the protoplasm, stretches out its little false feet to look for something that pushes back against it. It does not do this because it is hungry, but because of its drive for power. Then it tries to overpower, take hold of, and absorb whatever it touches. What people call "food" or "nourishment" is only a side result, a practical use, of the original, basic drive to grow stronger.

Pain does not shrink our feeling of power. Far from it: in most cases it actually pushes that feeling on, like a spur pushing a horse. The obstacle is what excites the drive for power.

703.

People have mixed up pain with one of its special kinds, which is exhaustion. Exhaustion really does mean a deep drop and weakening of the drive for power, a real loss of strength. In other words, there are two kinds of pain. First, there is pain that pushes us to gain more power. Second, there is pain that comes after we have used up power. In the first case pain is a spur. In the second case it is the result of too much spurring.... The second kind of pain goes with being unable to fight back. The first kind goes with going out to challenge whatever pushes back.... When you are exhausted, the only happiness you can feel is falling asleep. In the other case, happiness means victory.... The big mistake of psychologists was that they did not keep these two kinds of happiness clearly apart: the happiness of falling asleep, and the happiness of winning. Exhausted people want rest, relaxed limbs, peace and quiet. These things make up the bliss promised by the religions and philosophies of the belief that nothing has meaning. But people who are rich in life and strength, the active ones, want victory, beaten opponents, and the spreading of their feeling of power over wider and wider areas. Every healthy function of a living body has this

need. And the whole body is a tangled web of systems, all struggling to increase the feeling of power....

704.

How is it that the most basic belief in every kind of psychology is a piece of the most shocking twisting and making-up of facts? Take, for example, "Humans strive for happiness." How much of this is true? To understand what life is, and what sort of striving and tension life holds, the rule we use should work not only for trees and plants, but also for animals. "What does the plant strive for?" But here we have already invented a false thing that does not exist. When we give it the clumsy name "plant," as if it were one single unit, we hide and deny the fact that it is an endlessly varied growth, starting from many separate and half-separate points. It is very clear that the very last and smallest "individuals" cannot be understood as fixed, deep-down units or atoms. The area of their power keeps shifting all the time. But through all these changes, can we say that any of them is striving for happiness? All this spreading out, this taking in and growing, is a search for resistance. Movement is closely tied to states of pain. So the force driving all this must be some other desire, if it leads to such constant wanting and seeking of pain. Why do the trees in a wild, untouched forest fight one another? "For happiness"? No: for power! ...

Humans are now masters of the forces of nature. They are also masters of their own wild, unchecked feelings; the passions have fallen into line and have learned to be useful. Compared with the earliest humans, the person of today holds a huge amount of power, but not any more happiness! So how can anyone claim that humans have been striving for happiness?..

705.

But even as I say this, I see above me, and below the stars, a glittering tail of mistakes, like a rat's tail, that until now has been humanity's greatest inspiration: "All happiness comes from virtue, and all virtue comes from free will"!

Let us turn these values upside down: all ability comes from a body and mind that are fortunately built, and all freedom comes from ability. By freedom I mean here the ease of steering yourself. Every artist will understand what I mean.

706.

"The value of life." Every life stands on its own. All existence has to be justified, not only life. And the principle that justifies it has to be one through which life itself speaks.

Life is only a means to something else: it is the outward sign of the ways in which power grows.

707.

The "conscious world," the world of what we are aware of, cannot be the starting point for judging values. What we need is a judgment of value that is "objective," that stands outside our own awareness.

The whole life of any living thing is made up of huge, complicated processes that fight against one another. Compared with these, its conscious world of feelings, aims, and judgments of value is only a small slice. We have no right at all to claim that this little bit of awareness is the goal, the purpose, of all the events of life. Becoming aware is clearly just one more tool that helps life unfold and spread its power. That is why it is childishly simple-minded to set up happiness,

or intelligence, or morality, or any other single area of awareness as the highest value, and perhaps even to use it to justify "the world."

This is my basic objection to every philosophy and every moral view of the universe, and to every religion and theology built on them. I object to all the "purposes" and "highest values" that philosophers and philosophical religions have offered so far. They mistake a tool for the goal itself. And the other way around, they lower life itself, and the way it grows in power, to the level of a mere tool.

Suppose we wanted to name a proper goal for life. That goal would not have to be connected in any way with conscious life. Instead, it would have to explain conscious life as just a tool that serves it....

Imagine treating "saying no to life" as the goal of life, the goal of evolution! As if existence were one huge piece of stupidity! Crazy ideas like this only come from measuring life by the things consciousness notices: pleasure and pain, good and evil. Here the means are set up against the goal. The means look "sinful," absurd, and above all unpleasant, and so people ask: how can the goal be worth anything if it needs means like these? But here is where the mistake lies. Instead of looking for the goal that would explain why such means are needed, we picked a goal from the start that actually rules such means out. In other words, we took our wish for certain kinds of means, especially pleasant, reasonable, and virtuous ones, and turned that wish into a rule. Only after that did we decide what goal we would like life to have....

The basic mistake is this. We should have seen consciousness as a tool, a single, separate part of life as a whole. Instead, we made it the measuring stick, the highest value in life. This is the wrong point of view that judges the whole by one of its parts. And that is why, today, all philosophers are instinctively searching for a consciousness of everything: something that lives and wills consciously along with

everything that happens, a "Spirit," a "God." But someone has to tell them that this is exactly how life gets turned into a monster. A "God," a mind that feels everything, would have to be something that makes us condemn the whole of existence.... Our greatest relief came when we got rid of the idea of an all-seeing consciousness that sets goals and means. That is how we stopped being forced to be pessimists.... The strongest charge we ever brought against life was the existence of God.

708.

About the value of "constant change." If the world's movement were really heading toward some final state, it would have reached that state already. But the one basic fact is that it is not heading toward any final state. Every philosophy and every scientific theory, for example materialism, that says such a final state must come is proven wrong by this basic fact.

I would like a view of the world that does justice to this fact. Constant change should be explained without bringing in any final plans or purposes. Constant change must seem justified at every single moment, or else it must be beyond all judging of value, since such judging always aims at some single unity. The present must never be justified by some future, and the past must never be justified for the sake of the present. "Necessity" must not be understood as some overall force that rules everything, or as a first mover that started it all. Even less should it be seen as the cause that is needed to bring about some valuable result. But to get there, we must deny that constant change has a consciousness over it all, a "God." Otherwise life would be hidden in the shadow of a being who feels and knows the way we do, and yet wants nothing. A "God" who wants nothing is useless. And if he does want something, that assumes a total amount of suffering and senselessness, which lowers the overall value of constant change.

Luckily, no such overall power exists. A suffering God watching over everything, a mind that feels all and a Spirit that is everywhere, would be the worst charge ever brought against existence.

Strictly speaking, nothing like fixed, unchanging existence can be allowed to remain. If it did, constant change would lose its value and become pure, pointless nonsense.

So the next question is this: how did the illusion of fixed, unchanging existence come about? Why did it have to come about?

And also: how did it happen that all the values built on the idea that fixed, unchanging existence is real came to lose their worth?

But in this way we have come to see that this idea of fixed, unchanging existence is the source of all the slander that has been aimed at the world. It is behind ideas like the "better world," the "true world," the "world beyond," and "a thing as it is apart from us."

First: constant change has no final state. It does not move toward standing still.

Second: constant change is not mere appearance. It is more likely that the world of fixed, unchanging existence is the one that is only appearance.

Third: constant change has exactly the same value at every moment. The total of its value always stays the same. To put it another way, it has no value at all. That is because there is nothing to measure it against, nothing that would give the word "value" any meaning here. The total value of the world cannot be judged. And for that reason, philosophical pessimism is a kind of joke.

709.

We should not make our small wishes the judges of existence! And we should not take the highest forms that evolution has produced, for example the mind, and treat them as the "absolute" that stands behind evolution!

710.

Our knowledge has become scientific to the extent that it has been able to use numbers and measurement. It might be worth trying to see whether we could build a scientific ranking of values, based on a scale of numbers and measurements of energy.... All other values come from prejudice, simple-mindedness, and misunderstanding. They can all be brought down to that scale of numbers and measurements of energy. Going up the scale would mean an increase in value, and going down would mean a decrease.

But here, how things look and what people already believe are against you. Moral values are only values on the surface, compared with the values that come from the body.

711.

Why the idea of "value" falls apart:

Because in the "whole process of the universe," the work of humankind does not count for anything. Because there is no such thing as one overall process, seen as an organized system.

Because there is no such thing as a "whole." Because human life and human goals cannot be made to seem worthless by comparing them with something that does not exist.

Because "necessity," "cause and result," and "design" are only useful "appearances."

Because the goal is not "to widen the range of consciousness," but to increase power. The usefulness of consciousness is included in that increase. The same is true of pleasure and pain.

Because a mere tool must not be raised up to be the highest measure of value. This applies to states of consciousness like pleasure and pain, if consciousness is itself only a tool.

Because the world is not a living body at all, but a thing of chaos. Because the growth of "intelligence" is only a tool that tends to make an organized being last a bit longer.

Because asking what is "desirable" makes no sense when it comes to the overall nature of existence.

712.

"God" is the high point, the moment of greatest power. Life is a never-ending process of turning things into gods and then taking their godhood away again. *But even so, there is no highest point of values.* There is only a highest point of *power.*

We must *completely reject explanations of the world that treat it as a machine or as mere matter.* Both of these views only express lower, weaker states. They come from feelings that have had all spirit drained out of them (all spirit of the "drive for power").

Things can slide *backward from the high point* of development. This happens, for example, when power turns into mere thinking on some ground that has been infected by slaves. We can show that this sliding back is the *result* of the greatest energy *turning against* itself. Once that energy has nothing left to organize, it uses its power to *break things apart*.

(a) Societies are *held down* more and more, and are ruled by a smaller and smaller number of stronger individuals.

(b) The privileged and the strong are held down more and more. From this comes the rise of democracy, and in the end the rise of *anarchy,* of disorder, among the parts.

713.

Value is the greatest amount of power that a person can take in and make his own. A single person, not mankind! Mankind is much more a means to an end than an end in itself. What matters is the type of person. Mankind is just the material for the experiment. It is the overflow of those who turned out badly. It is a field of ruins.

714.

Words about values are only flags. They are planted on the spots where people found a *new happiness,* a new *feeling*.

715.

To judge "value" is the same as to look at what a living thing *needs to survive* and *to grow stronger.* This applies to complex creatures that are fairly stable and that show up as evolution goes on.

There are no lasting, final building blocks of the world. There are no atoms and no monads, those tiny units some thinkers imagined. Here too, we ourselves were the first to bring in the idea of "permanence." We did it for practical and useful reasons, and for other reasons too.

Think of "the forms that rule." The area of what they control keeps spreading. Or it shrinks or grows, depending on whether conditions, such as food, are good or bad.

"Value" is, at its core, the point of view that measures whether these ruling centers are growing or shrinking. These centers are always

made of many parts, because "oneness" can never be seen anywhere in the way things develop.

Language gives us no good way to describe the facts of "development," of things changing and growing. We feel a need to imagine a rougher world, made of stable things that simply exist. That need is part of our *never-ending wish to survive.* We can talk about atoms and monads in a loose, relative way. And one thing is certain: *the smallest world is the most stable world* .... There is no such thing as a single will. There are only points of will, and these keep gaining and losing power.

Part Three

The Drive for Power in Society and in the Individual

1. Society and the State

716.

We start from this principle: only individuals feel any responsibility. Groups and organizations are invented to do what a single person does not have the courage to do. That is why all communities are far more honest and far more revealing about human nature than the individual. The individual is too cowardly to stand up for what he really wants.

All selflessness is just the careful good sense of a private person. Societies are not selfless toward each other. The rule "You shall love your next-door neighbor" has never been stretched to mean your neighbor in general. What Manu, the ancient Indian lawgiver, says is probably closer to the truth: "We must think of all the states on our own border, and their allies, as enemies. And for the same reason, we must think of all of their neighbors as our friends."

Studying society is extremely valuable, because a person in a group is much more childlike than a person alone. Society has never seen virtue as anything other than a means to strength, power, and order. Again, Manu's words are simple and dignified: "Virtue could hardly depend on her own strength alone. In truth, it is only the fear of punishment that keeps people within their limits and lets everyone keep what is his in peace."

717.

The State is *immorality* that has been organized. On the inside, it is the police, the criminal laws, social rank, trade, and the family. On the outside, it is the urge for war, for power, for conquest, and for revenge.

A crowd of people will do things that one person will not. There are several reasons. Responsibility is split up, and so is the giving of orders and the carrying of them out. Virtues like obedience, duty, love of country, and loyalty to one's own place are all brought in. And feelings like pride, harshness, strength, hate, and revenge, in short all the typical strong traits, are kept alive. These are traits that are completely foreign to the person of the crowd.

718.

Not one of you has the courage to kill a man or to whip him. But the huge machine of the State crushes the individual. It makes him refuse to take responsibility for his own actions, by calling them obedience, loyalty, and so on.

Everything a person does in the service of the State goes against his own nature. The same is true of everything he learns in order to serve the State later. This result comes from dividing up the work, so that responsibility gets divided up too:

There is the one who makes the law, and there is the one who carries it out.

There is the one who teaches strict self-control, and there are those who have grown hard and tough under that training.

719.

Inside society, the feelings are divided up like jobs. This makes individuals and social classes develop a kind of soul that is incomplete but more useful. Notice how every type of person in society has let certain feelings shrink and wither, so that other feelings can be grown and made stronger.

Morality can be defended in these ways:

In terms of economy, morality tries to make the best possible use of each person's power, so that exceptional people are not wasted.

In terms of beauty and taste, morality shapes fixed types of people, and it gives people pleasure in their own kind.

In terms of politics, morality is the skill of putting up with the huge differences in power between people in society.

In terms of the mind, morality is a made-up preference for the failed and the average, so that the weak can be kept alive.

720.

Humans have one terrible and basic wish: they want power. This urge, which people call freedom, must be held back the longest. That is why morality has, by instinct, aimed at a kind of upbringing that holds back the desire for power. So our morality speaks badly of anyone who wants to be a tyrant, and it praises charity, love of country, and the ambitions of the crowd.

721.

Look at how weakness, the lack of power, hides itself and pretends. It dresses up as obedience, as knowing your place, as pride in duty and morality, as giving in, as devotion, and as love. (When people worship the one who commands them and treat him like a god, it makes up for their weakness. It is a roundabout way of making themselves feel bigger.) Weakness also hides behind fate and giving up, behind being "objective," behind being a tyrant to oneself, behind calmly enduring everything, behind denying oneself pleasures, behind self-sacrifice, and behind making things holy. Other disguises are: criticizing, expecting the worst, getting angry, being easily hurt, playing the "beautiful soul," virtue, treating oneself as a god, the cool distance of the philosopher, and staying away from the world. (When people realize they have no power, they disguise it as looking down on things.)

Everyone needs to use some kind of power, or at least to make it look as if they have some power. Even if it lasts only a short while, it may come in the form of rapture, of high excitement.

Some people want power only for the happiness they think it will bring them. These people are mostly found in political parties. Other people want power just as badly, even when it clearly costs them something, even when it means giving up their happiness and their comfort. These are the ambitious ones. And still other people are like a dog lying in a manger, which can't eat the hay itself but won't let the other animals eat it either. They want power only to keep it from falling into the hands of others, because then they would have to depend on those others.

722.

Suppose there is justice and everyone is equal before the law. What would that get rid of? It would get rid of tension, conflict, and hatred.

But it is a mistake to think that this makes people happier. After all, the people of Corsica, with all their feuds, enjoy more happiness than the people on the mainland of Europe.

723.

The idea of "I give so that you give back," the expectation of getting a reward, is one of the most tempting ways of making human beings worth less. It brings with it a kind of equality that looks down on any big gap between people and calls it immoral.

724.

Whether something is useful depends completely on the goal you want to reach. In other words, it depends on the question: what for? And this "what for," this goal, depends in turn on how much power a person has. So the belief that usefulness is the highest standard is not a basic truth. It only tells us about what follows from certain goals, and it cannot be made a rule that everyone must obey.

725.

In the past, people thought of the State, in theory, as something that exists to be useful. Now it has become that in actual practice. The age of kings is over, because people are no longer worthy of having kings. They don't want to see in a king a symbol of their highest ideal. They only want a tool for getting what they want for themselves. That is the whole truth of it.

726.

I am trying to understand what the group's way of judging and valuing things really means at bottom. Of course, I have no intention of drawing moral lessons from it.

First: how much lying to oneself and how much dullness of mind is needed to make holy the feelings that are necessary for keeping power and growing it, and to give people a clear conscience about those feelings.

Second: how much stupidity is needed so that general rules and values can go on existing at all, including education, the building of culture, and training.

Third: how much nosiness, suspicion, and intolerance is needed to deal with people who are exceptions, to crush them as if they were criminals, and so to give them a guilty conscience and make them feel sick about being different.

727.

Morality is basically a shield, a way of defending oneself. And to that extent, it is a sign of a person who is not yet fully developed. Such a person is still wearing armor; he is still a Stoic, just bearing and enduring things.

The fully developed person, above all, is equipped with weapons. He is a person who attacks.

The weapons of war are turned into tools of peace, the way the scales and hard shells of animals turned, over time, into feathers and hair.

728.

The very idea of a "living thing" means that there must be growth. It means there must be a push to expand one's power, and so a process of taking in other forces. When people are drowsy from the sleeping pills of morality, they talk about the right of a person to defend himself. By the same logic, you could talk about his right to attack. Both of these, and attacking even more than defending, are necessary

for all living things. Selfishness that attacks and selfishness that defends are not matters of choice, or even of "free will." They are part of the unavoidable fate of life itself.

Here it makes no difference whether we are thinking of a single person, a living body, or "a society that is moving forward." The so-called right to punish, which is really society's way of defending itself, was only reached by misusing the word "right." A right can only be gained through an agreement, a contract. But defending yourself and keeping yourself alive do not rest on any contract. With just as much reason, a nation should at least be able to see its hunger for power, whether through weapons, business, trade, or setting up colonies, as a right. Perhaps the right to grow.... When the instincts of a society finally make it give up war and stop conquering, that society is in decline, in decay. It is ready for democracy and for being run by shopkeepers. It is true that, in most cases, promises of peace are just drinks that numb and dull the mind.

729.

Keeping up a military state is the last way to hold on to the great tradition of the past. Or, where that tradition has already been lost, it is the last way to bring it back to life. Through the military state, the superior, strong type of human is kept alive. Because of this, all the institutions and ideas that keep hostility and the ranking of people by worth alive within states may seem justified. These include things like national feeling, protective taxes on foreign goods, and so on.

730.

For a thing to last longer than a person, that is, for a work to outlive the individual who made it, people have to be bound by all kinds of limits and prejudices. But how is that done? It can be done through

love, respect, and gratitude toward the person who created the work. Or it can be done through the thought that our ancestors fought for it. Or it can be done through the feeling that our children and grandchildren will be safe if we keep the work going. One example is the polis, the ancient Greek city-state. Morality is, at its heart, the tool for making something survive the individual, because it necessarily turns the individual into a slave. Clearly, the view from the top is different from the view from the bottom, and the two lead to very different ways of understanding things. How is organized power kept going? By countless generations sacrificing themselves for its cause.

731.

Marriage, property, language, tradition, race, family, nation, and state are each links in a chain. They are separate parts, and each one comes from a more or less high or low origin. In economic terms, they are justified by the extra gain they bring. That gain comes from the benefits of work that never stops and of producing many things at once. This gain is set against the drawbacks: the higher cost of trading and the difficulty of making things last. (There are more and more working parts, yet many of them sit idle much of the time. So it costs more to produce them, and it also costs quite a lot to keep them running.) The benefit lies in avoiding interruptions and the losses that come with them. Nothing costs more than starting from scratch. "The higher the standard of living, the higher the cost of keeping it up, feeding it, and passing it on. And the higher, too, the risk and the chance of a total collapse once the peak has been reached."

732.

In middle-class marriages, taking the word marriage in its best sense of course, the question is not about love at all, any more than it is about money. That is because no institution can be built on love. The

whole thing comes down to society giving two people permission to satisfy their sexual desires, under conditions clearly designed to protect social order. Of course, in any such contract there has to be some attraction between the two people, and a great deal of good nature, patience, getting along, and kindness. But the word love should not be misused when talking about such a union. For two real lovers, in the true and strong sense of the word, satisfying sexual desire is not the main thing. It is only a symbol. For one partner, as I have already said, it is a symbol of total surrender. For the other, it is a sign of stooping down graciously, a sign of taking possession of property. Marriage, as the real old nobility understood it, meant raising a stronger kind of people to carry on the race. (But are there any nobles left today? That is the question.) In other words, it meant keeping alive a fixed, clear type of ruler, and husband and wife were both sacrificed for that goal. Naturally, the first thing considered here had nothing to do with love. Quite the opposite! It did not even require the mutual liking that is absolutely necessary for a middle-class marriage. The first concern was the interest of the race, and the second was the interest of a particular class. Every healthy aristocracy held this noble, high-minded idea of marriage, such as ancient Athens, and even Europe in the eighteenth century. Faced with how cold, strict, and coldly clear-headed this idea was, we warm-blooded creatures with our sadly oversensitive hearts, we "moderns," cannot help a small shudder. That is why love as a passion, in the big sense of the word, was invented for an aristocratic community and inside one, where custom and self-denial are at their strictest.

733.

About the future of marriage: a heavy extra tax on inherited property, and a longer term of military service for unmarried men in the community above a certain age.

All kinds of privileges for fathers who bring many boys into the world, and maybe extra votes for them as well.

A medical certificate as a requirement for any marriage, signed off by the local authorities. In it, the couple and the doctors must answer a set of questions ("family histories").

To work against prostitution, or to raise it to something more decent, I would recommend marriages taken out like a lease, lasting a set number of years or months, with proper support arranged for the children.

Every marriage should be vouched for and approved by a certain number of good, trustworthy men from the local community, as a duty of the community.

734.

Another commandment of love for humanity: there are cases where having a child would be a crime. This is true, for example, for people who are chronically ill and for people with extreme nervous exhaustion. These people should be won over to giving up sex, and for this purpose one could at least try the music of Parsifal, Wagner's opera. After all, Parsifal himself, that innocent born fool, had good reasons for not wanting to have children. Sadly, though, one of the usual signs of a worn-out bloodline is that it cannot hold itself back when tempted, and it reacts to even the smallest sexual attraction. It would be quite wrong, for example, to think that the poet Leopardi was a man who kept away from sex. In cases like these, the priest and the moral teacher are playing a game they cannot win. It would be much better to call in the pharmacist. Finally, society has a real duty to carry out here, and of all the demands placed on it, few are more urgent and necessary than this one. Society is the guardian of life, so it is answerable to life for every failed and weak life that comes into the

world. Since it has to pay for such lives, it ought to make sure they never come into being at all. In many cases it should actually stop people from having children. And, without caring about anyone's social rank, family background, or intelligence, it may keep the strictest forms of force and restriction ready, and in some situations it may even use castration. The law of Moses, "You shall not murder," is a piece of childish innocence compared with how serious this ban on life for people in decline is: "You shall not have children"!!! ... For life itself does not recognize any bond or equal rights between the healthy and the unhealthy parts of a living body. The unhealthy parts must be cut away at any cost, or else the whole body will fall apart. Pity for people in decline, equal rights for those whose bodies are failed and weak: this would be the very height of immorality. It would mean making Nature's most dangerous enemy into morality itself!

735.

There are some fragile, sickly people, the so-called idealists, who can never, no matter what happens, rise any higher than a crude, childish crime. And yet that crime is the great excuse for their pale, weak little lives. It is the small payment they get for lives of cowardice and lying: for one single moment, at least, they were strong. But they usually fall apart after doing such a thing.

736.

In our civilized world we hardly ever hear about any criminal except the pale, shaking kind. He is crushed by society's curses and scorn. He even doubts himself, and he keeps making his deeds seem smaller than they were and lying about them. He is a badly made sort of criminal. That is why people refuse to accept the idea that all great people have been criminals. By that I mean criminals in a great, commanding style, not small or pathetic ones. People also refuse to accept that

crime must be part of greatness. And yet this is what everyone agrees on who has studied human nature and explored the deepest depths of great souls. To feel cut loose from every question of family background, conscience, and duty: this is the danger that every great person faces. But this is exactly what he wants. He wants the great goal, and so he also wants the means to reach it.

737.

When people are guided by reward and punishment, the kind of person the lawmaker has in mind is still of a low and primitive type. He is treated the way you treat a child. In our late culture, the general decline and decay takes all the meaning out of reward and punishment. Steering people's actions by the hope of reward and the fear of punishment only works with young, strong, and energetic peoples. In worn-out peoples, the urges are so impossible to hold back that a mere idea has no power at all. Being unable to resist any stimulus, and feeling that you have to react to it: this extreme sensitivity of people in decline makes all such systems of punishment and reform completely pointless.

The idea of "improving" someone assumes a normal and strong creature. His actions must somehow be balanced out or undone, so that he is not lost to society and turned into an enemy of the community.

738.

The effect of forbidding things. Every power that forbids something, and knows how to make the forbidden person afraid, creates a guilty conscience. (In other words, a person wants something but knows it is dangerous to satisfy that want, so he is forced to be secretive,

sneaky, and careful.) So every ban makes worse the character of those who do not accept it willingly but are forced into it.

739.

"Punishment and reward." These two things stand or fall together. These days nobody will accept a reward, or admit that any authority should have the power to punish. Fighting has been changed into something else. We want something. Someone stands in our way. Then we see that the easiest way to get it is to come to an agreement, to draw up a contract. In modern society, where everyone has agreed to a certain contract, the criminal is a person who breaks that contract. At least this is a clear idea. But if so, then anarchists and enemies of the social order could not be put up with.

740.

Crimes belong to the group of acts that are revolts against the social system. A rebel is not punished; he is simply put down. He may be a completely contemptible and pathetic creature. But there is nothing shameful in rebellion itself. In fact, in our particular society, revolt is far from disgraceful. In some cases a rebel deserves honor exactly because he is aware of certain things in society that are crying out to be fought against. Such a person wakes us up from our sleep. When a criminal commits just one crime against one particular person, that does not change the fact that all his instincts push him to stand up against the whole social system. His single act is only a sign of this.

The idea of punishment should be boiled down to the idea of putting down a revolt. It is a weapon used against those who have been defeated, by means of long or short prison sentences. But punishment should not be linked in any way with contempt. A criminal is, in any case, someone who has put his life, his honor, and his freedom at risk.

So he is a person with courage. Nor should punishment be seen as paying for one's sins or as revenge, as if there were some agreed exchange rate between crime and punishment. Punishment does not make a person clean, simply because crime does not make him dirty.

A criminal should not be stopped from making peace with society, as long as he does not belong to the born criminal type. But if he does, he should be fought even before he has done anything hostile. (As soon as society gets hold of him, the first thing done to him should be castration.) A criminal's bad manners and low intelligence should not be held against him. Nothing is more common than for him to misunderstand himself. This is especially true when his rebellious instinct, the bitterness of someone who has no place in society, has not become conscious, simply because he has not read enough. It is natural for him to deny his deed and speak badly of it while he is afraid because it failed. All this is quite different from cases where, in terms of psychology, the criminal gives in to an urge he cannot understand. He then gives his deed a reason by tying it to some side action that is accidental and unimportant. For example, he robs a man, when what he really wanted was to spill his blood.

A person's worth should not be judged by any single act. Napoleon warned us about this. Deeds that are only on the surface matter especially little. If we have no crime on our conscience, let us say no murder, why is that? It simply means that a few helpful circumstances have been missing from our lives. And suppose we were pushed into committing such a crime: would our worth really change much? In fact, we would only be looked down on if people did not think we had the power to kill someone in certain situations. In almost every crime, certain qualities come into play without which nobody would be a real man. Dostoevsky was not far wrong when he said that the prisoners in the Siberian prison camps made up the strongest and most valuable part of the Russian people. The fact that in our society the

criminal happens to be a badly fed and stunted animal is simply a judgment against our system. In the time of the Renaissance, the criminal was a thriving example of humanity, and he earned his own virtue for himself. That means virtue in the Renaissance sense, what the Italians called virtù: strength and excellence, free from the sour taste of moralizing.

We can only lift up those whom we do not look down on. Moral contempt is a far greater humiliation and insult than any kind of crime.

741.

Shame first became part of punishment when certain penalties were given to people who were looked down on, such as slaves. The group that was punished most often was a despised group. That is how punishment and contempt came to be linked together.

742.

In the old idea of punishment, there was a religious belief built right into it: the belief that suffering a penalty paid back what you owed. Punishment made you clean again. In modern society, though, punishment drags you down. Punishment is a way of paying off a debt. Once it has been paid, you are set free from the act you were so willing to suffer for. As long as people believe that punishment has this power, paying the penalty brings a feeling of relief and lightness. That feeling is not so different from getting better after an illness and being healthy again. You have made your peace with society, and you see yourself as more worthy and pure.... Today, however, punishment cuts a person off from others even more than the crime itself does. The fate that follows the wrongdoing has become so heavy that it is almost hopeless. A person comes out of punishment still an enemy of society. From then on, society counts one more enemy against it. The

old rule of "an eye for an eye," which the Romans called the jus talionis, may come from the wish to pay back harm (that is, from a softer form of the urge for revenge). But in the Book of Manu, an ancient Indian law book, for example, it comes from the need to have something of equal weight to give in order to make up for a wrong, or to become free in a religious sense.

743.

Here is my rather radical question about all the more modern laws on punishment: shouldn't the punishment fit the crime? Deep down, that is what you really want. But then you would have to take into account how sensitive each criminal is to pain. In other words, there should be no penalty decided in advance for any crime, and no fixed list of punishments in a law code. But since it would not be easy to measure how sensitive each criminal is, would punishment then have to be done away with in practice? What a sacrifice that would be! Wouldn't it? And so ...

744.

Ah! And then there is the philosophy of law! That is a field of study which, like all the studies of morals, has not even been wrapped in its baby blankets yet. It is still not even born. Even among legal experts who think of themselves as open-minded, the oldest and most valuable meaning of punishment is still misunderstood. In fact, it is not even known. As long as the study of law does not build on a new foundation, on history and on comparing different peoples and cultures, it will never stop arguing about deeply false, abstract ideas. People lovingly imagine that these ideas are the "philosophy of law," but they have nothing at all to do with modern people. The person of today, however, is such a complicated weave, even in how he judges

right and wrong in law, that he can be explained in all sorts of different ways.

745.

A wise man in ancient China once said he had heard that when great empires were about to fall, they began to have countless laws.

746.

Schopenhauer wanted all scoundrels to be castrated and all silly fools to be locked up in convents. But from what point of view would that be a good thing? The scoundrel has at least one advantage over other people: he is not average. And the fool is better than us in this way: he does not suffer when he sees how average everything is. It would be better to make the gap wider, which means there should be more roguery and more stupidity. That way human nature would become broader ... but in the end, this is fate, and it will happen whether we want it or not. Stupidity and roguery are growing: this is part of modern progress.

747.

Society today is full of thoughtfulness, tact, and holding back. It is full of good-natured respect for other people's rights, even for the demands of strangers. Even more than that, there is a kind, almost instinctive habit of not thinking too highly of what a person is worth, and this shows in all sorts of trusting habits. Respect for people, and not only for the most virtuous ones, is perhaps what truly separates us from the Christian storytellers. We also have a good share of irony, even when we listen to sermons about morals. Anyone who preaches morality to us lowers himself in our eyes and becomes almost funny. Being relaxed and open-minded about morality is one of the best

signs of our time. Where it is most clearly missing, we see that as a sign of sickness (for example, Carlyle in England, Ibsen in Norway, and Schopenhauer's gloomy outlook all over Europe). If anything can make us feel at peace with our own time, it is exactly the amount of immorality it allows itself without thinking any less of itself. Quite the opposite, in fact! So what makes a cultured age better than an uncultured one? What makes the Renaissance better than the Middle Ages, for example? Only this: it has a greater amount of openly accepted immorality. From this it must follow that the moral fanatic will see the very peak of human development as the absolute worst corruption possible. Think, for example, of how Savonarola judged Florence, how Plato attacked Athens under Pericles, how Luther condemned Rome, how Rousseau cursed the society of Voltaire, and how Germany was hostile to Goethe.

A little more fresh air, for heaven's sake! This ridiculous state of Europe must not go on any longer. Is there even one real idea behind this dull, cattle-like nationalism? What good can it possibly do to encourage this proud self-importance, when everything today points toward bigger interests that people share? This is happening at a time when nations clearly depend on each other in spirit and are losing their separate national character. That process is opening the way for nations to come closer together and enrich one another, and that is what gives today's culture its real value and meaning! ... And it is exactly now that "the new German Empire" has been founded on the most worn-out and discredited ideas of all: the vote for everyone and equal rights for all.

Think of all this fighting to get ahead, in conditions that are rotten in every way. Think of this culture of big cities, of newspapers, of rushing around, and of having "no aim"! The economic union of Europe must come, without a doubt. And along with it, as a reaction, will come the peace movement.

Imagine a peace party, free of all sentimental feeling. It would forbid its children to go to war. It would forbid going to the law courts. It would give up all fighting, all arguing, and all persecution. For a time it would be the party of the oppressed, and later it would become the powerful party. This party would be against everything that looks like revenge and resentment.

There will also be a war party. It will be just as thorough and just as strict with itself, but it will go in exactly the opposite direction.

749.

The kings and rulers of Europe should honestly think about whether they can actually get along without our help—without us, we who reject morality. Today we are the only power that can win a victory without any allies, and so we are by far the strongest of the strong. We can even get by without lying. Tell me, what other power can give up that weapon? A strong temptation fights on our side, maybe the strongest one there is: the temptation of truth.... Truth? Where did I get that word? I have to take it back. I have to reject that proud word. But no. We don't even need it. We will be perfectly able to win our victory of power without its help. The real charm that fights for us is like the eye of Venus, the goddess of love—an attraction that our enemies themselves dull and blind. That charm is the magic of the extreme. Everything extreme has a power to fascinate people. And we who reject morality—we are extreme in every way.

750.

