

## Santa Clara University Scholar Commons

Philosophy

College of Arts & Sciences

3-1996

# Nietzschean Genealogy and Hegelian History in the Genealogy of Morals

Philip J. Kain

*Santa Clara University*, [pkain@scu.edu](mailto:pkain@scu.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarcommons.scu.edu/phi>

 Part of the [Philosophy Commons](#)

### Recommended Citation

Kain, P. J. "Nietzschean Genealogy and Hegelian History in the Genealogy of Morals," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 26 (1996): 123-48.

This is an Accepted Manuscript of an article published by Taylor & Francis in *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* on March 1996, available online:  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00455091.1996.10717447>.

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts & Sciences at Scholar Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Philosophy by an authorized administrator of Scholar Commons. For more information, please contact [rscroggin@scu.edu](mailto:rscroggin@scu.edu).

# Nietzschean Genealogy and Hegelian History in *The Genealogy of Morals*

Philip J. Kain  
Santa Clara University  
Santa Clara, CA 95053  
USA

I would like to offer an interpretation of the *Genealogy of Morals*, of the relationship of master morality to slave morality, and of Nietzsche's philosophy of history that is different from the interpretation that is normally offered by Nietzsche scholars. Contrary to Nehamas, Deleuze, Danto, and many others, I wish to argue that Nietzsche does not simply embrace master morality and spurn slave morality.<sup>1</sup> I also wish to reject the view, considered simply obvious by most scholars, that the *Übermensch* develops out of, or on the model of, the master, not the slave.<sup>2</sup> And to make the case for all of this, I want to explore the relationship between Hegel's master-slave dialectic and the conflict Nietzsche sees between master morality and slave morality. That Nietzsche does not intend us to recall the famous master-slave dialectic of Hegel's *Phenomenology* as we read the *Genealogy of Morals*, I find difficult to believe. Yet very few commentators ever notice, let alone explore, this connection. Those who do, like Deleuze, Greene, and Houlgate, think that Nietzsche, in direct opposition to Hegel, simply sides with the master, not the slave, and that Nietzschean genealogy renounces all Hegelian dialectic--or any sort of

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Nehamas, *Nietzsche: Life as Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press 1985), 206. G. Deleuze, *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, H. Tomlinson, trans. (New York: Columbia University Press 1983), 10. A.C. Danto, *Nietzsche as Philosopher* (New York: Macmillan 1965), 158-160, 166. Also see O. Schutte, *Beyond Nihilism: Nietzsche without Masks* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1984), 108. On the other hand, Kaufmann does not think that Nietzsche necessarily identifies with the master; W. Kaufmann, *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 1968), 3rd edition, 297.

<sup>2</sup> Schacht is an exception here; he does not think that the *Übermensch* simply grows out of master morality; R. Schacht, *Nietzsche* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul 1983), 466.

Hegelian developmental view of history.<sup>3</sup> I do not think any of these views are correct. I wish to argue that Nietzsche is very much influenced by Hegel and that Nietzschean genealogy and Hegelian history are intimately linked in the *Genealogy of Morals*. Thus I think that there is a limit that must be put to the recent tendency, otherwise most insightful and illuminating, to see Nietzsche as radically postmodern, as totally breaking with the 19th century, and, certainly, as having little to do with Hegel.

I

In the first essay of the *Genealogy of Morals*, Nietzsche holds (in direct contradiction to most other modern theorists) that morality originally had nothing to do with what benefited others, with what was non-egoistic or non-selfish, or even with what was useful to others. It did not even describe what was done to *others*, but simply *who* did it, the character of the doer--the good ones themselves. 'Good' originally meant noble, aristocratic, powerful, true, the truthful ones. *We* are the good ones! It was a concept inextricably connected with class--the upper and superior class, the good people--their estimation and affirmation of themselves. Master morality was a triumphant affirmation of self.<sup>4</sup>

And 'bad' meant the opposite--the low, the plebeian, the base. This concept, too, was established by the aristocrats, not the slaves. It was established by those who 'seized the right to create values ... [t]he lordly right of giving names ... they say "this *is* this and this," ... and, as it were, take possession of it...'<sup>5</sup> The bad were the *others*, the ones not like us good ones. Etymologically, Nietzsche claims, the word 'good' in all languages originally<sup>6</sup> meant noble, aristocratic, great, excellent; and 'bad' meant base, common, plebeian.

---

<sup>3</sup> Deleuze, 10, 156, 195. Also M. Foucault, 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History,' in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice*, D.F. Bouchard, ed. (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press 1977), 151-4. M. Greene, 'Hegel's "Unhappy Consciousness" and Nietzsche's "Slave Morality,"' in D.E. Christensen, ed., *Hegel and the Philosophy of Religion* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff 1970), 125-41. S. Houlgate, *Hegel, Nietzsche and the criticism of metaphysics* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1986), 19-20. However, Schacht thinks that Nietzsche holds a revised view of Hegelian development; Schacht, 395. For a good review of the literature on the relationship of Hegel to Nietzsche, though for the most part dealing with issues other than those that I will treat, see D. Breazeale, 'The Hegel-Nietzsche Problem,' in *Nietzsche-Studien*, M. Montinari, W. Müller-Lauter, H. Wenzel, eds. (Berlin: de Gruyter 1975), IV, 146-58.

<sup>4</sup> Whenever available, I have used Kaufmann's translations of Nietzsche and, for the German, *Nietzsche Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, G. Colli and M. Montinari, eds. (Berlin: de Gruyter 1967 ff.). I will, whenever possible, cite both the section and the page of Nietzsche's text so that any other editions, English or German, may be used. *On the Genealogy of Morals* (hereafter *GM*), in *On the Genealogy of Morals and Ecce Homo*, W. Kaufmann, ed. (New York: Vintage 1969), 'First Essay,' § 2, pp. 25-6; § 5, p. 29; § 10, p. 36.

<sup>5</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 2, p. 26.

<sup>6</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 4, pp. 27-8.

Slave morality is the very opposite of master morality. It is not self-affirming. Slaves do not first look to themselves and say we are good. Slave morality is reactive. It first looks to the other--the nasty, vicious, brutal masters. And it says they are evil. It is filled with *ressentiment*. Only secondly does it look to itself and affirm weakness, humility, subservience, not strength and power. This is the morality of priests, slaves, subordinates.<sup>7</sup>

Nietzsche thinks we find master morality in Homer, in Rome, in the Renaissance, and for a last brief moment in Napoleon before this morality disappears in the modern world. It has been defeated by slave morality. We find slave morality among the Jews, in Christianity, in the Reformation, in the French Revolution, in democracy, and in socialism--all of which are committed to the weak, the poor, and the powerless.<sup>8</sup>

It is nearly impossible, it seems to me, to read the first essay of the *Genealogy of Morals* without recalling the master-slave dialectic of Hegel's *Phenomenology*. There we met two desiring consciousnesses, each seeking the confirmation of their own self-conscious reality through the recognition--to the point of total submission--of the other. These two engage in a life and death struggle. One of them wins and becomes the master. The other loses and is made a slave. The first seems to become a powerful, independent, autonomous consciousness, who now imposes his will upon the other and satisfies his desires--he puts the slave to work for him and enjoys life in a way that he could not before. The slave, on the other hand, becomes a dependent consciousness, one who works and serves--a mere thing whose very reality is defined by the master and for the master.<sup>9</sup>

