

PHILOSOPHER AND HIS TASK FROM NIETZSCHE'S PERSPECTIVE

Dr. Khalid Jamil Rawat
Iqra University, Karachi ,
PAKISTAN.
khalidastro@hotmail.com ,

Dr. Wasim Qazi
Iqra University, Karachi ,
PAKISTAN.
whqazi@hotmail.com,

Dr. Shams Hamid
Iqra University, Karachi
PAKISTAN.
shamshamid@hotmail.com,

ABSTRACT

Philosophy was once considered as an authority that could guide and command people in various spheres of life. However, by the end of the nineteenth century, philosophy no longer enjoyed the place of an authority and science replaced it as the new authority. Nietzsche has criticized this change and asserted that philosophy as the study of whole being, should be restored to its proper place. Nietzsche expressed his ideas about the role of a philosopher in guiding a civilization, a century ago. His ideas about the role of a philosopher, who a philosopher is, what kind of difficulties lie between him and his tasks and what eventually is the task of a philosopher are very much needed in the 21st century and bear a universal meaning. This article reviews Nietzsche's ideas on philosophy and philosopher in general.

Keywords: *philosophy, Nietzsche's ideas,*

INTRODUCTION

If, after reading the first chapter in Gadamer's Truth and Method, titled, Transcending the Aesthetic Dimensions, one looks at Nietzsche's description of who a philosopher is, or who the expert of *Geisteswissenschaften* is , one would be puzzled to find that Nietzsche has rested the authority of philosophy in the person and not in the method. This actually amounts to saving some place for philosophy as a metaphysical pursuit in modern day's scientific world; a world that no longer finds a priori synthetic judgments meaningful.

Gadamer, on the other hand has suggested that the authority of human sciences, in the course of history has shifted from the personal to the methodical, though he himself advocates that historical texts allow a person to encounter a truth regardless of the method with which this truth is arrived at. Viewing this way, even Apocalypses appear to present a truth that does not require verification in the modern sense; the truth presented here is to be appreciated regardless of the method followed in arriving at the knowledge presented in the text.

However, Nietzsche's approach can be contrasted with that of Husserl, who advocates that the authority of philosophy in modern times relies on its method alone. Nietzsche on the other hand considers philosophy as a personal achievement regardless of its ability to be tested or verified according to the modern standards of authentic knowledge. He wants to restore the notion of authority in philosophy. Not only that he claims that philosophical knowledge is a personal achievement, but he also severely criticizes positivism that provided a scientific model for the methodology in human sciences in the 19th century. In order to know his position on the meaning of philosophical knowledge and the aims of this knowledge, for Nietzsche does not regard knowledge as an end in itself, let us see how he views philosophy.

Nietzsche in his Beyond Good and Evil, in the section We Scholars, expressed his views on philosophy and its plight in his times, the dangers it was facing then, the commonplace misconceptions about it and the qualities that differentiate a philosopher from scientific and philosophical workers; two terms that were coined to differentiate a genuine philosopher from both scientists and those

thinkers who construct an understanding of the past and extant value systems, and produce a critique of ideas. The later are called philosophical workers and included among them are people like Hegel and Kant, and this shows the stature that Nietzsche assumes for a true philosopher.

This distinction between a genuine philosopher and philosophical workers is not similar to the distinction made by Aristotle in his *Metaphysics*, between dialecticians and sophists on the one hand and true philosophers on the other. For the distinction made by Aristotle in a sense excludes both dialecticians and sophists from the realm of true philosophy. On the other hand, the distinction made by Nietzsche, does not in any sense exclude philosophical workers from the realm of philosophy. In Nietzsche's view these philosophical workers are among the necessary and essential preconditions for the possibility of having a genuine philosophy. Their task is to facilitate the philosopher in his pursuit.

For instance the task Hegel performed was to present the whole past of humanity in a small space, reducing what was detailed and concrete in history to ideas, so that those who want to know about the past, can know it without going through the whole details.