The corrupt ruling classes have given ruling a bad name. The way the State hands out justice is a kind of cowardice, because there is no great person who could serve as a measure for everyone else. In the

end, people feel so unsafe that they throw themselves down in the dust before any strong will that gives orders.

751.

In democratic times, "the drive for power" is so hated that the whole way these times understand the human mind seems aimed at making it look small and speaking badly of it. We are told that the kind of men who chased after the highest honors were Napoleon! Caesar! and Alexander!—as if these men had not been exactly the ones who looked down on honor the most.

And the French thinker Helvétius would like to show us that we strive for power so that we can enjoy the pleasures that powerful people have at hand. In other words, according to him, this striving for power is really just a desire for pleasure—the belief that pleasure is the goal of life!

752.

It depends on what a people feels. If they feel that "the rights, the sharp eye, the gift of leading, and so on, belong to the few," they form a society ruled by a small group. If they feel that these things belong "to the many," they form a democratic society.

Monarchy stands for the belief in one man who is completely superior: a leader, a savior, a half-god.

Aristocracy stands for the belief in a chosen few—in a higher class of people.

Democracy stands for not believing in any great people or in any elite groups. Everybody is equal to everybody else: "Deep down, we are all the crowd and the mob."

753.

I am against Socialism because it naively dreams of goodness, truth, beauty, and equal rights. (Anarchy chases the same ideal, but in a more brutal way.)

I am against government by parliament and against the power of the newspapers, because they are the tools by which cattle become the masters.

754.

Giving weapons to the people means, in the end, giving weapons to the mob.

755.

Socialists seem especially silly to me, because of their foolish optimism about the "good man." They imagine he is waiting in their cupboard, ready to appear once the present order of society has been overthrown and has made room for natural instincts. But the opposite party is just as silly, because it refuses to see the violence that lies under every law, and the harshness and selfishness that are part of every kind of authority. "I and my kind will rule and win. Whoever goes downhill will be either thrown out or destroyed."—This was the basic feeling behind all ancient lawmaking. The idea of a higher kind of human is hated much more deeply than kings themselves are. Hatred of aristocracy always hides behind hatred of kings as a mask.

756.

How every political party betrays its own people! A party drags into the light things about its leaders that those leaders may have kept carefully hidden until now, using great skill to keep them under cover.

757.

Modern Socialism would like to build a worldly copy of the Jesuit order: a system where everybody is a perfect tool. But what it is all for, what the purpose of it is, nobody has worked out yet.

758.

The slavery of today: a piece of savagery. Where are the masters these slaves are working for? We should not always expect the two halves of society that complete each other, masters and slaves, to show up at the same time.

Usefulness and pleasure are slaves' ideas about what life is for.

"The blessing of work" is a fancy phrase that makes slaves feel noble. It hides the fact that they cannot handle free time.

759.

There is no such thing as a right to live, a right to work, or a right to be happy. In this way, a human being is no different from the lowest worm.

760.

We must surely think about these things as harshly and firmly as Nature does: they keep the species going.

761.

We should look at what the masses need with a kind of mocking pity: they want something that we already have. Ah!

762.

European democracy is only a tiny bit an expression of powers set free. Above all, it stands for setting free laziness, tiredness, and weakness.

753.

About the future of the worker: Workers should learn to see their duties the way soldiers do. Soldiers receive pay and an income, but they do not get wages!

There is no link between the work someone does and the money they get. Each person should be put in a place, according to what kind of person they are, where they can do the very best that their abilities allow.

764.

One day the noble, high-minded people should live the way middle-class people live now, but above them, standing out because they need so little. The top class will then live more poorly and more simply, and yet still hold power.

For the lower kinds of people, the opposite values apply: the task is to plant "virtues" in them. They need absolute orders and harsh, forced methods, so that they can rise above simply living a comfortable life. The rest may obey, but their pride demands that they feel they depend not on great people, but on principles.

765.

"Making Up for All Sin?"

People talk about how deeply unfair the way society is set up is. They act as if it were obviously unjust that one person is born into good

conditions and another into bad ones, or that one person has talents another lacks. The more honest of these enemies of society say this: "We have bad, sick, and criminal qualities, and we admit it. But we are only the unavoidable result of the strong crushing the weak for ages." In this way they slip their own bad natures onto the consciences of the ruling classes, making the rulers feel guilty for them. They threaten, rage, and curse. They become virtuous out of pure outrage. They don't want to have turned into bad people and riffraff for nothing. If I'm not mistaken, the name for this attitude, which was invented in the last century, is pessimism, and more exactly the pessimism that comes from outrage. With this frame of mind, history gets judged. It is stripped of its unavoidable, fated nature, and people claim to find responsibility and even guilt in it. Because what they want most of all is to find guilty people in history. The failed and weak, the people in decline and decay of every kind, are disgusted with themselves. They need victims, so that they do not turn their thirst for destruction against themselves (which might actually be the most sensible thing to do). But to do this, they at least need something that looks like a justification. That is, they need a theory saying that the fact that they exist, and the kind of people they are, can be paid for by a scapegoat. This scapegoat may be God (in Russia there is no shortage of such bitter atheists), or the way society is ordered, or schooling and upbringing, or the Jews, or the nobles, or, in the end, healthy and strong people of every kind. They say: "It is a sin for a person to be born into decent conditions, because by doing so he robs the others of their share. He shoves them aside. He forces on them the curse of vice and of work.... How can I be held responsible for my misery? Surely someone must be to blame for it, or I could not stand to live."...

In short, bitter, resentful pessimism finds people to blame so that it can give itself a pleasant feeling: revenge.... "Sweeter than honey": that is how even old Homer describes revenge.

***

Why is such a theory no longer understood, or let us say, no longer met with contempt? It is because of that bit of Christianity that still flows in the blood of every one of us. It makes us tolerant of things just because we smell a Christian flavor in them.... The Socialists appeal to Christian instincts; this is their truly clever trick.... Thanks to Christianity, we have now gotten used to the superstitious idea of a soul: an immortal soul, a soul as a single separate unit. This soul supposedly comes from somewhere else, and only ends up inside certain people, that is, takes on a body in them, by chance. But the soul's nature is not changed by these people, much less shaped by them. The conditions of society, of family ties, and of history are only accidents for the soul, maybe bad luck. In any case, the world is not the soul's doing. Through the idea of the soul, the individual is lifted above this world. Thanks to it, the individual can be given a ridiculous amount of importance.

In fact, it was Christianity that first led the individual to set himself up as the judge of everything. It made extreme self-importance almost his duty. It has placed everything temporary and limited below eternal rights! "What do I care about the State, about society, about the laws of history, about the body and how it works?" That is how something speaks from outside the world of constant change, something that stays the same all through history. That is how something immortal speaks, something divine: it is the soul!

Another Christian idea, just as crazy, has soaked even deeper into the fabric of modern thinking: the idea that all souls are equal before God. This idea is the original model of every theory about equal

rights. People were first taught to stammer this statement in a religious way. Later it was turned into a moral rule. No wonder people have finally started to take it seriously, to put it into practice! That is, to make it political, socialist, and part of the bitter, resentful pessimism of revenge.

Whenever people have gone looking for someone or something to blame, it was the urge for revenge that was doing the looking. Over the centuries, this urge for revenge gained such a strong hold over humans that it has poisoned all of our big ideas about reality, our understanding of the mind, our ideas about society, and, most of all, our morality. People have fed this idea of blame so much that they have spread the germ of revenge into everything. With it, they have even made God sick, and they have killed the innocence of the universe, because they trace every state of things back to someone's choice, someone's intention, someone who can be held responsible. The whole teaching about the will is the most harmful trick that the study of the mind has ever played on us so far, and it was invented mainly so that people could be punished. Punishment was useful to society, and that usefulness is what gave the idea of the will its respect, its power, and its look of truth. If we want to find who started this way of thinking, which we will call the psychology of the will, we must look among the groups who held the right to punish. Above all, that means the priests, who stood at the very top of the old societies. These people wanted to give themselves the right to take revenge. They wanted to hand God the special right to punish. For this purpose, man was declared "free." For this reason, every action had to be seen as chosen on purpose, and every deed had to be seen as starting in the conscious mind. But ideas like these are exactly what prove the old psychology wrong.

Today, Europe seems to be heading the other way. We peaceful, calm-minded people would love to pull the idea of guilt and punishment

out of the world, break it up, and drive it away with all our strength. Our most serious efforts are aimed at cleaning this filth out of psychology, morality, history, nature, social institutions and privileges, and even out of God Himself. So who must we see as our deadliest enemies? Exactly those preachers of revenge and resentment, the people who are gloomy above all out of anger, and who make it their mission to make their filth look holy by calling it "righteous anger." The rest of us have only one wish: to win back innocence for the world of constant change. We would love to spread a cleaner idea, namely, that no one is responsible for what a person is like. Not God, not society, not his parents, not his ancestors, and not even himself. In fact, no one is to blame for him. There is simply no being at all who could be held responsible for a person existing, for the way he is made, or for his being born into certain conditions and a certain setting. And it is a great blessing that no such being exists. We are not the result of some eternal plan, or of a will, or of a wish. No one is using us as an experiment to reach an "ideal of perfection," an "ideal of happiness," or an "ideal of goodness." And we are just as little the result of some mistake by God, a mistake that ought to make Him feel uneasy (an idea which, as is well known, lies at the very root of the Old Testament). There is no place, no purpose, and no meaning that we can point to as the reason for our existence or for the kind of existence we have. First of all, no one is able to do this. It is completely impossible to judge the whole universe, to measure it, to compare it with anything, or even to reject it. And why? For five reasons, all of which an ordinary person can understand. For example, because nothing exists outside the universe. And let us say it once more: this is a great blessing, because in this lies the whole innocence of our lives.

2. The Individual

766.

Basic mistakes: treating the crowd as the goal instead of the individual! The crowd is only a means to an end and nothing more! But these days people are trying to think of the crowd as if it were a single person, and to give it higher rights than they give to separate individuals. A terrible mistake!! On top of that, everything that pulls people together into a crowd, such as sympathy, is seen as the more valuable side of our nature.

767.

The individual is something completely new, and able to create new things. He is something complete in himself, and all his actions belong only to him. In the end, the individual has to find the value of his actions inside himself, because he has to give his own personal meaning even to words and ideas he has inherited. Even if he does not invent a rule himself, at least the way he understands it is his own. At the very least, as someone who interprets things, he is creative.

768.

The self, the 'I', crushes and kills. It acts like a living cell. It hunts and it is violent. It wants to renew itself, as in pregnancy. It wants to give birth to its own God and see all of humanity bowing at its feet.

769.

Every living thing reaches out and feels its way as far as its power lets it, and it overpowers everything weaker than itself. That is how it finds joy in being alive. The way this urge is becoming more "humane" is this: we are starting to sense, more and more finely, how hard it really is to take others into ourselves. We could show our power by

hurting another person, but his own will pushes him away from us, and so makes him harder to overpower.

770.

Freedom, for individuals or for societies, is measured by how much resistance has to be constantly overcome in order to stay on top. Here freedom means real, active power, the drive for power. If this is true, then the highest kind of personal freedom, of being one's own master, would most likely be found only a step away from its opposite. That is, it would be found where the danger of slavery hangs over life like a hundred swords of Damocles, the sword that hung by a single hair over a man's head. Let anyone look through all of history with this in mind. The times when the individual reached full maturity, meaning the free times, when the classic type of the self-ruling person was achieved, were certainly not kind or gentle times!

There should be no in-between choice: either you are on top, or you are at the very bottom, like a worm, looked down on, wiped out, stepped on. You must have tyrants against you in order to become a tyrant yourself, which means in order to be free. It is a real advantage to have a hundred swords of Damocles hanging over you. Only that way do you learn to dance, and only that way do you gain any freedom in how you move.

771.

More than any other animal, humans were at first unselfish and focused on others. That is why they grow slowly, as we see in their long childhood, and why they developed so highly. That is also why their unusual, most recent kind of selfishness exists. Predators, by contrast, are much more focused on themselves as individuals.

772.

A criticism of selfishness. La Rochefoucauld was naive without meaning to be. He thought he was saying something bold, open-minded, and surprising when he wrote, in French: "Great souls are not the ones that have fewer passions and more virtues than ordinary souls. They are only the ones that have bigger plans." (Of course, in his time, plain truth about the human mind was something that shocked people.) It is true that John Stuart Mill calls Chamfort the noble, high-minded and philosophical La Rochefoucauld of the eighteenth century. But Mill sees in him only a sharp, clear-eyed observer of everything that comes from the everyday selfishness in the human heart. And Mill adds: "A noble, high-minded spirit cannot see why anyone needs to keep watching what is low and contemptible, unless it is to show which corrupting forces a lofty spirit and a noble character managed to overcome."

773.

How Feelings About the Self Take Shape

First point of view: To what extent are sympathy, or feelings of belonging to a group, the lower, early stages? These come at a time when single people cannot yet respect themselves on their own or decide for themselves what things are worth.

Second point of view: The group's self-respect can reach its highest point. The clan is proud of being special. It feels that people are unequal, and it somewhat hates compromise, equal rights, and making peace. To what extent is all this a school that teaches the single person to respect himself? It can be, because it forces the single person to stand for the pride of the whole group. He has to speak and act with huge self-respect, because he represents the group. The same

is true when a person sees himself as the tool or the mouthpiece of a god.

Third point of view: To what extent do these ways of not being just yourself give a person enormous importance? They do so because higher powers are using him as a go-between. A kind of religious awe towards oneself is the state that prophets and poets live in.

Fourth point of view: To what extent does being responsible for a whole group train a person to think ahead? To what extent does it give him a stern and frightening hand, a cold and calculating heart, and a grand way of carrying himself and acting? These are things he would not allow himself if he were standing up only for his own rights.

In short, a group's self-respect is the great training school for a person ruling himself. The noble, high-minded class is the one that builds up this ability and passes it down.

774.

The hidden forms of the drive for power:

(1) The wish for freedom, for independence, for balance, for peace, for working side by side as equals. This also includes the wish of the loner, the hermit, and of the "independent thinker." In its lowest form, it is the wish to stay alive no matter what, the instinct to protect oneself.

(2) Fitting in below others, so that the drive for power of a whole group can be satisfied. Being obedient. Making yourself necessary and useful to the person who has the power. Love, which is a secret path into the heart of the powerful person, so that you can become his master.

(3) The sense of duty and conscience. The made-up comfort of belonging to a higher level than the people who actually hold power. Accepting a ranking of people by worth that lets you judge even those more powerful than you. Putting yourself down. Inventing new moral codes (the Jews are the classic example of this).

775.

Praise and thanks as forms of the drive for power. People give praise and thanks for harvests, good weather, victories, weddings, and peace. Every festival needs someone or something to pour its feelings onto. People want all the good things that happen to them to look as if someone did them on purpose for them. They want a giver. The same is true of a work of art. People are not happy with the work alone; they have to praise the artist. So what is praise? It is a kind of payment for good things received, a kind of giving back, a display of our own power. For the person who praises is agreeing, blessing, putting a value on something, judging it. He claims the right to give his approval to something and to hand out honours. A stronger feeling of happiness or of being alive is also a stronger feeling of power. It is because of this feeling that a person praises. It is also because of this feeling that he invents a giver, a "doer behind actions." So thanks is a high-class kind of revenge. It is given and demanded most strictly where both equality and pride must be kept up, which means where revenge is carried out most fully.

776.

On the Cunning Tricks of Power

The drive for power shows up in these ways:

(a) Among the oppressed and slaves of every kind, it takes the form of a wish for "freedom." Just breaking away from something seems to be

a goal in itself. (In religion and morals, this sounds like: "You only have to answer to your own conscience," or "the freedom the Gospel gives," and so on.)

(b) In a stronger kind of people who are rising towards power, it takes the form of a wish to overpower others. If that fails, it shrinks into a "wish for justice." That means a wish to have the same amount of rights as the ruling class has.

(c) In the strongest, richest, most independent, and bravest people, it takes the form of "love of humanity," "love of the people," "the Gospel," "truth," "God," "pity," "self-sacrifice," and so on. It also takes the form of overpowering, of capturing, of making someone serve you. It shows up as an instinct to count yourself as part of a great mass of power that you try to steer. Think of the hero, the prophet, Caesar, the Saviour, the lead sheep the flock follows. (Love between the sexes belongs here too. It wants to overpower something and own it completely, yet it looks like giving yourself up. Deep down, it is only love for your tool, for your "horse." It is the belief that things belong to you because you are able to use them.)

"Freedom," "Justice," "Love"!!!

777.

Love. Look at this love and pity of women. What could be more selfish? And when they do sacrifice themselves, and their honour or good name, who are they sacrificing themselves to? To the man? Or is it really to a desire they cannot control? These desires are just as selfish, even if they help other people and make them grateful. How far can one single value, swollen out of all proportion, make everything else seem holy!!

778.

"Senses" and "Passions." Sometimes the fear of the senses, the passions, and desires grows so strong that it warns us to stay away from them. When that happens, it is already a sign of weakness. Extreme measures always point to an unhealthy state. What is missing here, or more exactly what is breaking down, is the power to resist an urge. When you feel by instinct that you have to give in, meaning that you have to react, then it is a very good idea to avoid chances to do so (temptations).

Exciting the senses is only a temptation for creatures whose bodies and minds are easily pushed around and influenced. On the other hand, with people who are unusually dull and hard by nature, strong stimulation is actually needed just to get their bodily and mental functions going. Wild, excessive living can only be blamed in someone who has no right to it. And almost all passions have gotten a bad name because of people who were not strong enough to turn them to their own advantage.

We should understand that passions can be criticized in the same way as illnesses. Yet we would not be right to get rid of illnesses, and even less right to get rid of passions. We need what is abnormal. Through these great illnesses we give life a tremendous shock.

In more detail, we should tell apart the following cases:

(1) The ruling passion, the one that takes charge. It can even bring with it the very highest kind of health. In this case, all the parts of a person's inner system and their workings are best brought together to carry out one single task. But that is almost the definition of health itself.

(2) The passions fighting against each other: two, three, or many souls living in one chest.[6] This is very unhealthy. It is a sign that a

person is falling apart inside and breaking into pieces. It reveals, and also makes worse, an inner split and a kind of lawless chaos inside. That is, unless one passion becomes the master. Then comes a return to health.

(3) Passions placed side by side, without either fighting each other or joining together. This is very often a passing state, and then, once order has been set up, it can be a healthy one. A most interesting kind of people belong to this group: the chameleons. They are not necessarily at war with themselves. They are both happy and secure, but they cannot grow. Their moods lie next to one another, even if they seem to lie far apart. They change, but they never become anything.

[Translator's footnote 6: This refers to Goethe's play Faust. In Part One, Faust cries out in despair: "Two souls, alas! live within my chest!" See Theodore Martin's English verse translation of Faust.]

779.

How we measure the size of goals, and how that affects the way we judge things: the great criminal and the small criminal. Whether a person's goals are great or small will decide whether he still respects himself through it all, or whether he feels cowardly and miserable.

How much intelligence shows in the methods someone uses can also change how we judge him. Think how differently the bold thinker who brings in new ideas, the experimenter, and the man of force stand out compared with robbers, barbarians, and adventurers! The first kind seem, at least on the surface, not to be acting for selfish reasons.

Finally, there are noble, high-minded manners, the way a person carries himself, his courage, his self-confidence. How much these change the value of whatever is gained through them!

***

About the way we see things when we judge their value, the lens we use:

The effect of whether the goals are great or small.

The effect of how intelligent the methods are. The effect of how a person behaves while acting. The effect of success or failure. The effect of the forces working against someone, and what those forces are worth. The effect of what is allowed and what is forbidden.

780.

Here are the tricks used to make actions, measures, and passions seem acceptable, even when, looked at from a single person's point of view, they are no longer proper manners or even in good taste:

Art, which lets us step into such strange worlds, makes them appealing to us.

Historians show that these things had their reasons and their justification. So do travel, a taste for the foreign and exotic, psychology, criminal law, the mental hospital, the study of criminals, and sociology.

Then there is acting impersonally, not as ourselves. As stand-ins for a larger group, we allow ourselves these passions and actions. Think of lawyers in court, juries, the respectable middle-class citizen, the soldier, the government minister, the prince, society, and "critics." This makes us feel that we are giving something up, making a sacrifice.

781.

Worrying about yourself and about saving your soul forever does not show a rich or self-confident nature. A self-confident nature lets all questions about heavenly happiness go to the devil. It does not care about that kind of happiness. It is all power, action and desire. It forces itself on things; it even does violence to things. The Christian is a romantic hypochondriac, someone always imagining he is sick, who does not stand firmly on his own two feet.

Whenever the idea that pleasure is the highest goal comes to the front, you can always assume that pain is present, along with a certain weakness or poor health in the people who hold it.

782.

"The growing independence of the individual"—Parisian philosophers like Monsieur Fouillée talk about things like that. They would do well to take a moment to study the "sheep-like race," because they belong to it themselves. For heaven's sake, open your eyes, you sociologists who make plans for the future! The individual grew strong under exactly the opposite conditions. What you describe is the most extreme weakening and impoverishment of human beings. You actually want this weakness and poverty, and you use all the lying machinery of the old ideal to get what you want. You are made in such a way that you actually treat the needs of the crowd as an ideal! What we see here is a complete lack of honesty about how the mind really works.

783.

The two traits that mark the modern European seem to be opposites: individualism and the demand for equal rights. I am finally beginning to understand this. The individual is an extremely easily hurt bundle of vanity. When this vanity knows how easily it can be hurt, it de-

mands that everyone be made equal, so that the individual stands only "among equals." But this paints a picture of a social race in which, in fact, talents and powers are spread out more or less evenly. A pride that would choose loneliness and only a few people who appreciate it is completely beyond these people's understanding. To them, truly "great" successes can only be reached through the masses. Indeed, we hardly understand yet that a success with the mob is really only a small success, because, as the Latin saying goes, "beauty belongs to the few."

No morality will allow a ranking of people by worth, and the lawyers know nothing about a shared conscience of the community. The principle of individualism rejects truly great people. Instead, it demands the sharpest eye for spotting talent, and the quickest discovery of it, among people who are almost all equal. And since in such late and civilized cultures everyone has a little bit of talent, and so can expect his share of honor, there is more flattering of modest achievements today than ever before. This gives our age the look of unlimited fairness. Its unfairness is not found in its endless hatred of tyrants and rabble-rousers, even in the arts. It is found in its hatred of noble, high-minded natures who look down on the praise of the many. The demand for equal rights—which means the privilege of passing judgment on everything and everybody—is against the aristocratic spirit.

This age knows just as little about the individual being absorbed, about his merging into a great type of people who do not want to be personalities at all. In the past, this was exactly what gave many lofty natures, including the greatest poets, their distinction and their passion. Our age also knows little about the wish to be part of a city-state, a polis, as in ancient Greece; or about the spirit of the Jesuits, or of the Prussian army staff and its officials; or about serving as an apprentice and carrying on the tradition of great masters. For all these

things, you need conditions that are not driven by society and its pressures, and you need the absence of petty vanity.

784.

Individualism is a modest form of the drive for power, one that is not yet aware of itself. With it, a single human unit seems to think it is enough to free himself from the overwhelming power of society, or of the State or the Church. He does not stand up against it as a personality, but only as a unit. He stands for the rights of all the other individuals against the whole. In other words, by instinct he puts himself on the same level as every other unit. What he fights, he does not fight as a person, but as a representative of single units against a mass.

Socialism is just a way of stirring people up on behalf of individualism. It recognizes that, to get anything done, people must organize themselves into a common movement—into a "power." But what the Socialist wants is not society as the goal the individual serves. He wants society as a means of making many individuals possible. This is the Socialists' instinct, though they often fool themselves about it. Apart from that, to make their kind win out, they are forced to fool others on a huge scale. So moral preaching about selflessness ends up serving individual selfishness. This was one of the most common frauds of the nineteenth century.

Anarchy, too, is just a way of stirring people up on behalf of Socialism. With it, the Socialist makes people afraid. Through fear he begins to fascinate and to terrorize. But above all, what he does is draw all brave and reckless people to his side, even in the most intellectual circles.

In spite of all this, individualism is the most modest stage of the drive for power.

***

Once you have reached a certain degree of independence, you always want more. People separate from each other in proportion to how much strength they have. The individual is no longer happy to see himself as equal to everyone. He actually looks for his true equal, someone of his own level, and he makes himself stand out from others. After individualism comes the forming of groups and bodies. Tendencies that fit together join up and become powerfully active. Then, between these centers of power, there arise friction, war, scouting out each other's strength, give-and-take, agreements, and rules for exchanging services. Finally, a ranking of people by worth appears.

Summary

1. Individuals set themselves free.

2. They fight, and in the end they agree on equal rights. Justice is made a goal in itself.

3. Once this is reached, the real differences in how much power people have start to be felt, and more strongly than before. The reason is that, on the whole, peace has been established, and countless small centers of power begin to create differences that earlier were hardly noticed. Now individuals begin to form groups. These groups strive for privileges and for the upper hand, and war starts again in a milder form.

People demand freedom only when they have no power. Once they have power, the next thing they crave is more power than others. If they cannot get that, because they are still too weak for it, then "justice"—that is, "equal power"—becomes what they long for.

785.

Fixing the idea of "selfishness." Once you have found out what a mistake the idea of the separate "individual" is, and that every single living being carries within it the whole long process of evolution (not just as something "inherited," but in "itself"), then the individual becomes hugely, enormously important. Here the voice of instinct is completely right. When this instinct starts to weaken, that is, when a person starts to look for his worth in what he does for others, you can be sure that tiredness and decay have set in. A truly unselfish attitude, when it runs deep and has no hypocrisy in it, is really an instinct to create a second kind of value for oneself by serving other selfish people. Usually, though, this unselfishness is only on the surface. It is a roundabout way of protecting one's own feeling of being alive and worth something.

786.

How Morality Was Built Up, and How It Breaks Down

First point. There are no such things as moral actions. They are pure imagination. Not only is it impossible to prove that they exist (something that Kant and Christianity, for example, both admitted), but they cannot even exist at all. Because people misunderstood how the mind works, someone invented an opposite to the natural drives of life, and believed that he had found a new kind of instinct. People assumed a "first mover," a starting force behind actions, that does not exist at all. If we use the same way of judging that created the opposites "moral" and "immoral," then we would have to say: there is nothing on earth but immoral intentions and immoral actions.

Second point. The whole split between "moral" and "immoral" comes from one assumption: that both moral and immoral actions spring from a free, self-starting will. In short, it assumes that such a will

exists. Put another way, it assumes that moral judgments only apply to intentions and actions that are free. But this whole set of free actions and intentions is pure imagination. The only world that the moral yardstick could be used on does not exist at all. There is no such thing as a moral or an immoral action.

The mistake about the mind that gave rise to the opposites "moral" and "immoral" is this: the ideas of "selfless," "unselfish," and "self-denying." All of these are unreal and made-up.

A false set of fixed beliefs also gathered around the idea of the self, the 'I'. The self was seen as a single, unsplittable unit, like an atom, and it was wrongly set against everything that is "not-self." It was also lifted out of constant change and declared to belong to the realm of fixed, unchanging existence. So the self was falsely turned into a solid thing. Because people believed that each person's soul lives forever, this was made into a matter of faith, under the pressure of religious and moral training and strict self-control. Through this artificial freeing of the self, and by moving it into the realm of the absolute, people thought they had found a pair of opposite values that could not be argued with: the single self on one side, and the vast "not-self" on the other. It then seemed obvious that the single self could only have value when it was linked to the vast "not-self," and especially in the sense of being under its control and existing only for its sake. Here, of course, the herd instinct decided which way the thinking went. Nothing goes more against this instinct than the idea that the individual rules over himself. But if we suppose that the self is absolute, then its value has to lie in denying itself.

So, step by step: (1) the false freeing of the "individual" as a separate atom;

(2) the crowd's self-importance, which hates the wish to stay a separate atom and sees that wish as an enemy;

(3) as a result, the individual is overcome by having his goal changed;

(4) at this point there seemed to be actions in which a person wiped himself out, and around these actions people imagined a whole world of opposites;

(5) people asked: in what kinds of actions does a human being assert himself most strongly? And on these actions (sex, greed, hunger for power, cruelty, and so on and so on) they piled hatred, scorn, and curses. People believed that there could be such things as selfless drives. Everything selfish was condemned, and everything unselfish was wanted.

(6) And what was the result? What had been done? A ban had been placed on the strongest, the most natural, yes, the only real drives. From then on, for an action to deserve praise, it had to contain no trace of any of those real drives. This was a monstrous cheat in the understanding of the mind. Every kind of "feeling pleased with oneself" had to be reshaped, and could only happen through misunderstanding and by bending oneself to look "good" (as the Latin phrase puts it, "under the appearance of the good"). On the other side, there was the kind of people who gained something by taking away humanity's pleasure in itself: those who spoke for the herd instincts, for example the priests and the philosophers. They were clever enough, and sharp enough about the human mind, to show that selfishness ruled everywhere. The Christian conclusion from this was: "Everything is sin, even our good qualities. Human beings are completely worthless. Selfless actions are impossible." This is the idea of original sin. In short, once people had set their instincts against a purely imaginary world of the good, they ended up despising themselves as unable to do "good" actions.

Note: in this way, Christianity was a step forward in sharpening our insight into the human mind, as we see in the French thinkers La

Rochefoucauld and Pascal. It saw that human actions are basically the same, and that, taken as a whole, they all have the same value: all of them are immoral.

***

Now the first serious goal was to raise people in whom the self-seeking drives had been snuffed out: priests and saints. And even if people doubted that perfection could really be reached, they had no doubt about what perfection was.

The way of thinking of the saint, of the priest, and of the "good" person must, of course, have seemed like pure fantasy, like a ghostly dream. The real motive behind every action had been declared bad. So, to make action still possible at all, people had to prescribe deeds that were not really possible, but which had to be declared possible and holy. Now people honored these things and made ideals of them, with just as much falseness as they had earlier used in slandering the natural drives.

Attacking the instincts of life came to be seen as holy and worthy of respect. The priests' ideal was: total sexual purity, total obedience, total poverty! The ideal for ordinary people was: giving to the poor, pity, sacrificing oneself, giving up beauty, reason, and the pleasures of the body, and a dark frown at every strong quality there was.

***

Then a step forward is taken. The slandered instincts try to win back their rights. One example is Luther's Reformation, the crudest form of moral lying, hiding under the cover of "Gospel freedom." The instincts are given new, holy names.

The instincts that had been badly spoken of try to prove that they are needed so that the virtuous instincts can exist at all. As the French

saying goes: "One must live, in order to live for others." So selfishness becomes a tool to reach a goal.[7]

But people go even further. They try to give both the selfish and the unselfish drives the right to exist, equal rights for both, on the grounds of what is useful.

People go further still. They see more usefulness in putting the rights of selfishness ahead of the rights of unselfishness. By "more useful" they mean more happiness for the majority, or raising humanity higher, and so on and so on. So the rights of selfishness start to win out, but they are wrapped in the cloak of an extremely unselfish point of view: what is useful for humanity as a whole.

People try to make unselfish behavior fit with the natural way things work. They look for unselfishness in the deepest roots of life itself. They say that unselfishness and selfishness both come from the very nature of life and of the world.

People dream that one day the conflict between the two will disappear. They hope that, as humans keep adapting over time, the two will blend into one.

In the end, people see that unselfish actions are simply one kind of selfish action. They see that how much a person loves and gives himself away shows how much personal power and strength of character he has. In short, they see that the more "evil" a person can be made, the better he is, and that you cannot have the one without the other. At this point the curtain is pulled back, and we can see the huge fraud hidden behind the way people have understood the human mind until now.

***

Results. There are only immoral intentions and immoral actions. The actions people call moral must be shown to be immoral too. All feel-

ings come from one single will, the drive for power, and so they are all basically the same. Here is the idea of life: when we seem to see a clash between good and evil, all that is really being shown is that some instincts have more power than others. We set up a ranking of people by worth, but only for the time being. Under it, some instincts are kept in check and others are put to work for us. Morality can be justified, but only on practical grounds, such as what is useful, and so on.

***

An argument against the second claim. Determinism, the belief that everything we do is already fixed by causes, is an attempt to save the moral world by moving it into a place we cannot know.

Determinism is just a way of letting ourselves make our values vanish like a magic trick, once they no longer have a place in a world that is explained like a machine. So determinism must be attacked and torn down, whatever it costs. In the same way, we should challenge our right to split the world into a so-called true world beyond this one and the world as it seems.

[Translator's note 7: This is the conclusion Herbert Spencer reached in his book The Data of Ethics.]

787.

We absolutely must free ourselves from thinking in terms of motives. Otherwise we would not even be allowed to try to sacrifice ourselves or to let ourselves go! Only the world's freedom from guilt gives us the greatest courage and the greatest freedom.

788.

The "evil" person must be given back a clear conscience. Has this been what I have been trying to do all along, without meaning to? For by the evil person I mean the strong person. (Here one should look at what Dostoevsky believed about the convicts he met in prison.)

789.

Our new "freedom." What a relief it is to think that we free thinkers do not feel tied, like horses to a cart, to any system of goals and final purposes. What a relief, too, that the ideas of reward and punishment are not built into the nature of existence! And that good and bad actions are not good or bad in themselves, but only from the point of view of what helps certain kinds of humans survive! And that our thoughts about pleasure and pain do not matter to the universe as a whole, and matter even less to anything beyond the physical world! (Look at the kind of pessimism linked to the name of Hartmann. It promises to weigh even the pain and pleasure of life against each other on a scale. But it locks itself in the narrow prison of thinking from before Copernicus, when people thought the earth was the center of everything. Such a view would not just be a step backward but a sign of decay, unless it is simply a bad joke made by a "Berliner."[8])

[Translator's note 8: "Berliner" means someone from Berlin. In Germany, the people of Berlin are well known for telling bad jokes.]

790.

If you are clear about "why" you are living, then the "how" will sort itself out.

When people start putting pleasure and pain first, and when teachings about chasing pleasure, or about life being mostly suffering, become

popular, this is already a sign that people no longer believe in the "why" of life, in its purpose and meaning. In fact, it is a sign that the will itself is weak. And giving up oneself, quietly accepting one's fate, virtue, and so-called "objectivity" may, at the very least, be signs that the most important thing is starting to go missing.

791.