But then there occurs the profound reversal that makes the master-slave dialectic so classic. The master, we begin to see, is not really independent. He is quite dependent. He depends upon the slave not only for work and the satisfaction of his desires, but for recognition as well.<sup>10</sup> What kind of self-confirmation can be gained from the recognition of a slave--a nobody, an object, a thing? On the other hand, for his part, the slave, through fear and work begins to overcome his thing-like dependence. Daily fear for his life before the master forces the slave to become self-referent, self-conscious, aware of his own self-importance, and to do so in a way that deepens and interiorizes the slave far more than occurs for the master. And through work the slave transcends his dependence and develops the power to accomplish something of value. Work requires that desire be delayed and disciplined in order to develop the ability to control nature and to create an object that can meaningfully satisfy human needs and desires.<sup>11</sup>

Thus, the demands of the master, which begin as an external and repressive force, are internalized by the slave; they become a discipline which deepens and spiritualizes the slave; they push him to work and allow him to create something of significance. This

---

<sup>7</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 10, pp. 36-7.

<sup>8</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 16, pp. 53-4.

<sup>9</sup> *Phenomenology of Spirit*, A.V. Miller, trans. (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1977), 114-16; for the German see *Phänomenologie des Geistes*, J. Hoffmeister, ed. (Hamburg: Felix Meiner 1952), 144-6.

<sup>10</sup> *Phenomenology*, 116-7 and *Phänomenologie*, 147-8.

<sup>11</sup> *Phenomenology*, 118-9 and *Phänomenologie*, 148-50.

very same model can be found at all levels of Hegel's thought, and ultimately it explains the construction of our whole reality. Kojève has argued that all change, progress, and development occur on the part of the slave, not the master.<sup>12</sup> At any rate, we must see that historical development, for Hegel, very much follows the model of the slave. In the *Philosophy of History*, Hegel writes: 'The two iron rods which were the instruments of this discipline were the Church and serfdom. The Church drove the "Heart" to desperation--made Spirit pass through the severest bondage.... In the same way serfdom, which made a man's body not his own, but the property of another, dragged humanity through all the barbarism of slavery.... It was not so much *from* slavery as *through* slavery that humanity was emancipated.... it is from this intemperate and ungovernable state of volition that the discipline in question emancipated him.'<sup>13</sup>

In the *Philosophy of Right*, Hegel puts it in more general terms: 'Mind attains its actuality only by creating a dualism within itself, by submitting itself to physical needs and the chain of these external necessities, and so imposing on itself this barrier and this finitude, and finally by maturing (*bildet*) itself inwardly even when under this barrier until it overcomes it and attains its objective reality in the finite.'<sup>14</sup> History is a process that involves external repression, which is accepted as a discipline, which is internalized and sublimated, which produces greater spiritual depth, and which allows one to create by transforming the world and oneself. In the *Phenomenology*, for Hegel, consciousness, which begins simply as a desiring consciousness, quickly becomes an ascetic, self-denying consciousness, and in the sphere of religion, at the stage which Hegel calls 'Unhappy Consciousness,' projects from itself, imaginatively creates, all reality, though it takes this reality to be an other, a beyond, an ideal, not itself or its own doing.<sup>15</sup>

At any rate, while Hegel and Nietzsche agree that slaves in fact have won out over masters, nevertheless, Nietzsche seems to reject with contempt the Hegelian slave and Hegelian history, certainly as having anything to do with the emergence of the *Übermensch*. Instead, Nietzsche seems to side with the master and with genealogy as opposed to history.

For Nietzsche, the past is understood as the result of a meaning, a direction, an interpretation imposed upon things by those with the power to do so--by those with the 'lordly right of giving names ... they say "this *is* this and this," they seal every thing and event with a sound and, as it were, take possession of it.'<sup>16</sup> Whatever exists:

---

<sup>12</sup> A. Kojève, *Introduction to the Reading of Hegel*, A. Bloom, ed. (New York: Basic Books 1966), 22, 51.

<sup>13</sup> *Philosophy of History*, J. Sibree, ed. (New York: Dover 1956), 407 and, for the German, see *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Weltgeschichte*, G. Lasson, ed. (Hamburg: Felix Meiner 1968), II-IV, 875.

<sup>14</sup> *Philosophy of Right*, T.M. Knox, trans. (Oxford: Clarendon Press 1952), 125 and, for the German, see *Grundlinien der Philosophie des Rechts*, J. Hoffmeister, ed. (Hamburg: Felix Meiner 1955), 168.

<sup>15</sup> *Phenomenology*, 138 and *Phänomenologie*, 170-1. Also Greene, 137.

<sup>16</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 2, p. 26.

is again and again reinterpreted to new ends, taken over, transformed, and redirected by some power superior to it; all events in the organic world are a subduing, a *becoming master*, and all subduing and becoming master involves a fresh interpretation, an adaptation through which any previous 'meaning' and 'purpose' are necessarily obscured or even obliterated.... purposes and utilities are only *signs* that a will to power has become master of something less powerful and imposed upon it the character of a function; and the entire history of a 'thing,' an organ, a custom can in this way be a continuous sign-chain of ever new interpretations and adaptations whose causes do not even have to be related to one another ...<sup>17</sup>

The best example of this can be found in the second essay of the *Genealogy of Morals* where Nietzsche explores the meaning of punishment. He says, 'the concept "punishment" possesses in fact not *one* meaning but a whole synthesis of "meanings": the previous history of punishment in general, the history of its employment for the most various purposes, finally crystalizes into a kind of unity that is hard to disentangle, hard to analyze ... Today it is impossible to say for certain *why* people are really punished: all concepts in which an entire process is semiotically concentrated elude definition ...'<sup>18</sup> The meaning of punishment is variable, accidental, plural. It has meant many very different things: rendering harmless, preventing further harm, recompense, inspiring fear, repayment, expulsion, preserving purity, a festival to mock a defeated enemy, and many other things.<sup>19</sup> As Deleuze puts it, the history of anything is the succession of forces which take possession of it or struggle for its possession. The same thing changes sense depending upon the forces that appropriate it. There is thus always a plurality of senses to anything.<sup>20</sup>

It would seem to be clear from this that history, for Nietzsche, cannot be going anywhere; it certainly cannot be progressing or developing in a Hegelian sense. There is no goal to history, nor even any goals within history. There is certainly no 'logic' to history, nor necessity. There is not even a single, coherent 'flow' of history. It is a random series of seizures by different forces. Looking back on it, we who study it can dig up a series of layers, geological strata, or, perhaps better, we find a palimpsest, one text written over another. There is as much logic, connection, development, goal-directedness, or necessity between different stages of history as there is between different layers of text in a palimpsest.