Hegel, as a philosophical worker, conceptualized and reduced the large volumes of history to ideas, and made history accessible in its totality to a philosopher. Without such an effort it would no longer be possible for anyone to understand the entire human history as a system of ideas. Kant as a critic checked or tested whether or not the claims of a theory or claims of speculative philosophy in general are practically possible. Nietzsche says that a true philosopher also has to learn to employ the practical criticism on the data he receives from other branches of knowledge. This critical examination of data should be done through practicing ideas, hence testing, in what sense a theory is meaningful, and what actually are the practical bearings and limitations of a thought or idea.

This practical approach, for instance, is emphasized by Nietzsche in the learning of dialectics. Dialectics according to Nietzsche is not something to be learned from books and others' experiences. Dialectics is something that one experiences when the leading beliefs of a person, due to his life experiences, are overthrown, thus leaving a person in a void for some time. Plato², in the *Republic* also pointed out the practical implications of dialectics. When a young person is exposed to dialectical reasoning, that person, owing to the fact that dialectics overthrows and changes the extant notions about life, at least for some part of his life is left with no idea of the right way. Dialectics is not only an academic discipline; it is also an experience of life. For both Plato and Nietzsche, dialectics means life experiences that result in changing one's notions about life.

Nietzsche has given a very high stature to the philosopher because of the task he has to undertake and the test he has to undergo. The basic aim that a philosopher has to pursue is that of the creation of values. A philosopher is the one who creates new values. A philosopher has to estimate the value of whole being, he has to know being in its totality. This aim of philosophy is not something new; Aristotle in his *Metaphysics* suggested that the aim of philosophy is to know the whole being as being. Philosophy has to know the principles and causes of being as being. Different sciences study slices of being, but philosophy has the task of knowing being in its totality and has to focus being as being. This means that a philosopher has to know what causes the reality to exist.

Nietzsche has also suggested this similar aim for philosophy. Heidegger regarded Nietzsche as the philosopher of being. Accordingly his interest in philosophy as a philosopher of being also takes into account the value estimation; it is through the creation of new values that a philosopher changes and transforms the meaning of human life.

A philosopher, says Nietzsche, has to command the civilization on the issue of right and wrong, and for this reason he has to assess and reassess the value of everything. This can only be done through knowing being in its totality; for instance being as a manifestation of human will to power, taking eternal recurrence as its principle. These metaphysical principle and cause, equivalent to Aristotle's

² Plato, *The Republic*: tr. by: Desmond Lee, Penguin Classics, Second Edition pg-283

cause and principle behind the reality, allow the philosopher to assess the value of everything. A philosopher can give judgments about each and every slice and aspect of being.

The knowledge of this principle that works behind the reality allows a philosopher to estimate, create and share the value of each and everything. However, the knowledge of this principle does not come from pursuing any method; it is a knowledge that requires a lot for its achievement. Some of these steps towards this ultimate kind of philosophical knowledge, a knowledge that bestows the authority to command upon a philosopher, are pointed out by Nietzsche. A philosopher is not at all like a scientist, the authority of whose knowledge resides in following a certain method, a method both valid and reliable in the modern sense of the word. On the other hand philosophy requires experiences, a proper background, a dangerous strife that requires courage to endure and a great deal of knowledge and practical criticism of ideas.

A philosopher with all his effort tries to change the value system of his times. Since change is always resisted, therefore, a philosopher also has to face and overcome resistance in his work. In his Zarathustra Nietzsche presented a distinction between a good man and a creative man. A good man is the one who maintains existing values and a creative man is the one who creates new values. A creative man always stands in opposition to the good ones, because he establishes new values. A philosopher is the one who has to respond towards the question concerning life and the worth of life. So a philosopher has to accept and negate things. A philosopher has to command things and his will to knowledge is his will to transform; in Nietzsche's words a philosopher's will to knowledge is his will to power.