Until now there has been no German culture. Someone might say: but there have been great loners, great hermits, in Germany, Goethe for example. That does not disprove my claim, because these people had their own culture. In fact, they stood like huge, defiant, lonely rocks, and all around them lay the rest of the German spirit, as their opposite. It was like soft, swampy, slippery ground, where every step and every footprint from the rest of Europe left a mark and shaped it. German culture had no character of its own and would give way to almost anything.

792.

Germany is very rich in clever, well-read scholars. But for some time now it has been so terribly poor in great souls and powerful minds that it almost seems to have forgotten what a great soul or a powerful mind even is. Today, average people, and even poorly made, weak people, stand up in the public square without the slightest pang of conscience or any sign of shame, and call themselves great people, reformers, and so on. Take Eugen Dühring, for example. He is a truly clever and well-read scholar. But almost every word he says gives away that he has a pitifully small soul, and that he is terribly tormented by petty, jealous feelings. It also shows that what drives him is not a powerful, overflowing, generous spirit that gives freely, but only ambition! And being ambitious in an age like ours is far more un-

worthy of a philosopher than it ever was before. For today it is the mob that rules, and the mob that hands out the honors.

793.

My idea of the "future": a tough technical and scientific education. Compulsory military service, so that, as a rule, every man of the upper classes would be an officer, whatever else he might also be.

IV.

THE DRIVE FOR POWER IN ART.

794.

Our religion, our morality, and our philosophy are human institutions in decline, decay. What works against them? Art.

795.

The artist-philosopher. A higher idea of art. Can a person stand so far above other people that he can shape them, the way an artist shapes clay? (Practice steps toward this:

1. To become someone who shapes himself, a loner, a hermit.

2. To do what artists have done until now, that is, to reach a small level of perfection in one particular kind of material or art form.)

796.

Art as it shows up without an artist, that is, as a body or an organization, such as the Prussian officer corps or the Jesuit order. How far is the artist only an early, preparatory stage? The world seen as a work of art that keeps creating itself.

797.

The thing we call the "artist" is the easiest thing to see through. From there, we can look down and see clearly the basic instincts of power, of nature, and so on, even of religion and morality.

"Play," doing things that have no use: this is the ideal of someone who is overflowing with power, and it is the ideal of a child. God is like a child; in the old Greek words, "a child at play."

798.

Calm and orderly (like the god Apollo), and wild, life-loving (like the god Dionysus). There are two states in which art shows up in a person almost like a force of nature. It takes hold of him and uses him, whether he agrees or not. It can push him into seeing visions, or it can come as a wild, frenzied urge. Both of these states can be seen in ordinary life too, but there they are a bit weaker: we see them in dreams, and in moments of rapture, high excitement.[9]

But the same contrast exists between dreaming and rapture, high excitement. Both of these states set free all kinds of artistic powers inside us, but each one unlocks a different kind of power. Dreaming gives us the power to see images, to connect ideas, and to make poetry. Rapture gives us the power of grand poses and gestures, of passion, of song, and of dance.

[Footnote 9: In German the word is "Rausch." English has no single word for the German "Rausch." When Nietzsche uses it, he means a mix of two of our words: being drunk or intoxicated, and being thrilled or elated. This note is from the translator.]

799.

Sexuality and sensual pleasure belong to the wild, life-loving rapture of Dionysus, Greek god of wine and joy. But neither of them is missing from the calm and orderly state, like the god Apollo. The two states also move at different speeds. Some kinds of rapture bring a deep, extreme peace. More exactly, the sense of time slows down and the sense of space shrinks. This peace usually shows itself in visions of the most restful poses and the calmest states of the soul. The classical style is, at its heart, about stillness, simplifying, shortening things down, and focusing them. The highest feeling of power is gathered together in the classical type of person. Such a person is slow to react, deeply aware, and feels no inner struggle.

800.

The feeling of rapture is, in fact, the same as a feeling of extra power, more than you need. It is strongest in mating seasons, when animals grow new body parts, show new skills, new colours, new shapes. Decoration and beauty come from increased power. Decoration is simply the expression of a will that has won. It shows that everything inside is working together better, that all the strong desires are in harmony, and that the person stands in a perfect, upright balance that cannot fail. Simplifying things, the way logic and geometry do, is a result of growing power. And the other way round: just looking at such a simplification makes the person watching feel more powerful. The highest point of this development is the great, commanding style.

Ugliness means that a type of person is in decline, decay. It shows that the deepest desires are fighting each other and do not work together properly. This means that the power to organize is getting weaker, or, to put it in terms of the mind, the will is getting weaker. The pleasant state we call rapture is really a raised-up feeling of

power. In this state, the sense of space and time changes. The eye travels across huge distances, and only then do those distances become visible. Vision stretches over larger masses and wider spaces. The senses become sharper, able to catch the smallest and most slippery details. A person can guess and understand things from the slightest hint, the smallest suggestion. There is an intelligent kind of sensitivity. Strength is felt as a sense of mastery in the muscles, as quickness and love of movement, as dancing, as lightness and fast rhythm. Strength also shows up as the love of proving one's strength: as showing off, as love of adventure, as fearlessness, as not caring about life or death. All these thrilling moments of life stir each other up. The images and fantasies of one are enough to spark another. In this way, states end up blending together that might be better kept apart. For example, religious rapture and sexual excitement: two very deep feelings that are always wonderfully linked. What pleases almost all religious women, old or young? The answer: a saint with beautiful legs, still young, still innocent. Another example is cruelty in tragedy and pity, which are also usually linked. Springtime, dancing, music: all these things are really just one sex showing off to the other. The same goes for that "endless longing of the heart" that belongs to the character Faust.

Artists, if they are any good at all, are people with strong urges, even in their bodies. They have energy to spare. They are powerful animals, full of the senses. Without a certain overheating of the sexual drive, a man like the painter Raphael could not even be imagined. Making music is also, in a way, making children. Staying chaste is just the artist's way of saving energy. And in all creative artists, the ability to create certainly ends when sexual power ends. Artists should not see things as they really are. They should see them fuller, simpler, and stronger. But for this, their lives must have a kind of youthfulness, a springtime freshness, a sort of never-ending rapture.

801.

There are certain states in which we change how things look to us. We make them seem fuller and richer, and we get carried away praising them, until they shine our own fullness and love of life back at us. These states are: sexual desire, rapture and high excitement, the good feeling after a big meal, springtime, beating our enemies, scorn, bold showing-off, cruelty, and the ecstasy of religious feeling. But three things matter most of all: sexual desire, rapture, and cruelty. All three belong to the oldest joys that people have celebrated at their feasts. They are also the strongest forces in young artists who are just starting out.

It also works the other way around. Sometimes we come across things that already show us this richness and fullness. When that happens, our animal side reacts with excitement in the very same places where these happy states come from. When these very fine shades of animal well-being and desire mix together, the result is what we call the feeling for beauty, the artistic state. This state only appears in people who have a wasteful, overflowing fullness of bodily strength. That strength is always the first thing that sets everything in motion. The dull, sober person, the tired person, the worn-out and dried-up person (for example, the scholar), can have no feeling for art. That is because he lacks the basic force behind art, which is the pressure of inner riches that demand to come out. Whoever has nothing to give away cannot feel anything either.

"Perfection." In these states, and especially in sexual love, our deepest instinct gives itself away without meaning to. It innocently shows what it thinks is highest, most wanted, and most valuable: the rising upward of its own kind. It also shows the condition it is really striving toward. Perfection means this: the huge swelling of this instinct's

feeling of power, its wealth, and the way it must overflow all its banks, like a river in flood.

802.

Art reminds us of times when our bodies are full of strength. It can be the overflow, the bursting out, of blossoming life into the world of images and desires. Or, on the other hand, it can work the other way: images and desires of a high and glorious life can stir up our bodily functions. In that case art raises our feeling of being alive. It acts as a stimulant to life.

How far can ugliness have this same power? It can do so in two ways. First, it may pass on to us something of the winning energy of an artist who has mastered the ugly and the disgusting. Second, it may gently stir our appetite for cruelty. In some cases this can even be the appetite to hurt ourselves, to be violent toward ourselves, and with that, to feel power over ourselves.

803.

So to the artist, "beauty" is something above every ranking of worth. In beauty, opposites are overcome. That is how the highest sign of power shows itself: in conquering opposites. And this happens without any feeling of strain. Force is no longer needed. Everything gives way and obeys so easily, and does it willingly and gracefully. This is what delights the powerful will of the artist.

804.

What beauty and ugliness are worth for life itself. Over humanity's very long experience, whatever we instinctively dislike in terms of looks has come to be felt as harmful, dangerous, and suspicious. When our sense of beauty suddenly speaks up, for example when we

feel disgust, it is really making a judgment. In that sense, beauty belongs to the general group of things that are valuable for life: useful, good for us, and helping life along. So a whole crowd of signals that for ages have been linked to useful things and situations, and that remind us of them, give us the feeling of beauty. That feeling of beauty means a rise in our feeling of power. And it is not only the things themselves, but also the sensations tied to those things or to their symbols. In this way we can see that beauty and ugliness are decided by our most basic values for staying alive. Apart from this, it makes no sense to declare anything beautiful or ugly. Absolute beauty exists no more than absolute goodness or absolute truth do. In any given case, it depends on what a certain type of person needs to survive. So a person ruled by the herd instinct will have a completely different feeling for beauty than an exceptional person or the higher human to come.

The value we call beauty, and also goodness and truth, comes from a way of seeing that looks only at what is close in front of us and thinks only about immediate results.

All instinctive judgments are short-sighted when it comes to the long chain of results. They only tell us what must be done right now. Reason, at its core, is a braking device. It stops us from reacting right away to our instinctive judgments. It pauses, it calculates, and it follows the chain of results further ahead.

Judgments about beauty and ugliness are short-sighted, and reason is always against them. But they are extremely convincing. They speak to our instincts in exactly the place where instincts decide fastest and say yes or no with the least hesitation, even before reason can step in.

The most common ways we say "this is beautiful" feed each other and stir each other up. Once the urge toward beauty starts working, a whole crowd of other perfections, ones that do not really belong

there, form around that "particular kind of beauty," like crystals forming around a seed. It is impossible to stay objective. It is certainly impossible to do without the power that interprets, gives, transforms, and makes poetry. And this poetry-making is really just a string of statements praising beauty itself. The sight of a beautiful woman....

So, first: our judgment about beauty is short-sighted. It sees only the immediate results.

Second: it covers the thing that caused it with a charm that comes from linking together many different judgments about beauty. But these judgments have nothing at all to do with what that particular thing really is. To see something as beautiful is, by necessity, to see it wrongly. That, by the way, is why marriages made for love are, from society's point of view, the least sensible kind of marriage.

805.

Where art comes from. There is a kind of making things perfect and seeing them as perfect that belongs to a brain overloaded with sexual energy. Think of a lover alone with his sweetheart in the evening: he turns even the smallest details into something wonderful. Life seems a chain of glorious things, and he feels that "the pain of an unhappy love affair is worth more than anything else." On the other hand, everything perfect and beautiful works like an unconscious memory of that state of being in love and the way of seeing that goes with it. All perfection, and all the beauty of things, brings back the bliss of love and desire, because the two have been so closely linked. (In bodily terms, this is the artist's creative instinct and the spreading of his sexual energy through his blood.) The longing for art and beauty is a roundabout longing for the ecstasy of sexual desire, which gets passed on to the brain. The world made perfect through "love."

806.

Sensuality in its different disguises. (1) First, it shows up as idealism, as in Plato. This is common in young people. It builds a kind of curved, magnifying mirror. In that mirror the picture of the loved one gets coated over, blown up, and transformed, and everything about them seems endless. (2) Second, it shows up in the religion of love. Here "a fine young man" or "a beautiful woman" seems somehow god-like, like a bridegroom or a bride of the soul. (3) Third, it shows up in art, as a force that decorates. For example, a man looks at a woman and gives her, in his mind, every gift that could make her more charming. In the same way, the artist's sensuality covers an object with everything else he honors and values. This is how he makes it perfect, or turns it into an ideal. A woman knows what a man feels about her. So she tries to meet his idealizing halfway. She decorates herself, she walks and dances well, and she expresses delicate thoughts. On top of that, she may practice modesty, shyness, and holding back. Her instinct tells her that all this makes the man's power to idealize her even stronger. (Women's instincts are extremely refined, so we must not think of her modesty as conscious faking. She senses that it is exactly her natural simplicity and real shame that attract a man most, and push him to value her far more than he otherwise would. That is why a woman seems innocent and open: her sharp instincts show her how useful a state of innocence is. It is a willful closing of one's eyes to oneself.... Whenever pretending works better when it is unconscious, it actually becomes unconscious.)

807.

So many things can be done by the state of rapture, of high excitement, that we call love, which is really something more than love! And yet everyone has their own experience of this. A girl's muscle strength suddenly goes up as soon as a man comes near her. There are

instruments that can measure this. When the sexes come even closer, for example in dancing and the other fun that goes with social gatherings, this strength rises so much that real feats of strength become possible. In the end, you no longer trust your own eyes, or your watch! In any case, we have to keep in mind that dancing itself, like every kind of fast movement, causes a kind of rapture in the whole body: the nerves, the muscles, and the inner organs. So here we must count the combined effect of a double rapture. And how smart it is to be a little out of your mind now and then! There are some facts we cannot admit even to ourselves, especially when we are women and have all kinds of feminine modesty and shyness.... Those young girls dancing over there are clearly far beyond all reality. They are dancing only with a crowd of ideals they can almost touch. What's more, they even see ideals sitting all around them: their mothers!... This is a chance to quote Faust. These pretty girls look far lovelier when they have lost their heads a little. And they know it very well, and they are even more delightful because they know it! Finally, their fancy clothes inspire them. Their fine clothes are their third little rapture. They believe in their dressmaker the way they believe in God. And who would want to destroy that faith in them? Blessed is this faith! And admiring yourself is healthy! Admiring yourself can even protect you from the cold! Has a beautiful woman who knew she was well dressed ever caught a cold? Never, not once on this earth! I would even say so in a case where she is wearing barely a scrap of clothing.

808.

Suppose someone wants the most amazing proof of how far the power to transform things, which comes from rapture, can go. That proof is right here, in love, or in what is called love in all the languages and silences of the world. In this passion, rapture works on reality so strongly that, in the lover's mind, the real cause of his love

is completely pushed aside. Something else seems to take its place: a shimmer and sparkle from all the magic mirrors of Circe, the enchantress.... In this respect, it makes no difference whether you are a human or an animal. And it matters even less whether you have intelligence, goodness, or honesty. If you are clever, you are fooled in a clever way. If you are dim, you are fooled in a dim way. But love, even the love of God, holy love, "the love that saves the soul," is all the same thing at bottom. It is nothing but a fever that has good reasons to dress itself up, a state of rapture that does well to lie about itself.... And in any case, when a man is in love, he is a good liar about himself and to himself. He seems to himself transformed: stronger, richer, more perfect. And he really is more perfect.... Here art works like a natural function of the body. We find it present in that most angelic instinct, "love." We find it as the greatest spur to life. So art is useful in a lofty way, 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 change how we feel about values: the lover really does have greater value. He is stronger. In animals, this state produces new weapons, colors, pigments, and shapes, and above all new movements, new rhythms, new mating calls and ways of attracting a partner. It is exactly the same in humans. A person's whole inner system is richer, more powerful, and more complete when he is in love than when he is not. The lover spends freely, because he is rich enough to do so. Now he dares things. He becomes an adventurer, and even a fool in his generosity and innocence. His belief in God and in goodness comes back to life, because he believes in love. What's more, these happy fools grow wings and gain new abilities, and even the door to art opens for them.

If we take away the hint of this fever in the gut from the lyrics of music and words, what is left for poetry and music? ... Perhaps "art for art's sake." That is the professional chatter of frogs shivering out in

the cold and dying of despair in their swamp.... Everything else was created by love.

809.

All art works like a suggestion aimed at the muscles and the senses, the ones that were first active in the simple, natural artistic person. Its voice is heard only by artists. It speaks to this kind of person, whose body and nature are tuned to such fine sensitivity. The idea of a "layman," a non-artist who still appreciates art, is a misleading name. A deaf person is not a smaller group within the group of people with healthy ears. All art works as a tonic, a boost. It increases strength. It lights up desire, which means the feeling of strength. It stirs up all the finer memories of rapture and high excitement. There is actually a special kind of memory beneath such states: a distant, flickering world of sensations comes back to life here.

Ugliness is the opposite of art. It is what art shuts out, the denial of art. Whenever someone senses decline, a poorer and weaker life, powerlessness, rotting, or falling apart, even faintly, the person with a feel for beauty answers with a firm "No." Ugliness brings us down: it is a sign of being brought down. It takes away strength, it makes us poorer, it weighs on us. Ugliness hints at disgusting things. You can test this on your own health: when you feel unwell, you notice that you more easily imagine ugly things. What you pick out, what interests you, and what questions you ask all change. Logic creates a state that is a close relative of ugliness: heaviness and dullness. Where there is ugliness, balance is missing, in a purely physical sense: ugliness limps and trips. It is the exact opposite of the godlike lightness and quickness of a dancer.

The artistic state is an overflow of ways to communicate. It is also a state of being extremely sensitive to every stimulus and every sign. It

is the high point of sharing and passing things on between living beings. It is where languages come from. Languages of every kind, whether made of signs, sounds, or looks, are born in it. The richer thing always comes first: our abilities are refined, thinned-out versions of richer abilities. But even today we still listen with our muscles, and we even read with our muscles.

Every mature art rests on a large set of shared rules and habits, because it is a kind of language. These rules are a requirement for great art, not something that blocks it. Every time life is raised to a higher level, the power to communicate also rises, and so does the ability to understand people. The power to live inside other people's minds and feelings had nothing to do with morality at first. It came from a bodily sensitivity to suggestion. "Sympathy," or what people call "altruism," meaning caring for others, is just a result of that link between mind and muscle movement which people count as spirituality. (The scientist Charles Féré calls it "psycho-motor induction.") People never really pass a thought to each other. They pass on a movement, a sign that the other person copies, and that sign is then read as a thought.

810.

Compared with music, talking with words is a crude and shameless way of doing things. Words shrink things and make them dull. Words take away what is personal. Words turn what is rare and special into something common.

811.

What makes someone an artist are unusual states of mind and body. These states are all closely tied up and tangled with signs of illness, so that it almost seems impossible to be an artist without being sick.

Here are the bodily conditions that, in the artist, get shaped into a "personality," and which, to some extent, can show up in any person:

(1) Rapture, high excitement: the feeling of increased power. It is an inner push to make things into a mirror that reflects your own fullness and perfection.

(2) Some senses become extremely sharp, so sharp that they can understand a completely different language of signs, and can also create such a language. This condition shows up in some nervous illnesses. There is an extreme sensitivity, and out of it grow great powers of connecting with others. Everything that can make signs wants to speak. There is a need to get free of oneself through gestures and body positions. There is the ability to talk about oneself in a hundred different languages. In short, it is a state of explosion.

First you have to picture this condition as an urgent, forced need to get rid of the ecstasy of being so tense, through all kinds of muscle work and movement. You also have to picture it as these movements lining up, without your choosing, with what is going on inside you: images, thoughts, desires. It is like the whole muscle system running on its own, driven by strong forces pushing from within. You cannot stop yourself from reacting, and the parts of you that normally hold back are switched off too. Every inner movement, whether a feeling, a thought, or an emotion, comes with changes in the blood vessels, and so with changes in skin color, body heat, and the body's fluids. This is the suggestive power of music, its "mental suggestion" ("suggestion mentale," as the French say).

(3) The urge to imitate: an extreme sensitivity that makes any example catching, like a disease. Just a few signs are enough for someone to guess a whole state and act it out. A complete picture forms in the mind, and its effect soon shows in the way the arms and legs move. The will is partly put on hold (think of the philosopher

Schopenhauer, who praised exactly that!!!!). There is a kind of blindness and deafness toward the outside world. Only a sharply limited range of stimuli is let in.

This is what sets the artist apart from the ordinary person, the one who watches art. The watcher reaches the peak of excitement just by taking things in. The artist reaches it by giving. And the clash between these two gifts is not only natural, it is even a good thing. Each of these states looks at things from the opposite side. To ask the artist to see things the way the watcher or the critic does is the same as asking him to make his creative power poorer. Here the same difference holds as the one between the sexes: you should not ask the artist, who gives, to become a woman, that is, to "receive."

Our ideas about beauty so far have been women's ideas about beauty, because they have only described what it is like to experience beauty from the side of those who receive art. In all of philosophy up to now, the artist has been missing. As we have already hinted, this is a fault that could not be helped. An artist who started to understand himself would, in doing so, start to misunderstand himself. He must not look back; he must not look at all; he must give. It is an honor for an artist to have no talent for criticism. If he can criticize, he is average; he is modern.

812.

Here I set out a list of mental states that I see as signs of a thriving, complete life, even though today we usually think of them as sick. But by now we have broken the habit of treating "healthy" and "sick" as opposites. It is a question of how much. My view on this is that what people call healthy today is really a lower level of what would truly be healthy under good conditions. In other words, we are all somewhat sick.

The artist belongs to a much stronger breed of people. What would be harmful and sickly in us is natural in him. But people argue against this. They say it is exactly when the body's machine is weak and run down that this unusual power to pick up every kind of suggestion becomes possible. Their example is our hysterical women.

Too much vigor and energy can lead to the same signs as weak life force does: parts of the body acting on their own, the senses seeing or hearing things that are not there, oversensitive nerves at the edges of the body. The triggers are different, but the effect is the same. What is not the same, above all, is the final outcome. Sick people, after their nervous outbursts, sink into deep sluggishness and dullness. That has nothing in common with the states of the artist, who never needs to regret his best moments. He is rich enough for all of it: he can spend freely without becoming poor.

These days we feel we have good reason to see genius as a kind of nervous illness. In the same way, we might perhaps see the artist's power to sway and move people as a kind of illness too. And in fact, our artists are far too closely related to hysterical women!!! But this is only an argument against our own times. It is not an argument against artists in general.

The states that are not artistic are these: being detached and neutral, thinking things over, switching off the will... (Schopenhauer made a shocking mistake here. He thought art was just a bridge that leads us to turning away from life.)... The states that are not artistic are the ones that make us poorer, that take things away, that drain the color out of us, the ones under which life suffers. In short, the Christian state.

813.

The modern artist, whose body and nerves make him a close relative of the hysterical person, can also be counted as a type that belongs to this sick condition. The hysterical person is false. He lies because he loves lying. He is amazing at every kind of pretending and hiding the truth, unless his sick vanity fools him. This vanity is like a fever that never goes away. It always needs drugs to numb it. It will not hold back from any self-deception or any silly act, as long as it promises even the briefest moment of satisfaction. (He is unable to feel real pride, and he constantly needs to take revenge for the deep contempt he feels for himself. That is almost the definition of this man's vanity.)

His nervous system is so ridiculously easy to upset that he turns every experience into a crisis. He sees drama in the smallest, most unimportant events of life. Because of this, he can never think things over calmly. He stops being one single person. At most, he becomes a meeting place for many different personalities, where first one and then another takes over, with shameless confidence. That is exactly why he is so great as an actor. All these poor people with no will of their own, whom doctors study so closely, amaze us with their skill at imitating, at transforming themselves, and at taking on almost any character that is needed.

814.

Artists are not people of great passion, even though they keep claiming the opposite, both to themselves and to others. There are two reasons for this. First, they have no shyness or modesty toward themselves. They watch themselves live, they spy on themselves, they are far too curious. And they also have no shyness when faced with passion, because as artists they use it as material. Second, their talent is like a vampire. It usually does not allow them to spend as much en-

ergy as real passion needs. A person who has a talent is sacrificed to that talent. He lives with his talent sucking the life out of him like a vampire.

A person does not get free of his passion by expressing it in art. Rather, he is already free of it if he is able to express it in art. (Goethe teaches the opposite. But it looks as if he misunderstood himself on purpose here, out of tact and delicacy.)

815.

About a sensible way of living. Being fairly chaste, being basically and wisely careful about sex and desire, even in one's thoughts, can be a sensible way of living, even for people who are richly gifted and whole. But this rule applies especially to artists. It is part of the best wisdom of their lives. Completely trustworthy voices have already spoken up for this view, for example Stendhal, Théophile Gautier, and Flaubert. The artist, in his own way, may have to be a sensual person, easily moved, open to everything, and able to react to the faintest stimulus, or even just a hint of one. Still, as a rule, he is under the control of his work and of his urge to master his craft, and so he is really a sober and often even a chaste person. His strongest instinct wants him to be this way. It does not let him waste himself carelessly. The same kind of strength is used up both in creating art and in the sexual act. There is only one kind of strength. The artist who gives in here and wastes himself gives himself away. By doing this he shows that he lacks instinct and that he lacks will in general. It may be a sign of decline, decay. In any case, it lowers the value of his art beyond measure.

816.

Compared with the artist, the scientist, seen as a type of person, is really a sign that life is being stored up and flattened out, made more level and ordinary. (But he is also a sign of growing strength, strictness, toughness, and willpower.) To what extent can an artist's falseness, and his not caring about truth or usefulness, be a sign of youth, of being childlike? ... Think of how artists usually behave: their lack of reason, their not knowing themselves, their not caring about "eternal values," how serious they are when they play, their lack of dignity. They are clowns and gods at once, the saint and the low crowd together.... Copying others is a commanding instinct in them. Don't artists of rising, growing life and artists of decline turn up in every age? ... Yes!

817.

Would any link be missing from the whole chain of science and art if women, and women's work, were left out of it? Let us admit the exception, since it proves the rule: woman can reach perfection in everything that is not a finished work. She can be perfect in letters, in memoirs, in the most detailed handiwork. In short, she can be perfect in everything that is not a real craft. And she perfects herself in exactly these things because in them she follows the only artistic urge in her nature, which is the urge to charm and win people over.... But what does woman have to do with the passionate coolness of the true artist? He sees more importance in a breath, in a sound, in the smallest little thing, than in himself. He feels around with all five fingers for his most secret, hidden treasures. He gives no value to anything unless it knows how to take on a shape, unless it gives itself up and makes itself visible in some way. Art as artists really practise it: don't you understand what it is? Isn't it an attack on all our modesty and shame? ... Only in this century have women dared to try their hand at

writing. As old Mirabeau put it, they have gone over "to the scribbling rabble of pen-pushers." Women now write, they now paint, and they are losing their instincts. And for what purpose, if we may ask such a question?

818.

A person is an artist to the degree that he treats everything non-artistic people call "form" as the real content, as the "main" thing. With ideas like that, a person certainly lives in a world turned upside down. From then on, content seems to him only a matter of form, and that includes his own life.

819.

A feel for small shades of difference, and a delight in them, is typical of modern times. It is a delight in what is not general. This goes against another instinct, one that finds its joy and strength in grasping what is typical, as Greek taste did in its best period. In that Greek taste, the fullness of life is mastered and held in check. Restraint is in control. But in the modern taste, the calm of the strong soul, which is slow to move and somewhat dislikes too much activity, is defeated. In the Greek way, the general rule, the law, is honoured and put at the front. On the other hand, the exception is set aside and fine shades are pushed down. Everything that is firm, mighty, and solid, life standing on a broad and powerful base and hiding its strength, is pleasing. That is, it matches the way we think of ourselves.

820.

On the whole, I am far more on the side of artists than of any philosopher who has appeared so far. Artists, at least, did not lose sight of the great path that life follows. They loved the things "of this world";

they loved their senses. Trying hard to be "spiritual," when it is not plain hypocrisy or fooling oneself, seems to me to be either a misunderstanding, a sickness, or a cure. For myself, and for all those who live without the worries of a strict, puritan conscience and who are able to live this way, I wish for the senses to become ever more refined and spiritual, and ever richer and more many-sided. In fact, we would gladly be thankful to the senses for their sharpness, power, and fullness, and for that reason offer them the best our minds have to give. What do we care about the curses that priests and philosophers of the beyond have put on the senses? We no longer need to treat them that way. It is a sign of being healthy and strong by nature when a man like Goethe holds on to the "things of this world" with more and more joy and warmth. In this way he keeps firm hold of the great idea of humanity: that a human becomes the power that glorifies existence when he learns to glorify himself.

821.

Pessimism in art? The artist slowly learns to love, for their own sake, the means that produce a state of artistic excitement: very fine and glorious colour, clear outlines, the quality of a sound, sharpness where things are normally not sharp. All sharp, clear things and all fine shades remind us of the highest levels of power, the kind that produce rapture, high excitement. So, through this connection, they light up the feeling of rapture in us. The effect of works of art is to stir up the very state that creates art: the rapture of beauty.

The key feature of art is its power to make existence perfect, to produce perfection and fullness. At its heart, art is saying yes to existence, blessing it, and making it godlike.... So what would a pessimistic art mean? Isn't that a contradiction? Yes, it is. Schopenhauer is wrong when he uses certain works of art to serve pessimism. Tragedy does not teach us to "give up." ... Showing terrible and doubtful things

is, in itself, a sign that the artist has an instinct for power and grandeur. He isn't afraid of them.... There is no such thing as a pessimistic art.... Art says yes. Job says yes. But what about Zola? And the Goncourt brothers? The things they show us are ugly, but their reason for showing them to us is their love of ugliness ... I don't care what you say! You are simply fooling yourselves if you think otherwise. What a relief Dostoevsky is!

822.

If I have taught my readers well enough that even "goodness," in the whole comedy of life, is a form of exhaustion, then they will now give Christianity credit for being consistent when it thought of the good as the ugly. On this point, Christianity was right.

It is completely unworthy of a philosopher to say that "the good and the beautiful are one." If he goes on to add "and the true as well," he deserves a beating. Truth is ugly.

We have art so that truth does not destroy us.

823.

Art can be used to fight the urge to preach morals. Art is freedom from narrow-minded moralising and from smug, self-satisfied "good little boy" philosophy, like Little Jack Horner's. Or art can mock these things. Art can be an escape to Nature, where beauty and terror go together. And then there is the idea of the great person.

Then there are the fragile, useless luxury souls, thrown off balance by the slightest breath of wind: the so-called "beautiful souls."

The ancient ideals, with their merciless hardness and brutality, should be woken up again, since they are the mightiest of monsters.

We should take a loud, rowdy delight in seeing, through psychology, how all artists who preach morals turn into worms and play-actors without realising it.

The falseness of art, its immorality, must be brought out into the open.

The "basic powers that make things ideal" (our sensuality, our rapture, our overflowing animal nature) should be brought to light.

824.

The fake tricks used in modern art: people see them as necessary. In other words, they fit perfectly with what the modern soul most truly needs.

Modern artists have gaps in their talent. They have even bigger gaps in their education, their background, and their training. Today those gaps are filled in the following ways:

First: they look for a public that knows less about art, a public able to love without limit and ready to fall on its knees before a strong personality. The superstition of our century, the belief in "genius," helps this along.

Second: artists make loud speeches aimed at the dark instincts of people in a democratic age, the unhappy, the ambitious, and those who fool themselves. This is why striking poses matter so much.

Third: the methods of one art are carried over into another. The goal of art gets mixed up with the goal of science, or of the Church, or of the interests of a race (nationalism), or of philosophy. One man rings all the bells at once, and so he stirs up a vague feeling that he might be a god.

Fourth: artists flatter women, people who suffer, and people who are angry. Art is filled mainly with things that numb you and put you to sleep, like drugs. The imagination of educated people, and of those who read poetry and ancient history, is pleasantly tickled.

825.

We have to tell apart the "general public" and the "chosen few." To please the public today, a man has to be a fraud and a showman. To please the chosen few, he will be a skilled master of technique and nothing more. The geniuses typical of our century got past this split: they were great for both groups. The huge showmanship of Victor Hugo and Richard Wagner came together with such real skill that it satisfied even the most refined experts in art. That is exactly why true greatness is missing. These geniuses looked in two directions at once: first they served the crudest needs, and then the most refined ones.

826.

False emphasis: (1) In romantic art born of lack, this never-ending push to be "expressive" is not a sign of strength. It is a sign of feeling that something is missing.

(2) Music that paints pictures, the so-called dramatic kind, is above all easier to make. The same goes for the crude spreading of scandal in realistic novels, and their habit of just piling facts and details next to each other.

(3) "Passion" as something that comes from strained nerves and worn-out souls. The same is true of the delight in high mountains, deserts, storms, wild parties, and disgusting details, and in things that are huge and heavy (historians, for example). In fact, there is a real worship of overblown feelings. Why is it that in stronger ages, art wanted just the opposite, which was to hold passion back?

(4) The liking for exciting subjects, such as sex, socialism, or sickness. All these things show what kind of public is being served today: people who are overworked, distracted, or weakened.

Such people have to be bullied and overpowered before they feel anything at all.

827.

Modern art is the art of bullying the audience. Its outlines are drawn crudely, sharply, and boldly. The main idea is boiled down to a formula, and formulas take control. Inside the lines there are wild, twisting decorations. There are crushing masses of material that confuse the senses. There is brutal force in the colors, in the subjects, and in the desires shown. Examples are Zola, Wagner, and, in a more mental and refined way, Taine. That is where the logic, the bulk, and the brutality come from.

828.

About painters, someone has said: "All these modern painters are really poets who wanted to be painters. One searched for dramas in history, another for scenes of everyday life. This one translates religions into pictures, that one a philosophy." One copies Raphael, another copies the early Italian masters. Landscape painters use trees and clouds to write poems of praise and poems of sorrow. Not one of them is simply a painter. They are all experts in old things, students of the mind, and showmen for some event or theory. They enjoy our learning and our philosophy. Like us, they are full, too full, of general ideas. They like a shape not for what it is, but for what it says. They are the children of a learned, troubled, and over-thinking generation. They are a thousand miles away from the Old Masters, who never read books and only cared about giving their eyes a feast.

829.

Deep down, even Wagner's music is literature, to the extent that it stands for all of French romantic art born of lack. It offers the charm of the exotic, meaning strange times, customs, and passions, and it works its charm on sensitive people who like to sit in cozy corners. There is the delight of entering very far-off, ancient lands that books lead you into, so that the whole horizon gets painted with new colors and new possibilities. There are dreams of even more distant worlds that no one has used up yet, and a scorn for the ordinary city streets. Let us not fool ourselves: nationalism, too, is just one more form of love for the exotic. Romantic musicians only tell us what exotic books have turned them into. People would love to feel exotic sensations and passions in the style of old Florence and Venice. In the end, they settle for looking for them in a picture. What really matters here is a new kind of desire: the desire to imitate, the desire to live the way people once lived in the past, and the desire to disguise and hide the soul. Romantic art born of lack is nothing but an emergency exit out of a "reality" that seems broken.