For this reason we need genealogy rather than Hegelian history. Genealogy, as Shapiro puts it, has to do 'with the ascertaining of actual family lineages to determine rights to titles, honors, and inheritances ...'<sup>21</sup> These lineages are not at all necessarily the

---

<sup>17</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 12, p. 77.

<sup>18</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 13, p. 80.

<sup>19</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 13, pp. 80-1.

<sup>20</sup> Deleuze, 3-4.

<sup>21</sup> G. Shapiro, 'Translating, Repeating, Naming: Foucault, Derrida, and the *Genealogy of Morals*,' in C. Koelb, ed., *Nietzsche as Postmodernist* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press 1990), 39.

result of steady Hegelian growth like the interest in a bank account, but could well be the result of ruthless conflicts, reversals, accidents, victories, seizures. Where Hegelian history builds to, culminates in, and reinforces the present, genealogy, much more so than Hegelian history, has a powerful tendency to undermine the present. It can show us that things were radically different in the past, that despite our present condition our ancestors were great and grand and noble--or it may show us that they were small, ugly, and embarrassing.

History is not, it would seem, a slave-like development, a discipline, a deepening, a working toward some end. In the *Use and Abuse of History*, Nietzsche ridicules Hegel's notion that we have reached our zenith through world history, a view 'which turns practically every moment into a sheer gaping at success, into an idolatry of the actual ...'<sup>22</sup> Nietzsche rejects this conservative aspect of Hegel's thought. Nietzsche wants to radically subvert the present. He uses genealogy to undermine the actual and hopefully to go beyond it. For Nietzsche we must look selectively to the past in order to create the future. But we can understand the past only 'by what is most powerful in the present.'<sup>23</sup> Only by straining our noblest qualities to their highest power can we find what is greatest in the past. It would seem that it would take a master, an *Übermensch*, to interpret the past, to grasp its greatest meaning--otherwise you draw it down to your own level. And what this master grasps then must be coined into something never heard before and used to create a new cultural vision--to impose and construct a future.<sup>24</sup> This is not the slave who suffers and labors. This is the master who names and imposes--who seizes, reinterprets, and projects a new vision. It would seem that Nietzsche rejects the slave and Hegelian history. It would seem that Nietzsche embraces the master and genealogy. And it would seem that the *Übermensch* is connected with the latter, not the former. It would seem so. That is the reading of almost all the commentators. Nevertheless, it is not, finally, Nietzsche's view. Or so I wish to argue in what follows.

## II

Even in the first essay, if we look for them, there are passages that disturb the easy and seemingly obvious assumption that Nietzsche simply approves of the masters and not the slaves or priests. He says that only with the priestly form of existence did 'man first become *an interesting animal*, that only here did the human soul in a higher sense acquire *depth* and become *evil*-- and these are the two basic respects in which man has hitherto been superior to the other beasts!'<sup>25</sup> He says that 'history would be altogether too stupid a thing without the spirit that the impotent have introduced into it ...'<sup>26</sup> It is Nietzsche's view, I think, that the masters really are not very bright, 'When the noble

---

<sup>22</sup> *The Use and Abuse of History* (hereafter *UAH*), A. Collins, trans. (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill 1949), § VIII, pp. 51-2. See also *Beyond Good and Evil* (hereafter *BGE*), W. Kaufmann, trans. (New York: Vintage 1966), § 207, p. 128.

<sup>23</sup> *UAH*, § VI, p. 40.

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>25</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 6, p. 33. Also *The Will to Power* (hereafter *WP*), W. Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale, trans. (New York: Vintage, 1968), § 864, p. 460.

<sup>26</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 7, p. 33.

mode of valuation blunders and sins against reality, it does so in respect to the sphere with which it is *not* sufficiently familiar, against a real knowledge of which it has indeed inflexibly guarded itself: in some circumstances it misunderstands the sphere it despises, that of the common man, of the lower orders ...<sup>27</sup> At any rate, it is quite clear that priests are much more intelligent than the masters, 'A race of such men of *ressentiment* is bound to become eventually *cleverer* than any noble race ...'<sup>28</sup> This is hardly a flattering picture of the masters and it is far from a negative picture of the priests. The masters are quite stupid. They are beasts not just in the sense of *wild and vicious* beasts but in the sense of *ignorant* beasts. With masters alone, without priests, humans would not even have risen above the animals. What can we have been doing when we thought that Nietzsche simply loved the masters and was repelled by the priests? This is just not his view, "'The masters" have been disposed of; the morality of the common man has won. One may conceive of this victory as at the same time a blood-poisoning ... The progress of this poison through the entire body of mankind seems irresistible ... To this end, does the church today still have any *necessary* role to play? ... Which of us would be a free spirit if the church did not exist? It is the church, and not its poison, that repels us.-- Apart from the church, we, too, love the poison.--"<sup>29</sup> Such passages, even if they do not yet convince us, should unsettle us, should make us very uneasy about the normal interpretation of Nietzsche.

In the second essay, Nietzsche continues his genealogy of morals, and the first question he takes up is how an individual with the ability to make promises--how responsibility--originally developed. This raises a problem for Nietzsche because he believes that we all have a natural tendency to forgetfulness. It is absolutely essential to forget if we are to have any peace, and thus be able to act.<sup>30</sup> If we remembered everything, all the infinite detail we are constantly bombarded with, we would be overwhelmed; we would, as he puts it in the *Use and Abuse of History*, lose ourselves in the 'stream of becoming.'<sup>31</sup> Thus, if we are to breed an individual with responsibility, we must breed an ability to overcome forgetfulness and to keep promises. How was this done? For Nietzsche, it required brutal torture and cruel punishment. A memory had to be *burned* into the individual: 'Man could never do without blood, torture, and sacrifices when he felt the need to create a memory for himself; the most dreadful sacrifices and pledges (sacrifices of the first-born among them), the most repulsive mutilations (castration, for example), the cruelest rites of all the religious cults (and all religions are at the deepest level systems of cruelties)--all this has its origin in the instinct that realized that pain is the most powerful aid to mnemonics.'<sup>32</sup>

The important question that we must ask here is *who* this memory had to be burned into? One's immediate impression after reading the first essay and from some of the language at the beginning of the second essay, including the passage just cited, is that

---

<sup>27</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 10, p. 37.

<sup>28</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 10, p. 38.

<sup>29</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 9, p. 36.

<sup>30</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 1, pp. 57-8.

<sup>31</sup> *UAH*, § I, p. 6, see also pp. 5-8.