A good man abides by the convention; he never challenges the established meanings and values and strives to preserve extant notions of life. A good man, also termed as a just man by Nietzsche in his Zarathustra, thinks and believes that the debate over values and standards of good and bad is over, furthermore, he also believes that meanings of things and their designations are also established and cannot be changed. These good man for Nietzsche, are like Pharisees, who challenged the truth of Christ. A creative man on the other hand strives to change ideals and values under which people live their life.

This attempt to change the notions of life actually is a dialectical concern, so dialectics plays a vital role in this transformation. However the role of dialectics finishes when someone overthrows the old ideas, after this a 'Yes saying' an affirmation, in the words of Nietzsche, is also required. Negation alone is not enough; after negation an acceptance is also required, and this acceptance results from the creative will of a philosopher.

In his Zarathustra, in the section , 'On Three Metamorphosis of Spirit', Nietzsche has metaphorically described a three step dialectics of soul. The first step is to accept each and every extant value and meaning, and burdened with this heaviest of burdens, says Nietzsche, the spirit becomes like a camel; a beast of burden.

The second stage starts when the camel becomes a lion and negates all previous values and meanings, however, the vigor of lion is helpful in destruction alone and is not able to create or accept new values and meaning. This task is accomplished when the spirit becomes a child; a child for Nietzsche is a symbol of creative will and acceptance. A philosopher has to undergo all these stages of spirit; he has to put his feet in each and every shoe; he has to overthrow all of the extant values and meanings; he also has to create new values and meanings.

Thus striving towards his magnanimous goal, a philosopher always finds himself in a position contradictory to his age; he has to challenge the most popular ideals of his age. This line of thought adopted by Nietzsche also clarifies his objections on the European democracy of his times. Nietzsche has not criticized democracy in its essence. It is an accidental attribute of nineteenth century European democracy that Nietzsche has criticized. His criticism on democracy is thus applied only indirectly to democracy.

The attribute that he has criticized is the accidental popularization of anti philosophical ideals of nineteenth century. Democracy popularizes each and every idea that people have; it brings up what is common and it is only in the later part of the history of a democratic nation that people understand and consequently differentiate the right ideas from the wrong ones. Thus philosophy and human sciences were wrongly underestimated and that lies behind what Nietzsche and Husserl identified as the sickness of Europe.

For Nietzsche the cause for the sickness lies in skepticism. Skepticism becomes an answer to the questions about the spiritual dimensions of humanity, leaving no room for the proper understanding of humanity. Skepticism is fatal for any positive advancement in any direction. Husserl has also identified skepticism resulted from the failure of Hegelian system and Renaissance methodology as the major cause behind the Crisis of European Man. Democracy, according to Nietzsche popularized skepticism, and left no room for the philosophical authority that gives clear judgments and claims knowledge.

Democracy, according to Nietzsche in its emphasis upon the equality of rights can easily be converted into an equality of wrongs. An equality of wrongs here means distaste for anything that is rare, higher in nature, strange and great. Democracy can beget an antagonism for greatness, which in return can harm the cause of humanity; on the other hand, the goal of humanity is to create something superior to itself. Moreover, since the true philosopher is a person who is distinguished from others on the basis of his ideas and values, therefore his very existence is endangered due to the distaste for strange and great.

In one of his aphorisms in Beyond Good and Evil, Nietzsche has described a nation as a detour to a few great persons; a nation actually has a goal, and that goal is the creation of a visionary, a philosopher, a redeemer, a teacher who can guide and command.

Nietzsche, in his Beyond Good and Evil has described the constitution of a nation in a very interesting manner. A nation, for Nietzsche has a great cohesive force in the form of its language. Language comprises signs, and these signs refer to concepts; concepts that are formed from the experiences of the world. Thus, a people who speak the same language are a nation provided that the words and expressions they use refer to the same concepts and experiences. This simply means that a nation is a nation for its members share the similar kind of experiences, and when a word is uttered, they all understand the same thing from the utterance.