The attempt to do new things: the revolution, and Napoleon. Napoleon stands for a passion for new possibilities of the spirit, for making the soul's territory bigger.

The weaker the will, the wilder the urge to feel, to show, and to dream new things. Here is the result of all the excess people have given in to: a thirst that can never be satisfied for feelings without any limits. Foreign literatures provide the strongest spices.

830.

The Greeks of Winckelmann and Goethe, the Orientals of Victor Hugo, Wagner's characters from the old Norse legends, Walter Scott's Englishmen of the thirteenth century: some day this whole play-act-

ing will be exposed! All of it was historical far beyond reason, and false. But it was modern.

831.

About how each nation's genius deals with things that are foreign and borrowed:

The English genius makes everything it sees crude and down-to-earth;

The French genius trims things down, simplifies them, makes them reasonable, and decorates them;

The German genius muddles things, makes half-way deals, tangles everything up, and infects it all with morality;

The Italian genius has used borrowed material by far the most freely and with the most finesse. It has added a hundred times more beauty to that material than it ever took out of it. It is the richest genius; it had the most to give.

832.

The Jews, with Heinrich Heine and Offenbach, came close to genius in the field of art. Offenbach was the cleverest and most high-spirited of mocking wild spirits, like the satyrs of old myth. As a musician he stayed true to the great tradition. For anyone who has more than just ears, he is a real relief after the sentimental and, at heart, rotten musicians of German romantic art born of lack.

833.

Offenbach: French music filled with the wit of Voltaire. It is free and playful, with a slight mocking grin, yet clear and clever, almost to the point of being ordinary. Offenbach never prettifies or fusses over

things. And his music is free of the dainty sweetness found in sickly sensuality, or in the blond Viennese kind.

834.

Suppose that by "artistic genius" we mean perfect freedom while still following the rules, a godlike ease, and the skill to overcome the hardest problems without effort. If that is what genius means, then Offenbach has an even better claim to be called a genius than Wagner does. Wagner is heavy and clumsy. Nothing is more alien to him than those moments of playful, carefree perfection that this clown Offenbach pulls off five or six times in almost every one of his comic pieces. But perhaps we should mean something else by genius.

835.

About "music." There is French music, German music, and Italian music. (The times when we were weakest and lowest in politics are the times when we created the most. And what about the Slavs?) Ballet has taken over opera, and ballet itself comes from studying the history of foreign cultures far too much. There is music made for the stage, and there is music made for musicians. People are wrong to think that what Wagner composed was a form. It was really the lack of any form. The real possibilities of building music like a drama are still waiting to be discovered. Then there is rhythm. There is the push for "expression" no matter the cost. There is a cheap, crowd-pleasing showiness in how the instruments are used, like someone selling themselves. All honor to Heinrich Schütz, and all honor to Mendelssohn! In them we find something of Goethe, and we find it nowhere else. (We also see another part of Goethe blooming in Rahel, and a third part in Heinrich Heine.)

836.

Music that describes things simply lets reality do the work on its own. All these kinds of art are easier to make and easier to copy. People with little talent turn to them. They work by stirring up our instincts. It is art that works by suggestion, by planting feelings in us.

837.

About our modern music. Melody is decaying, just as "ideas" are decaying, and just as freedom in thinking is decaying. This decay is really a kind of clumsiness and dullness. But now it is turning itself into bold new experiments, and even into principles. In the end, a person only has the principles that match his talents, or that match his lack of talent.

"Dramatic music"? Nonsense! It is just bad music. "Feeling" and "passion" are only replacements, used when people can no longer reach high intelligence and the joy that comes with it, the kind of joy Voltaire had. Speaking in terms of technique, feeling and "passion" are easier to produce. They need a much weaker kind of artist. When an artist turns to drama, it shows that he is much better at tricks than at real skill. Today we have dramatic painting too, and dramatic poetry, and so on.

838.

What music is missing is a theory of beauty, a set of standards that would give musicians rules to follow and give them a conscience. Because of this, we also lack any real argument about "principles." As musicians, we laugh just as hard at Herbart's half-hearted attempts in this area as we laugh at Schopenhauer's. The truth is, there are huge difficulties here. We no longer know what to build our ideas on when we decide what counts as a model to follow, as masterful, as perfect.

We feel our way around in a world of values, guided only by the instincts of old loves and old admiration. We almost believe that "whatever pleases us is good." I always get suspicious when I hear people everywhere calmly call Beethoven a "classic." What I would claim, and quite firmly, is that in the other arts a classic is the exact opposite of Beethoven. But when people teach and praise the total and obvious breakdown of style, Wagner's so-called dramatic style, as a model, as masterful, as progress, then I lose all patience. Dramatic style in music, as Wagner understood it, simply means giving up on style altogether. It means assuming that something else, namely drama, is a hundred times more important than music. Wagner can paint pictures with sound. He does not use music for its own sake. He uses it to highlight poses and moods. He is a poet. In the end he appealed to beautiful feelings and heaving chests, just as every other stage artist has done. And with all this he won over women, and even people whose souls are thirsty for culture. But what do women and uncultured people care about music? None of these people have an artistic conscience. None of them feel pain when the first and most basic virtues of an art are mocked and stamped on in favor of something that should only come second, music as a mere servant of drama. What good does it do to widen the ways of expressing things, when the thing being expressed, art itself, has lost all its rules and order? The colorful splendor and force of sound, the symbolism of tones, the rhythm, the color effects of harmony and clashing notes, music's power to suggest things, the whole sensual side of this art that Wagner made dominant: all this is what Wagner took from music, developed, and drew out of it. Victor Hugo did something very similar with language. But in France people are already asking about Victor Hugo whether he spoiled the language. They ask whether reason, intelligence, and a careful respect for the rules of language get pushed down when sensual expression is raised to the top. Is it not a sign of decline, decay, that French poets have turned into sculptors

and painters of words, and that German musicians have turned into actors and sellers of culture?

839.

Today there is a kind of musical pessimism, a gloomy view of life, even among people who are not musicians. Who has not met, and cursed, that wretched young fellow who tortures his piano until it screams in despair, and who all by himself shoves along a sludge of the most mournful, dreary harmonies? By doing this, a person shows that he is a pessimist. But it is doubtful whether he also proves that he is a musician this way. For my part, nobody could ever make me believe it. A pure-blooded Wagner fan is not musical. He gives in to the raw, basic forces of music very much the way a woman gives in to the will of a man who hypnotizes her. And to be able to do this, he must not be made suspicious about music and musicians by a conscience that is too strict or too sensitive. I said "very much the way," but here I may have said more than just a comparison. Look at the methods Wagner likes best when he wants to make an impression, methods he mostly had to invent himself. They are frighteningly similar to the methods a hypnotist uses to gain power over people. There is the choice of his gestures, and the general color of his orchestra. There is the painful way he avoids steadiness, evenness, and regular beats in his rhythm. There is the creepy feeling, the soothing touch, the mystery, the hysteria of his "endless melody." Take the overture to Lohengrin, for example. Is the state it puts the men in the audience into, and the women even more, really so different from a sleepwalker's trance? Once, after that overture had been played, I heard an Italian lady say, with her eyes half shut, in the way that women Wagner fans are so good at: "Come si dorme con questa musica!"[10]

[Footnote 10: "How this music makes you sleep!" Translator's note.]

840.

Religion in music. Wagner's music satisfies all kinds of religious needs to a huge degree, even though nobody admits this, or even realizes it! So much prayer, virtue, holy sweetness, purity and salvation speak through this music!... This sly saint leads us and tempts us back to everything people used to believe in. And oh, how much he gains from the fact that he can do without words and ideas! ... Our thinking conscience doesn't need to feel ashamed. It stays to one side while some old instinct touches its trembling lips to the edge of a forbidden magic drink.... This is clever and healthy. And since it shows a certain shame about feeding the religious instinct, it is even a good sign.... Sly Christianity: that is the kind of music that came from the "late Wagner."

841.

I tell apart courage in front of people, courage in front of things, and courage on paper. The last one was the courage of David Strauss, for example. I also tell apart courage in front of witnesses and courage with no witnesses. The courage of a Christian, or of anyone who believes in God, can never be courage with no witnesses, because God is always watching. For that reason alone, Christian courage is condemned. Finally, I tell apart courage that comes from a person's nature and courage that is really the fear of being afraid. One example of the second kind is moral courage. To this list we should add the courage of despair.

This is the courage Wagner had. Deep down, his relationship to music was a desperate one. He lacked two things that make a good musician: natural talent and upbringing. That means a born gift for music, and the training and strict self-control and schooling that music demands. But he had courage. He turned this lack into a principle. He invented

a kind of music for himself. The dramatic music he invented was simply the music he was able to write. Its limits are Wagner's own limits.

And people say he was misunderstood! But was he really misunderstood?... The same is true of five out of six artists today. Wagner is their savior. And five out of six is the "lowest count." Wherever nature has shown itself openly and without holding back, and wherever a person's education is just luck, a mere try, an amateur's hobby, the artist turns to Wagner by instinct. What am I saying? I mean he turns to Wagner with enthusiasm. As the poet says: "Half she pulled him, half he sank."[11]

[Footnote 11: This is a slightly changed quote from Goethe's poem "The Fisherman." The translation is by E. A. Bowring. Translator's note.]

842.

"Music" and the great, commanding style. An artist's greatness should not be measured by the beautiful feelings he stirs up. Leave that belief to young girls. It should be measured by how close he comes to the great, commanding style, by how capable he is of that style. This style and great passion share something: they refuse to try to please; they forget to try to persuade; they give orders; they will.... To become master of the chaos inside you. To force your inner chaos to take a shape. To become consistent, simple, clear, mathematical, to become law. That is the great ambition here. Through it, a person pushes others away. And nothing draws people to such powerful men more than this. A desert seems to lie around them. They make everyone fall silent, and they fill everyone with awe at how great their breaking of sacred rules is.... Every art knows people who reach for the great, commanding style. So why are they missing in music? No musician

has ever yet built the way the architect who put up the Palazzo Pitti in Florence built.... This is a puzzle. Does music perhaps belong to a culture in which the rule of powerful men of every type has already ended? Is the idea of a "great, commanding style" actually against the very soul of music, against "the Woman" in our music? ...

With this I touch on the central question: where does all our music belong? The age of classical style of simplicity and strength knows nothing like it. Music bloomed when the world of the Renaissance was reaching its evening, when "freedom" had already said goodbye to both people and their ways of life. Is it part of music's nature to be against the Renaissance? Is music perhaps the sister of the baroque style, since the two grew up at the same time anyway? Isn't music, modern music, already decline, decay? ...

I have pointed to this question before: Isn't music an example of art that goes against the Renaissance? Isn't it the closest relative of the baroque style? Hasn't it grown up in opposition to all classical style of simplicity and strength, so that the very nature of music rules out any attempt to be classical?

The answer to this most important of all questions about values would hardly be in doubt, if people fully understood one fact: music reaches its greatest ripeness and fullness as romantic art born of lack, which is also a backward-looking movement against classical art.

Mozart was a gentle and lovable soul, but completely of the eighteenth century, even in his serious slips ... Beethoven was the first great romantic, in the French sense of romantic art born of lack, just as Wagner is the last great romantic ... Both of them are, by instinct, enemies of classical style of simplicity and strength, of strict style. Not to mention the "great, commanding" style in this respect.

843.

Romanticism, that is, romantic art born of lack, is a question with two sides, like every modern question.

There are two kinds of conditions that give rise to art:

There is the full and generous kind, and against it there is the kind that is searching and wanting.

844.

A romantic artist is one who becomes creative because he is deeply unhappy with himself. He looks away from himself and from the people around him, and so he sometimes looks back to the past.

845.

Does art come from being unhappy with reality? Or is it a way of saying thank you for happiness someone has known? If it is the first, it is romantic art born of lack. If it is the second, it is praise and a joyful hymn, in short, art that glorifies life. Even Raphael belongs here, except that he was two-faced: he went against the Christian view of the world while seeming to follow it. He was grateful for life exactly in the places where life was not really Christian.

If you judge the world only in moral terms, it becomes unbearable. Christianity was an attempt to defeat the world through morality, which means to say no to the world. In practice, such a crazy experiment, a foolish attempt to raise humans above the world, could only end by making people gloomier, smaller, and poorer in spirit. The only kind of person who gained anything from it, who was pushed forward by it, was the most average, the most harmless, the most crowd-following type.

Homer was an artist of the kind that glorifies life, and so was Rubens. Music has not yet had an artist like that.

Turning the great criminal into an ideal, and feeling his greatness, is a Greek thing. Looking down on the sinner, speaking badly of him, and despising him is a Jewish and Christian thing.

846.

Romantic art and its opposite. Whenever I judge anything in art, I now use one basic distinction. In each single case I ask myself: was it hunger that created this, or was it overflowing abundance? At first another distinction might seem better, because it is much more obvious. For example, you could ask whether the work was created out of a wish for stability, for lasting forever, for fixed, unchanging existence, or out of a wish for destruction, for change, for constant change. But when you look more closely, both kinds of wish turn out to have two possible meanings. In the end they can only be understood by using the first distinction I mentioned, which I believe is rightly the better one.

The wish for destruction, for change, for constant change, may come from a power so full that it overflows and is full of promise for the future. My name for this, as people know, is wild and life-loving, like the god Dionysus. But it may also be the hatred of the badly made, the needy, and the failed and weak in body. That hatred destroys, and has to destroy, because such people are angry and irritated by anything that lasts and stays firm.

On the other hand, the urge to make something last forever can come from gratitude and love. Art that comes from this source is always art that glorifies life. It may be wildly joyful, as perhaps with Rubens; happy, as perhaps with the poet Hafiz; or bright and kind, throwing a glow of glory over everything, as with Goethe. But this urge may also

come from the bullying will of someone who suffers greatly. Such a person wants to take the most personal, private, and narrow thing about himself, the very strangeness of his own pain, and turn it into a law everyone must obey. In this way he takes revenge on everything by stamping it, branding it, and forcing on it the picture of his own torment. This second case is romantic pessimism at its highest, whether it shows up as Schopenhauer's philosophy of the will or as Wagner's music.

847.

We may ask whether the contrast between classic and romantic is really hiding another contrast: the one between acting and merely reacting.

848.

To be a classic, you must have all the strong gifts and passions, even ones that seem to fight each other. But they must pull together, like horses in the same harness, and at the same moment lift some kind of writing, art, or politics to its very peak. They must not do this after that peak has already been reached. They must mirror the whole state of a people or of a culture and show its deepest and most hidden nature. And this must happen while that people or culture is still solid and not yet stained by copying foreign things, or while it still depends on them. Such a spirit does not just react. It is deliberate and moves forward, and it says yes in every situation, even when it hates.

Someone may ask: "And doesn't the highest personal worth belong to this too?" It is worth thinking about whether moral prejudices might be at work here. Maybe being extremely morally high-minded actually goes against the classical. Maybe moral monsters, people who are all morality, are bound to be romantic in both their words and their ac-

tions. When one virtue outweighs all the others, as it does in the moral monster, that is exactly what fights hardest against the classical power, which depends on balance. Suppose a people showed this great moral height and was still classical. Then we would have to boldly conclude that they were just as high up in immorality too! Perhaps this was true of Shakespeare, if he really was Lord Bacon.

849.

About the future. Against romantic art of great passion. We must understand that a certain amount of coldness, clear-headedness, and hardness always goes with the classical style of simplicity and strength. Above all it needs consistency, a cheerful use of the mind, the "three unities" of old drama, and focus. It needs a hatred of all gushing feeling, all sentimentality, all clever wit. It hates too much variety, all uncertainty, all dodging, and all foggy vagueness. It also hates anything too short, too fussy, too pretty, or too sweet-natured. You must not play games with artistic formulas. Instead, life itself must be reshaped so that it is forced to express itself in those forms.

It is really a very amusing sight, one we have only learned to laugh at quite recently, because we have only seen through it quite recently. It is the sight of the people living in the time of Herder, Winckelmann, Goethe, and Hegel claiming that they had rediscovered the classical ideal... and, at the same time, Shakespeare! And these very same people had meanly denied any connection with the classical school of France! As if the basic principle could not have been learned there just as well as anywhere else! But what people wanted was "nature" and "being natural." Oh, how stupid that was! They thought that the classical was a kind of naturalness!

Without bias and without going easy, we should try to find out in what kind of ground a classical style of simplicity and strength can

grow. Making people harder, simpler, stronger, and even more devilish is part of classical taste and cannot be separated from it. It means simplifying both thinking and the mind. It means looking down on small details, on complication, and on unclear things.

The German romantics are not really protesting against the classical. They are protesting against reason, against the Enlightenment, against good taste, and against the eighteenth century.

At its core, the romantic music of Wagner is the opposite of the classical spirit.

It has a will to make everything one whole, because a unified whole has power over people, for example over the listener and the viewer. But the artist is unable to take control of himself where it is needed most, that is, in the work itself: in knowing what to cut out, what to shorten, what to make clear, and what to simplify. Instead it overwhelms people with sheer size and mass, as Wagner, Victor Hugo, Zola, and Taine do.

850.

The belief that nothing has meaning, as artists live it. Nature is cruel even when she is cheerful. Her sunrises are cynical, as if she does not care at all. We have turned against feelings. We run away to places where Nature stirs our senses and our imagination, where there is nothing for us to love, and where nothing reminds us of the moral show and the fine, delicate feelings of this northern kind of nature. The same goes for the arts. We like best whatever no longer reminds us of good and evil. Our moral sensitivity and soft-heartedness seem to find relief right in the middle of terrible and happy Nature, in the blind fate of the senses and of natural forces. Here is life without goodness.

A deep sense of well-being comes from looking at how Nature does not care about good and evil.

There is no justice in history, and no goodness in Nature. That is why the pessimist, when he is an artist, likes best those subjects from history where the lack of justice shows itself in a grand, simple way, where something perfect actually comes through. In the same way, he likes best those parts of Nature where her cold, evil character is not hidden behind a fake mask, where that character can be seen in its perfect form. The artist who believes that nothing has meaning gives himself away by wanting and preferring a cynical history and a cynical Nature.

851.

What is tragic? Again and again I have pointed out Aristotle's big mistake. He claimed that the feelings stirred by tragedy were two feelings that drag us down: fear and pity. If he had been right, tragedy would be an art that works against life. People would have needed a warning against it, as against something harmful and suspect. Art is usually the great boost to life, the great rapture of life, the great will to live. But here it would become a tool of decline and decay, the servant of pessimism and sickness. And Aristotle's idea that stirring up these feelings would clean people out of them is simply wrong. Anything that keeps stirring up fear or pity throws us into disorder, weakens us, and takes away our courage. Now suppose Schopenhauer were right that tragedy teaches us to give in, which means meekly giving up happiness, hope, and the will to live. Then we would have an art in which art itself was denied. Tragedy would then be a process of falling apart. The instinct for life would destroy itself inside the instinct for art. Christianity, the belief that nothing has meaning, tragic art, and bodily decline and decay would then all be linked. They

would grow strong together and push each other onward, which really means downward. Tragedy would then be a sign of decline.

This theory can be proven wrong in the coldest, most scientific way: by measuring the effect of a tragic feeling with a machine that measures strength. The result would be a fact that only a rule-bound theorist, false to the bottom, could fail to see: tragedy is a tonic. It strengthens us. Schopenhauer refuses to see the truth here. He treats a general low mood as the tragic state. He would have told the Greeks, who to his disgust did not simply give in, that they did not truly hold the highest truths about life. But he only does this because he had already taken sides, because his system needed to stay consistent, and because of the dishonesty of a rule-bound theorist. That dreadful dishonesty spoiled, step by step, Schopenhauer's whole understanding of the human mind. He was the one who willfully, almost violently, misunderstood genius, art itself, morality, pagan, non-Christian religion, beauty, knowledge, and nearly everything else.

852.

The tragic artist. Whether we call something "beautiful," and what we call beautiful, depends on how strong a person or a people is. There is a feeling of fullness, of strength overflowing, which meets many obstacles cheerfully and bravely, the same obstacles a weak person shudders at. This feeling of power calls things and situations "beautiful" that the instinct of weakness can only see as hateful and ugly. We have a kind of nose that lets us tell whether the things we meet are dangerous, tricky, or tempting. That same nose also decides when we say yes to something as art. Saying "This is beautiful" is a way of saying yes.

From this we can see that, in general, liking dark and terrible things is a sign of strength. A taste for pretty, charming little things belongs to

the weak and the delicate. Loving tragedy is typical of strong ages and strong characters. Its highest peak is perhaps Dante's Divine Comedy. It is heroic spirits who say yes to themselves in the cruelty of tragedy. They are hard enough to feel pain as pleasure.

Now on the other side, suppose weak people want to enjoy an art that was not made for them. How would they want to explain tragedy to make it fit their taste? They would read their own sense of values into it. For example, they would see in it "the victory of the moral order of things," or the lesson that "life is useless," or a call to "give in." Or they would see half-medical, half-moral outpourings, the way Aristotle did. Finally, the art of terrible, powerful natures can excite the nerves, and so the weak and worn-out may use it as a stimulant. This is happening right now, for example, in how people admire Wagner's art. Here is a test of a person's well-being and sense of power: how far can he admit that things are terrible and questionable, and does he still need a faith at the end of it all?

This kind of pessimism in art is the exact opposite of the religious and moral kind. That other kind suffers over how corrupt people are and how puzzling life is, and it demands to be saved, or at least to hope for saving. People who suffer, who doubt and distrust themselves, in other words the sick, have in every age needed the uplifting power of visions just to be able to go on living. The idea of "blessedness," of heavenly happiness, came about this way. Something similar happens with the artists of decline and decay. Deep down they believe that nothing in life has meaning, and they hide in the beauty of form, in those rare cases where Nature is perfect, where she is great and beautiful without caring. So the "love of beauty" may be something very different from the ability to see or create beauty. It may even be a sign of being unable to do so. The most convincing artists are those who make harmony ring out of every clash of sounds, and who make everything richer through the gift of their power and their inner

harmony. In every work of art they simply show a sign of their deepest experiences. What they create is a way of saying thank you to life.

The depth of the tragic artist lies in this: his sense for art looks out over the far-off results. He does not stop, short-sightedly, at whatever is closest. He says yes to the whole way the universe works, which justifies the terrible, the evil, and the questionable, and does more than justify them.

853.

Art in "The Birth of Tragedy"

I.

The idea of the world that stands in the background of this book is extremely dark and unpleasant. Of all the kinds of pessimism that have ever been known so far, none seems to have reached this level of spite. Here there is no contrast at all between a true world and a world that only seems real. There is only one world, and it is false, cruel, full of contradictions, tempting, and without meaning. A world made like that is the true world. We need lies in order to rise above this reality, above this truth. In other words, we need lies in order to live.... The fact that life needs lies is itself part of what makes existence so terrible and so doubtful.

In this book, metaphysics, morality, religion, and science are all seen simply as different kinds of lies. Through them we are led to believe in life. "Life must make us trust it": the job this gives us is huge. To solve this problem, a human being must already be a liar deep down, but above all he must be an artist. And he is one. Metaphysics, religion, morality, science: all of these are only branches growing out of his urge to make art, his urge to lie, to run away from "truth," to deny "truth." This ability, this artistic skill that humans have more than

anything else, lets him beat reality with lies. And it is a quality he shares with every other form of existence. After all, he himself is a piece of reality, of truth, of nature. So how could he not also be a piece of genius at bending the truth!

The fact that people misunderstand what existence is really like is the deepest and highest hidden reason behind everything to do with virtue, science, religious faith, and art. To be blind to many things, to see many things wrongly, to imagine many things: oh, how clever humans have been at the very times when they thought they were anything but clever! Love, excitement, "God" are only subtle kinds of the deepest self-deception. They are only temptations to live and to believe in life! In those moments when people were fooled, when they had tricked themselves and believed in life, oh, how their spirit swelled up inside them! Oh, what joy and rapture they felt! What power they felt! And what artistic victories there were in that feeling of power! ... Humans had once again become masters of "matter," masters of truth! ... And whenever a person is joyful, it is always in the same way: he is joyful as an artist. His power is his joy, and he enjoys the lie as his own power....

II.

Art and nothing else! Art is the great tool that makes life possible. It is the great tempter that draws us to life, the great spark that drives life on.

Art is the only strong force that can push back against every wish to deny life. Above all, it is the force that stands against Christianity, against Buddhism, and against the belief that nothing has meaning.

Art brings relief to the one who searches for knowledge. It helps the person who sees how terrible and doubtful existence is, and who chooses to see it. It helps the tragic seeker of knowledge.

Art brings relief to the person of action. That is the one who not only sees how terrible and doubtful existence is, but also lives it and chooses to live it: the tragic, fighting person, the hero. Art brings relief to the one who suffers. It is the path to states where pain is wanted, where pain is transformed and made holy, where suffering becomes a kind of great rapture.

III.

It is clear that in this book pessimism, or better, the belief that nothing has meaning, stands for "truth." But truth is not set up as the highest measure of value, and even less as the highest power. Here, the urge toward how things seem, toward illusion, toward deception, toward constant change and transformation (that is, toward deception built into the world itself) is seen as deeper, older, and more basic than the urge to find truth and reality. In fact, the urge to find truth is just one form of the urge toward illusion. In the same way, happiness is seen as older and more basic than pain. Pain is seen as something that depends on something else: it is a result of the urge toward happiness, that is, the urge toward constant change, toward growth, toward shaping things, which means toward creating. And creating always includes destroying. The highest state of saying yes to life is seen as a state that does not shut out even the greatest pain: the tragic state that is wild and life-loving, like the god Dionysus.

IV.

In this way, this book is even against pessimism. It is against it in the sense that it teaches something stronger than pessimism and more "godlike" than truth: art. It might seem that nobody would be more ready to seriously and completely reject life, and to reject action even more than life, than the author of this book. The only difference is

that he knows that art is worth more than truth. He knows it because he has lived through it, and perhaps has lived through little else!

Even in the preface, where Richard Wagner is, in a way, invited to join the author in a conversation, the author states this belief, this good news for artists: "Art is the only task of life. Art is the deepest, most basic activity of life...."

Book Four

Training and Strict Self-Control, and Raising a Stronger Kind of People

I.

The Ranking of People by Worth

1. The Teaching About the Ranking of People by Worth

854.

We live in an age where everyone gets a vote, and where everybody is allowed to pass judgment on everything and everyone. Because of this, I feel I have to bring back the ranking of people by worth.

855.

Only amounts of power decide a person's rank and set one rank apart from another. Nothing else does.

856.

The drive for power. What kind of people would be needed to carry out this turning all values upside down? The ranking of people by worth is really a ranking by power. War and danger are what a rank needs in order to keep the conditions it lives by. The amazing example of this is humans in nature: the weakest but cleverest creature made itself the master, and put all the less intelligent forces under its control, like animals under a yoke.

857.

I separate two types of people. One type stands for life that is rising and growing. The other stands for decay, falling apart, and weakness. Should anyone really think there could be any doubt about which of these two types ranks higher?

858.

The small amount of power that you carry decides your rank. Everything else is just cowardice.

859.

There are advantages to standing apart from your own time. I mean standing apart from two movements: individualism, and the morality that puts the group first. Even individualism does not accept the ranking of people by worth, because it wants to give every single person the same freedom as everyone else. My thoughts are not about how much freedom should be given to one person, or another, or to everyone. They are about how much power one person or another should have over the people around him, or over everyone. Above all, I ask this: to what extent could giving up freedom, or even slavery, serve as the base for growing a higher type of person? To put it plainly: how could one give up the progress of humanity as a whole, in order to help a kind of being higher than humans come into existence?

860.

About rank. The terrible results of "equality" are that, in the end, everyone thinks he has the right to tackle every question. Every kind of ranking of people by worth has disappeared.

861.

Exceptional people must declare war on the masses! Everywhere, average people are joining forces so that they can take control. Everything that spoils people, that makes them soft, and that pushes "the people" or "women" to the front, works in favor of everyone having a vote. And that means rule by lower kinds of people. But we must strike back. We must drag this whole situation, which began in Europe with Christianity, out into the open and put it on trial.

862.

What is needed is a teaching strong enough to act as training and strict self-control. It should work in a way that makes the strong stronger, and that freezes and crushes those who are tired of the world.

The wiping out of races that are in decline. The decay of Europe. The wiping out of ways of judging value that are stained by the outlook of slaves. Ruling the world as a way to raise a higher type of person. The wiping out of the fraud called morality. (Christianity is a hysterical kind of honesty about this, as seen in Augustine and Bunyan.) The wiping out of everyone having a vote, meaning the system by which the lowest natures make themselves into a law for the higher natures. The wiping out of being average and of how widespread it is. (Against the one-sided, against single individuals and single peoples: a fullness of nature should be aimed at by joining opposites together, and for this purpose mixing races should be tried.) A new kind of courage: no truths that are fixed in advance (it was people used to believing in something who looked for those kinds of truths!), but instead freely choosing to obey a guiding idea that has its own time, and will pass. For example, the idea that time is a quality of space, and so on.

2. Strong and Weak People

863.

The idea of a "strong man" and a "weak man" comes down to this. In the first case, a lot of strength has been inherited, and the man is the total sum of it. In the other case, there is not yet enough, because what was inherited was too little, or the inherited qualities were split up and spread thin. Weakness can be something at the beginning, meaning "not yet enough." Or it can be something at the end, meaning "no more."

What decides things is where great strength is present, or where a large amount of strength can be released. The masses, being the total of all the weak, react slowly. They defend themselves against many things they are too weak for, against things they have no use for. They never create anything, and they never take a step forward. This goes against the theory that denies the strong individual and claims that "the masses do everything." The difference is like the gap between generations that are far apart: four or even five generations may lie between the masses and the person who is the driving spirit. It is a difference in time.

The values of the weak are out in front, because the strong have taken them up so they can lead with them.

864.

Why the weak win. On the whole, sick and weak people have more sympathy for others and are more "humane." Sick and weak people have more brains, and they are more changeable, more varied, more entertaining, and more spiteful. The sick alone invented spite. (An unhealthy early cleverness can often be seen among people with rickets, skin diseases of the glands, and tuberculosis.) Wit and sharp intelligence belong to older races: Jews, French people, Chinese. (The

anti-Semites cannot forgive the Jews for having both brains and money. "Anti-Semites" is just another name for the failed and weak.)

Sick and weak people have always had the power to fascinate on their side. They are more interesting than healthy people. The fool and the saint are the two most interesting kinds of human beings. Closely related to them is the "genius." The "great adventurers and criminals," and every great person, especially the healthiest ones, have always been sick at certain times in their lives. Great upheavals of feeling, such as the passion for power, love, or revenge, all come with very deep inner disturbances. And as for decline, decay: every man who does not die young shows it in almost every way. So he knows from his own experience the instincts that go with it. For half of his life, nearly every man is in decline and decay.

And finally, women! One half of humanity is weak, always sick, changeable, and shifty. A woman needs strength so that she can cling to it. She also needs a religion of the weak, one that praises weakness, love, and modesty as holy. Or, better still, she makes the strong weak: she rules when she manages to overcome the strong. Women have always plotted together with types in decline and decay, such as priests, against the powerful, against the "strong," against men. Women use children to promote the worship of devotion, pity, and love. The mother stands as the symbol of a selflessness that wins people over.

Finally, as civilization grows, certain things grow along with it, because they always go together: more sick and unhealthy elements, more people who are *nervously ill* and *mentally ill*, and more *criminals*. A kind of *in-between species* appears: the artist. He is different from people who become criminals because their wills are weak and they fear society, even if those people are not yet bad enough to be locked in a mental hospital. But the artist has feelers that reach out with curiosity into both of these worlds. He is a special plant that grows in our

culture: the modern artist, the painter, the musician, and, above all, the novelist, who describes his own particular way of looking at things with the very vague word "naturalism."... Madmen, criminals, and realists[1] are increasing. This is the sign of a culture that is growing and rushing forward at reckless speed. In other words, its waste, its garbage, the rubbish it throws out every single day, is starting to matter more and more. The movement backward *keeps up* with the movement forward.

Finally, there is *the social mix-up,* the jumble of all classes. It comes from revolution, from setting up equal rights, and from the superstition called the "equality of men." Because of it, the people who carry the instincts of decline are mixing into every class of society. These are instincts of resentment, of discontent, of the desire to destroy, of anarchy and of belief that nothing has meaning. Along with them come the instincts of slavery, cowardice, slyness, and dishonesty, which are deep-rooted in the classes that have been held down for a long time. All of this is starting to flow into the blood of every rank of people. Two or three generations later, you can no longer recognize the race. Everything has turned into *mob*. And so a shared instinct grows up that is against *choosing the best,* against every kind of *privilege*. This instinct works with such force, certainty, harshness, and cruelty that in the end even the privileged classes have to give in. Everyone who still wants to keep power has to flatter the mob, work with the mob, and have the mob on their side. This is true of the "geniuses" *most of all*. They become the *messengers* of the feelings that can stir up the mob. So the expression of pity, and even of honor, for everything that suffers, for everything low and looked down on, for everything that has lived under persecution, becomes the main thing. (Examples of this type: Victor Hugo and Richard Wagner.) The rise of the mob means, once again, the rise of the old values.

When a movement is as extreme as the one that marks our civilization, both in its speed and in its methods, the weight that keeps people steady gets shifted. The people who are worth the most, whose task, so to speak, is to balance out the huge danger of such a sick movement, become the slowpokes above all others. They are slow to accept anything new, and they hold on stubbornly. They are beings that last fairly long in the middle of this huge mixing and changing of everything. In a situation like this, power necessarily ends up in the hands of the *average*. *Being average,* as the guardian and carrier of the future, makes itself strong against the rule of the mob and against odd, extreme people (and in most cases those two go together). In this way a new opponent appears for exceptional people, or in some cases a new temptation. As long as they do not adapt themselves to the mob and fight for what satisfies the instincts of the people who have been left out, they will find they need to be "average" and solid. They know this: the middle way is also the golden way. Being average alone controls money and *gold* (and everything that glitters...).... And once again, the old virtue and the whole worn-out world of ideals finds a crowd of talented defenders to argue its case.... The result: being average gains brains, wit, and genius. It becomes entertaining, and even attractive.