<sup>32</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 3, p. 61.



memory had to be burned into the slave, certainly not the master. This also seems to be the view of Deleuze and Danto.<sup>33</sup> The notion of being subject to punishment and torture does not fit well with our image of a powerful, independent, and autonomous master. It would seem rather slave-like. But this is because we have been led astray in our understanding of Nietzsche's conception of masters and slaves. It is most certainly Nietzsche's view that memory, responsibility, truthfulness had to be burned into the masters. In describing the sovereign individual, Nietzsche clearly has the masters in mind,

This precisely is the long story of how *responsibility* originated. The task of breeding an animal with the right to make promises ... presupposes ... that one first *makes* men to a certain degree ... uniform ... and consequently calculable ... [T]he labor performed by man upon himself during the greater part of the existence of the human race, his entire prehistoric labor, finds in this its meaning ... If we place ourselves at the end of this tremendous process ... then we discover that the ripest fruit is the *sovereign individual* ... the man who has his own independent, protracted will and the *right to make promises*-- and in him a proud consciousness, quivering in every muscle, of *what* has at length been achieved and become flesh in him, a consciousness of his own power and freedom ... This emancipated individual, with the actual *right* to make promises, this master of a *free* will, this sovereign man--how should he not be aware of his superiority over all those who lack the right to make promises and stand as their own guarantors, of how much trust, how much fear, how much reverence he arouses--he '*deserves*' all three--and of how this mastery over himself also necessarily gives him mastery over circumstances, over nature, and over all more short-willed and unreliable creatures?<sup>34</sup>

The masters of the first essay are clearly examples of sovereign individuals. The masters were the truthful ones, as opposed to 'the *lying* common man'.<sup>35</sup> It is, then, *especially* the masters that must have a memory burned into them--more so than the slaves.

What we must see here is that the second essay does not just continue on historically from the point reached at the end of the first essay. It does not just continue on discussing the historical development of masters and slaves. Rather, the second essay digs deeper genealogically; it goes back in time *before* the issues discussed in the first essay. It goes back before masters existed and tries to explain the origin of masters. And perhaps like all genealogy which *undermines*, the second essay begins to undermine our first impression of the master, the impression that we had at the end of the first essay. At any

---

<sup>33</sup> Deleuze, 114-15. A.C. Danto, 'Some Remarks on *The Genealogy of Morals*, ' in R.C. Solomon and K.H. Higgins, eds., *Reading Nietzsche* (New York: Oxford University Press 1988), 17, 26.

<sup>34</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 2, pp. 58-60.

<sup>35</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 5, p. 29. Also *BGE*, § 260, p. 205.

rate, these masters must have a memory burned into them through a discipline that is very much like that of Hegel's slave.

Moreover, if we begin to look for it, we can find other evidence, even in the first essay, that the society of the masters is one that involves repression, discipline, and coercion,

the same men who are held so sternly in check *inter pares* by custom, respect, usage, gratitude, and even more by mutual suspicion and jealousy, and who on the other hand in their relations with one another show themselves so resourceful in consideration, self-control, delicacy, loyalty, pride, and friendship--once they go outside, where the strange, the *stranger* is found, they are not much better than uncaged beasts of prey. They savor a freedom from all social constraints, they compensate themselves in the wilderness for the tension engendered by protracted confinement and enclosure within the peace of society, they go *back* to the innocent conscience of the beast of prey, as triumphant monsters who perhaps emerge from a disgusting procession of murder, arson, rape, and torture, exhilarated and undisturbed of soul, as if it were no more than a students' prank ...

<sup>36</sup>

We tend to remember the ugly brutality of the last part of this passage rather than the emphasis on constraint, repression, and self-discipline of the first part. A good example of the masters would be the ancient Spartans, vicious to their enemies, but whose life at home was one of barracks-room discipline, a discipline far more rigorous and difficult even than the discipline they imposed upon their slaves. At any rate, the masters, as much as, or more than, the slaves, must develop the ability to keep promises, and for this to occur they must go through a discipline of torture and punishment.

Even further, there is no way to avoid seeing, once we start to look for it, that for Nietzsche this slave-like discipline produces spiritual depth, sublimation, creativity, and indeed that for Nietzsche this is the way that we must ultimately come to understand power. In the first essay, power often seemed to mean the ordinary power of the master--military power, political power. In the second essay that is a very secondary type of power. It is there. A memory is burned into us through punishment and torture. It is even Nietzsche's view that the state closes in on us and makes us direct our cruelty inward against ourselves.<sup>37</sup> But what we must see--the important point here--is that this external repression causes us to develop a power *within* ourselves. It brings about an internalization, a discipline, an *empowering*-- and this is the form of power that Nietzsche is after. This is what power primarily and ultimately means for him. We begin to notice a shift in this direction when he tells us that what is most interesting about civil laws is not that they impose the will, say, of a ruler or master, but that they 'constitute a partial restriction of the will of life' which serves 'as a means of creating *greater* units of power.'

<sup>38</sup> Repression, very much in Hegelian fashion, produces a discipline, an overcoming, the development of greater power. Nietzsche nowhere sounds more like Hegel than in the

---

<sup>36</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 11, p. 40.

<sup>37</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 16, pp. 84-5.

<sup>38</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 11, p. 76.

following passage from *Beyond Good and Evil*: 'The discipline of suffering, of *great* suffering--do you not know that only *this* discipline has created all enhancements of man so far? That tension of the soul in unhappiness which cultivates its strength, its shudders face to face with great ruin, its inventiveness and courage in enduring, persevering, interpreting, and exploiting suffering, and whatever has been granted to it of profundity, secret, mask, spirit, cunning, greatness--was it not granted to it through suffering, through the discipline of great suffering?'<sup>39</sup>

The power Nietzsche is after has little to do with the repression of others. It has much more to do with accepting repression oneself, turning it into a discipline that can produce sublimation and self-overcoming, 'This self-overcoming of justice: one knows the beautiful name it has given itself--*mercy*; it goes without saying that mercy remains the privilege of the most powerful man, or better, his--beyond the law.'<sup>40</sup> Moreover, this sort of power, it becomes clearer and clearer the further we proceed in the *Genealogy of Morals*, has little to do with the master of the first essay. By the time we reach the beginning of the third essay it has become quite evident that the main contenders for the sort of power that Nietzsche is after are the poet, the priest, and the philosopher. Nietzsche even says that 'a Homer would not have created an Achilles nor a Goethe a Faust if Homer had been an Achilles or Goethe a Faust.'<sup>41</sup> It is not Achilles--a perfect example of the master of the first essay--that Nietzsche is after. He is after Homer--*blind, crippled* Homer. Homer's accomplishment is far greater than Achilles'. The best example of the sort of power Nietzsche is after, the best example of the *Übermensch*, I want to argue, is King Vishvamitra,

As men of frightful ages, they did this by using frightful means: cruelty toward themselves, inventive self-castigation--this was the principal means these power-hungry hermits and innovators of ideas required to overcome the gods and tradition in themselves, so as to be able to *believe* in their own innovations. I recall the famous story of King Vishvamitra, who through millennia of self-torture acquired such a feeling of power and self-confidence that he endeavored to build a *new heaven*-- the uncanny symbol of the most ancient and most recent experience of philosophers on earth: whoever has at some time built a 'new heaven' has found the power to do so only in his *own hell*.<sup>42</sup>

Vishvamitra is a poet, a priest, a philosopher who creates a new heaven, that is, a new religion, a new vision, new meaning and values. Why this is so important will have to be discussed at greater length below. At this point, we must notice that King Vishvamitra is not the master of the first essay. He is much more like Hegel's slave who develops internally, who deepens, who becomes more spiritual, who does so through discipline,

---

<sup>39</sup> *BGE*, § 225, p. 154. Also *WP*, § 382, p. 206.