In the case of democracy, says Nietzsche, there is a danger that a different experience will never be cherished, for only those experiences are considered valuable that have a public demand, public, on the other hand, for Nietzsche, scarcely approves of anything strange. That is the reason why, Nietzsche wants to bring a certain kind of change in the democratic character of a nation, and teaches the acceptance of weirdness and strangeness to the people.

More than that Nietzsche's criticism on democracy is also motivated from his belief that a philosopher has to oppose the dominant ideas of his time; this however is not merely an ungrounded belief on Nietzsche's part, and he has a reason for this as well. For him, had he born in another age, say during the fifteenth century, he would have supported democracy, for it was the most marginalized idea of that age. One more example that can be cited here is of Platonic critique on sense knowledge. Nietzsche says that this critique of sense perception may have been motivated by the fact that Greeks had very strong senses.

For Nietzsche, during his times it was possible that a person different from others can easily be marginalized because people lack taste for greatness. One can bring Kierkegaard's definition of individuality as subjectivity to support Nietzsche's apprehension about the commonplace attitude.

One can easily see that Nietzsche has always reserved a different way of viewing things for true philosophers; these true philosophers are mentioned, for example, in the first section of his Beyond Good and Evil, when he talks about a species of coming generation of philosophers; philosophers of dangerous maybes, capable of taking great risks. Nietzsche views philosophers' way of looking at

things as highly unconventional; a way of viewing things that is quite extraordinary and different from all previous habits.

In his famous essay *On Truth and Lies*, he clearly points out that even perception of things follows the usage of common place perception metaphors. These perception metaphors are our perceptual interpretations of the reality, thus leaving the actual, the thing in itself, unknown. For Nietzsche perceiving something does not mean that we perceive what is out there; rather than perceiving the real, the thing in itself, we perceive our own visual interpretation of the world. So, for Nietzsche, if a person breaks this convention of perceiving things and views the world in a different manner, then there is a danger that people, owing to their conservative attitude, will marginalize this creative effort. However, for Nietzsche there is no privileged way of perceiving the reality and one has to create his way of looking at things before having a new way of perception.

Nietzsche has pointed towards so many fallacies and misconceptions regarding people's thinking about philosophy and philosopher. He says that most of the ideas that people hold about philosophy are wrong and democratic attitude is mainly responsible for making these popular mistakes the yardstick to judge the value of philosophy.

He points towards the attitude prevailing during his times; people disregarded any philosopher who goes against skepticism. Skepticism, for Nietzsche, means a sickness that prevails in a society where classes that were historically separated from each other were merged, leaving class specific rankings, virtues and evaluations meaningless. European democracy, according to Nietzsche merged people of different cultures and classes to an unprecedented scale, leaving their estimations and values unrecognized. Now anyone who says that he is concerned with the estimations of good and bad and claims knowledge of these matters appears strange to the parliamentary taste of the 19th century Europe.

The other thing that Nietzsche holds responsible for degrading philosophy is science and the reverence and respect a man of science draws from the society. A philosopher believes in comprehensive and synthetic knowledge as compared to the specialization promoted by science. Specialization actually corners people in different nooks of the vast field of knowledge. A philosopher, on the contrary has to estimate the value of each and every human experience; a philosopher has to study the whole being. Therefore, he has to seek knowledge in all domains of inquiry.

Thus, the distinctions and boundaries of knowledge, the compartmentalization of knowledge in various fields, all combine to produce a taste that opposes and jests any attempt to achieve a comprehensive vision of reality. A philosopher, for Nietzsche, on the other hand has to attempt this grand task. People like Kant and Hegel attempted to achieve a comprehensive vision of reality, and one among them wrote the history of philosophy, worked on the tradition and the other succeeded in writing a great critique. These are among the essential condition behind the progress of a civilization.