***

Result. A high culture can only stand on a wide base, on a large, strong, and solidly built layer of average people. *Science*, and even art, do their work in the service of this average and with its help. Science could not ask for anything better. By its nature it belongs to a middle-class kind of person. Among exceptional people it does not fit in. There is nothing aristocratic in its instincts, and even less anything wild or lawless. The power of the middle classes is then kept up through trade, but above all through dealing in money. The instinct of the great bankers is against everything extreme. For this reason the

Jews are, for now, the most *conservative* power in the threatening and unstable conditions of modern Europe. They have no use for revolutions, for socialism, or for militarism. If they want power, and if they should need it, even over the revolutionary party, this only follows from what I have already said, and it does not contradict it at all. Against other extreme movements they may sometimes need to frighten people by showing how much power they hold. But their instinct itself is deeply and stubbornly conservative and "average." ... Wherever there is power, they know how to become powerful. But they always use their power in the same direction. The polite word for *average*, as everyone knows, is "*Liberal*."

Reflection. It is complete nonsense to think that this general *victory of these values* goes against life itself. To explain it, we should try to show that it comes from a certain interest that life has in keeping the type "human" going, even by this method, which lets the weak and the failed and weak in body win out. If things were different, might humans stop existing altogether? That is the problem...

Raising the type higher may turn out to be deadly for *keeping the species alive*. Why? History shows that strong races *wipe each other out,* by war, by hunger for power, and by taking risks. They have strong emotions. They are wasteful: strength is no longer saved up, and their minds break down from too much strain. Their existence is expensive. In short, they keep causing conflict *among themselves*. Then come periods of *deep slackness* and dullness in between. Every great age has to be *paid for*.... In the end, strong people are actually weaker, have less will to go on, and are more foolish than the average weak people.

They are races that *waste themselves*. "*Lasting a long time*" has no value in itself. What ought to be preferred is a shorter life for the species, but a life *richer* in creations. It would still need to be proved that, even as things are now, a richer total of creations is reached than in the case

of a shorter existence. In other words, it would need to be proved that humans, as a storehouse of power, gain a much greater degree of control over things under the conditions that have existed until now.... Here we are facing a problem of *economics*, a question of profit and loss.

[Footnote 1: The German word is "Naturalist," and it really means "realist" in a bad sense. (Translator's note.)]

865.

Look at the state of mind that calls itself "idealism"! It won't let average people simply be average, and it won't let a woman simply be a woman! Don't make everything the same! We should see clearly how high a price we have to pay to set up a virtue. And a virtue is not something everyone should want. It is a noble, high-minded piece of madness, a beautiful exception, and it gives us the right to feel lifted up and proud....

866.

It is necessary to show that something must push back against the trend we see today. People and humanity are being used up more and more efficiently, and the "machinery" of interests and services is getting more and more tightly tangled together. Whenever that happens, a counter-movement is bound to come with it. I call this counter-movement the separating out of humanity's rich, extra overflow. Through it, a stronger kind of person, a higher type, must come into view. This type needs different conditions to be born and to survive than the average person does. As you know, my idea, my image for this type, is the phrase "the higher human to come." Along the first road, which we can now see from beginning to end, these things grew up: people fitting themselves in, people becoming dull, a highly

developed culture like that of old China, humble and tamed instincts, and pleasure at seeing humans made smaller. In other words, humanity stopped and stood still at one level. Someday soon we will surely have one overall control of the whole world's economy. When that happens, humanity can be used as a machine and find its best purpose in serving this economy. It will be like a huge clockwork made of smaller and smaller wheels, each one fitted more and more exactly to its job. Then everything that leads and commands will be needed less and less. The whole machine will gain huge energy, while each single part in it will stand for only a tiny bit of strength and of worth. To fight against this shrinking of people, this squeezing of them into narrow, useful jobs, we need a movement going the other way. We need to bring into being the complete, whole person, who carries everything in himself and makes it all worthwhile. For this person, turning humanity into a machine is a basic condition for his existence. For him, the rest of humanity is only the soil on which he can build his higher way of living.

He needs the masses as his opposite, the people who have been "leveled down." He needs that feeling of distance from them. He stands on top of them; he lives off them. This higher form of aristocracy, of rule by the best, is the form of the future. Seen from a moral point of view, the shared machine I described above, where all the wheels are bound together, is the most extreme case of using people up for others' ends. But it only makes sense if there exist people for whom such using-up would have some meaning.[2] Otherwise, to be honest, it would simply mean that the human type as a whole becomes worth less and less. It would be a huge step backward.

Readers are starting to see what I am fighting against. It is economic optimism: the belief that the more everyone sacrifices himself, the more everyone's well-being must grow. To me, the exact opposite seems true. When everyone sacrifices himself, everyone loses togeth-

er. People become lower and smaller, so that in the end nobody knows what goal this monstrous effort was even for. A reason why? A new reason why? That is what humanity needs.

[Translator's footnote 2: This sentence forever sets Nietzsche's aristocracy apart from our present aristocracy of money and industry. At least for now, it would be hard to find any meaning in ours.]

867.

We must see clearly that the total power of the group is growing. And we should work out how much of this overall growth comes from the ruin of single people, of social classes, of whole eras, and of whole nations.

Moving the heavy load, the dead weight, of a culture onto other shoulders. Every huge growth has a cost: who pays it? Why does that cost have to be so enormous right now?

868.

Here is the general picture of the European of the future. He will be the smartest of all servant animals: very hardworking, deep down very humble, curious beyond all limits, many-sided, spoiled, and weak-willed. He will be a jumble of passions and ideas gathered from all over the world. How could a stronger kind of people possibly be raised from such a person? A kind with a classical style of simplicity and strength? The classical style means this: the will to be simple, to make things stand out sharply, and to let happiness be seen. It also means the will to face what is terrible, and the courage to lay the mind bare. (Simplicity comes from the will to make things stand out. Letting both happiness and bareness be seen comes from the will to face what is terrible.) To fight your way out of that jumble and up to this form, you need a certain hard pressure of training and strict self-

control. A person should be forced to choose: either be ruined or win out. A ruling kind of people can only grow up in terrible and violent conditions. So here is the question: where are the barbarians of the twentieth century? Clearly, they will only appear and grow firm after huge crises caused by socialism. They will be made of those people who can be the hardest on themselves, and who can promise the longest-lasting willpower.

869.

The strongest and most dangerous passions in people are the ones that most easily lead them to complete ruin. These passions have been forbidden so thoroughly that powerful people have either become impossible, or else they have to see themselves as evil, as "harmful and forbidden." The losses have been heavy, but until now they were necessary. But now, by holding these passions down for a while, a whole army of opposing forces has been built up. These passions include the hunger to rule and the love of change and of trickery. Because of those opposing forces, setting these passions free has become possible again. They will no longer be as savage as they once were. We can now allow ourselves this tame kind of barbarism: just look at our artists and our politicians!

870.

The root of all evil is this: that the morality of the weak won out, with its humility, sexual purity, selflessness, and total obedience. Because of this, people born to rule were sentenced first to pretending and second to a guilty conscience. Creative people saw themselves as rebels against God. They felt unsure of themselves and boxed in by values that were supposed to last forever.

The barbarians showed that they did not have the power to stay within reasonable limits. They feared and spoke badly of the natural passions and instincts, and they did the same to the image of the ruling emperors and ruling classes. On the other hand, people came to suspect that all holding back is a kind of weakness, or a sign of early old age and tiredness. (For example, the French writer La Rochefoucauld suspects that "virtue" is just a nicer word used by people who no longer get any pleasure from vice.) The ability to hold back was described as a matter of hardness, self-control, and self-denial, as a fight against the devil, and so on and so on. People with a sense for beauty naturally delight in balance and measure. They take pleasure in the beauty of measure. But this was ignored and denied, because what people wanted was a morality that was against happiness. Until now, people have not believed in the pleasure that comes from holding back. It is the pleasure of a rider controlling a wild, fiery horse! The moderation of weak people, who simply lack strong drives, was mixed up with the self-control of the strong!

In short, the best things have been cursed and insulted, because weak or uncontrolled swine have made them look bad. The best people have stayed hidden, and they have often misunderstood themselves.

871.

Wicked and wild, uncontrolled people have a depressing effect: they lower the worth we give to strong feelings and passions. In the Middle Ages, morality was shockingly brutal, and that was the main reason people were forced to turn to a real "alliance of virtue." Along with this came an equally shocking exaggeration of everything that makes a human being valuable. A "civilisation" that is at war, which really means a taming of people, needs all kinds of chains and tortures to hold its ground against terrible people who are like beasts of prey.

In a situation like this, a mix-up is quite natural, even though it can have the most harmful effects. Here is the point: what people of power and willpower are able to demand of themselves sets the standard for what they may also allow themselves. Such people are the exact opposite of the wicked and the wild. And yet, in certain situations, they may do things for which a lesser person would be found guilty of wickedness and excess.

In this respect, the idea that "all people are equal before God" does an enormous amount of harm. Actions and ways of thinking were forbidden that rightly belonged only to the strong, as if those actions were in themselves unworthy of a human being. Everything strong people tended to do got a bad name, because the weapons the weakest people use to defend themselves were made into the measuring stick for what is good. And this includes even those who were weakest toward themselves.

The confusion went so far that the true masters of the art of living were called the most shameful names. And these are the very people whose self-control is the sharpest contrast to the wicked and the wild. Even today, people feel they have to run down someone like Cesare Borgia, and that is simply ridiculous. The Church has cursed German emperors because of their vices, as if a monk or a priest had any right to say what a man like the emperor Frederick the Second should allow himself. Don Juan, the famous seducer in the stories, is sent to hell, and that is very simple-minded. Has anyone ever noticed that all the interesting men are missing from heaven? ... I only say this as a hint to the girls, about where they might best find their salvation. If you think logically at all, and also see deeply into what makes a great person, there can be no doubt at all: the Church has sent all "great people" to the underworld, to hell. Its fight is against all "greatness in human beings."

872.

The rights a person claims for himself depend on the duties he sets himself, and on the tasks he feels able to carry out. The great majority of people have no right to life, and are only a misfortune for those above them.

873.

Selfishness is misunderstood. It is misunderstood by low-minded people who know nothing of the hunger to conquer, or of the endless appetite of a great love. They also know nothing of the overflowing sense of power that makes a person want to master things, to pull them over to his side, and to hold them close to his heart. This is the same power that drives an artist toward the material he works with. It also often happens that an active mind simply looks for a place to put its energy to work. But in ordinary "selfishness," it is exactly the ... "non-self" who wants to keep himself going: the deeply average creature, the member of the crowd. And when the rarer, finer, less average people notice this, it disgusts them. Because their judgment is this: "We are the noble, high-minded ones! It matters far more to keep us going than that herd of cattle!"

874.

The decline and decay of rulers and of the ruling classes has caused all the great upheavals in history! If it hadn't been for the Roman emperors and Roman society, Christianity would never have won.

When lower people start to doubt whether exceptional people even exist, then the danger is great! That is when people finally decide that there are virtues even among the lowly, the downtrodden, and the small-hearted, and that everyone is equal before God. That idea is the very peak of all the muddled nonsense that has ever appeared on

earth! Because in the end, exceptional people start measuring themselves by the virtues that the slaves stand for. Then they find out that they are "proud," and so on, and that all their higher qualities ought to be condemned.

When Nero and Caracalla were in charge of Rome, that is when a strange, upside-down idea came about: "The lowest person is worth more than that man on the throne!" And so the way was opened for a picture of God that was as far as possible from the picture of the most powerful. It was God on the Cross!

875.

Exceptional people and crowd people. When there are no great people around, the great people of the past get turned into half-gods or full gods. The birth of religions proves that humanity no longer takes any joy in human beings ("nor in women either," as Hamlet says). Or else a big mass of people is gathered into a heap, in the hope that, as a Parliament, they will rule just as forcefully as one tyrant would.

Ruling over others like a tyrant is the mark of great people. They make lesser people stupid.

876.

Buckle is the best example of how unable a common rabble-rouser is to get a clear idea of what a "higher nature" means. He fights very passionately against the view that great people, such as individuals, princes, statesmen, geniuses, and warriors, are the levers and causes of all great movements. But by instinct he gets this view wrong. He takes it to mean that the only important and valuable thing about such a higher person is that he can get the masses moving. In short, he thinks the person's only worth is the effect he has.... But the higher nature of a great person lies exactly in being different. It lies in being

unable to share himself with others, and in how high his rank is. It does not lie in any effect he may have, even if that effect were to shake both halves of the world to pieces.

877.

The French Revolution made Napoleon possible: that is what justifies it. We ought to wish for the chaotic collapse of our whole civilization if that kind of reward came out of it. Napoleon made nationalism possible: that is nationalism's excuse.

A person's value does not lie in how useful he is. (Of course, I am leaving aside morality and immorality here, because those ideas don't even scratch the surface of a person's worth.) After all, he would still exist even if there were no one he could be useful to. And why couldn't the very peak of humanity be a person who caused the worst possible effects for his own kind? He could be so high and so far above others that everything around him would fall into ruin out of envy.

878.

Judging a person's value by how useful he is to humanity, or by what he costs it, or by how much harm he can do to it, is just as good and just as bad as judging a work of art by its effects. But that way you never even touch on the value of one person compared with another. "Moral judgment," to the extent that it is social, measures people entirely by their effects. But what about the person who has his own taste on his tongue? What about someone wrapped up and hidden in his loneliness, who does not share himself and cannot be reached? What about a person no one has yet figured out, meaning a being of a higher kind, or at least a different kind? How would you judge his

worth, when you cannot know him and cannot compare him with anything?

Moral judgment has caused enormous dullness in how we judge. The value of a person in himself is underrated, almost overlooked, and in practice denied. This is left over from a simple-minded belief that everything exists for some purpose. It says that a person's value can only be measured in relation to other people.

879.

Being obsessed with moral questions shows a very low level of intelligence. It shows that something is missing: the instinct for special rights, for standing apart, the feeling of freedom that creative people have, people who are "children of God" (or of the devil). And it doesn't matter whether such a person preaches the ruling morality or criticizes the accepted moral code from the point of view of his own ideal. Either way, by doing these things he shows that he belongs to the crowd, even if he is what the crowd needs most, namely a "shepherd."

880.

We should replace morality with the will to reach our own goals, and so also the will to use the means that lead to them.

881.

About the ranking of people by worth. What is it that makes the typical person average? It is that he does not understand that things necessarily have their other side. He fights against bad conditions as if we could do without them. He will not accept the bad along with the good. He would like to wipe out and erase what is special about a thing, a situation, an age, or a person, by calling only part of their

qualities good and pushing down the rest. What average people wish for is exactly what the rest of us fight against. Their ideal is something that would no longer contain anything harmful, evil, dangerous, doubtful, or destructive. We see the opposite to be true: that every time a person grows, his other side must grow too. If such an idea is allowed, the highest person would be the one who shows most strikingly how full of clashing opposites existence is. He would be its glory and its only justification.... Ordinary people can only show a small corner and nook of this natural character. They fall apart as soon as the variety of the parts that make them up, and the tension between their opposing traits, gets stronger. But that is exactly what a person needs in order to be great. That a person should become better and, at the same time, more evil: that is my formula for this unavoidable fact.

Most people are only partial, broken-off pieces of what a human being can be. Only when you mix all these people together does one complete human being appear. In this sense, whole eras and whole nations can also seem like pieces rather than a whole. It may even be part of how human development works that people only develop bit by bit. But because of this, we should not forget that the only thing that really matters is the rise of the complete, well-combined human being. Lesser people, and by far most people, are just practice runs and exercises. Out of them, here and there, a complete human being may come. Such a person is like a milestone for humanity, showing how far humankind has come up to that point. Humanity does not move forward in a straight line. Often a type of person is reached and then lost again. For example, even with all the effort of the last three hundred years, we have not produced people like those of the Renaissance again. And on top of that, we must remember that the Renaissance person was already a step behind his brother from ancient Greece and Rome.

882.

People admit that the ancient Greeks and the people of the Renaissance were superior. But they would like to produce such people without the conditions and causes that made them what they were.

883.

A "cleaner, finer taste" can only come from making the type of person stronger. Our society today only offers the systems for shaping and educating people, but the well-shaped person himself is missing. The great, complete human being, in whom many different forces are properly harnessed together to reach a goal, is completely absent. The example we do have is the many-sided person, who is the most interesting kind of chaos that has ever existed. But this is not the chaos that came before the creation of the world. It is the chaos that comes after it. Goethe is the most beautiful example of this type, and he is completely and utterly not like a calm god on Mount Olympus! [3]

[Translator's note 3: The Germans always call Goethe "the Olympian."]

884.

Handel, Leibniz, Goethe, and Bismarck are typical of the strong German type. They lived calmly, even though they were surrounded by contradictions. They were full of a quick, flexible kind of strength. This strength carefully avoided firm beliefs and fixed teachings. It did this by using one belief as a weapon against another, while keeping complete freedom for themselves.

885.

I am sure of this: if the rise of great and rare people had depended on the votes of the masses, there would never have been a single great person! And that is true even if we assume the masses knew what qualities make someone great, and also the price every great person pays to grow into that greatness.

Things go their own way without depending on what the many want. That is why a few amazing things have happened on earth.

886.

The Ranking of People by Worth

(a) You should not judge a person by single actions. Many actions are only skin-deep. Nothing is rarer than an action that truly comes from the person himself. A person's class, rank, race, surroundings, and plain chance are all much more likely to show in an action than the "personality" of the one who does it.

(b) We should never rush to believe that many people are real personalities. Some people are only a pile of several personalities mixed together, and most people are not even one. Whenever the average qualities that keep the species going are the main ones, being a personality would be a needless cost. In fact, it would be a luxury. It would be foolish to demand that anyone be a personality in such cases. In these conditions, everyone is just a channel, a container that passes things along.

(c) A "personality" is something fairly rare and cut off from others. Since keeping the human race going at an average level is more important, a personality might even be seen as something that goes against nature. For a personality to be possible, a person needs to be cut off from others at the right time, and needs a life where he must

attack and defend himself. He needs something like a wall around him, an ability to shut out the world. But above all, he needs to be much less sensitive than the average person, who too easily catches other people's opinions like a disease.

The first question about ranking people by worth is this: how much is a person inclined to be alone, and how much is he inclined to be part of a group? If he leans toward the group, his value lies in the qualities that help his tribe or his type survive. If he leans toward being alone, his value lies in the qualities that set him apart from others, cut him off, protect him, and make his solitude possible.

What follows from this: the person who stands alone should not be judged by the standards of the group person, and the group person should not be judged by the standards of the one who stands alone.

Seen from above, both types are necessary, and so is the conflict between them. Nothing deserves more blame than the "wish" to create a third thing out of the two, where "virtue" becomes a kind of mix of both, like a creature that is half male and half female. This is just as undesirable as making the sexes equal and blending them together. The qualities that make each type different must be developed more and more. The gap between them must be made wider and wider...

What decline means in both cases: when the qualities of the crowd move closer to those of people who stand alone, and the other way around. In short, decline is when they begin to look like each other. This idea of decline lies outside the field of moral judgments.

887.

Where to look for the strongest natures. The ruin and decline of the solitary kind of person is much greater and more terrible. The instincts of the crowd and the traditional values are against them. Their

ways of defending themselves and their instincts for staying alive are, from the start, not strong or reliable enough. Luck must be especially kind to them if they are to do well. They actually do best in the lowest levels and the very bottom of society. If you are looking for real personalities, you will find them there much more surely than in the middle classes!

Once the struggle between classes for equal rights is nearly over, the fight against the person who stands alone will begin. (In one sense, such a person can actually keep himself going and grow most easily in a democratic society. There, the rougher ways of defending yourself are no longer needed, and a certain habit of order, honesty, fairness, and trust is already common.) The strongest people must be tied down the most tightly, watched the most closely, put in chains, and kept under control. This is the herd instinct. For them there is a system of self-control, of harsh self-denial and distance from pleasure, and of "duties" made of exhausting work, where a person can no longer say that his soul belongs to himself.

888.

I am trying to show that virtue can be justified on *economic* grounds, that is, by how useful it is. The goal is to make people as useful as possible, and to make them as close as we can to a machine that never makes mistakes. To do this, a person must be given *machine-like virtues*. He must learn to value most highly the states in which he works in the most mechanical and useful way. And to make this happen, he has to be made to feel as much disgust as possible for all his other states, and these other states have to be shown to him as very dangerous and shameful.

Here is the first problem: the boredom and sameness that all mechanical work brings with it. Learning to put up with *this*, and not only to

put up with it, but to see boredom as if it were wrapped in a beam of wonderful charm: up to now, this has been the job of all higher schools. Learning something you don't care about one bit, and finding your "duty" exactly in this "objective" work; learning to see happiness and duty as two separate things: this is the priceless job that higher schools do, and do well. That is why, up to now, the scholar of old languages has been the teacher above all others. His work, in itself, is the best example of grand, impressive boredom in action. Under his flag, young people learn to "grind away" at their studies. And that is the first thing needed if they are later to carry out mechanical duties thoroughly, as government officials, husbands, slaves to their desks, newspaper readers, and soldiers. A life like this may need, more than any other, to be praised and justified by philosophy. Pleasant feelings must be judged by some kind of court that can never be wrong as being completely of lower rank. "Duty for its own sake," and maybe even a deep, emotional respect for everything unpleasant, must be firmly demanded as something that stands above everything useful, enjoyable, and practical.... A mechanical way of life is then seen as the highest and most respectable way of life, and it worships itself. The model for this is Kant, who was a fanatic about the bare idea of "You must."

889.

Here is how all the ideals that have existed so far can be judged economically: they are the choosing and raising of certain passions and states of mind at the expense of other passions and states. The one who sets new values (or the instinct of the community) picks out a number of states and passions whose presence makes sure that regular actions get done. Mechanical actions would then be the result of what those passions and states regularly require.

If these states and passions included painful parts, some way would have to be found to overcome that pain by giving it a value. Pain would have to be explained as something valuable, as something pleasant in a higher sense. Put as a formula: "*How does something unpleasant become pleasant?*" For example, this happens when our obedience and our giving in to the law are honored because of the energy, power, and self-control they require. The same is true of our community spirit, our kindness to neighbors, our love of country, our "becoming more humane," our "selflessness," and our "heroism." The *goal of all idealism* should be to get people to do unpleasant things cheerfully.

890.

For a long time, the main goal must be to make people *smaller*. That is because what is needed first is a wide base from which a stronger kind of people can rise. (We might ask: up to now, how far has *every stronger* kind of people risen from a *lower layer of lesser people*?)

891.

There is a silly and contemptible kind of idealism that does not want average people to stay average. Instead of feeling proud and victorious at being exceptional, it becomes *outraged* at cowardice, dishonesty, pettiness, and misery. *We should not wish things to be any different*. We should make the gaps between people even *wider*! The higher types of people should be forced to stand out through the sacrifices they make in their own lives.

The main point: distances between people must be set up, but *no opposites must be created*. The *middle classes* must be broken up, and their influence reduced. This is the main way to keep the distances in place.

892.

Who would dare to make average people disgusted with being average! As you can see, I do exactly the opposite. Every step away from being average, so I teach, leads to *immorality*.

893.

Hating average people is beneath a philosopher. It almost puts a question mark over his "*right* to do philosophy." It is exactly because he is the exception that he must protect the rule, and win the favor of all average people.

894.

What I fight against is this: that an exceptional type should go to war against the rule, instead of understanding that the rule continuing to exist is the first condition for the exception having any value. For example, there are women who, instead of seeing their unusual thirst for knowledge as something that sets them apart, would like to overturn the whole position of women.

895.

The *growth of strength*, even though individuals may be ruined for a time:

A new level must be set up;

We must have a way of saving up energy to keep small tasks going, as opposed to wasting resources;

For once, destructive nature must be turned into a *tool* for this future way of managing things;

The weak must be kept alive, because there is a huge amount of *fussy, detailed* work to be done;

The weak and the suffering must be supported in their belief that life is still possible for them;

Sticking together must be planted as an instinct, against the instinct of fear and of acting like a servant;

War must be made on chance, even on the chance appearance of "the great person."

896.

War on *great* people can be justified on economic grounds. Great people are dangerous. They are accidents, exceptions, storms, strong enough to call into question things that took a long time to build and establish. Explosive material must not only be set off without doing harm, but, if possible, it must be *stopped* from going off at all. This is the basic instinct of every civilized society.

897.

Anyone who thinks about how the human type could be raised to its highest glory and power will see from the start that he must place himself beyond morality. That is because morality, at its core, aimed at the opposite goal. Its aim was to stop and destroy that glorious growth wherever it was taking place. In fact, growth of that kind means that a huge number of people must serve it, so it is only natural that a *movement against it* arises. The weaker, more fragile, more average lives feel they must take sides *against* that glory of life and power. And for that purpose they need a new way of valuing themselves, which lets them condemn, and if possible destroy, life when it is this full and overflowing. Morality is therefore, at its core,

an expression of hostility to life, in so far as it tries to defeat the most vital and powerful types of people.

898.

The strong people of the future. In the past, necessity on one side and pure chance on the other sometimes produced conditions in which a stronger kind of human being could be raised. Now we are able to understand how far this happened, and we can make it happen on purpose. We can now create the conditions that make such a rise possible.

Up to now, education has always aimed at what is useful to society. It has not aimed at what would be most useful for the future, but at what is useful to the society that exists right now. What people needed were "tools" for this purpose. But if there were a greater wealth of strength and energy, it would be possible to imagine drawing on some of it for a different aim. That aim would not be what is useful to society, but what would be useful for the future.

People would come to see more and more clearly that today's form of society is in a stage of change. Sooner or later it will no longer be able to exist for its own sake. Instead, it will exist only as a means, a tool in the hands of a stronger race. And the more clearly people saw this, the more this task would have to be moved to the front and taken up.

Human beings are being made smaller and smaller. And it is exactly this shrinking of man that pushes one to think about raising a stronger race. This would be a race with more than enough strength in exactly those places where the shrunken, dwarfed kind was weak and getting weaker. Those places are: will, responsibility, relying on oneself, and the ability to set goals for oneself.

The means to do this would be the ones history teaches us. First, keeping this group apart, by giving it interests that protect it, interests that are the opposite of the ones most people accept. Second, practice in living by values that have been turned upside down. Third, a feeling of distance from others. Fourth, a clean conscience about the very things that are most looked down on and most forbidden today.

The people of Europe are being made more and more alike, flattened to one level. This is a great process, and it should not be stopped. It should even be sped up. Because of this, it is absolutely necessary to cut deep gaps between people, to create distance, and to set up a ranking of people by worth. But it is not necessary to slow down the levelling process just described.

Once this flattened, levelled-down kind of human has come about, it needs a reason for existing. Its reason is this: it exists to serve a higher, ruling race. That higher race stands on top of it, and can only be lifted up on its shoulders to do the task it is meant to do. This would not just be a ruling race whose whole job is simply to rule. It would be a race with whole areas of life all its own, with so much extra energy that it overflows into beauty, courage, culture, and good manners, and even into the most abstract thinking. It would be a race saying yes to life, able to allow itself every kind of great luxury. It would be strong enough not to need the bullying commands of virtue. It would be rich enough not to need to save and penny-pinch or to be fussy about rules. It would be beyond ordinary right and wrong. It would be like a greenhouse for rare and unusual plants, a place where exceptional people can grow.

899.

Our psychologists, without meaning to, keep looking at the signs of decline and decay. Because of this, they lead us to distrust the mind

and intelligence more and more. People keep seeing only the bad effects of intelligence: how it weakens people, spoils them, and makes them sick. But now there are going to appear:

New barbarians: cynics, experimenters, and conquerors. In them, a superior mind will be joined with well-being and with an overflow of strength.

900.

I am pointing to something new. Of course, a democratic society like ours faces the danger of barbarians. But people only look for these barbarians down below, among the lowest. There is also another kind of barbarian, one who comes from the heights. These are conquering, ruling natures, who are looking for material they can shape. Prometheus, the Greek hero who stole fire from the gods, was a barbarian of this sort.

901.

The main point of view is this. We should not think that the job of a higher kind of human is to lead the lower people, as the philosopher Comte thought, for example. Instead, the lower people should be seen as the foundation on which a higher kind can live its higher life. Only on that foundation can they stand. The conditions a strong, noble, high-minded kind of person needs to keep itself going, in matters of training the mind, are the exact opposite of the conditions the working masses live under. Those masses are like the tea-shop keepers that the philosopher Spencer would admire. There are certain qualities that only the strongest and most fearsome natures can handle, and these qualities are what make their lives possible: free time, adventure, disbelief, and even wild living. These same qualities would ruin average people if they had them, and in fact they do ruin them. For

average people, the right things are hard work, regular habits, moderation, and firm "beliefs." In short, all the "herd virtues." Under the influence of these virtues, average people become as good as they can be.

902.

About the types who rule. Think of the shepherd compared with the "lord." The shepherd is only a tool for keeping the crowd going. The lord is the actual goal, the reason the crowd exists at all.

903.

It makes sense, and it is even useful, that society's values are on top for a while. They help lay a base, a foundation, on which a stronger kind of human can finally be built. Here is the test of strength: being able to live by values that have been turned upside down, and wanting to live by them forever. The state and society should be seen as the lower floor of the building, the base for something higher. That means looking at them from an economic point of view, and thinking of education as raising a stronger kind of people.

904.

Here is something that "independent thinkers" fail to see. The very same training and strict self-control that makes a strong person even stronger, and lets them take on big projects, breaks down and dries up average people. This goes for things like doubt, a generous and open heart, trying things out, and standing on your own.

905.

The hammer (a tool to smash old values). What kind of people would be needed to judge things in the opposite way from how they are

judged now? They would be people who have every quality of the modern soul, yet are strong enough to turn those qualities into real health. And what would they need to carry out their task?

906.

The strong person has powerful instincts that come from a strong, healthy body and mind. He digests what he has done just as easily as he digests his food. He can even handle heavy meals, meaning hard and painful experiences. But mostly he is guided by a firm, strict instinct that cannot be broken. It stops him from doing anything that goes against his nature, just as he never does anything that goes against his taste.

907.

Can we predict the right conditions for the most valuable kinds of people to appear? It is a thousand times too complicated, and the chances of failure are huge. So the idea of working toward them cannot really fire us up! That is the doubting view. To push back against it, we can build up courage, understanding, toughness, independence, and a sense of responsibility. We can also sharpen our judgment and learn to see in advance which way the delicate scales of chance will tip, so that lucky accidents end up working for us.

908.

Before we can even think about acting, a huge amount of work has to be done. Mostly, though, the best and wisest plan would be to make careful use of the conditions we have now. To actually create, on purpose, the kind of conditions that now only happen by accident, you would need people as hard as iron, people who have never yet existed. Our first job must be to make the personal ideal win out and

become real! Anyone who has understood human nature, and where humanity's greatest examples came from, trembles in fear of humans and runs away from all action. This is what comes from the values we have inherited!!

What comforts me is that human nature is evil, and this is exactly what makes sure humans stay strong!

909.

The typical ways of shaping yourself, or the eight main questions:

1. Do we want to be more many-sided than we are, or simpler?

2. Do we want to be happier than we are, or to care less about both happiness and unhappiness?

3. Do we want to be more pleased with ourselves, or more demanding and more merciless toward ourselves?

4. Do we want to be softer, more giving-in, and more humane than we are, or less humane?

5. Do we want to be more careful than we are, or more daring?

6. Do we want to reach a goal, or do we want to stay away from all goals? Think, for example, of the philosopher, who sniffs out in every goal a limit, a dead end, a prison, a bit of foolishness.

7. Do we want to be more respected, or more feared, or more looked down on?

8. Do we want to become tyrants and tempters, or do we want to become shepherds and animals of the crowd?

910.

The kind of followers I want. To the people who matter to me in any way, I wish suffering, loneliness, sickness, cruel treatment, and every kind of humiliation. I want them to know deep self-contempt, the torture of not trusting themselves, and the misery of being beaten. I feel no pity for them. That is because I want them to have the one thing that, today, shows whether a person is worth anything or not: the ability to stand firm and not give in.

911.

Think of the happiness and self-satisfaction of lazy street beggars, or the bliss of so-called "beautiful souls," or the sickly, wasting love of strict Puritan believers. None of this proves anything about the ranking of people by worth. A great teacher ought to beat such a race of blissful creatures into unhappiness, without mercy. The danger of people shrinking and their powers growing slack comes right after that kind of happiness. I am against happiness in the style of Spinoza or Epicurus, and against all the relaxing calm of quiet, thoughtful states of mind. And if virtue is the way to that kind of happiness, well then, one must get control even over virtue.

912.

I cannot see how anyone can make up for missing a good school at the right time in life. Such a person does not know himself. He walks through life without ever having learned how to walk. His weak muscles give him away with every step. Sometimes life itself is kind enough to give a person back this lost, tough schooling. Maybe it does this through times of sickness that demand every bit of willpower and self-control. Or maybe through sudden poverty, which puts his wife and child at risk, and which can force him into the kind of hard work

that puts strength back into his slack muscles and gives his will to live a tough spirit again. But the very best thing, in every case, is to get strict training at the right time. That means at the age when it makes us proud that people expect great things from us. This is what sets hard schooling apart, as good schooling, from every other kind. A lot is demanded, and a lot is strictly required. Being good, and even being excellent, is expected as if it were normal. Praise is rare, and there is no going easy. Blame is sharp, practical, and offers no second chances, and it pays no attention to talent or background. We need a school like this in every way. This is true for the body as well as for the mind and spirit; it would be a deadly mistake to separate them here! The same training makes both the soldier and the scholar good at what they do. And if you look more closely, there is no real scholar who does not have a real soldier's instincts in his blood. Being able to give orders and being able to obey with pride. Keeping your place in line, and yet being ready to lead at any moment. Choosing danger over comfort. Not weighing what is allowed and what is forbidden like a shopkeeper weighing goods on a scale. Being more against pettiness, sneakiness, and living off others than against wickedness. So what do you learn in a hard school? To obey and to command.