<sup>40</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 10, p. 73.

<sup>41</sup> *GM*, 'Third Essay,' § 4, p. 101.

<sup>42</sup> *GM*, 'Third Essay,' § 10, p. 115. See also *The Gay Science* (hereafter *GS*), W. Kaufmann, trans. (New York: Vintage 1974), § 338, p. 269. Also *WP*, § 1030, p. 532.

torture, suffering, and who goes beyond the master, the old order, by creating something new, a new religion, a new cultural vision.

But actually this is not *quite* accurate. King Vishvamitra is most interesting not because he represents just the slave principle, but because he represents a *linking* of the slave principle with the master principle, and thus of history with genealogy.

Self-discipline, self-torture, going through one's own hell is necessary to build up power. And power is understood as the power to create a new vision. Just as for Hegel, the slave does not confront the master militarily or politically. The slave deepens, sublimates, overcomes by overthrowing the old gods and building a new heaven. The slave undermines old values and creates new ones. All quite slave-like, certainly, but nevertheless we must also see that there is much of the master here also--or rather than the *actual* master of the first essay, we must see that what we have is a *master-principle* that applies more generally (even in our world, even in the future). Vishvamitra imposes a new vision, revalues things radically, names them differently. This *Übermensch* says 'this *is* this and this,' and 'take[s] possession of it.'<sup>43</sup> This imposition, this creation of a new reality, clearly requires a master-like power. To impose a new heaven you must have the power to do so--the power of an *Übermensch*. And at the point where this new vision is expressed there occurs a historical break. The new values imposed will be radically different from the old--conceptually and substantially different. The new meaning created will not evolve out of the old in Hegelian fashion. The *Übermensch* imposes a radically new and different creative vision. It short-circuits historical development. We get a new paradigm. A revaluation of all values. A new *Weltanschauung*. A new force takes possession of things and wrenches their meaning in a new direction.

At the same time, though, the power to set in motion this genealogical break was built up on the Hegelian slave model. It grew out of the slave morality of the Jewish and Christian herd. And so, for Nietzsche, I think we must say that whole stretches of history operate on the Hegelian developmental model of discipline, interiorization, and sublimation. This build-up can even last for centuries before an *Übermensch* comes along with the power to build a new heaven. In fact, it would seem that in large part the whole Jewish and Christian era up to the present, and perhaps also a good part of the tradition back to Socrates and Homer--in other words, most of Hegel's *Philosophy of History*-- can be accepted roughly as it stands, except that, for Nietzsche, it is not headed for the Absolute, but rather empowers a Vishvamitra--or a Nietzsche--who will finally reject it all and create a new worldview. Foucault is wrong, then, when he says that Nietzsche rejects ideal continuity and teleological movement.<sup>44</sup> It is true that history as a whole is not continuous and teleological. *Übermenschen* introduce breaks into it. But long segments are continuous and teleological. And they are necessary to lead up to, and make possible, the *Übermenschen* who introduce these breaks.

If we now glance back at the first essay, I think we can begin to see how far we have come from the normal interpretation of the *Genealogy of Morals*. If we look back at the slaves, the herd, the Jews of the first essay, one of the questions we want to ask is how they differ from Vishvamitra--how they differ from the *Übermensch*? And don't we have

---

<sup>43</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 2, p. 26.

<sup>44</sup> Foucault, 'Nietzsche, Genealogy, History,' 154.

to admit that there is a great deal of resemblance between the Jews and Vishvamitra? Don't we have to admit that it is most difficult to find any difference? Don't they both overthrow the old gods and build a new heaven? Don't they both revalue all values? 'It was the Jews who ... dared to invert the aristocratic value-equation (good = noble = powerful = beautiful = happy = beloved of God) ... saying "the wretched alone are the good; the poor, impotent, lowly alone are the good; the suffering, deprived, sick, ugly alone are pious, alone are blessed by God, blessedness is for them alone--and you, the powerful and noble, are on the contrary the evil ... " In connection with the tremendous and immeasurably fateful initiative provided by the Jews ... there begins the *slave revolt in morality*: that revolt which ... we no longer see because it--has been victorious.'<sup>45</sup>

How does this differ from Vishvamitra? I think we must just admit that both slaves and *Übermenschen* undergo discipline and torture, which deepens them, makes them more spiritual, which allows them to overthrow old values, and which allows them to create a new heaven. One might object that the slaves are reactive, and that this is an important difference. But it seems to me that Vishvamitra reacts also. He reacts against the old gods and tradition--it takes him a millennia of self-torture in his own hell to build up the power to overthrow this old order.<sup>46</sup> It is not easy to find a meaningful difference here.

What defines the *Übermensch* for Nietzsche, the test of the *Übermensch*, is the ability to embrace eternal recurrence and *amor fati*. I have discussed these notions in detail elsewhere.<sup>47</sup> Here let me just say that Nietzsche's notion of eternal recurrence implies that we will have to live through our life over and over again an infinite number of times, 'and there will be nothing new in it, but every pain and every joy and every thought and sigh and everything unutterably small or great in your life will have to return to you, all in the same succession and sequence ...'<sup>48</sup> Most people, Nietzsche thinks, would be crushed by such a notion. It would sap any life of every shred of meaning, value, or interest to have to repeat it over and over again. But that is not the view of the *Übermensch*. *Übermenschen* love their lives, every single detail of them. They would change nothing.<sup>49</sup> Whether eternal recurrence and *amor fati* are to be understood as doctrinal truths or rather as myths, illusions, lies,<sup>50</sup> is not very important. The important thing is that the ability to accept eternal recurrence and *amor fati* implies an absolute

---

<sup>45</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 7, p. 34.

<sup>46</sup> Deleuze seems to suggest that a reactive force can only become active as a kind of baseness, meanness, stupidity; see Deleuze, 66. This hardly fits Vishvamitra.

<sup>47</sup> 'Nietzsche, Skepticism, and Eternal Recurrence,' in *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 13 (1983) 365-87.

<sup>48</sup> *GS*, § 341, p. 273.

<sup>49</sup> *Ecce Homo* (hereafter *EH*), in *On the Genealogy of Morals and Ecce Homo*, 'Why I Am So Clever,' § 10, p. 258. *WP*, § 1041, p. 536. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* (hereafter *Z*), W. Kaufmann, trans. (New York: Viking 1966), Second Part, 'On Redemption,' 139-41.

<sup>50</sup> For further discussion as to whether eternal recurrence and *amor fati* are to be taken as truths or as illusions, see my 'Nietzsche, Skepticism, and Eternal Recurrence,' 365-87. Also, *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 24, p. 95.

affirmation of life, of life as it is, of one's own life as an intrinsic and ultimate value. The *Übermensch* finds meaning in life which is not given to it from outside, from some higher purpose or end which life must serve and be subordinate to. To accept eternal recurrence and to love one's fate, to love one's own life, implies enormous power and an enormous self-confidence in that power. It implies an ability, I suggest, to give your own life whatever meaning it is to have, to create for yourself your own meaning, and to find that acceptable, enough, the highest fulfillment. I think that the ability of the *Übermensch* to accept eternal recurrence and *amor fati* is tied to the ability of the *Übermensch* to create a new heaven.