Besides his criticism on the way science is received and valued by the people, he does not exclude scientists from the list of the preconditions of philosophy. Nietzsche regards science and the scientist as instruments. An instrument that can detect and verify and consequently can also be verified by others. People, however, have a wrong estimation of scientists and they consider them as those who can become guides and creators of new values.

Nietzsche points out this fallacy in the popular ideas, and holds it responsible for creating difficulties for philosophers. Consequently, for Nietzsche, there are two dangers lie between philosopher and his universal task. First, the great amount of knowledge that science has gathered can discourage a philosopher from making an attempt to have a comprehensive knowledge of everything. Second, the self esteem of a philosopher is badly hurt because of the response a philosopher usually gets from the society. The ever growing public likeness and respect for the scientific man is hiding the philosophic man in a mist of unpopularity and disrespect. Nietzsche compares this attitude of 19th century Europe with that of Classical Greece, where philosophers like Heraclitus and Plato were greatly revered. Nietzsche rated Greeks at a higher place.

The other misconception is regarding the life experience of a philosopher. For people, a wise man, a lover of wisdom, should live wisely. According to popular understanding persons who claim knowledge and wisdom should live a life free of troubles, for people generally believe that wisdom resides in an ability to escape trouble. On the other hand, a philosopher learns from his own great experiences, and for Nietzsche, a great experience is essentially an experience of misfortune. A philosopher's wisdom does not allow him to escape a bad game; rather a philosopher plays a bad game and learns through this experience.

The disrespect for philosophy that Nietzsche found in his age is attributed to a multitude of causes. The industrious worker of a newly emerging economy finds a certain kind of *epicurean otium*, in Nietzsche's words, a luxury in a philosopher's life and attitude and thus despises it. A utilitarian thinker does not find any good in it for the society. Even philosophers themselves are responsible for creating this disrespect and Nietzsche cites the example of Schopenhauer who criticized Hegel as a philosopher to an extent where the criticism of the philosopher became a critic on philosophy itself. In a democratic age where people's ideas are upheld and count very much, these ideas through becoming public, harmed the reputation of philosophy to a great extent.

Nietzsche asks to remain careful in praising objectivism. Objectivist thinker, for Nietzsche is merely a mirror of reality who reflects anything that passes him and has no power to give values to this reflection. An objectivist thinker is identified by Nietzsche as the one who believes in disinterested knowledge and has nothing of his own. He can only mirror things and cannot either produce or engender values or ideas; he cannot make judgments for he has suspended his ability to make judgments.

A philosopher for Nietzsche has to value things; for his objectivity and disinterested attitude, an objectivist thinker is not capable of valuing things. This disqualification of an objectivist lies in his inability to accept or reject anything as he is unskilled in giving any kind of importance to his own person. Liking and disliking, acceptance and rejection are, for Nietzsche signs of a good taste-and a good taste belongs to people who hold themselves important, who can judge and are not value neutral.

An objectivist, being an objective soul, does not care much about his subjectivity; hence, he is not able to talk about himself- for he has no taste, no liking or disliking. The apparent calm of an objectivist is not because of the lack of problems; it is because of his lack of ability to address his problems that he appears calm³. In certain cases, the objectivist becomes a skeptic, to suspend his judgment for all eternity in order to find an escape from the responsibility of knowing his own person and consequently solving and addressing his own problems. Such a person has no importance, says Nietzsche, for women⁴, and elsewhere he has also said that truth is a woman.

Thus, an objectivist is very much unlike a genuine philosopher, who accepts and rejects things, who has his opposition and his friends. The examples of objectivist thinkers are 19th century positivists and realists. Nietzsche holds them responsible for changing the standards or degrading the standards of the society to a level where genuine thought finds no importance. These realists and positivists, says Nietzsche, have reduced philosophy to a mere theory of knowledge. Such a philosophy says Nietzsche, in its last throes can only awake pity and is denied the right to enter the doors of the philosophical knowledge.