913.

We should refuse to care about earning credit and praise, and do only what is above all praise and beyond all understanding.

914.

The new forms of morality:

Make honest promises to yourself about what you want to do and what you want to avoid. Give up many things completely and for

good. Set tests to see whether you are truly *ready* for this kind of training and strict self-control.

915.

I want to make self-denial something *natural* again, the way it is in nature. The old aim of this hard way of living was to deny yourself. I would replace that with my own aim: to *make yourself stronger.* Think of it as a workout for the will. There should be times when you hold back and sometimes go without, in every area of life, even in things of the mind. We should carefully weigh our actions, case by case, against the views we form from our own strengths. We should try adventures and face dangers on purpose. (Think of the famous dinners at the Magny restaurant in Paris: all of those guests were people who loved fine ideas the way some people love fine food, and all of them had ruined stomachs.) We should also come up with *tests* to find out how strong a person is at keeping his word.

916.

Here are the things that have been *ruined* because the Church misused them:--

(1) *Self-denial and a hard way of living.*--People still hardly dare to show plainly how useful and how necessary a hard, self-denying life is by nature, when the goal is to *train the will.* Our silly world of education holds up the useful government clerk as the ideal to aim for. It thinks it has done its job once it has taught or trained the brain. It never even guesses that something else is needed first: training the *power of the will.* There are tests for everything except the most important thing of all: whether a person can truly *want* something, and whether he can *make a promise and keep it.* A young man finishes his schooling

without anyone ever asking or looking into the question of the most valuable part of his nature.

(2) *Fasting:*--Fasting in every sense of the word. It can even be a way to keep your ability to enjoy all good things. For example, you could stop reading for a while, stop listening to music for a while, or stop being pleasant for a while. You should even have fasting days for your good qualities, days when you take a break from your virtues.

(3) *The monastery.*--By this I mean going away for a while and cutting yourself off strictly, for example from all letters and news. It is a kind of deep looking inward and finding yourself again. It does not mean hiding from "temptations"; it means stepping away from "duties." It means getting out of the daily routine of the world around you. It means breaking free from the tyranny of all the outside pushes and influences that keep poking at us. These force us to spend our strength only on reacting. They never let our strength build up until it bursts out into action that comes from ourselves. (Just look closely at our scholars: they only think in reaction to something. In other words, they have to read first before they can think.)

(4) *Celebrations.*--A person must be very crude and dull not to feel how heavy and stifling Christians and Christian values are. They are so heavy that they kill every festive mood. What we mean by a celebration is this: pride, high spirits, overflowing energy; laughing at every kind of seriousness and narrow small-mindedness; a godlike saying yes to yourself, which comes from having a body full of energy and in perfect shape. These are all states that a Christian cannot honestly say yes to. *A celebration is a pagan, non-Christian thing above all else.*

(5) *Having the courage of your own nature, instead of dressing it up in morality.*--Can you call your passions good without needing a moral rule to back you up? That is the measure of how far a person can say yes to

his own nature. In other words, it shows how much or how little he has to fall back on morality.

(6) *Death.*--Death is a stupid fact of the body, but we must turn it into something we morally choose. You should live in such a way that *you are able to want to die at the right time*!

917.

Feeling yourself become stronger—or to put it another way: happiness always depends on a comparison. This is not necessarily a comparison with other people. It can be a comparison with yourself, while you are growing, and without you even knowing that you are comparing.

This feeling can also be pumped up *artificially*: either by stimulating drugs or by exciting mistakes in thinking, that is, "illusions."

Take, for example, the Christian's feeling of being *safe*. He feels strong in his trust, in his patience, and in his calm acceptance of whatever happens. But he owes this artificial boost to the idea that a God is protecting him. Or take the feeling of being *better than others*: like the ruler of Morocco who is only shown globes on which his three joined kingdoms fill four-fifths of the world. Or take the feeling of being *one of a kind*: like when a European imagines that culture belongs to Europe alone, and sees himself as a kind of short version of the whole history of the universe. Or like when the Christian makes all of existence turn around the "salvation of man."

The real question is: at what point does a person start to feel pressure and limits? That is how we can tell different levels of people apart. A philosopher, for example, feels like a fish in water when he is doing the coldest, most far-off feats of abstract thinking, as if high above the mountains. Yet colors and sounds weigh on him and bother him. And

that is not even to mention those silent longings—what other people call "the ideal."

918.

A healthy, energetic little boy will look up mockingly if you ask him: "Do you want to become good and virtuous?" But he gets excited right away if you ask him: "Do you want to become stronger than your friends?"

***

How do you become stronger? By making decisions slowly, and by sticking firmly to a decision once you have made it. Everything else follows on its own. People who act on every sudden impulse, and people who keep changing their minds: both are kinds of weak people. We must not mix ourselves up with them. We must feel the distance between them and us—and early on!

Watch out for good-natured, easygoing people! Spending time with them makes you sluggish. Any surroundings are good if they make you use the powers to defend yourself and to attack that every human has by instinct. All your creativity should go into testing the power of your will.... *Here* we must see that what really decides things is not knowledge, cleverness, or wit.

You must learn to give orders early in life—and also to obey. A person must learn modesty, and tact in being modest. He must learn to notice and respect modesty wherever he sees it. In the same way, he must be careful to notice and respect the people he chooses to trust.

What do people regret most? Their modesty. The fact that they did not listen to their own most personal needs. The fact that they misjudged themselves. The fact that they thought too little of themselves. The fact that they lost their fine sense for hearing their own instincts.

This lack of respect for yourself takes revenge on you through all kinds of losses: in health, friendship, well-being, pride, cheerfulness, freedom, determination, and courage. Later on, a person never forgives himself for this lack of true self-interest. He sees it as a mark against himself and as a reason to doubt his real self, the 'I.'

919.

I would like people to start by *respecting* themselves. Everything else follows on its own from that. Of course, a person who does this stops meaning anything to other people, because this is exactly the thing they are least likely to forgive. "What? A man who respects himself?"[4] This is something quite different from the blind instinct to *love* yourself. In love between the sexes, and in that split inside us which we call the self, the 'I', nothing is more common than a certain contempt for what is loved. That is the fatalism of love: the way love goes on anyway, whatever it thinks of the one it loves.

[Footnote 4: Compare Disraeli in his novel *Tancred*: "Self-respect, too, is a superstition from past ages.... It does not fit these times. It is much too arrogant, too full of itself, too selfish. Nobody is important enough to have self-respect these days" (book 3, chapter 5). Translator's note.]

920.

"I will have this or that." "I wish this or that were so." "I know that this or that is so." These are the levels of power: the person of *will*, the person of *wishing*, and the person of *fate*, who simply accepts what is.

921.

How a strong kind of people keeps itself going:

It gives itself the right to do exceptional things, as a way of testing how much self-control and freedom it has.

It lets itself fall into situations where a person cannot be anything other than a barbarian.

It tries to build up willpower through every kind of hard self-denial.

It does not pour itself out or show off. It practises silence. It is careful about anything charming or tempting.

It learns to obey in such a way that obeying becomes a test of whether it can still hold on to itself. On questions of honour, it argues over the finest details as carefully as it possibly can.

It never argues, "What is right for one is right for the other." It thinks the opposite! It sees being rewarded, and being able to pay back, as a special right, as a mark of distinction.

It does not want to have *other* people's virtues.

922.

How you have to deal with raw savages, and the fact that you simply cannot do without harsh, barbaric methods, becomes obvious in practice. It becomes obvious when you are moved, with all your soft European comforts, to a place like the Congo, or anywhere else where you have to keep your control over barbarians.

923.

Warlike people and peaceful people. Are you someone with a warrior's instincts in your blood? If so, there is another question to ask. Do your instincts push you to attack, or to defend? The rest of humanity, everyone whose instincts are not warlike, wants peace, harmony, freedom, "equal rights." These are just different names and different steps

toward one and the same thing. Such people only want to go where they will not need to defend themselves. They become unhappy with themselves when they are forced to fight back. They would like to create a world where war is no longer needed. If the worst came to the worst, they would give in, obey, and submit. All of that is better than going to war. That, for example, is what the Christian's instinct whispers to him. The born warrior has something like armour in his character. It is also there in the situations he chooses, and in the way each of his qualities grows. Weapons are best developed by the attacking type; shields are best invented by the defending type.

What tricks and what virtues do people who have no weapons and no defences need in order to survive, and even to win?

924.

What will become of a person who no longer has any reason either to defend himself or to attack? What will be left of his *passions* once he has lost the ones that serve as his defence and his weapons?

925.

A note in the margin about a piece of English silliness: "Do not do to others what you would not want them to do to you." People treat this as wisdom. They treat it as good sense. They treat it as the very foundation of morality, as "a golden rule." John Stuart Mill believes in it, and what Englishman does not?... But the rule does not hold up when you look at it closely. The idea "Do not do what you would not want done to you" forbids actions that lead to harmful results. The thought behind it is always that every action will be paid back in kind. What if someone came along holding Machiavelli's book *The Prince* and said: "We should only do the actions that let us get ahead of others, and that take away other people's power to do the same to us"? On

the other hand, think of the man from Corsica who swears on his honour to carry out a blood feud. He does not want to be shot either. But the chance of a bullet, even the likelihood of one, does not stop him from defending his honour.... And in every truly decent action, don't we deliberately not care what result it will bring? To avoid every action that might have harmful results would amount to forbidding all decent actions altogether.

Apart from this, the rule above is valuable because it gives away a certain *type of person*. Through him, the herd instinct puts itself into words: "We are equal. We see each other as equal. As I am to you, so you are to me." In this kind of community, people really believe that actions can be equal to each other. But that kind of equality never, under any circumstances, shows up in real life. It is impossible to pay back every action. Between real individuals there are no equal actions, so there can be no such thing as "paying back."... When I do something, I am very far from thinking that anyone else could do anything at all like it. The action belongs to me.... Nobody can pay me back for anything I do. The most anyone can do is make me the target of some other action.

926.

Against John Stuart Mill. I hate how common and cheap this man is when he says: "What is right for one person is right for another," and "Do not do to others what you would not want them to do to you." Rules like these want to build all human dealings *on trading favours*, so that every action would look like a cash payment for something done to us. The assumption here is as low and unworthy as it can be. It takes for granted that my actions and yours are somehow equal in value. In this way, the most personal value of an action is simply wiped out: the part of an action that has no equal and that cannot be paid for. "Give and take in equal measure" is a piece of outrageous

vulgarity. The truth is that what I do *cannot* and *must not* be done by someone else. There is *no such thing as an equal exchange*, except in those *very select circles* where a person really does have his equal, among equals. In a truly deep sense, a person never pays back, because he is something *unique* in himself and can only do *unique* things. This basic conviction is the reason why aristocrats *keep their distance from the mob*. The mob believes in equality, and *so* it believes that equal exchange and "give and take" are possible.

927.

The narrow, small-town way of judging things morally, with its ideas of "useful" and "harmful," makes good sense in its place. It is the point of view a community needs when it can only see and keep track of results that are close and come right away. But the State and the politician already need a way of thinking that goes beyond ordinary morality, because they have to work out results that form a much more tangled web. It should be possible to have an economic plan for the whole world that looks at things from so far out that each of its separate demands would, for the moment, seem not only unfair but random and baseless.

928.

"Should you follow your feelings?" To risk your life on a sudden urge, moved by a generous feeling, is not worth much, and it does not even make you stand out. Everyone is equally able to do this. And when it comes to acting this way with firm resolve, the criminal, the bandit, and the hot-blooded Corsican easily do better than the honest man.

A higher kind of excellence would be to master this urge, and to hold back from doing a heroic deed just because the urge demands it. It would be to stay cool and reasonable, free from the stormy rush of

pleasant feelings that come along with such a deed.... The same is true of pity. It must first be sifted through reason, like flour through a sieve. Without that, pity becomes just as dangerous as any other passion.

Giving in blindly to a passion, whether it is generosity, pity, or hatred, is the cause of the greatest harm. Greatness of character does not mean not having these passions. On the contrary, a person should have them to a fearsome degree, but should steer them the way a rider steers a horse with the reins... And even this he should not do out of a love of being in control, but simply because....

929.

"To give up your life for a cause" sounds very impressive. But there are many things people give up their lives for: every single passion wants to be satisfied. Whether you pledge your life to pity, to anger, or to revenge makes no difference when it comes to its worth. How many people have sacrificed their lives for pretty girls, and, what is even worse, their health! When you have a strong temperament, you instinctively pick the most dangerous things. If you are a philosopher, for example, you pick the risky adventures of deep thinking. If you are virtuous, you pick immorality. One kind of person will risk nothing; another kind will risk everything. Do we despise life, then? On the contrary, what we look for is life raised to a higher level, life lived in danger.... But, let me say it again, this does not mean we want to be more virtuous than others. Pascal, for example, wanted to risk nothing, and so he stayed a Christian. Maybe that was virtuous. A person always sacrifices something.

930.

Think how many advantages a person gives up! How little he really goes after his own gain! All his feelings and passions want to claim their rights. And how far away a passion is from that careful kind of usefulness that only means looking after your own profit!

A person does not chase after "happiness." You would have to be an Englishman to believe that people are always looking out for their own advantage. Our desires long to take hold of things with passion, even roughly. Their strength overflows, and it goes looking for obstacles to push against.

931.

All passions are, on the whole, useful. Some are useful directly, others indirectly. But when it comes to usefulness, it is completely impossible to set up any ranking of which ones are worth more. The forces of nature in general can surely be seen as good, meaning useful, if you look at the big economy of things. Even so, they are still the source of a great deal that is terrible, and a great deal that is deadly and can never be undone. The most you could say is that the mightiest passions are the most valuable, because there are no stronger sources of power.

932.

All the kind, helpful, good-natured ways of thinking did not come to be honoured because they were useful. They came to be honoured because they belong to rich souls, people who have so much inside them that they can give it away, and whose worth lies in their overflowing life. Look into the eyes of a kind, generous person! In them you will see the exact opposite of self-denial, of hating yourself, of the gloomy attitude of Pascal.

933.

In short, what we need is to master the passions, not to weaken them or root them out! The stronger the will that rules them, the more freedom the passions can be given.

The "great person" is great because he gives his desires plenty of room, and because he has an even greater power that knows how to put these magnificent monsters to work for him.

In every stage of civilisation, the "good man" is at the same time the least dangerous and the most useful. He is a kind of middle-of-the-road person. Ordinary people picture such a man as someone you have no reason to fear, but whom you still must not look down on for that.

Education is, at its heart, a way of ruining the exceptions in favour of the rule. Culture is, at its heart, a way of turning people's taste against the exceptions, in favour of the average.

Only when a culture has extra strength to spare can it become a hot-house, a warm place where rare things can grow richly: the exception, the experiment, the danger, the fine shade of difference. That is the direction every aristocratic culture tends to go.

934.

These are all questions of strength. How far should a person try to win out against the ways society protects itself, and against its prejudices? How far should a person set free his own terrible qualities, the very qualities that ruin so many people? How far should a person go against truth, and take the side of its most doubtful parts? How far should a person fight against suffering, self-contempt, pity, disease and vice, when it is always uncertain whether anyone can ever master them? (Whatever does not kill us makes us stronger.) And finally,

how far should a person accept the rights of the rule, of the ordinary, of the small, of the good, of the honest, in fact of the average person, without letting himself become common and crude by doing so? The hardest test of character is to resist being ruined by how tempting goodness is. Goodness must be seen as a luxury, as a refinement, even as a vice.

3. The Noble, High-Minded Person

935.

The type. Real goodness, a noble, high-minded nature, greatness of soul, all come from a wealth of life inside a person. This goodness does not give in order to get something back. It has no wish to raise itself up by being good. Spending itself freely, even wastefully, is typical of true goodness. Its starting point is a rich, overflowing life in the person himself.

936.

Aristocracy. Today the ideals of the crowd, born of the herd instinct, are reaching their peak as society's highest measure of value. People have even tried to give these ideals a meaning for the whole universe, and even a meaning beyond the physical world. I defend aristocracy against them.

Any society that wants, on its own, to keep a sense of respect and fine feeling about freedom must see itself as an exception. It must have some force set against it, something it stands apart from and looks down on with hostility.

The more rights I give up, and the more I lower myself to the level of others, the deeper I sink into the average, and in the end into the great mass of the majority. An aristocratic society that wants to keep a high degree of freedom among its members needs, first of all, a state

of extreme tension. This tension comes from the most opposed instincts being present in every one of its members: from their will to rule over others....

If you want to get rid of strong contrasts and differences in rank, you will also get rid of strong love, lofty ways of thinking, and the sense of being an individual.

***

About the real psychology of societies built on freedom and equality. What is it that tends to shrink in such a society?

The will to be responsible for yourself (losing this is a sign that people are no longer standing on their own). The ability to defend and to attack, even in matters of the mind. The power to give orders. The sense of reverence and of serving something higher. The ability to keep silent. Great passion, great achievements, tragedy and cheerfulness.

937.

In 1814 the historian Augustin Thierry read what Montlosier had written in his book, "On the French Monarchy." He answered with a cry of outrage and set to work on his task. That emigrant noble, Montlosier, had said:

"You are a race of freed slaves, a race of slaves torn from our hands, a people who paid us tribute, a new people. You were granted permission to be free. We were not granted permission to be noble. For us, everything is ours by right. For you, everything is a favour. We are not part of your community. We are a whole by ourselves."

938.

How constantly the aristocratic world cuts itself down and weakens itself more and more! Because of its noble, high-minded instincts, it gives away its privileges. And because of its refined, overdone culture, it starts to take an interest in the common people, the weak, the poor, the poetry of humble folk, and so on.

939.

There is a noble, high-minded and dangerous kind of carelessness that makes deep conclusions and insight possible. It is the carelessness of a soul that relies on itself and is overflowing with riches. Such a soul has never bothered itself about having friends. It knows only hospitality, and knows how to practise it. Its heart and its house are open to everyone who wants to come in, whether beggar, cripple, or king. This is true sociability. Someone who is capable of it has hundreds of "friends," but probably not one real friend.

940.

The old Greek teaching "nothing in excess" is meant for people with overflowing strength, not for the average. Self-control and strict practice are only steps on the way to higher things. Above them stands "golden Nature."

"You shall." This means unconditional obedience, as found among the Stoics, in Christian and Arab religious orders, and in Kant's philosophy. (It makes no difference whether this obedience is given to a superior or to an idea.)

Higher than "You must" stands "I want" (that is the level of the heroes). Higher than "I want" stands "I am" (that is the level of the Greek gods).

The gods of barbarian peoples show nothing of the joy that comes from holding yourself back. They are not simple, not light-hearted, and not moderate.

941.

What our gardens and palaces are really about (and, just as much, what all our longing for wealth is really about) is this: *we want to free our eyes from mess and from cheap, crude things, and we want to build a home where the nobility of our soul can live.*

Most people really do believe that they will grow into higher, better natures once those beautiful and peaceful things have worked on them. That is why everyone rushes off to Italy, why people travel at all, and so on, and why they read and go to the theatre. *People want to be shaped by something outside them.* That is the core of all their effort to become cultured! But strong, powerful people want to *take part in the shaping themselves, and they would like nothing foreign to be in them!*

This is also why people go out into wild nature. They do not go to find themselves. They go to lose themselves and forget themselves. The wish "*to get away from yourself*" belongs to all weak people, and to everyone who is unhappy with who they are.

942.

The only true nobility is the nobility of birth and blood. (I don't mean the title "Lord" in front of a name, or the *Almanac de Gotha*, the book that lists noble families. I say this only for the donkeys who might misunderstand.) Whenever people talk about an "aristocracy of the mind," there is usually a reason for hiding something. It is known to be a password among ambitious Jews. Intelligence alone does not make a person noble. On the contrary, something extra is always needed *to make intelligence noble.* So what is needed? Blood.

943.

What is noble, high-minded?

It is being very careful and exact about outward manners. Such careful manners put a fence around a person. They keep others at a distance, and they stop him from being mixed up with someone else.

It is seeming light and playful in how you speak, dress, and carry yourself. Behind that light surface, a hard, calm self-control protects itself from all nosy prying and curiosity.

It is walking slowly and looking slowly. There are not very many valuable things in the world, and those that exist come by themselves, and want to come, to the person who has value himself. We are not quick to admire things.

We know how to put up with being poor, with going without, and even with being sick.

We stay away from small honours, because we don't trust people who are too eager to praise. Whoever praises something believes he understands what he is praising. But to understand something, as Balzac, that perfect example of an ambitious man, let slip, means this: *comprendre c'est égaler*, "to understand is to make yourself equal to it."

We deeply doubt that our hearts can ever really share themselves with others. For us, being alone is not something we choose. It is forced on us.

We are sure that we only have duties toward our equals. Toward everyone else, we act as we think best. We know that fairness can only be expected between equals (sadly, this will not come true for quite a while yet),

We are mocking toward so-called "gifted" people. We believe that no real morality is possible without good birth.

We always feel as if we are the ones who should be handing out honours. And it is not very often that we meet someone worthy enough to honour us.

We are always in disguise. The higher a person's nature, the more he needs to stay unrecognized. If there is a God, then simply out of good manners He should only show Himself on earth in the shape of a human being.

We are capable of *otium*, that is, of noble leisure. We are fully convinced that working at a trade with your hands is in no way shameful, yet it certainly lowers your rank. However much we respect hard work and know how to give it the credit it deserves, we do not value it the way the middle class does. Nor do we value it the way those greedy, noisy artists do, who are like hens: they cackle, lay an egg, and cackle again.

We protect artists and poets and anyone who happens to be a master at something. But we are beings of a higher kind than those who only know how to do something, who are only "productive people." So we do not mix ourselves up with them.

We enjoy all *forms* and ceremonies. We would gladly encourage everything formal, and we are convinced that politeness is one of the greatest virtues. We are suspicious of every kind of *laisser aller*, of just letting things go, and that includes freedom of the press and freedom of thought. Under such conditions, the mind becomes lazy and crude, and sprawls out comfortably.

We enjoy women as perhaps a finer, more delicate, more airy kind of being. What a treat it is to meet beings who have nothing in their heads but dancing, silliness, and pretty clothes! They have always been a delight to every tense and deep male soul whose life is weighed down with heavy responsibilities.

We enjoy princes and priests, because, in big matters as well as small ones, they actually keep alive the belief that human beings differ in worth. They even keep this belief alive in how we judge the past, and they do it at least as a symbol.

We know how to keep silent, but we don't say a word about this when anyone is listening.

We are able to carry on long hostilities. We don't have the ability to make up easily.

We hate people who stir up the masses, we hate "enlightening" everyone, we hate sweet niceness, and we hate the overly familiar ways of common people.

We collect precious things, the things that higher and choosy souls need. We don't want to share ownership of anything with others. We want to have our own books, our *own* landscapes.

We push back against both bad and good experiences, and we are careful not to make general rules too quickly. As for the single case: how mockingly we look at it when it has the bad taste to act as if it were a rule!

We love what is *naïf*, simple and innocent, and we love simple, innocent people. But we love them as onlookers and as higher beings. We think Faust is just as simple as his Margaret.

We don't think much of "good" people, because they are herd animals. We know how often a priceless golden drop of goodness lies hidden under the most evil, the most spiteful, and the hardest outside. And we know that this one single grain weighs more than all the goody-goody sweetness of weak, watered-down souls.

We do not think a man of our kind is proven wrong by his vices, or by his foolish pranks. We know very well that we are not easily recog-

nized for what we are, and that we have every reason to make our outward surface very loud and noticeable.

944.

What is noble, high-minded? It is being forced all the time to play a role. It is always looking for situations where you have to put on a show. It is leaving happiness to *the greatest number of people*: the kind of happiness that means inner calm, virtue, comfort, and the smug, angelic, cozy back-room satisfaction of the English, in the style of the thinker Spencer. It is seeking out heavy responsibilities by instinct. It is knowing how to make enemies everywhere, and if need be, even inside yourself. It is going against *the greatest number of people*, not with words at all, but by always acting differently from them.

945.

Virtue (for example, honesty) is *our* most noble, high-minded, and most dangerous luxury. We must not refuse the disadvantages that come along with it.

946.

We don't want to be praised. We do what serves our goals, what gives us pleasure, or what we have to do.

947.

What does it mean for a man to be chaste? It means that his taste in sex has stayed noble, high-minded. It means that in matters of love and sex he doesn't like the brutal, the sick and unhealthy, or the overly clever.

948.

The idea of honour rests on a belief in a select, special group of people, in the fine qualities of knights, and in the duty of always having to play a role. At its heart, it means that you don't take your own life too seriously. It means you always stick, without exception, to the most dignified manners with everyone, at least with everyone who is not one of "us." It means you are never overly friendly, never soft-hearted, never warm and jolly, never modest, except among your equals. It means you are always playing a role.

949.

When people put their lives, their health, and their honour at risk, it comes from high spirits and from a will that is overflowing and spends itself freely. It does not come from a love of other people. It comes from the fact that every danger makes us curious about how strong we really are, and it stirs up our courage.

950.

Eagles dive straight down at their prey. In the same way, a noble soul shows itself most clearly in the grand, proud foolishness with which it charges into its attacks.

951.

We should fight against all soft, sugary ideas of nobility! A certain amount of brutality is necessary. We can't do without it, just as we can't do without something close to criminal boldness. Being pleased with yourself must not be allowed. A person should look at himself with an adventurous spirit. He should experiment on himself and take risks with himself. No pretty, fake cures for the soul should be put up with. I want to give a tougher, stronger ideal the chance to win.

952.

"Paradise lies in the shadow of a swordsman." This saying is also a symbol and a kind of password. By how they react to it, souls of noble, warrior-like origin give themselves away and recognize one another.

953.

The two paths. A time comes when people have more power than they need. Science aims to make nature into a slave.

Then people gain free time, the leisure to grow into something new and higher. A new aristocracy, a new upper class. At that point, many virtues that are now needed just to survive become outdated. Qualities that are no longer needed get lost for that very reason. We no longer need virtues, and so we are losing them. The same goes for the morality of "only one thing matters," of saving the soul, and of life after death. These were tools for making people able to rule over themselves with enormous harshness, by filling them with great fear!!!

There are different kinds of need, and their hard training is what shapes human beings: need teaches us to work, to think, and to control ourselves.

***

Cleaning and strengthening of the body. The new aristocracy needs an opposing group that it can fight against. It must be pushed to the edge in order to keep itself going.

The two futures of humanity: first, the result of everyone being pulled down to being average; second, a deliberate standing apart and growing of oneself.

A teaching that would split people apart with a deep gap: it keeps the very highest and the very lowest kinds of people, and it wipes out the ones in the middle.

The aristocracies that have existed so far, both religious and worldly, prove nothing against the need for a new aristocracy.

4. The Future Rulers of the World

954.

One question keeps coming back to us. It may be a tempting and wicked question. Let it be whispered only into the ears of those who have the right to such risky problems: the strong souls of today, whose control over themselves never wavers. The question is this. Now that the "herd animal" type is growing more and more common in Europe, isn't it high time to start raising the opposite type, thoroughly, artificially, and on purpose, and to try to build up its virtues? And wouldn't the democratic movement itself, for the first time, find a kind of goal, a rescue, and a reason for being, if someone came along who made use of it? Then, next to democracy's new and grand product, slavery (for that must be where European democracy ends up), there could at last also be produced that higher kind of ruling, Caesar-like spirits. They would stand on top of democracy, hold on to it, and lift themselves up by means of it. This new race would climb up to new things that were impossible before, to a wider view, and to its task on earth.

955.

Looking at the European of today makes me very hopeful. A bold, ruling race is building itself up here, on top of a base made of a very intelligent mass of people who follow the crowd. It's clear that the

movements to educate that mass are not the only important ones these days.

956.

The same conditions that produce the herd animal also push forward the growth of leaders.

957.

A question, which is also a task, is coming closer. It comes slowly and hesitantly, as frightening as fate, but it can't be avoided: How should the whole earth be ruled? And for what purpose should humanity as a whole, no longer just one people or one race, be raised and trained?

Moral systems that lay down laws are the main tool for shaping humankind, in whatever way a creative and deep-thinking will wants to shape it. That only works, of course, if such a first-rate artistic will gets power into its own hands, and can make its creative will win out over long stretches of time, in the form of laws, religions, and morals. Right now, and probably for a while yet, you will look in vain for such hugely creative people, such truly great people, in the sense I mean. They will be missing. And after many letdowns, we will be forced to start understanding why they are missing. We will see that nothing blocks their rise and growth more fiercely, now and for some time to come, than what people in Europe today call "the" morality. People talk as if there were no other kind of morality, and could never be any other kind, except the one we have already described as the morality of the crowd. This is the morality that is now pushing with all its strength toward a kind of happiness on earth like that of cattle in a green meadow. That happiness means safety, no danger, comfort, an easy way to make a living, and, last but not least, "if all goes well," it even hopes to do without any shepherds or lead sheep at all, meaning

without any leaders. The two teachings it preaches most widely are "equal rights" and "pity for everyone who suffers." It even treats suffering itself as something that must be wiped out completely. The fact that such ideas count as modern makes you think very little of modern times. But anyone who has thought deeply about how and where the human plant has grown most strongly so far is forced to believe the opposite. He has to believe this growth has always happened under the opposite conditions. For it to happen, the danger of a person's situation has to grow enormously. His skill at inventing and his skill at hiding his true self have to fight their way up through long oppression and force. And his will to live has to grow into a total drive for power, a drive to overpower. Such a thinker believes that danger, harshness, violence, risk in the streets and in the heart, unequal rights, secrecy, hard self-endurance, tempting art, and devilishness of every kind, in short, the opposite of everything the herd instinct wants, are needed to raise humans higher. Imagine a morality with the opposite goals: one that raises people upward, instead of toward comfort and being average. Imagine a morality meant to produce a ruling class, the future rulers of the world. To be taught at all, such a morality would have to present itself as if it were somehow connected to the moral law that rules now. It would have to step forward hiding behind that law's words and forms. But a great many in-between steps and disguises would have to be worked out for this. And the life of one single person counts for almost nothing compared with such long tasks and goals. So the first thing to do is to raise a new kind of human being, one in whom the needed will and the needed instincts are made to last for many generations. This must be a new kind of ruling species and class. That should be just as clear as the rather long and hard-to-express results of this thought. The goal should be to prepare a turning all values upside down for an especially strong type of person, someone extremely gifted in mind and will. To do this, we must slowly and carefully set free in him a whole

crowd of instincts that have been badly spoken of and held back until now. Whoever thinks hard about this problem belongs with us, the independent thinkers. But certainly not with the kind of "free spirit" that has existed up to now, because those people wanted almost the exact opposite. In my view, this group includes, above all, the pessimists of Europe, the poets and thinkers of an idealism that has rebelled. That is, as long as their unhappiness with life in general has, if they are consistent, at least made them unhappy with the human being of today. The same goes for certain artists with endless ambition, who bravely and without holding back fight against the herd animal for the special rights of exceptional people, and who use their tempting art to overcome all the herd instincts and timid caution of more unusual minds. Third and last, we should count in this group all the critics and historians who will bravely carry on the rediscovery of the ancient world. That rediscovery has begun so well. It was the work of the new Columbus: German scholarship. And we are still only at the very start of this conquest. Because in the ancient world, in fact, a different and more lordly morality ruled than the one today. And the ancient person, raised under the strict rule of his morality, was stronger and deeper than the person of today. Up to now, he has been the only human who was healthy and strong by nature. But there is a temptation that, from ancient times to now, has always had power over such naturally fortunate people, that is, over strong and daring souls. Even today, that temptation is the most subtle and most effective of all forces against democracy and against Christianity, just as it was in the time of the Renaissance.

958.

I am writing for a kind of people who do not exist yet: for "the future rulers of the world."

In Plato's dialogue called the Theages, you will find this passage: "Every one of us would like, if we could, to be master of all humankind; if we could, to be a God!" This way of thinking must be brought back among us.

Englishmen, Americans, and Russians.

959.

Humans are like a plant from an ancient, wild forest. That kind of plant always shows up where the fight for power has gone on the longest. Great people.

Creatures of the ancient wild forest: the Romans.

960.

From now on, the starting conditions for bigger ruling powers will be better than anything ever seen on earth. And that is not even the most important point. It has now become possible to set up international unions of peoples whose job will be to raise a ruling kind of people, the future "future rulers of the world." This would be a new, huge upper class built on the strictest self-control. In it, the will of powerful thinkers and artist-tyrants would leave its mark for thousands of years. It would be a higher species of humans. Because they would have more will, knowledge, wealth, and influence than anyone else, they would use democratic Europe as the best and most flexible tool they could have. With it, they would take the fate of the earth into their own hands and work like artists on humanity itself, shaping it. Enough! The time is coming when we must change all our ideas about politics.

5. The Great Person

961.

I will try to find out at what times in history great people appear. Here is why harsh, controlling moral systems that last a long time matter: they pull the bow tight, as long as they don't snap it. In other words, they build up tension and strength in people, as long as they don't break them.

962.

A great person is someone whom Nature has built and invented in a great, commanding style. What is such a person like? First, the overall path of his actions holds together across such a wide span that it is hard to see all at once, and so it misleads people. He is able to stretch his will over long stretches of his life. He can look down on and throw away all small things, even if some of the most beautiful and "holy" things in the world are among them. Second, he is colder, harder, less careful, and freer from the fear of "public opinion." He does not have the good qualities that go along with being respectable and being respected. Nor does he have any of the things counted as the "virtues of the crowd." If he cannot lead, he walks alone. Then he may grumble at many things he meets along the way. Third, he does not ask for a "kind and pitying" heart. He asks for servants and tools. In his dealings with people, his one goal is to make something out of them. He knows he cannot show his true self to anyone. He thinks it is bad taste to get too friendly and close. And usually, when people think he is being close and friendly, he is not. When he is not talking to his own soul, he wears a mask. He would rather lie than tell the truth, because lying takes more spirit and more will. Deep in his heart there is a loneliness that neither praise nor blame can reach, because he is his own judge, and there is no higher court to appeal to.

963.