We must notice that *before* he creates his new heaven Vishvamitra could not embrace *amor fati*. At that point, he would not want all things the same, unchanged down to every little detail. That would rule out the great creative act he has been disciplining himself for millennia to accomplish. Only after he creates a new heaven, or at least after he knows he will be able to do so, could he be willing to embrace *amor fati*. It is also true that embracing *amor fati*, loving every detail of your life, would rule out *ressentiment*. One cannot affirm every moment of one's life and still feel *ressentiment*. But overthrowing the old gods and tradition would seem to require *ressentiment*, or at least reaction, or at least desire for radical change. It is only after this great creative act that one can overcome the need for change, reaction, or *ressentiment* and embrace *amor fati*. So also, before this creative act, Nietzsche could not embrace the master model of history. Before your creation, you still want to overcome, overthrow, change. You want the slave model of history. You want discipline, interiorization, sublimation. You want to build up the power to overcome the old gods and create your new vision. Then, and only then, could you embrace the master model of history.

Both the *Übermensch* and the slave undergo millennia of self-torture. The difference between them is that the *Übermensch* uses this to build up the power to create a *new* heaven, whereas Jewish and Christian slaves, who created their heaven a long time ago, do not want a *new* heaven and so undergo their self-torture, accept it, and remain under it. Moreover, for the priest or the slave, while suffering is necessary, salvation will mean the *end* of suffering. The priest or the slave, at least the Christian priest or slave, might not wish to change anything in their life--*because* it culminates in salvation. But to have to go through that life over again, let alone over again an infinite number of times, would be horrifying. For Nietzsche's *Übermensch*, the new heaven is not an escape from the suffering of this world. You just see the same world differently. You interpret it differently. You create a new meaning so that you accept the world fully. You love it. It is heaven. After all we must remember that Nietzsche, the man who dreamed up eternal recurrence and *amor fati*, himself led a life of intense misery and suffering--daily nausea and incapacitating migraine headaches. *Amor fati* embraces this, would have it no other way, loves every detail. Nietzsche was a slave to his illness. He could do nothing about it. Except that he was able to break its psychological stranglehold. He was able to turn an "it was" into a "thus I willed it."<sup>51</sup> He could not eliminate his illness, but he could eliminate its power over him by embracing it, willing it, deciding he wanted it no other

---

<sup>51</sup> *EH*, 'Thus Spoke Zarathustra,' § 8, pp. 308-9. *Z*, Third Part, 'On Old and New Tablets,' § 3, p. 198.

way. He could turn it into a discipline, so that he could sublimate, so that he could create new meaning. That is the difference between a slave and an *Übermensch*. At the same time here, we see the deep *link* between the slave and the *Übermensch*-- the way the latter develops out of the former.

### III

To understand the *Genealogy of Morals* further, we must discuss the origin of guilt, the development of the ascetic ideal, and Nietzsche's all important notion of punishment. Punishment alone, Nietzsche thinks, will not produce guilt. In fact, punishment tends to harden the criminal and actually hinder the development of guilt.<sup>52</sup> In Nietzsche's view, guilt arises as society develops, becomes peaceful, closes in, engages the individual, and prevents the outward discharge of instincts: 'All instincts that do not discharge themselves outwardly *turn inward*-- this is what I call the *internalization* of man: thus it was that man first developed what was later called his "soul".... Hostility, cruelty, joy in persecuting, in attacking, in change, in destruction--all this turned against the possessors of such instincts ...'<sup>53</sup> And once guilt, or bad conscience, develops, priests are quick to pick up on it, interpret it as punishment for sin, develop it, and push it further as an ascetic ideal,<sup>54</sup> 'the creature imprisoned in the "state" so as to be tamed, who invented the bad conscience in order to hurt himself after the *more natural* vent for this desire to hurt had been blocked--this man of the bad conscience has seized upon the presupposition of religion so as to drive his self-torture to its most gruesome pitch of severity and rigor. Guilt before *God*: this thought becomes an instrument of torture to him.'<sup>55</sup>

The state first arises, Nietzsche holds, as beasts of prey conquer a weaker population. These masters 'do not know what guilt, responsibility, or consideration are, these born organizers ... It is not in *them* that the "bad conscience" developed, that goes without saying--but it would not have developed *without them* ...'<sup>56</sup> Again, we have a Hegelian master-slave model. Much as for Hegel, the repression instituted by the masters forces the slaves to internalize, to deepen, and to develop guilt. And for Nietzsche, "'bad conscience"--you will have guessed it--as the womb of all ideal and imaginative phenomena, also brought to light an abundance of strange new beauty and affirmation, and perhaps beauty itself.'<sup>57</sup> It is out of this guilt and the ascetic ideal that develops from it that a Vishvamitra, an *Übermensch*, will gain the creative power to overcome, to sublimate, and to create a new heaven. The intensification of guilt in the Christian ascetic ideal is a form of self-discipline and self-torture that takes an especially internalized, spiritualized form and thus especially contributes to imagination and creativity. It is also, in Nietzsche's view, the cruelest and most intense form of self-torture and thus may either be totally crippling or the greatest test, the greatest obstacle to be overcome, and thus capable of generating the greatest power--the power of an *Übermensch*.

---

<sup>52</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 14, pp. 81-2.

<sup>53</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 16, pp. 84-5.

<sup>54</sup> *GM*, 'Third Essay,' § 20, p. 140.

<sup>55</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 22, p. 92.

<sup>56</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 17, p. 87.

<sup>57</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 18, pp. 87-8.

It is difficult to decide what Nietzsche means when he says that the masters produce guilt and responsibility in those they conquer but that they themselves do not know what guilt and responsibility are. It may be that since Nietzsche is discussing an extremely early period--the very origin of the state--the masters simply have not yet developed guilt or responsibility. The second essay, after all, is trying to explain how anyone *first* develops these qualities. Perhaps the masters will develop their feelings of guilt at a somewhat later period. We have already seen that the masters do develop responsibility. They, especially, are the truthful ones, as opposed to the '*lying* common man.'<sup>58</sup> Perhaps it is the case that masters only become responsible, but never develop guilt. Or perhaps they do develop guilt, but not as intensely as priests or slaves. If they never do develop guilt, or to the extent that they do not, then I think we must say that the *Übermensch* and the master simply would have no connection with one another--the *Übermensch* would not develop out of the master at all. This is so because it is Nietzsche's view, I think, that the *Übermensch* is not likely to be able to create a new heaven without passing through the intense, creative discipline of guilt and the ascetic ideal. Thus if one tries to keep the master and the slave neatly separate, as the normal interpretation would have it, by claiming that the master does not feel guilt, then the master would not give rise to the *Übermensch*. The master would repress the slave and get the process of internalization started, but, just as for Hegel, all important development would take place on the side of the slave and the master would simply be a dead end. If one instead decides to admit that the master does develop guilt and does undergo the ascetic ideal, then one must also admit that there is a definite slave-like side to the master, a side that we find to be deeper and more significant the more we continue to probe these issues. Whichever way we look at it, we must admit that the Hegelian slave model figures very centrally in the realization of the *Übermensch*.