Nietzsche also talks about the importance of two things in determining the ability to philosophize. The ability to become a philosopher depends upon the extent to which one can bear the responsibility of knowing things through ones experience, and the extent to which one can attempt to have a comprehensive vision of reality. Since one is supposed to know through one's own experience, therefore, knowledge pre supposes a strong and steadfast character in the face of sufferings

³ Beyond Good and Evil-pg-505

⁴ Beyond Good and Evil pg-506

For Nietzsche one's abilities to endure sufferings and the courage to undertake great experimentations depend on two factors; either one has the blood of a higher rank⁵ in his veins or one is specially educated to experience life like a philosopher. Otherwise people who claim to know who a philosopher is, do not know this fact by experience, whereas, who a philosopher is can only be known through ones experiences; through becoming a philosopher.

The hereditary factor, though it may not seem a serious thing to a 21st century audience, has remained a vital factor for determining the character of a person for Nietzsche. Nietzsche is a great believer of blood and heredity, and for him some families have a greater capacity to endure life; a few can suffer more than others. Philosophy, since it is learned through experience, cannot be learned without enduring pain and suffering. For Nietzsche, experience is the teacher, and one can know what philosophy is through experience alone, hence, one should have the capacity of bearing a lot of suffering; for experience generally brings suffering with it.

Nietzsche in his Zarathustra writes, "rash daring, prolonged mistrust, cutting into the living...from such a soil truth is born." For Nietzsche the capability of becoming the soil for truth is not something common; it is a rarity, most likely to be found in nobility.

For Nietzsche, only those people who have the courage and daring to undertake experimentations with life, people who are like this by nature, only such people can experience philosophy. For experience of suffering initiates thinking; and for common people thinking itself is a sign and cause of trouble; for the majority, says Nietzsche, thinking itself is a problem. Courage, suffering, solitude and pain constitute the most important prerequisites for knowing the truth.

Another avenue to reach philosophical knowledge for Nietzsche is through education, and here Nietzsche seems to support Plato's view that those who have a natural tendency towards philosophy can be taught and educated to become philosophers.

Although Nietzsche does not support ascetic ideal and he has criticized ascetics for their life negating attitude, he considers asceticism among the preconditions of an intellectual mindset. Philosophers, right from the beginning, have some sort of ascetic ideal to follow; they are celibates; they like solitude, and they avoid noise, to such an extent that they even don't like to think in words. Nietzsche writes that the one who thinks in words thinks about his relationship with the thing and not about the thing itself, for language idealizes the human relationship with things, and things in themselves. Language for Nietzsche has so many traits of the crudest age of humanity that was actually full of superstitions.

So Nietzsche approves of some kind of ascetic ideal for philosopher. Nietzsche cited the great Buddha who left his family to live a contemplative life. For him philosophers do not like to have a family life and responsibilities of children.

CONCLUSION

Nietzsche's description of who a philosopher is revolves around certain important themes. These include the distinction between a philosopher and a scientist, the distinction between philosophical workers and philosophers, the task that a philosopher has to perform, the life experience that a philosopher is likely to have and the dangers that surround philosophers in the form of popular attitude towards philosophy and abhorrence for the higher experiences.

Nietzsche is very strict in marking the boundaries between science and objectivism on the one hand and philosophy on the other. For him, since philosophy is mainly an activity resulting in producing new judgments about civilizations, therefore objectivity has no or a limited and well defined and

⁵ Beyond Good and Evil-pg-518

restricted role to play in it. For Nietzsche objectivity does not yield any kind of absolute or the only truth; it is for him only a commonplace way of looking at things.

When an objectivist or a positivist says that he has objectively presented something, he actually presents the popular interpretation of reality. An objective view is the view which each and every person can testify, but this does not entail that it is the most plausible way of reporting facts.

Facts for Nietzsche cannot be known for human beings are accustomed to view reality through certain spectacles. In the case of objectivism, the most commonplace spectacle is used. Philosophy on the other hand, is the name of acknowledging the fact that there is no absolute or privileged view of reality. Neither it asserts that all ways of looking at reality are equal; philosophy allows a person to break through the common way of looking at things, the habit, and then it allows a person to describe his own vision.