The great person must be a doubter, a sceptic. I don't mean he has to look like one. This is true as long as greatness means this: wanting something great, and also wanting the means to get it. Being free of every kind of fixed belief is part of what makes his will strong. And this fits with that "enlightened kind of rule by one master" that every great passion has over a person. Such a passion puts the mind to work for it. It even dares to use unholy means. It creates without holding back. It allows itself beliefs, it even uses them, but it never bows down to them. Needing faith, needing anything that says a total no or a total yes, is a sign of weakness. And all weakness is weakness of the will. The person of faith, the believer, is necessarily a lower kind of person. From this it follows that "all freedom of mind," meaning a natural, instinctive habit of doubt, is what you need first in order to be great.

964.

The great person knows he has power over a people. He also knows that, for a while, he and a people, or he and a whole century, match up and move as one. His sense of himself grows bigger, because he feels he is the cause and the will behind things. People misunderstand this as "living for others." He feels pushed to find ways to communicate and reach people, and all great people are inventive in finding such ways. They want to shape great communities in their own image. They would love to give a clear, firm shape to things that are many-sided and messy. Looking at chaos excites them and spurs them on.

The misunderstanding of love. There is a love like a slave's, which puts itself beneath the other and gives itself away. It makes the other seem perfect and fools itself. And there is a godlike kind of love,

which looks down on what it loves and loves it at the same time. This kind of love reshapes what it loves and raises it higher.

The goal is to reach that enormous energy of greatness that can shape the person of the future. It would do this through training and strict self-control, and also by wiping out millions of the failed and weak. And yet it must be able to keep from falling apart when it sees the suffering that this causes, suffering greater than anything ever seen before.

965.

In my opinion, the revolution, confusion, and misery of whole peoples matter less than the bad luck that great individuals meet as they grow and develop. We must not let ourselves be fooled. The many misfortunes of all these small, ordinary people do not add up to one big total, except in the feelings of mighty people. Take a person who is very different from the common mass. If, in moments of great danger, he thinks of himself and gains an advantage from the disasters of thousands of others, that may be a sign of great character, a character able to control its feelings of pity and fairness.

966.

Unlike animals, humans have grown such a crowd of instincts and urges inside themselves that fight against each other, that by combining them, humans have become masters of the earth. Moral systems are just the expression of local, limited rankings among this many-sided world of instincts. These rankings keep humans from being destroyed by the fight among their instincts. In this way, a ruling instinct weakens and refines the instinct that opposes it, until that opposing instinct becomes just an urge that gives energy and drive to the main instinct's activity.

The highest kind of person would have the widest variety of instincts. And he would have them at the strongest level he can bear. In fact, wherever the human plant is found growing strong, you find powerful instincts fighting against each other, as in Shakespeare, for example. But they are kept under control.

967.

Wouldn't we be right to count every great person among the *wicked*? That is not so easy to prove when you look at single individuals. Great people are so often skilled at hiding what they really are that they very often put on the look and manners of great virtues. Often, too, they truly respect virtues, and they do it in a way that makes them fiercely hard on themselves. But that hardness comes from cruelty. Seen from far away, things like this can easily fool us. Many great people, on the other hand, misunderstand themselves. And quite often a great task will draw out great qualities in a person, for example a sense of justice. The key point is this: the greatest people may perhaps have great virtues, but if so, they also have the opposites of those virtues. I believe that it is exactly from having these opposites inside them, and from the feelings these opposites stir up, that the great person comes into being. For the great person is like a wide bridge, an arch that stretches across two riverbanks lying far apart.

968.

In *great people* we find the special features of life at their strongest: injustice, lying, and using others. But because their impact has always been *overwhelming*, their true nature has been badly misunderstood, and people have explained it as goodness. A typical example of someone who explained them this way would be Carlyle.[5]

[Translator's footnote 5: This refers not only to Carlyle's book *Heroes and Hero-Worship*, but surely also to Carlyle's huge misunderstanding of Goethe. That misunderstanding still needs to be corrected by a critic who is not spoiled by Puritan thinking.]

969.

Generally speaking, everything *is worth exactly what was paid for it, no more and no less*. Of course, this does not apply to a single person taken alone. The great abilities of one person have nothing at all to do with what that person has done, given up, and suffered for them. But if you looked at the earlier history of that person's family line, you would be sure to find a record of an amazing saving up and building up of power. That power was gathered through all kinds of self-denial, struggle, hard work, and determination. The great person became great because he cost so much, not because he stands there as a miracle, a gift from heaven, or a lucky accident. "Heredity" is a false idea. A person's ancestors have always paid the price for what he is.

970.

The danger of being modest. Here is the danger. We may fit ourselves too early into duties, groups, and daily work routines that chance happened to put us in. We may do this at a time when neither our strengths nor our purpose in life have yet forced themselves clearly into our awareness. This early, modest attitude gives us a feeling, too soon, that our conscience is settled. It gives us a sense of relief and of belonging. And it seems to us like an escape from the troubles inside us and around us that stir up our feelings. But all of this spoils a person and holds him down in the most dangerous way you can imagine. We learn to respect the things that the people around us respect, as if we had no measure of our own and no right of our own to decide what things are worth. We strain to judge things the way others judge

them, *against* the quiet voice of our own inner taste, which also has a conscience of its own. This turns into a terribly sneaky kind of pressure. And if, in the end, there is no explosion that breaks all the ties of love and morality at once, then such a mind dries up. It becomes shrunken, weak and soft, and detached, with no self of its own. The opposite path is bad enough, but it is still better than this one. On that path, you suffer from the people around you, from their praise just as much as from their blame. You are hurt by them and you let the wound fester inside without showing it. Without meaning to, you defend yourself against their love and are suspicious of it. You learn to keep silent, and maybe you hide that silence by talking. You make little corners and safe, lonely hiding places where you can go to catch your breath for a moment, or to cry tears of deep, noble comfort. You do this until at last you have grown strong enough to say: "What on earth do I have to do with you?" and to go *your own* way alone.

971.

There are people who are, in themselves, a destiny. When they arrive, fate arrives with them. They are the whole breed of *heroic* people who carry heavy loads. Oh, how deeply and gladly they would like a break from themselves, just once in a while! How they long for strong hearts and strong shoulders, so that they could set down what weighs on them, even if only for an hour or two! And how uselessly they long for it! ... They wait. They watch everything that happens in front of them. But no one comes anywhere near them who has even a thousandth part of their suffering and their passion. No one guesses what they have been waiting for.... At last, at last, they learn the first lesson of their life: to stop waiting. And right away they learn their second lesson: to be friendly and modest. From then on they learn to put up with everyone and with every kind of thing. In short, they learn to put

up with a little more than they had already been putting up with before.

6. The Highest Human as the One Who Sets New Values for the Future

972.

Those who will set new values in the future. For a long time I tried, without success, to give one clear meaning to the word "philosopher," because I found many traits in philosophers that clashed with each other. After that, I realized that we can tell apart two kinds of philosophers:

(1) Those who want to set up some large system of values, whether of logic or of morals;

(2) Those who *set the values* themselves, the ones who decide what such value judgments will be.

The first kind try to get a grip on the world of the present or the past. They do this by capturing or shortening its many different events into signs and symbols. Their goal is to let us look over everything that has happened so far, think about it, understand it, and make use of it. They serve humanity by using everything from the past for the good of humanity's future.

The second kind of philosopher, though, are *commanders*. They say: "This is how it shall be!" They alone decide "where to" and "what for," and what will be useful and good for people. They take charge of the work that scientists have already done, and to them all knowledge is only a tool for what they want to create. This second kind of philosopher rarely shows up. And in fact, their position and the danger they face are terrifying. How often have they deliberately covered their own eyes, so they would not have to see the narrow strip of ground that separates them from the edge of the cliff and from total

destruction! Take Plato, for example. He talked himself into believing that "the good," the way he wanted it, was not just Plato's own idea of good, but "the good in itself," an eternal treasure that a certain man named Plato just happened to find along his way! The same wish to stay blind shows up in a much cruder form in the people who founded religions. Their "You shall" must never, ever sound to them like "I want." They only dare to carry out their task as if God had ordered them to. Setting down new laws and values is a burden they can only carry if they see it as a "revelation" from God. That way, the responsibility does not crush their conscience.

But once those two comforting tricks, Plato's and Muhammad's, have been knocked down, and no thinker can ease his conscience any longer by assuming "God" or "eternal values," then the demand placed on the one who sets new values, the demand to decide what is valuable, becomes more frightening than anything anyone has ever felt. Now those chosen few, who are just starting to see the faint glow of such a duty, try to find out whether they can dodge it, since it is their greatest danger. They look for a quick sidestep just in time. For example, they try to convince themselves that their task is already done, or that it simply cannot be done, or that their shoulders are not strong enough for such a heavy load, or that they are already busy with loads that are closer at hand. They may even tell themselves that this new and far-off duty is a temptation that lures them away from all their other duties, a sickness, a kind of madness. And in fact, many do manage to escape the path laid out for them. All through history we can see the traces of such runaways and their guilty consciences. In most cases, though, for these people of destiny there comes an hour of release, like a ripe autumn season. Then they are forced to do the very thing they did not even "want to do." And the deed they used to fear most falls easily from the tree without their reaching for it, like ripe fruit. It happens almost without their choosing, almost like a gift.

973.

How far humans can see and reach. Philosophers can be thought of as people who try their hardest to *find out* how high humans can *raise* themselves. This is especially true of Plato: he wanted to know how far human *power* can go. But philosophers do this as single individuals. Perhaps the instinct of the Caesars and of all the founders of states and the like was greater. They were busy with the question of how far humans could be pushed forward in their *growth* under "good conditions." What they did not understand well enough, however, was what good conditions really are. The big question is: "Where has the plant called 'human' grown most splendidly so far?" To answer it, we need to study and compare history.

974.

Every fact and every work speaks in a new and convincing way to every age and to every new kind of person. History keeps telling us new truths.

975.

Staying objective, strict, firm, and hard while pushing an idea through is maybe what artists do best. But if someone has to work with human beings as their material, the way teachers and statesmen do, then the calm, the coolness, and the hardness quickly disappear. In people like Caesar and Napoleon, we can sense something like "selflessness" in how they worked on their marble, that is, on people, no matter how many people were sacrificed along the way. This is where the future of exceptional people lies: to carry the greatest responsibilities without being wrecked and destroyed by them. Until now, a person has almost always needed the illusion of inspiration, of being moved

by a higher power, so as not to lose faith in his own hand and in his right to his task.

976.

Here is why philosophers mostly turn out to be failures. It is because the qualities that go into making a philosopher are the kind of qualities that usually ruin other people:

(1) A philosopher must have a huge variety of qualities. He must be a kind of short version of the whole human being and have all of humanity's high and low desires. The danger here is the clash of opposites inside him, and the chance that he may come to hate himself.

(2) He must be curious in an unusually large number of ways. The danger here is being spread too thin across too many interests.

(3) He must be fair and honest in the highest sense, and yet deep in both love and hate (and in being unfair as well).

(4) He must not only watch from the side, but also be one who sets new values. He must be both judge and the one on trial, to the extent that he is a short version of the whole world.

(5) He must have a great many sides to him, and yet be firm and hard. He must be flexible.

977.

The truly *royal* calling of the philosopher, in the words of Alcuin the Anglo-Saxon, is this: "*Prava corrigere, et recta corroborare, et sancta sublimare*," which means: to set right what is crooked, to strengthen what is right, and to lift up what is holy.

978.

The new philosopher can only appear together with a ruling class, as the highest and most spiritual form of that class. Great politics, ruling the whole earth, as something that may soon happen, and the complete *lack of fixed principles* that this requires.

979.

The basic idea: the new values must first be created, and this remains *our duty*! The philosopher must be the one who sets new values for us. A new kind of human. (Think about how the greatest kinds of people so far, for example the Greeks, were raised. What once happened by chance must now be aimed for *on purpose*.)

980.

Suppose we think of the philosopher as a teacher who looks down from his lonely height and is powerful enough to pull long chains of generations up toward him. Then he must be given the most frightening special rights that a great teacher has. A teacher never says what he himself thinks. He only says what he thinks it is good for his students to hear about any subject. This pretending must never be discovered. Part of his mastery is that people believe he is honest. He must be able to use every method of training, strict self-control, and education. Some people he will only be able to lift up by whipping them with his scorn. Others, who are lazy, unsure, cowardly, and vain, he will only be able to reach through overblown praise. Such a teacher stands beyond ordinary right and wrong, but no one must know that he does.

981.

We must not try to make people "better." We must not lecture them about morality of any kind, as if "morality in itself," or some ideal type of person in general, could just be taken for granted. Instead, we must create situations in which stronger people are needed. Those people, for their part, will need a morality (or, even better, a training and strict self-control of body and mind) that makes people strong, and so they will demand it! Because they will need it so badly, they will get it.

We must not let ourselves be tempted by blue eyes and heaving chests. Greatness of soul has nothing romantic about it at all. And, sadly, nothing pleasant or lovable either.

982.

From warriors we must learn three things. First, we must tie death to the causes we are fighting for, because that makes us worthy of deep respect. Second, we must learn to sacrifice large numbers of people, and to take our cause seriously enough not to spare lives. Third, we must practise training and strict self-control that never gives way, and we must allow ourselves violence and trickery in war.

983.

We need an education that grows the ruling virtues, the ones that let a person master their own kindness and pity. These are the great virtues of training and strict self-control, and next to them "Forgive your enemies" is just child's play. Along with them, the passions of the creator must be raised to the very top. In other words, we must stop carving marble, and start shaping people instead! Think of the rare and powerful position of such beings, compared with that of all rulers so far: a Roman Caesar with the soul of Christ.

984.

We must not separate greatness of soul from greatness of mind. Greatness of soul means being independent. But independence should not be allowed without greatness of mind. Without it, independence only causes disasters, even while it is eager to do good and to practise "justice." Lesser minds must obey, and so they cannot have greatness.

985.

Think of the higher kind of thinker who lives surrounded by loneliness. He is not alone because he wants to be, but because of what he is: he cannot find anyone equal to him. So many dangers and torments wait for him, especially now, when we have lost our belief in the ranking of people by worth, and so no longer know how to understand or respect this kind of isolation! In the past, when a wise man stepped aside like this, ordinary people almost saw him as holy. Today the loner, the hermit, finds himself wrapped in a cloud of gloomy doubts and suspicions. And not only from the jealous and the miserable. Even in every kind act done for him, he is bound to find misunderstanding, neglect, and shallowness. He knows the sly tricks of foolish pity, which make these people feel so good and holy when they try to save him from his own destiny by offering him a more comfortable life and more respectable, reliable company. Yes, he will even come to admire, in a way, the hidden urge to destroy that drives all average minds to stand up against him, while they believe the whole time that they have a holy right to do so! People of such hard-to-understand loneliness need to put a lot of distance between themselves and the meddling of others: this is part of their good sense. For such a person to stay on top today, among the dangerous whirlpools of our time that threaten to pull him under, he will even need cunning and disguise. Every time he tries to arrange his life in today's world and go along with it, every time he gets close to these people and their

modern wishes, he will have to pay for it as if it were a real sin. And yet he may look in wonder at the hidden wisdom of his own nature, which after each of these attempts quickly leads him back to himself through illnesses and painful accidents.

986.

"Cursed is the one who brings sorrow to an immortal spirit!" — Manzoni, from his play The Count of Carmagnola, Act Two.

987.

The hardest and highest form a human being can reach is also the one that succeeds least often. That is why the history of philosophy shows a huge number of ruined and unhappy human lives, and why it moves forward so very slowly. Whole centuries come in between and crush what has been achieved, and so the link that should connect one great mind to the next always ends up broken. It is a horrifying history, this history of the highest people, of the wise. What gets damaged most often is exactly the memory of great people. The half-successful, the failed and weak, misunderstand them and push them aside with their own "successes." Whenever some "effect" can be seen, the masses crowd around it. To hear the lesser and the small-minded having their say is a terrible, ear-splitting torture for the one who knows, and who trembles at the thought, that the fate of humanity depends on its highest types succeeding. Ever since I was a child, I have thought about what a wise person needs in order to live. And I will not hide my happy belief that in Europe such a person has become possible once again, though perhaps only for a short time.

988.

These new philosophers start by describing a clear ranking of people by worth, and the differences in value between people. What they want is, sadly, exactly the opposite of making people alike and equal. They teach separation in every sense. They dig gaps between people deeper than any that have ever existed, and they would gladly see humans become more evil than they ever were. For now, they live hidden, and cut off even from each other. For many reasons they will find they need to be loners and hermits, and to wear masks. So they will not be much good at finding others like themselves. They will live alone, and will probably know the pain of the loneliest kinds of loneliness. But if, by some chance, they did meet each other on the road, I bet they would not recognize each other, or that they would fool each other in all sorts of ways.

989.

The Italian writer Galiani said, in French: "Philosophers are not made to love one another. Eagles do not fly in flocks. Leave that to partridges and starlings. To soar high above and to have claws: that is the lot of great geniuses."

990.

I forgot to say that philosophers like these are cheerful. They like to sit in the bottomless depth of a perfectly clear sky. They need different ways of putting up with life than other people do, because they suffer in a different way. That is, they suffer just as much from how deeply they look down on people as from how much they love people. The animal that suffered most on earth invented something for itself: laughter.

991.

About the mistaken idea of "cheerfulness": Cheerfulness is a short break from long strain. It is the wild playfulness, the party mood, like the old Roman festival of Saturnalia, of a mind that is getting itself ready, almost as if for a sacred duty, to make long and terrible decisions. It is the "jester" dressed up as "science."

992.

The new ranking of minds by worth: tragic natures are no longer out in front.

993.

It comforts me to know that, above the smoke and dirt of human meanness, there is a higher and brighter kind of human being. Judging by how few they are, they must be a small group, because anything that stands out in any way is rare by its very nature. A person does not belong to this group because he happens to be more talented, more good, more heroic, or more loving than the people below. He belongs because he is colder, clearer-minded, more far-seeing, and more alone. He belongs because he puts up with loneliness, prefers it, and even demands it, as his joy, his special right, and even the very condition he needs to live. He belongs because he lives among clouds and lightning as if they were his equals, and also among sunbeams, dewdrops, snowflakes, and everything else that has to come from up high and always travels down from the sky to the earth. Wanting to look upward is not what we want. Heroes, martyrs, geniuses, and passionate believers of every kind are not quiet, patient, subtle, cold, or slow enough for us.

994.

Being completely sure that the values of those above and those below are different. Being sure that those below are missing countless experiences. Being sure that when people look up from below, they are bound to misunderstand.

995.

How do people come to have great power and take on great tasks? All the strengths and skills of body and soul are gained little by little, with hard effort. They come through great hard work, self-control, and keeping yourself within tight limits. They come from doing the same work and facing the same hardships again and again, often, with energy, and for real. But some people inherit and master this treasure of many strengths and skills, slowly built up over time. That happens because of happy and sensible marriages, and also because of lucky chances. The strength gained and stored up by many generations has not been wasted or split up. Instead it has been gathered together through steady struggle and strong will. And so, in the end, a person appears who is a giant of strength, so strong that he longs for a giant task. For it is our power that gives us our orders. The poor little mental game of goals, plans, and reasons is only what shows on the surface, no matter how much weak eyes may see those things as the main forces at work.

990.

The truly lofty person has the highest value, even when he is most delicate and easily broken. That is because a great many very difficult and rare qualities have been raised and grown over many generations and brought together in him.

997.

I teach that there are higher and lower people. And I teach that a single person, in certain situations, can make whole thousands of years of existence worth it. I mean a person who is richer, more gifted, greater, and more complete, compared with countless incomplete and broken-up people.

998.

The highest people live apart from rulers and free of all ties. And they use the rulers as their tools.

999.

The ranking of people by worth: the one who decides what things are worth, and who guides the will of thousands of years, and does this by guiding the highest kinds of people, he is the highest person.

1000.

I think I have guessed some of the things hidden in the soul of the highest person. Perhaps anyone who has guessed this much is bound to be destroyed. But whoever has seen the highest person must do everything he can to make such a person possible. The basic idea is this: we must make the future the measure of all our judgments of value, and not look behind us, to the past, for the rules of how to act.

1001.

The goal is not "mankind," but the higher human to come!

1002.

A line from Dante's Inferno, canto fifteen, line eighty-five, in Italian: "How man makes himself eternal..."

II.

Dionysus, Greek god of wine and joy.

1003.

Let this book be dedicated to the naturally fortunate person. To the one my heart goes out to. To the one who is carved from a single, whole block of material that is hard, sweet, and sweet-smelling. To the one whom even my nose can take some pleasure in.

He enjoys what is good for him.

He stops taking pleasure in something once it goes past the point where it is good for him.

He senses the cures for the harm done to parts of him. His illnesses are the great energizers of his life.

He knows how to make use of the serious bad things that happen to him.

He grows stronger through the disasters that threaten to wipe him out.

By instinct, he gathers from everything he sees, hears, and lives through the material for what matters most to him. He follows a rule of choosing. He throws away a great deal.

He reacts slowly, with a slowness that long caution and deliberate pride have built into him. He tests whatever pushes him: Where does it come from? Where does it lead? He does not give in.

He always keeps his own company, whether he is spending time with books, with people, or with nature.

He honors something by choosing it, by allowing it in, by trusting it.

1004.

We should climb so high in how we look at things, up to a lofty ledge like an eagle's, that we can understand that everything happens exactly as it should happen. And we should see that every "flaw," and the pain it brings, is part of what is most deeply worth wanting.

1005.

Around 1876 I got a real scare. I saw that everything I had wanted most up to then was being put at risk. I understood this when I saw what Wagner was really aiming at. And I was tied very tightly to him. I was tied by all the bonds of needing deeply similar things, by gratitude, by the feeling that no one could ever take his place, and by the total emptiness that I saw in front of me without him.

Right around this time I believed I was hopelessly trapped in my work on old languages and in my job as a professor. That job was a chance accident, a last way out I had grabbed in my life. I did not know how to escape from it. I was tired, worn out, and barely holding on.

At about the same time I understood something else. What my instincts wanted most of all was exactly the opposite of what Schopenhauer's instincts wanted. I wanted a way to show that life is worth it and right, even where life is at its most terrible, most unclear, and most false. For this purpose, I had a key word in my hand: "wild, life-loving (like the god Dionysus)."

Schopenhauer explained the deepest reality of the world, the "absolute," as will. That was certainly a step toward the old idea that this deepest reality must be good, blessed, true, and whole. But Schopenhauer did not know how to make this will into something holy, something to worship. He stayed stuck in the moral, Christian ideal. In fact, he was still so strongly ruled by Christian values that, once he could no longer see the deepest reality as God, he had to see it as evil,

stupid, and completely to be condemned. He did not see that there are endless ways of being different, and even endless ways of being God.

1006.

Up to now, moral values have been the highest values. Does anyone doubt this? If we knock these values down from their high stand, we change all values by doing so. The rule that has decided their ranking by worth until now is overthrown.

1007.

Turning all values upside down: what does this mean? It means that all the natural drives, all the new, future, and stronger drives, are already here. But right now they show up under false names and are judged in false ways. They have not yet become aware of what they really are.

We should have the courage to become aware of this, and to say yes to everything we have truly reached. We should get rid of the dull, ordinary quality of the old ways of judging, because they make us unworthy of the best and strongest things we have achieved.

1008.

Any teaching would be useless unless everything is already prepared for it, with built-up forces and explosive material ready to go off. Turning all values upside down can only happen when there is the pressure of new needs, and a new group of people in need who feel all the old values as painful, even though they do not know what exactly is wrong.

1009.

Here is the point of view from which I decide what things are worth. Is it plenty that is at work, or is it want and craving? ... Is a person

just watching, or is he pushing with his own shoulder at the wheel? Is he looking away, or is he turning aside? ... Is he acting on his own, because he has built up strength, or is he only reacting to a poke or a push? ... Is he acting simply because he has few parts inside him, or because he has such huge control over many parts that his power can put them to work for it whenever it needs them? ... Is he a problem himself, or is he already an answer? ... Is he perfect because his task is small, or imperfect because his goal is so extraordinary? ... Is he real, or only an actor? Is he real as an actor, or only a bad copy of an actor? Is he the one who stands for others, or the one being stood for? Is he a whole personality, or just a meeting place of several personalities? ... Is he sick from a disease, or from having too much health? Does he lead like a shepherd leads a flock, or as an "exception" (and a third choice: as someone running away)? Does he need dignity, or can he play the clown? Is he looking for resistance, or avoiding it? Is he imperfect because he came too early, or because he came too late? Is it in his nature to say yes, or to say no, or is he like a peacock's tail, a showy mix of loud colors? Is he proud enough not to feel ashamed even of his own vanity? Can he still feel the bite of a guilty conscience? (This kind of person is getting rare. In the past, conscience had to bite far too often; now it seems it no longer has enough teeth left to bite.) Is he still able to feel a "duty"? (There are some people who would lose all the joy in their lives if their duty were taken away from them. This is especially true of women, who are born to serve.)

1010.

Suppose the way we all usually understand the universe were a mistake. Could we imagine a kind of perfection in which even a mistake like this one could be accepted and approved?

This is the idea of a new kind of perfection. Something that does not fit our logic, our idea of "beauty," our "good," or our "truth," might still be perfect in an even higher sense than our ideal is.

1011.

Our most important limit is this: we must not turn the unknown into a god. We are only just beginning, and we know so little. And then there are all the false and wasted efforts.

Our "new world": we must find out how far we ourselves are the makers of our values. That way we will be able to give history a "meaning."

This belief in truth is reaching its final logical end in us. You know how it goes: if there is anything at all that must be worshipped, it is appearance, the way things seem. Lies, not truth, are what is holy.

1012.

Whoever pushes clear, reasonable thinking forward also pushes its enemy forward to new shows of strength. That enemy is mysticism and every kind of foolishness.

We should see that every movement in history is two things. First, it is partly a sign of tiredness left over from an earlier movement: being fed up with it, the spite that weakness feels toward it, and sickness. Second, it is partly a fresh waking-up of forces that have been sleeping and building up for a long time, and so it is reckless, violent, and healthy.

1013.

Health and sickness: let us be careful here! The measure is a body in full bloom, and a mind that is quick, brave, and cheerful. But of course the measure is also how much sickness a person can carry and

overcome, and turn into health. Things that would ruin more delicate people are, for great health, actually a kind of boost.

1014.

It is only a question of power: to have all the sick traits of this century, but to balance them out with a power that overflows, that shapes things, and that makes them young again. That is the strong person.

1015.

About the strength of the nineteenth century. We are more like the Middle Ages than the eighteenth century was. And it's not only that we are more curious, or more drawn to what is strange and rare. We have rebelled against the Revolution itself... We have freed ourselves from the fear of reason, which haunted the eighteenth century like a ghost. Once again we dare to be childlike, full of feeling, even absurd. In a word, we are musicians. And we are just as unafraid of looking ridiculous as we are of being absurd. The devil finds that even God puts up with him.[6] Better still, the devil has become interesting, as someone who has been misunderstood and spoken badly of for ages. We are the ones rescuing the devil's good name.

We no longer split the great off from the terrible. We accept that good things, with all their complexity, go together with the very worst things. We have gotten past the old wish of earlier times, which wanted goodness to grow without evil growing along with it. The cowardice toward the ideal that was typical of the Renaissance has shrunk. We even dare to aim for the Renaissance's own morality. At the same time, our intolerance toward priests and the Church has come to an end. People say, "It is immoral to believe in God." But that is exactly what we see as the best possible reason for holding that belief.

We have given all these things full rights as citizens in our minds. We don't tremble at the hidden, darker side of "good things." In fact, we go looking for it, because we are brave and curious enough to do that. This goes for Greek antiquity, for morality, for reason, for good taste, for example. We add up the losses that come with all this treasure, and we almost make ourselves poor by owning such a treasure. And we don't hide from ourselves the hidden side of "evil things" either.

[Footnote 6: This calls to mind Goethe's Faust. See the "Prologue in Heaven." (Translator's note.)]

1016.

What does us credit. If anything does us credit, it is this: we have moved our seriousness onto other things. All the things that every age has looked down on and pushed aside as low and common, we treat as important. On the other hand, we give up "fine feelings" cheaply.

Could any mistake be more dangerous than looking down on the body? As if that didn't doom all thinking and all mental life to become sick, and to run and hide in the foggy daydreams of "idealism"!

Nothing that Christians and idealists have thought up holds up under testing. We go deeper, to the roots. Everywhere, we have found that the "smallest world," the small everyday things, is what matters most.

The paving stones in the streets, good air in our rooms, food understood for what it is really worth: we take all the basic needs of life seriously. And we look down on all "beautiful soulfulness" as a kind of "lightness and silliness." What was most looked down on until now is now pushed to the front of the line.

1017

In place of Rousseau's "natural man," the nineteenth century discovered a much more honest picture of "Man." It had the courage to do that... On the whole, the Christian idea of man has, in a way, been put back in place. What we did not have the courage to do was to call exactly this kind of man, "man in the fullest sense," good, and to see the future of humanity made safe in him. In the same way, we did not dare to see the growth of the terrible side of human character as something that goes along with every step forward in culture. In this sense we are still under the spell of the Christian ideal. We side with it against pagan, non-Christian ways, and also against the Renaissance idea of "virtù," meaning bold, forceful excellence. But this is not the way to find the key to culture. And in practice, we still have history being faked in favor of the "good man," as if he alone made humanity move forward. We also have the socialist ideal, which is really the leftover of Christianity and of Rousseau in a world that has stopped being Christian.

The fight against the eighteenth century: its greatest conquerors were Goethe and Napoleon. Schopenhauer fights against the eighteenth century too. But without meaning to, he goes back to the seventeenth century. He is a modern Pascal, with Pascal's way of judging values, but without Christianity. Schopenhauer was not strong enough to invent a new "yes" to life.

Napoleon: in him we see the necessary link between the higher human being and the terrible one. "Man" was put back in his place, and woman was given back the share of contempt and fear she was owed. The highest activity and health are the signs of the great person. The straight line and the great, commanding style were rediscovered in action. The mightiest of all instincts, the instinct of life itself, the hunger to rule, was welcomed with open arms.

1018.

(From the Revue des deux mondes, February 15, 1887, where Taine writes about Napoleon.) "Suddenly his main talent shows itself. The artist, who was hidden inside the politician, comes out like a sword drawn from its sheath. He creates in the realm of the ideal and the impossible. Once again he is recognized for what he is: the brother of Dante and Michelangelo, born after their time. And truly, when you look at the sharp outlines of his vision, the intensity, unity, and inner logic of his dream, the depth of his thinking, and the more-than-human greatness of his ideas, he is their equal. His genius has the same size and the same structure. He is one of the three ruling minds of the Italian Renaissance."

Note well: Dante, Michelangelo, Napoleon.

1019.

About strong people's facing of hard truths. Inside the soul of primitive man, the fear of evil outweighs everything else. What is evil? Three kinds of things: chance, uncertainty, and the unexpected. How does primitive man fight evil? He imagines it as something with reason and power, even as a person. That way he is able to make deals with it, and in general to work on it ahead of time, to head it off before it strikes.

Another trick is to claim that its evil and harmful nature is only on the surface. The results of chance events, of uncertainty, and of the unexpected are explained as being meant well, as making sense.

A third way is to explain evil, above all, as deserved. In this way evil is excused as a punishment.

In short, man gives in to it. All religious and moral explanations are only ways of giving in to evil. Believing that a good purpose lies behind every evil means giving up any wish to fight it.

Now, the history of every culture shows this fear of chance, of uncertainty, and of the unexpected getting smaller. Culture means exactly this: learning to calculate, finding out causes, gaining the power to see events coming and head them off, and coming to believe that things happen by necessity. As culture grows, man can do without that primitive way of giving in to evil, which is called religion or morality, and without that "excusing of evil." Now he goes to war against "evil" and gets rid of it. Yes, a state of safety becomes possible, a state of trust in laws and in being able to calculate things. In that state, the mind finds these things boring, and the joy of chance, of uncertainty, and of the unexpected actually becomes something that spurs us on.

Let us stop for a moment and look at this sign of the very highest culture. I call it strong people's facing of hard truths. At this stage, a person no longer needs any "justification of evil." In fact, justifying it is exactly what he hates. He enjoys evil pure and raw, just as it is. He finds evil that has no purpose the most interesting kind of evil. In the past he needed a God. Now he takes delight in a disorderly universe with no God in it, a world of chance, whose very nature includes terror, uncertainty, and temptation.

In a situation like this, it is actually goodness that needs to be justified. That means goodness must either have something evil and dangerous at its root, or else it must contain a huge amount of stupidity. If it is stupid, it can still be pleasing. The animal side of humans no longer frightens people at such a time. In such periods, a very clever, happy, playful spirit that takes the side of the animal in man is the most victorious form of the life of the mind. Man is now strong enough to feel ashamed of believing in God. He can now take up the role of the devil's defender all over again. If in everyday life he pretends to support virtue, he will do it for reasons that link virtue with cleverness, cunning, greed for gain, and a kind of hunger for power.

This strong people's facing of hard truths also ends up in a defense of the world, a kind of justification of it. In other words, it ends up in a complete saying yes to the world. But the very same arguments that were once used against life will now be used in favor of it. And so it arrives at an idea of this world as the highest ideal possible, one that has actually been reached.

1020.

The main kinds of pessimism

The pessimism of oversensitivity. This means being far too easily irritated, with feelings of pain outweighing everything else.

The pessimism of the will that is not free. Put another way, this means not having the strength to resist outside urges and pressures.

The pessimism of doubt. This means being timid about everything fixed and solid, and shrinking from grasping or touching anything.

The mental states that go with these different kinds of pessimism can all be seen in a mental hospital, even if they appear there in a slightly more extreme form. The same is true of the belief that nothing has meaning, which is the deep, piercing feeling of being nothing.

But then what is the nature of Pascal's moral pessimism, and the pessimism about existence itself found in the Vedanta philosophy of India? What is the nature of the social pessimism of anarchists, such as the poet Shelley? And what about the pessimism of pity, like that of Leo Tolstoy and Alfred de Vigny?

Are all these things not also signs of decay and sickness? And isn't it the same kind of thing to be far too serious about moral values, or about made-up stories of an "other world," or about social disasters, or about suffering in general? Any such blowing up of one single,

narrow point of view is in itself a sign of sickness. The same goes for a negative attitude winning out over a positive one!