We must now attend much more carefully to punishment. Punishment is very much a key to Nietzsche's thought. It is punishment which burns a memory into individuals and makes them responsible, and it is punishment within the closed state which forces the internalization that becomes guilt and the ascetic ideal. Punishment is most central. And on Nietzsche's theory there must be a great deal of punishment taking place--it would seem to play a central role in the development of *all* morality. It is Nietzsche's view that in early history people take a great joy in inflicting punishment on others. This is more than just a convenient assumption on his part to explain the likelihood of sufficient punishment. It gets us to the strangest and most interesting dimension of Nietzsche's thought: 'Today, when suffering is always brought forward as the principal argument *against* existence, as the worst question mark, one does well to recall the ages in which the opposite opinion prevailed because men were unwilling to refrain from *making* suffer and saw in it an enchantment of the first order, a genuine seduction *to* life.'<sup>59</sup> The question we must ask is why the infliction of suffering was so enjoyable--such a seduction to life?

I think Nietzsche's answer is that we live in a terrible and alien cosmos, a cosmos that does not care about human beings, where all we can expect is to suffer. In the *Birth of*

---

<sup>58</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 5, p. 29.

<sup>59</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 7, p. 67.



*Tragedy*, Nietzsche recounts the wisdom of Silenus, who when chased down by King Midas and asked what is best for human beings, answered, 'What is best of all is utterly beyond your reach: not to be born, not to *be*, to be *nothing*. But the second best for you is--to die soon.'<sup>60</sup> Why? Because the possibility of happiness is the sheerest of illusions. Because human beings live in a miserable world where they are going to suffer. There is no way to avoid this. But, still, this is not *precisely* the problem. Human beings can live with suffering. What they cannot live with is meaningless suffering--suffering for no reason at all. Their problem is a problem of *meaning*.<sup>61</sup> We live in an empty and meaningless cosmos, and we cannot face that. We cannot look into reality without being overcome. We need lies; we must veil the horror of existence.<sup>62</sup> We must invent meaning. We must give suffering a meaning. So what do we do? The Greeks invented gods for whom wars and other forms of suffering were festival plays for their enjoyment. Christians invent a God for whom suffering is punishment for sin.<sup>63</sup>

Apart from the ascetic ideal, man, the human *animal*, had no meaning so far...*This* is precisely what the ascetic ideal means: that something was *lacking*, that man was surrounded by a fearful *void*-- he did not know how to justify, to account for, to affirm himself; he *suffered* from the problem of his meaning. He also suffered otherwise ... but his problem was *not* suffering itself, but that there was no answer to the crying question, '*why* do I suffer?'

Man, the bravest of animals and the one most accustomed to suffering, does *not* repudiate suffering as such; he *desires* it, he even seeks it out, provided he is shown a *meaning* for it, a *purpose* of suffering. The meaninglessness of suffering, *not* suffering itself, was the curse that lay over mankind so far--*and the ascetic ideal offered man meaning!*<sup>64</sup> It was the only meaning offered so far; any meaning is better than none at all ...

And so also, I suggest, when individuals punish others, suffering is no longer meaningless--it participates in the larger myth that has been created. It is given meaning. That is why people of past ages found it so enjoyable<sup>65</sup> to inflict suffering, not just because they were sadists, as Danto would seem to think,<sup>65</sup> but because in inflicting suffering on someone else you unconsciously participate in the maintenance of a myth. You keep meaningless suffering, the terror of existence, at bay. Unconsciously you give meaningless suffering a meaning. It is true that thereby suffering in the world is

---

<sup>60</sup> *Birth of Tragedy* (hereafter *BT*), W. Kaufmann, trans. (New York: Vintage 1967), § 3, p. 42.

<sup>61</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 7, p. 68.

<sup>62</sup> *BGE*, §4, pp. 11-12; § 39, p. 49. *BT*, § 3, p. 42; § 7, p. 60. *WP*, § 493, p. 272; § 853 (I), p. 451. 'On Truth and Falsity in Their Ultramoral Sense,' in *Complete Works of Friedrich Nietzsche, Volume Two: Early Greek Philosophy*, O. Levy, ed. (New York: Russell & Russell 1964), 184.

<sup>63</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 7, pp. 68-9.

<sup>64</sup> *GM*, 'Third Essay,' § 28, p. 162.

<sup>65</sup> Danto, *Nietzsche as Philosopher*, 176-7.

increased somewhat, but that, Nietzsche seems to be suggesting, is worth it as the price of removing meaningless suffering through participatory rituals in which you administer suffering yourself so as to invest it with the meaning it must have for you.

What we must begin to see here is that the question of power, for Nietzsche, is connected with the problem of meaning. The only kind of power Nietzsche is after, the sort of power the *Übermensch* must have, is the power to create meaning--a new heaven, a new vision, new cultural values. We live in an empty, meaningless void and need the power to invent meaning in order to be able to live. Nietzsche seeks someone, as he puts it, who will redeem us from nihilism<sup>66</sup> --from meaninglessness. This sort of power has nothing at all to do with the master of the first essay who was a military or political figure. We need a Homer, not an Achilles. We need an artist, a philosopher, or a priest. We need a Vishvamitra. And the sort of self-discipline this individual must go through, we are coming to see more and more clearly, is spiritual interiorization, sublimation, an ascetic self-denial that results in the imaginative expression of a new vision, the invention of a new meaning to mask the void. The ascetic ideal, Nietzsche thinks, is the precondition for this higher spirituality:<sup>67</sup> 'This secret self-ravishment, this artists' cruelty, this delight in imposing a form upon oneself as a hard, recalcitrant, suffering material and in burning a will, a critique, a contradiction, a contempt, a No into it, this uncanny, dreadfully joyous labor of a soul voluntarily at odds with itself that makes itself suffer out of joy in making suffer--eventually this entire *active* "bad conscience"--you will have guessed it--as the womb of all ideal and imaginative phenomena, also brought to light an abundance of strange new beauty and affirmation, and perhaps beauty itself ...'<sup>68</sup>

The ascetic ideal, then, does three things, two of which we have already discussed at length. First, the ascetic ideal creates meaning in our world, which otherwise would be a meaningless void. It thus banishes senseless, meaningless suffering. It interprets suffering as punishment by God for sin. Secondly, the ascetic ideal disciplines those who live under it, builds power in them, which may make it possible for a Vishvamitra to create a new heaven. This is the Hegelian slave model of discipline, interiorization, spiritualization, and sublimation which can make possible the master model of imposing new meaning. So far, the ascetic ideal, far from being a denial of life, as it may seem to some, is a powerful affirmation of life.<sup>69</sup>

Thirdly, and this is something we have not discussed at all yet, the ascetic ideal, because it contains and has always contained a powerful will to truth, begins, in the modern era, to destroy the meaning and the power it has created over the millennia; it begins to rip aside the veil and to plunge us into the void--into nihilism. The ascetic ideal, Nietzsche thinks, has a rigid and unconditional faith 'in a *metaphysical* value, the absolute value of *truth* ...'<sup>70</sup> The ascetic ideal denies itself, certainly denies itself all falsehood, illusion, lies. Moreover, in Nietzsche's view, science is the latest and noblest

---

<sup>66</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 24, p. 96.