This kind of novel view of reality is possible only when a person unlearns the common way of looking at things, but before unlearning these commonplace ways, one first has to learn how to see things in a commonplace manner. A philosopher, due to this reason has to learn each and everything; he has to learn the whole spectrum of extant and past forms of knowledge and values. This is made possible by philosophical workers, who after a lot of work squeeze infinite volume of knowledge into ideas. Thus, Hegel, who wrote the history of ideas, was necessary for the progress of Europe, because he was the essential prerequisite for thought.

Furthermore, since a philosophy also has to see the practicality and the possibility of each and every idea, therefore criticism is also essential. One cannot evaluate if one does not know how to criticize. According to Nietzsche, Kant, who wrote the critique of human faculties, was an essential condition for the growth of European civilization.

Objectivists or scientists are necessary for the growth because they present everything from a commonplace point of view. They employ the most commonplace metaphors to describe the fact of nature and humanity. Thus, the mirrors of reality are essential because due to their efforts one can see extension of prevailing ways in all domains of life. A philosopher has to imbibe from all these sources and more than that he has to learn from his own experiences, thus he should possess a great deal of courage to experience life.

Since a philosopher's way of looking at things is essentially different from the commonplace way, therefore he is destined to suffer resistance. A new philosophy, a new way of looking at things is always resisted by the good ones, the Pharisees, the conservative souls.

Nietzsche has also criticized skepticism, the suspension of judgment for all eternity; this however, does not at all mean that he is against suspending judgment. Judgment suspension is a necessary step towards forming proper judgments. One forms his own judgment when he unlearns to judge things in a common place way; suspending the common way of judging facts, a philosopher ultimately arrives at his own creative judgment. On the other hand, a skeptic suspends his judgment for all eternity, and this is what that distinguishes him from a true philosopher. One can recall here, Hegel's essay on abstract thinking in which he condemned the commonplace way of judging facts- in which a person uses conventional stereotypes to describe facts- as the way of uneducated people.

At the end one can say that Nietzsche has clearly described almost everything about philosophy, its task, its perils and its importance in the growth and survival of a civilization. However, there are certain points in his description that may create unease among modern generation of philosophers. These include his critique on democracy, his emphasis on hereditary conditions and his objections on objectivism. Someone might see a link between Nietzsche and Nazi movement here, but such a link is only an illusion.

Hitler's personality as the commander, the charismatic leader, is not a result of Nietzsche's philosophy. Hitler does not bear any resemblance to Nietzsche's image of a true philosopher. Hitler's will to power, was not a philosopher's will to power; it was the will of a degenerated person. Hitler

was the one who marked the end of the spiritual life of Germany; after Hitler Germany never produced a philosopher of spirit.

Nietzsche's emphasis on race should not be considered as the pre condition of Nazi anti-Semitic thought. Nietzsche was not anti-Semitic in any sense. One can see that he hold a very high opinion about Jews. In his Genealogy of Morals he says that the love and taste for the Old Testament is a sign of health.

Finally Nietzsche's critique on positivism is not out of place, and it should be compared with Aristotle's position on philosophy. Positivism or objectivism emphasizes method, and does not regard knowledge as valid and reliable if the method of its acquisition does not ensure validity and reliability. On the other hand for Aristotle, value of knowledge does not come from the method, philosophy has no specific method. The value of knowledge comes through its power to demonstrate the reality and the coherence of its propositions and results.

Objectivism or positivism, only talks about and values the method or the theory of knowledge, and does not take into account the value of knowledge as such. Thus, even from an Aristotelian standard objectivism cannot be categorized as a philosophy. Philosophy has to know the principle and causes of being, it is a metaphysical enterprise. Positivism, on the other hand restricts philosophy to the service of science; positivism made philosophy the handmaiden of science.