But here we must not confuse all that with something else: the joy of saying no and doing no that comes from the huge power and tension of a positive, life-affirming attitude. This joy belongs to all rich and mighty people and ages. It is a kind of luxury, and also a kind of courage. It stands up to the terrible. It feels a kinship with the frightening and the doubtful, partly because one is oneself terrible and doubtful. This is the wild, life-loving (like the god Dionysus) spirit in will, in mind, and in taste.

1021.

My Five "Noes"

(1) My fight against the feeling of sin, and against bringing the idea of punishment into the physical world and the world beyond, and also into psychology and the way history is explained. Recognizing that all philosophies and all ways of judging value up to now have been soaked through with morality.

(2) My spotting and uncovering of the traditional ideal, the Christian ideal, even where the official teachings of Christianity have been destroyed. The danger of the Christian ideal lies in the values it holds, in what can survive without any visible religious form. That is my struggle against hidden Christianity, for example in music and in Socialism.

(3) My struggle against the eighteenth century of Rousseau: against his idea of "Nature," against his "good man," against his belief that feeling should rule. It is a struggle against pampering people, weakening them, and preaching morals at them. That ideal was born out of hatred of aristocratic culture. In practice, it means unchecked feelings of resentment are in charge. It was invented as a standard to be used

as a weapon in a war. Both the Christian morality of the feeling of sin and the morality of resentment are attitudes of the mob.

(4) My fight against Romanticism. In Romanticism, the ideals of Christianity and of Rousseau come together. But at the same time it has a longing for the ancient world, which knew a culture of priests and aristocrats. It longs for virtù, the old Italian idea of manly excellence and strength, and for the "strong man." This makes it a very mixed and mongrel thing. It is a fake, copied version of a stronger kind of humanity. It admires extreme states in general and sees them as a sign of strength. Think of "the worship of passion," and of imitating the most dramatic, expressive forms, a frenzied expressiveness. But all this comes not from fullness but from lack. In the nineteenth century, some things do come from relative fullness, that is, from well-being: cheerful music, and so on. Among poets, for example, Stifter and Gottfried Keller show more strength and inner well-being than others do. The great advances in engineering, in inventions, in the natural sciences, and perhaps in history are, to some degree, the products of the strength and self-confidence of the nineteenth century.

(5) My struggle against the dominance of the herd instinct, now that science has joined forces with it. It is a struggle against the deep hatred with which every kind of ranking of people by worth, and every kind of standing apart, is treated.

1022.

There is a pressure that comes from being too full, from the tension of forces that keep growing inside us and cannot yet be released. This produces a state very much like the one before a storm: we, like the sky in nature, grow dark and clouded over. That, too, is "pessimism." Now imagine a teaching that ends this state by giving a command: a turning all values upside down that gives the built-up forces a channel

and a direction, so that they burst out into actions and flashes of lightning. Such a teaching does not need to be a teaching about pleasure at all. Because it sets free a strength that was squeezed together to the point of agony, it brings happiness.

1023.

Pleasure shows up together with the feeling of power.

Happiness means that the awareness of power and victory has begun to win out.

Progress is the strengthening of the type, the ability to use great willpower. Everything else is a misunderstanding and a danger.

1024.

A time comes when the old costumes and moral dressing-up of the passions start to disgust people, and they want naked Nature. At that time, amounts of power are seen as clearly simple facts that decide who ranks above whom. And at that time, the great, commanding style appears again, as the result of great passion.

1025.

The goal of culture would be to bring everything terrible under its control and make it useful, step by step, by trying things out. But before culture is strong enough to do this, it has to fight everything terrible, tone it down, hide it, and even curse it.

Whenever a culture calls something evil, it gives away that it is afraid, and so it shows that it is weak.

Main idea: everything we now call good is the evil of the old days, which has been tamed and put to use. The measuring rule: the more terrible and the greater the passions that an age, a people, or a single person is free to have, because they are able to use those passions as

tools, the higher their culture is. The more average, weak, obedient, and cowardly a person is, the more things he will call evil. For such a person, the kingdom of evil is the biggest kingdom of all. The lowest kind of person will see the kingdom of evil everywhere, meaning everything that is forbidden to him and everything that is against him.

1026.

It is not true that "happiness comes after virtue." Rather, it is the powerful person who first announces that his own happy state is what virtue means.

Evil actions belong to the powerful and the virtuous. Bad and low actions belong to those who are ruled by others.

The most powerful person, the creator, would have to be the most evil of all. That is because he forces his own ideal on everyone, against their own ideals, and reshapes them to look like him.

In this sense, evil means hard, painful, and forced on people.

People like Napoleon must keep coming back, and each time they must make us believe again in how glorious a single individual can be. Napoleon himself, though, was spoiled by the low methods he had to sink to, and he lost his noble, high-minded character. If he had needed to win out among a different kind of people, he could have used different methods. So it would not seem necessary that a Caesar, a great ruler, must turn bad.

1027.

A human being is a mix of a beast and something above the beast. An exceptional person is a mix of a monster and the higher human to come. These opposites belong together. With every step a person grows toward greatness and height, he also grows downward into the

depths and into what is terrible. We should not want the one without the other. Or better still: the more deeply we want the one, the more fully we will reach the other.

[Translator's note 7: The German words play on each other: "Unthier" (monster-beast) and "Überthier" (above-beast), "Unmensch" (monster-human) and "Übermensch" (above-human). Sadly, this wordplay cannot be carried over into English.]

1028.

Being terrible is part of being great. Let us not fool ourselves about that.

1029.

I have taught people to know such terrible things that it is impossible to feel calm, easygoing satisfaction about them, the kind the philosopher Epicurus praised. The only kind of joy that fits here is wild, life-loving joy, like that of the god Dionysus. I was the first to discover what the tragic really is. Because the Greeks were shallow in their thinking about morals, they misunderstood it. Giving up and accepting defeat is not what tragedy teaches. That is only a misunderstanding of it! Longing to be nothing at all is the denial of tragic wisdom. It is its exact opposite!

1030.

A rich and powerful soul does not just get through painful and even terrible losses, hardships, thefts, and insults. It actually comes out of these dark hells with even more fullness and power. And most important of all, it comes out with a greater joy in love. I believe that anyone who has guessed something about the deepest conditions of love will understand why Dante wrote over the door of his Hell: "I too was made by eternal love."

1031.

To have traveled all the way around the modern soul, and to have sat in every one of its corners: that has been my ambition, my torment, and my happiness.

To have truly beaten pessimism, the belief that life is bad, and because of that, to have gained eyes like Goethe's, full of love and goodwill.

1032.

The first question is not at all whether we are happy with ourselves. It is whether we are happy with anything at all. Suppose we say yes to even one single moment. Then we have said yes not only to ourselves, but to all of existence. That is because nothing stands alone, neither in us nor in anything else. If our soul has shaken and rung with happiness like a plucked string, even just once, then all of eternity was needed to make that one event happen. And in that single moment when we said yes, all of eternity was called good, was saved, was proven right, and was blessed.

1033.

The passions that say yes: pride, happiness, health, love between the sexes, hostility and war, deep respect, fine bearing, good manners, a strong will, the training and strict self-control of a high-minded spirit, the drive for power, and thankfulness to the Earth and to Life. All that is rich, all that wants to give, and all that refreshes Life, covers it in gold, makes it last forever, and makes it godlike. The whole power of the virtues that glorify. All of it calls things good, says yes, and does yes.

1034.

We, whether many or few, who dare once again to live in a world cleaned of morality, we who are pagan, non-Christian, in our faith, are

probably also the first to understand what a pagan faith really is. It means having to imagine beings higher than humans, but imagining them beyond ordinary right and wrong. It means being forced to see every higher kind of existence as an existence outside morality. We believe in Olympus, the home of the Greek gods, and not in the "man on the cross."

1035.

Modern people have used their power to picture an ideal God mostly by making God more and more moral. What does that mean? Nothing good. It means that human strength has gotten smaller.

In fact, the opposite would be possible, and there are signs of it. God could be imagined as freedom from morality, holding within himself the whole rich crowd of life's opposites, and saving them and proving them right through a godlike struggle and suffering. God could be imagined as what lies beyond, and high above, the miserable dead end of the morality of "Good and Evil."

1036.

A kind, human-loving God cannot be proven from the world we know. That much you are pushed and forced to admit today. But what do you conclude from this? You say, "He cannot be proven to us." That is doubting what we can know. You are all afraid of the other conclusion: "From the world we know, a very different God could be proven, one who would certainly not be kind and human-loving." In short, you hold on tight to your God, and you make up a world for him that we know nothing about.

1037.

Let us remove "the highest good" from our idea of God. It is not worthy of a God. Let us also remove "the highest wisdom." That comes from the vanity of philosophers, who made the silly mistake of

picturing God as a monster of wisdom. Their idea was to make God as much like themselves as they could. No! God as the highest power: that is enough! Everything follows from that, even "the world"!

1038

And how many new gods are still possible! Take me, for example. In me the religious instinct, which means the instinct that creates gods, sometimes wakes up at the worst possible moments. And how differently the divine has shown itself to me every single time! ... So many strange things have passed before my eyes in those timeless moments. Such moments drop into a person's life as if they came from the moon, and in them he no longer has any idea how old he is or how young he might still be! ... I would not doubt that there are several kinds of gods.... There are some you simply could not picture without a certain peaceful, sunny calm and lightness of heart.... Maybe light feet are part of the very idea of "God." Do I need to explain that a god prefers to keep away from all narrow-minded, small-town people and all dry rationalists? And also, just between us, that a god stands beyond ordinary right and wrong? His way of seeing is a free one, as Goethe would put it. And to call on the authority of Zarathustra, which can hardly be valued too highly on this point: Zarathustra goes so far as to admit, "I would only believe in a God who knew how to dance ..."

I say it again: how many new gods are still possible! Of course, Zarathustra himself is just an old atheist. He believes in neither old gods nor new ones. Zarathustra says "he would" believe, but Zarathustra will not.... Make sure you understand him properly.

The idea of God shaped after the model of creative minds, of "great people."

1039.

And deep down, how many new ideals are still possible? Here is a little ideal that I grab hold of about once every five weeks, during a wild and lonely walk, in a sky-blue moment of joy that mocks what is holy. It goes like this: to spend your life among delicate and silly things; to be a stranger to reality, half artist, half bird, half philosopher of the unseen; to say neither yes nor no to reality, except that now and then you greet it with the tips of your toes, the way a good dancer would; to be always tickled by some happy ray of sunshine; to be lifted up and cheered even by sorrow, because sorrow keeps the happy person going; to pin a little tail of jokes even onto the holiest thing. As you can plainly see, this is the ideal of a heavy spirit, one that weighs a ton, a spirit made of that heavy, serious spirit itself.

1040.

From the army school of the soul. (Dedicated to the brave, the cheerful, and those who hold themselves back from indulgence.)

I would not want to look down on the friendly, pleasant virtues. But greatness of soul does not go together with them. Even in the arts, the great, commanding style shuts out everything that is merely pleasing.

***

In times of painful strain, when you feel easily hurt, choose war. War toughens you and builds muscle.

***

Those who have been deeply wounded have the laughter of the gods on Mount Olympus. A person only has what he needs.

***

It has already gone on for ten years now: no sound reaches me anymore. I live in a land without rain. A person needs a huge supply of

human warmth inside him so as not to waste away in such a drought. [8]

[Footnote 8, from the translator: For readers who do not know the facts of Nietzsche's life, it is worth pointing out that this is a purely personal complaint. It is easy to understand coming from someone like Nietzsche, who for years lived as a lonely hermit.]

1041.

My new road to saying yes. Philosophy, as I have understood it and lived it so far, means choosing to go looking for the ugly and horrible sides of life. Through long experience of wandering like this, over ice and through desert, I learned to see everything that had been thought by philosophers before in a completely different way. The hidden history of philosophy, the psychology of its great names, came into the light for me. "How much truth can a mind bear? How much truth does it dare to face?" For me, that became the true measure of value. Error is a kind of cowardice ... every win for knowledge comes from courage, from being hard on yourself, from being clean and honest with yourself.... The kind of experimental philosophy that I am living even expects, as a matter of principle, the possibility of the most extreme belief that nothing has meaning. But I do not mean that it stops there, at a denial, at a "no," or at a wish to deny. Instead it wants to reach the exact opposite: a wild, life-loving (like the god Dionysus) yes to the world just as it is, without taking anything away, without exceptions, without picking and choosing. It would want an eternal circling movement: the same things, the same reasoning, and the same illogical chain of events, over and over. The highest state a philosopher can reach is to hold a wild, life-loving (like the god Dionysus) attitude toward life. My formula for this is amor fati, which means "love of fate."

To get there, we must look at the sides of life that have been denied until now. We must see them not only as necessary but as desirable. And not only desirable for the sake of the sides of life that have been approved until now, as if they were just add-ons or first conditions for those. No, we must want them for their own sake, as the more powerful, more terrible, and more truthful sides of life, the sides in which life's will shows itself most clearly.

To get there, we must also put a value on the side of life that alone has been approved until now. We must understand where this way of valuing comes from, and how little it has to do with a wild, life-loving (like the god Dionysus) way of valuing life. I picked out and understood what it is that says "yes" in this case. First, there is the instinct of the one who suffers. Second, there is the herd instinct. And third, there is the instinct of the majority against the exceptions.

In this way I guessed how a stronger kind of person must necessarily picture the raising and improving of humankind in a different direction: higher beings, beyond ordinary right and wrong, beyond those values that clearly show they were born among suffering, among the crowd, and among the majority. I searched history for evidence of this upside-down way of forming ideals. (The ideas "pagan, non-Christian," "classical," and "noble, high-minded" have been rediscovered and brought back into view.)

1042.

We should show how much higher the religion of the Greeks was than Jewish and Christian religion. Christianity won only because Greek religion had already gone bad and was in decline, decay.

1043.

It is no surprise that it has taken a couple of centuries to reconnect with that past. A couple of centuries is really very little time.

1044.

There must be some people who make the body's functions holy. Not only eating and drinking, and not only by remembering them or by living in tune with them. Rather, this world must be glorified again and again, forever, and in new ways.

1045.

The most thoughtful, intellectual people feel the thrill and charm of things of the senses in a way that other people cannot possibly imagine. These others are the ones with "hearts of flesh," and they should not even be able to imagine it. The thinkers enjoy the senses with a completely clear conscience. That is because they give the senses a deeper value than that fine sieve, that machine for thinning things out and chopping them small, or whatever you want to call it, which ordinary people call "spirit." The strength and power of the senses is the most important thing in a healthy person who is a naturally fortunate person. The splendid animal has to be there first. Otherwise, what is all this "making us more human" worth?

1046.

(1) We want to hold on tight to our senses, and to our trust in them, and to accept where they logically lead! Philosophy up to now has been hostile to the senses. That hostility has been the greatest piece of nonsense humans have ever pulled off.

(2) Look at the world as it exists now. All earthly and living things have built themselves into it in such a way that it now looks the way it does: lasting, and moving forward slowly. We would like to keep building on this world, not argue it away as false!

(3) The values we hold help in this building. They stress things and make them stand out. So what does it mean when whole religions say,

"Everything is bad, false and evil"? Condemning the whole process like this can only be the verdict of those who have failed!

(4) It is true that the failures might be the ones who suffer most, and so they might be the most sharp and sensitive! And the contented people might be worth very little!

(5) We have to understand the basic artistic happening that we call "Life." It is a shaping, building spirit that creates even in the worst conditions, and in the slowest way possible. Every one of its combinations has to prove itself all over again, and the proof is this: it keeps itself going.

1047.

Sex, the desire to rule, the pleasure we get from appearances and from deception, and a great and joyful thankfulness toward Life and the usual conditions it brings: these things are at the heart of all pagan, non-Christian life, and paganism feels no guilt about them. What is against Nature fights paganism by using morality and logical argument. This was already happening in ancient Greece.

1040.

A view of the world that rejects any world beyond this one, yes, but a view that is artistic.

1049.

Apollo's mistake: believing that beautiful forms last forever, and giving the proud, aristocratic command, "This is how it must always be!"

Dionysus, Greek god of wine and joy: desire of the senses, and cruelty. The fact that everything in existence passes away could be understood as the joy of a force that both creates and destroys, as creation that never stops.

1050.

The word "wild, life-loving (like the god Dionysus)" means the following. It means being driven toward oneness. It means rising above your own personality, above everyday life, above society and reality, and above the deep pit of things that last only a short time. It means the passionate, painful feeling of overflowing too much, in darker, fuller, more shifting states. It means joyfully saying yes to existence as a whole, as something that stays the same and is just as mighty and blissful through all its changes. It means a great sense of being one with all of nature in both pleasure and pain, a feeling that calls even the most terrible and doubtful sides of existence good and makes them holy. It means the never-ending will to create new life, to be fruitful, and to have things come back again. It means feeling united with the need both to create and to destroy.

The word "calm and orderly (like the god Apollo)" means the following. It means being driven to stand completely alone, to be the typical "individual." It means a drive toward everything that simplifies, sets things apart, and makes them strong, clear, definite and typical. It means freedom within the law.

The further growth of art depends on the struggle between these two natural forces in art, just as surely as the further growth of humanity depends on the struggle between the sexes. Fullness of power combined with self-control, the highest way of saying yes to yourself, shown in a cool, noble, high-minded and reserved kind of beauty: that is the calm and orderly side of the Greek will.

This struggle between the wild, life-loving side and the calm and orderly side in the Greek soul is one of the great riddles that drew me to the heart of Greek culture. Deep down, I cared about nothing except answering one question: why did Greek calm and order have to grow out of wild, Dionysian soil? The answer is that the wild Greek

needed to become calm and orderly. He needed this to break his urge toward the gigantic, the complicated, the uncertain and the horrible, by using a will toward balance, toward simplicity, and toward obeying rules and ideas. Excess, wildness and Asian tendencies lie at the roots of the Greeks. Their courage lies in their fight against their own Asian nature. Beauty was not given to them, any more than logic or natural good manners were given to them. For them, these things were victories. They wanted them and fought for them. These things are the triumph of the Greeks.

1051.

Clearly, only the rarest and luckiest humans can reach the highest and most glorious human joys, in which Life celebrates and glorifies itself. And this only happens when these rare people, and their ancestors before them, have lived a long life of preparation leading to this goal, though without doing it on purpose. Then a person holds an overflowing wealth of many different forces, together with the quickest power of "free will" and masterful command, all in perfect harmony. Then the mind feels just as comfortable and at home in the senses as the senses feel at home in the mind. Everything that happens in the senses must create amazingly delicate joys in the mind. And the other way around, too: just think about this "other way around" for a moment in a man like the Persian poet Hafiz. Even Goethe, though less so, gives some idea of how this works. In such perfect people, healthy and strong by nature, the most bodily functions are probably in the end lifted up and transformed by a symbolic high feeling of the greatest intellect. In themselves they feel the body becoming something like a god. They are as far as possible from the self-denying philosophy that says "God is a Spirit." From this saying it becomes clear that the self-denier is the "failed and weak person." He calls good and "God" only what is absolute, only what judges and condemns.

There is a long and huge scale of the light and colour of happiness. At the top is the height of joy where a person feels himself to be, completely, a form of nature turned into a god, nature's own proof that it is right. At the bottom is the joy of healthy farmers and healthy half-human animals. The Greeks gave this whole scale a godlike name: Dionysus. They spoke it with the grateful trembling of someone let in on a secret, with great care and with holy silence. So what do all modern people know about the full range of Greek happiness? They are the children of a crumbling, mixed-up, sick and strange age. How could they know anything about it! Where would the slaves of "modern ideas" get the right to hold wild, life-loving feasts for Dionysus!

When Greek bodies and souls were at their healthiest, in full "bloom," and not in states of sick over-excitement and madness, something special appeared. It was the secret symbol of the highest saying-yes to life and the world, and of the greatest glorifying of them, that has ever existed. Here we have a measuring stick, and next to it everything that has grown up since seems too short, too poor, too narrow. Just say the word "Dionysus" next to the best names and things of later times, next to Goethe, for example, or Beethoven, or Shakespeare, or Raphael. In an instant we see that our best things and best moments are judged and found lacking. Dionysus is a judge! Do you understand me? There is no doubt that the Greeks used their wild, life-loving (like the god Dionysus) experiences to explain the deepest mysteries of the "fate of the soul." They used them to explain everything they knew about how a person is raised and made pure. Above all, they used them to explain the strict ranking of people, and the fact that people are not equal in worth. This is the deepest experience of all the Greeks, and they hid it under a great silence. We do not really know the Greeks as long as this hidden, underground path to them stays blocked. The nosy eyes of scholars will never see anything in these things, no matter how much learned effort is still spent on this dig-

ging. Even the high-minded eagerness of such lovers of the ancient world as Goethe and Winckelmann seems a bit tasteless and arrogant, exactly on this point. So what should one do? Wait, and get ready. Wait for new sources of knowledge to appear. Get ready, alone, to see new faces and hear new voices. Clean your soul more and more of the dust and noise of this age, which is like the dust and noise of a country fair. Overcome everything Christian with something that goes beyond Christianity, and not just get rid of it, because Christian teaching is the opposite of the wild, life-loving (like the god Dionysus) teaching. Find the warm, sunny South again inside yourself, and stretch a clear, sparkling, mysterious southern sky above you. Win back for yourself the southern health and the hidden strength of the soul. Widen your soul step by step, and become less bound to one nation, more European, more than European, more Eastern, and in the end more Greek. For Greek culture was in fact the first great joining and blending of everything Eastern, and for exactly that reason it was the beginning of the European soul, the discovery of our "new world." Whoever lives by such commands, who knows what he might meet one day? Perhaps a new dawn!

1052.

The two types: Dionysus, Greek god of wine and joy, and Christ on the Cross. We should find out whether the typical religious person is a sign of decline, decay. After all, the great founders of new religions were all sick and epileptic. But let us not forget to include the kind of religious person who is pagan, non-Christian. Isn't pagan worship a way of being thankful for life and saying yes to it? Shouldn't its truest example be a defense of life and a way of making life holy, like a god? That is the type of a spirit that is healthy and strong by nature and overflowing with joy and rapture! The type of a spirit that takes in the contradictions and problems of existence and solves them!

Here I place the Dionysus of the Greeks: the religious yes to life, to the whole of life, not to a life that is denied or only partly accepted. It is typical that in this worship, the act of sex brings up feelings of depth, mystery, and deep respect.

Dionysus against "Christ": that is the contrast. The difference is not about suffering a martyr's death. Both suffer, but the suffering means something different. In the case of Dionysus, life itself, with its endless fruitfulness and its coming back again and again, causes pain, destruction, and the urge to wipe things out. In the other case, the suffering of "Christ, the Innocent One" stands as an argument against life. It is the formula for condemning life. Readers will guess that the question is about the meaning of suffering: is it given a Christian meaning or a tragic meaning? In the Christian case, suffering is the road to a holy way of living. In the tragic case, life itself is seen as holy enough to make even huge amounts of suffering worth it. The tragic person says yes even to the most terrible suffering. He is strong enough, rich enough, and able enough to make things holy that he can do this. The Christian says no even to the happy parts of life on earth. He is weak, poor, and left out enough to suffer from life in any form. God on the Cross is a curse on life, a signpost telling people to escape from it. Dionysus torn into pieces is a promise of life: life will be born again forever, and will rise again out of destruction.

III.

Everything Coming Back Forever

1053.

My philosophy shows the winning idea that will, in the end, destroy every other way of thinking. It is the great testing idea. The peoples

who cannot bear it are doomed. The peoples who see it as the greatest blessing are meant to rule.

1054.

The greatest fight of all: for it, a new weapon is needed.

The hammer (a tool to smash old values): a terrible choice must be created. Europe must be made to face the logic of the facts. It must be asked whether its wish to ruin itself is really serious.

Everyone being pulled down to being average must be avoided. It would be better to die than to let that happen.

1055.

A gloomy, pessimistic mindset, a pessimistic teaching, and a rapturous belief that nothing has meaning may, in some situations, even be necessary for the philosopher. That is, they can serve him as a powerful kind of pressure, or a hammer. With it he can smash weak, dying peoples and put an end to them. With it he can clear a path to a new way of life. Or he can plant a longing for nothingness in those who are in decline and who want to die.

1056.

I want to teach the idea that gives many people the right to end their lives: the great testing idea.

1057.

Everything Coming Back Forever: A Prophecy

1. Explaining the teaching, its basic ideas in theory, and what follows from them.

2. The proof of the teaching.

3. The likely results of people believing it. (It makes everything burst open.)

(a) Ways to bear it.

(b) Ways to ignore it.

4. Its place in history as a means to an end.

The time of greatest danger. Setting up a small ruling group that stands above nations and their interests. Education aimed at creating a political plan for all of humanity.

Something like the Jesuits, but working in the opposite direction.

1058.

The two greatest ways of seeing things in philosophy (both discovered by Germans).

(a) The view of constant change and the view of evolution.

(b) The view based on what life is worth (but the miserable German kind of pessimism must first be overcome!).

I have brought both views together, once and for all.

Everything changes and comes back forever. There is no escape!

Suppose we really *could* measure what life is worth. What would come of it? The idea of everything coming back forever works as a way of *sorting people out*, and it serves *power* (and harshness!).

Whether people are ready, or grown up enough, for this idea.

1059.

1. The idea of everything coming back forever: the basic starting points that would have to be true if the idea itself were true. And what follows from it.

2. It is the most *crushing* idea there is. Here is what it would probably lead to, unless something stops it, which means unless all values are turned upside down.

3. How to *bear it*: by turning all values upside down. We should stop finding joy in being sure of things, and find it instead in not being sure. Instead of "cause and result," there should be constant creating. Instead of the wish just to stay alive, there should be the drive for power. Instead of the humble saying, "it is all *just* how we see it," we should say, "it is all *our own* work! Let us be proud of it."

1060.

To bear the idea of everything coming back, you have to be free from morality. You need new ways of dealing with the *fact of pain*. Pain should be seen as a tool, even as the parent of pleasure; and pain does not pile up in our minds over time. You need to enjoy every kind of uncertainty and trying things out, to balance against the belief that everything is fixed in advance. You need to get rid of the idea of "necessity," get rid of the idea of "the will," and get rid of the idea of "perfect, total knowledge."

The *highest possible rise* in a person's *sense of their own strength*, since that is what produces the higher human to come.

1061.

The two opposite ways of thinking, the materialist one (that only matter exists) and the Platonic one (that perfect ideas are what is truly real), are brought together in *everything coming back forever*: both are treated as ideals.

1062.

If the universe had a goal, it would have reached that goal by now. If there were any kind of unexpected final state, the universe would

have reached that too by now. If it were able to stop at all, or to settle into any fixed, unchanging existence, then it would have needed that ability for only one moment in its whole history. After that, constant change would have been over for ages, and with it all thinking and all "mind." The fact that minds are *still developing* proves that the universe can have no goal, no final state, and cannot settle into fixed, unchanging existence. But the old habit is very strong: we are used to seeing a purpose behind everything that happens, and to imagining a God who guides and creates the universe. It is so strong that a thinker has to work very hard not to imagine that even the world's lack of purpose was meant to be that way. Some people want to say the universe can renew itself forever. Those people will end up thinking that the universe is deliberately avoiding a goal, and even that it knows clever tricks to keep itself from falling into going round in a circle. In other words, they want to give a limited, definite force, one whose amount never changes, as the universe is, the miracle power of renewing its shapes and its states *forever and ever*. In their view, even though the universe is no longer a God, it must still have the godlike power to create and to transform. It must forbid itself to fall back into any shape it had before. It must not only want to avoid repeating itself, but must also have the means to do so, every second it exists. It must even control every single movement it makes, so that it avoids goals, final states, repeats, and everything else that would follow from such an unforgivable and crazy way of thinking and wishing. All of this is just the old religious way of thinking and wishing. Despite everything, it still longs to believe that the universe is somehow like the old, beloved, endless God who creates endlessly, that somehow "the old God is still alive." This is the same longing Spinoza had, which he put into the words "*deus sive natura*," meaning "God, or in other words Nature." (What he really felt was "*natura sive deus*," "Nature, or in other words God.") So what statement, what belief, best sums up the big shift that has happened, the fact that the

scientific way of thinking now *wins out* over the religious way of thinking, which likes to imagine gods? Shouldn't it be this: the universe, being a force, must not be imagined as unlimited, because it simply cannot be imagined that way? We do not allow ourselves the idea of an *infinite* force, because that idea *does not fit* with the very idea of force. And from this it follows that the universe does not have the power to keep renewing itself forever.

1063.

The law that energy is never created or destroyed, only kept, necessarily leads to *everything coming back forever*.

1064.

A state of perfect balance has never been reached, and that proves it is impossible. Yet in endless space it would have had to be reached. The same is true in space shaped like a sphere. So the *shape* of space must be what causes the endless movement, and in the end what causes all imperfection. "Energy" on one side, and "stability" and "never changing" on the other, contradict each other. The amount of energy is fixed in size, even though by its nature energy is always flowing.

The idea of "something outside of time" has to be proven wrong. At any given moment of energy, all the conditions needed for a new arrangement of all the forces are present, so it cannot stay still. Change is part of what it is, and so time is too. But in saying this, we have only proven in theory, once again, that change has to happen.

1065.

There was an emperor who always kept in mind how quickly all things pass away, so that he would not take them too seriously and could live calmly among them. I feel the opposite. Everything seems far too important to me to be so short-lived. I look for a way for everything to last forever. Should anyone pour the most precious oint-

ments and wines into the sea? My comfort is that everything that has ever existed lasts forever: the sea will wash it back up onto the shore again.

1066.

The new idea of the universe. The universe exists. It is not something that grows into existence and then fades out of existence. Or, to put it better: it does grow, and it does fade away, but it never started growing, and it has never stopped fading away. It *keeps itself going* in both states at once. It lives off itself: its own waste is its food.

We don't need to spend even a moment on the theory that the world was *created*. Today the idea of "creating" something from nothing cannot be clearly defined or even pictured. It is just a word left over from superstitious times, and a mere word explains nothing. The latest attempt to picture a world that *had a beginning* happened quite recently, often with the help of logical arguments, and usually, as you can guess, with a hidden religious motive behind it.

Lately, several people have tried to show that the idea of "a universe with an endless past" (in Latin, *regressus in infinitum*) contradicts itself. It is true that they even claimed to prove it, but only by mixing up the head with the tail, that is, by getting the beginning and the end confused. Nothing can stop me from counting backwards from this moment in time and saying: "I will never reach the end." In the same way, I can count forwards from this same moment without ever stopping. I only go wrong if I try to match this correct idea of an endless past with the completely impossible idea of a limited stretch of time running forward up to now. I will be careful not to make that mistake. Only if I treat the direction, forwards or backwards, as if it made no logical difference, do I grab the head, which is this very moment, and think I am holding the tail. That pleasure I leave to you, Mr. Dühring!...

I have found this idea in other thinkers before me. Every time, I saw that it was driven by hidden motives, mostly religious ones, meant to support the idea of a creating spirit (a *creator spiritus*). Suppose the universe could in any way freeze solid, dry up, or die. Or suppose it could reach a state of perfect balance where everything stops. Or suppose it had any kind of final goal that a long passing of time, with no more change and a final ending, was saving up for it. To put it in philosophical terms: suppose constant change could settle down into fixed, unchanging existence, or into nothingness. If any of this were possible, that state should already have been reached by now.

But it has not been reached. And so it follows.... This is the only sure thing we can hold on to. It can serve to correct a whole crowd of ideas about the universe that might otherwise seem possible. For example, take materialism, the view that everything is just matter. If materialism, staying true to itself, cannot avoid ending up with a final, finished state of the universe, as William Thomson worked out for it, then materialism is proven wrong by that very fact.

Let us suppose the universe can be thought of as a fixed amount of energy, as a fixed number of centres of energy. Any other idea of it stays vague and is therefore useless. From this it follows that, in the great game of chance that makes up its existence, the universe must pass through a number of combinations that could, in principle, be counted. Over endless time, at some moment or other, every possible combination must have happened once. Not only that: it must have happened an endless number of times. Between each of these combinations and the next time it comes around again, every other possible combination would have to happen first. And since each of these combinations would set the whole series in motion in the same order, this proves a circle of exactly identical series. So the universe is shown to be a circular movement that has already repeated itself an endless number of times, and that plays out its game for all eternity. This idea

is not simply materialistic. If it were, it would not lead to an endless return of identical cases, but to a final, finished state. And because the universe has not reached such a finished state, materialism turns out to be only an incomplete and temporary theory.

1067.

And do you know what "the universe" is to me? Shall I show it to you in my mirror? This universe is a monster of energy, with no beginning and no end. It is a fixed, solid, unbending amount of energy, like something cast in bronze. It grows neither bigger nor smaller. It does not use itself up; it only changes its face. As a whole, its size never changes. It is like a household with no losses and no gains, but also with no growth and no income. It is surrounded by nothingness, as if by a border. It is nothing blurry or wasteful, and it does not stretch out forever. Instead, it is a set amount of energy in a limited space, and not in a space that is empty anywhere. Rather, it is energy everywhere, a play of forces and waves of force, one and many at the same time, piling up here and shrinking there. It is a sea of forces storming and raging within itself, always changing, always rolling back, over ages that could be counted, to come around again. Its forms rise and fall like the tide. Out of the simplest structures it produces the most complicated things. Out of the calmest, stiffest, most frozen material it produces the most burning, the wildest, and the most self-contradicting things. And then it returns from great variety back to sameness, from the play of opposites back to the joy of harmony. Even in the sameness of its paths and ages, it says yes to itself. It forever blesses itself as something that must come back for all eternity. It is constant change that never gets full, never feels disgust, and never grows tired. This is my wild, life-loving world, like the god Dionysus, a world that forever creates itself and forever destroys itself. It is a mysterious world of double pleasure, the pleasure of making and the pleasure of breaking. This is my world "beyond ordinary right and

wrong," without any goal, unless there is a goal in the happiness of the circle itself; without any will, unless a ring, by its very nature, feels goodwill toward itself. Would you like a name for this world of mine? An answer to all your riddles? Do you also want a light, you most hidden, strongest, and most fearless people of the darkest midnight? *This world is the drive for power, and nothing else!* And you yourselves are this drive for power too, and nothing besides!

sun | *Intelligent Audio*



sunapp.ai/download