<sup>67</sup> *GM*, 'Third Essay,' § 1, p. 97; § 7, pp. 107-8; § 8, p. 111.

<sup>68</sup> *GM*, 'Second Essay,' § 18, pp. 87-8.

<sup>69</sup> *GM*, 'Third Essay,' § 11, p. 117; § 13, p. 120.

<sup>70</sup> *GM*, 'Third Essay,' § 24, p. 151.

form of the ascetic ideal,<sup>71</sup> and certainly modern science has a powerful will to truth. This drive to get at the truth is a problem. It is a problem because reality is terrible. Truth is horrible. We live in an empty and meaningless cosmos where we can only expect to suffer. We cannot live without myths and illusions. We have always needed an *Übermensch*, someone powerful enough to impose these myths. And now the will to truth characteristic of the ascetic ideal is ripping aside the veil, leading us to the last thing we want--true reality. We are about to fall into the abyss--plunge into nihilism. We will perish if that occurs. We need a Vishvamitra, an *Übermensch*, to create a new heaven. Even the *Übermensch* needs such illusion. No more than anyone else can the *Übermensch* live in the void.

Thus, the ascetic ideal, for a couple of millennia, has given us meaning in a meaningless cosmos. It is now undermining that meaning through its will to truth. But it also disciplines us, builds power in us, that may make it possible to create a new heaven.

#### IV

At this point, it has to be clear to us that masters and slaves are not two neat and separate classes. The master of the first essay is not someone Nietzsche does anything so simple as just identify with. He plays with the concept of the master--experiments with it. He uses it to dislodge and reveal. He uses it to undermine the morality of the present. He shows us the genealogy of this morality--which embarrassingly leads us back to the opposite of what presently exists. When Nietzsche succeeds in relaxing our grip on the morality of the present, the master is tossed aside, and the *master-principle* begins to shift, evolve, and become much more subtle:

*master morality* and *slave morality*-- I add immediately that in all the higher and more mixed cultures there also appear attempts at mediation between these two moralities, and yet more often the interpenetration and mutual misunderstanding of both, and at times they occur directly alongside each other--even in the same human being, within a *single* soul.<sup>72</sup>

consider how regularly and universally the ascetic priest appears in almost every age; he belongs to no one race; he prospers everywhere; he emerges from every class of society....--it must indeed be in the *interest of life itself* that such a self-contradictory type does not die out.<sup>73</sup>

Here we have different tendencies, different attitudes within the same person--not different classes of people. Furthermore, back in the first essay, if we now read even more carefully than before, Nietzsche makes it quite clear that priests--while they are the opposite of the masters and are aligned with the slaves--nevertheless, are themselves aristocrats, nobles, masters.<sup>74</sup> And Nietzsche speaks of 'how easily the priestly mode of

---

<sup>71</sup> *GM*, 'Third Essay,' § 23, p. 147; § 27, p. 160.

<sup>72</sup> *BGE*, § 260, p. 204.

<sup>73</sup> *GM*, 'Third Essay,' § 11, p. 117.

<sup>74</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 6, pp. 31-2.

valuation can branch off from the knightly-aristocratic and then develop into its opposite; this is particularly likely when the priestly caste and the warrior caste are in jealous opposition ...<sup>75</sup> Priests and masters are two parts of the same class. Priests are masters. Even Zarathustra tells us that his blood is related to that of priests 'and I want to know that my blood is honored even in theirs.'<sup>76</sup>

If we admit that the priest is a type of master, then the next step is to notice that for Nietzsche the 'Jews ... were the priestly nation ... *par excellence* ...'<sup>77</sup> It follows, then, that Jews are a type of master. And there is good reason to think that Nietzsche accepts this view. In the Jews, he says, 'there dwelt an unequalled popular-moral genius: one only has to compare similarly gifted nations--the Chinese or the Germans, for instance--with the Jews, to sense which is of the first and which of the fifth rank.'<sup>78</sup> Clearly the Germans are of the fifth, and the Jews of the first, rank. In *Beyond Good and Evil*, Nietzsche says: 'The Jews, however, are beyond any doubt the strongest, toughest, and purest race now living in Europe; they know how to prevail even under the worst conditions (even better than under favorable conditions) ... That the Jews, if they wanted it--or if they were forced into it, which seems to be what the anti-Semites want--*could* even now have preponderance, indeed quite literally mastery over Europe, that is certain; that they are *not* working and planning for that is equally certain.'<sup>79</sup> What we must

---

<sup>75</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 7, p. 33. This, it seems to me, sets up a dialectic that is quite Hegelian--a possibility vigorously rejected by Deleuze, 8-10.

<sup>76</sup> *Z*, Second Part, 'On Priests,' p. 91.

<sup>77</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 16, p. 53; also § 7, p. 33.

<sup>78</sup> *GM*, 'First Essay,' § 16, p. 53.

<sup>79</sup> *BGE*, § 251, p. 187-8. I think Kaufmann is correct in arguing that Nietzsche is not anti-Semitic (Kaufmann, *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist*, Chapter 10). At least, Nietzsche is not anti-Semitic in the ordinary sense--he does not hate Jews, think them inferior, etc. But Nietzsche is often guilty of what might be called positive racism. He is all too willing to generalize about races or nations, to assign them a character, a unified identity, perhaps even an essence. In doing so, he often points to what he takes to be the strengths of a people. But to ignore variation between individuals, to rank a people against other peoples, to lump them together and to generalize in this way, only differs from ordinary racism in that it approves of this people rather than disapproves and demeans.

Schutte has suggested that Nietzsche scholars tend to cover up for Nietzsche--they tend to avoid criticizing many of his values. She argues that we ought to be much more critical of him. I agree with this. I think many of Nietzsche's views, especially those centering around his elitism, are morally atrocious. But I think our criticism must be carefully timed. We must restrain our criticism until we understand Nietzsche. Schutte goes on to say that 'Nietzsche repeatedly justified slavery and the exploitation of the disadvantaged for the sake of the development of a "higher culture ..."' (Schutte, 162). This, I have tried to argue in this paper, is to misunderstand and to oversimplify the relation of master to slave as Nietzsche understands it. The *Übermensch* is as much a slave as a master and the role of the slave in producing a higher culture is much more subtle and complex than Schutte's complaint suggests.

finally accept is that 'master' and 'slave' refer to qualities, characteristics, tendencies that can be found in any society, class, or person.

So instead of asking whether Nietzsche endorses or approves of the master or the slave, we should ask which model of history Nietzsche uses, that of the Hegelian slave or that of the master and genealogy? Which will explain the possibility of the *Übermensch*? Which will explain the possibility of Europe's move to and beyond nihilism? As I have tried to argue in this paper, it is definitely not simply the master model that can be used to do these things. It requires a complex mix of *both* models.

