

Nietzsche begins a process we started with Rousseau (concludes it too)
Rousseau taught us the significance and meaningfulness of history to humanity
we went from Rousseau to Hegel to Marx respectively
both of whom argued for a kind of historical determinism
(Rousseau didn't argue for historical determinism, but that the events of the past had a great impact on our current condition)

that study of history brought us to certain problems in Hegel/Marx
if the truth is historically determined, if the truth is different given the historical epoch we are in,
how can we ever find the one and the single and the unchangeable truth?

for Hegel and Marx the answer is in history
according to Marx, the historical process reveals its own truth
the end of history which would be characterized by communism
Marx this meant that history would end because class struggle would end
class struggle would end because we would have a society made up of one class
this would be a classless society

in Hegel we found a culmination of the idea of freedom as a clear and comprehensive answer to everything that was important to humanity
once this Idea was found, it was left to humanity to put it into operation

those who subscribe to the theory of historical determinism are called historicists
Hegel and Marx are historicists
those who believe that history reveals its own truth are called simply historicists

however, Nietzsche is a radical historicist
says the truth is indeed historically determined, but there is no end to history
and so consequently there is no final truth

one of the objections to radical historicism is that proclaiming history determines truth and consequently saying there is no truth is in and of itself pronouncing a truth

Nietzsche does have an answer to that problem
his solution or escape from this problem is deeply enmeshed and concerned with a doctrine that he teaches called the eternal return of the same
cannot understand this without understanding the Superman or will to power
why not explain all of them? none of these appear in substantial form in the UAAOH
we have no way to understand Nietzsche in his entirety

tentative answer: he is aware of the problem, and he is regretful that this leads to a problem in our understanding, but after all, the problem is not in his theory, the problem is in reality; reality is contradictory

there is a fourth concept that is crucial to understanding the Nietzschean system
it does appear in substance, but not by name, in UAAOH: the death of God

11 - this is what Nietzsche means by the death of god
there is no narrative description of the death of god that is superior to this one
his argument is not distressed by churchgoing people, because almost all of them don't really believe, and the few who do really believe are fundamentally irrelevant to society
(will come back to this notion)

if one believes in a socially relevant sense, then one must live one's life according to the tenets of that particular belief

consider christianity/christ; while it is eminently true that there are a great many churches in the US it is not so clear to Nietzsche that the people who attend these institutions are "christians" it is quite clear to him that they are not: penned the words "the last good christian died on the cross" - christ preached a certain ethic/way of life, and he preached that this ethic and this way of life would lead one to ultimate salvation and consequently to happiness
those who really believe could only be those who follow that ethic and who follow that way of life in every detail to the letter
but who follows christ to the letter? christ preaches pacifism, but christian countries go to war that is the most evident contradiction in the system

what about priests? nuns? carmelite? etc.
those follow that ethic and that way of life indeed
it is very questionable if these people are at all socially relevant
how much of a political/social impact could they have on the masses?
beyond that, we have witnessed in the modern world priests blessing the inhabitants of their own countries, blessing their soldiers, as they go to make war on other christian countries

for Nietzsche, it is simply nonsense to talk about this as having anything whatsoever to do with true belief

notice he does not argue what Marx argues: that god does not exist. Nietzsche argues that God is dead, which implies God was at one time alive. argues God was at one time powerful and relevant and is now no longer powerful or relevant. argues (back to p11) that there was a God, who, exhibited madness, blind passion, and an earthly and darkened horizon, who had immense power in history. but this is dead, and has been killed by knowledge.

this is a different way of looking at the matter than the Marxian way
we are encountering the difference between right wing atheism and left wing atheism
be careful: not talking about stupid atheism, but atheism at its highest level, intimately connected to reason and knowledge; stupid atheism is not

in any case, the idea that god is dead is not meant to offend, does not relate to any specific religion or god; notion that god is dead does not relate to any specific belief; it relates to all beliefs

nationalism is dead, patriotism is dead, etc.

any basis for belief is dead

any basis for faith is dead

the most problematic of those is the faith in science, which is also dead

7 - this is the only place in the entire Nietzsche canon where he refers to a universal law
there are problems with him referring to a universal law - sounds like a belief, should be dead?

a horizon is something that could be called a belief/belief system

modern social scientists call it a value system

a horizon is a boundary or perimeter or area in which one believes what is right and what is wrong, and it is that which gives one, be it an individual or a people, an identity

consider ancient greeks

there were greeks and there were barbarians

aka greeks and everyone else

horizon of greekness; that was the real world, then there were those other beings

low and high level understandings; low level is that it was race

high level - it had to do with the greek notion of reason

for aristotle, there was a horizon of greekness; tied/connected to the notion of reason

when aristotle pointed out regimes worth emulating; some theoretical and some historical;

so that they act and react with complete impunity, confidence, without hesitation, completely authentically knowing who they are, what they are, why they are entitled, and why nobody else is; that's what gives them the possibility for greatness

the horizon contains all the truths and conventions and laws and cultures that can possibly be entailed in it

horizons have been created by single individuals

e.g. napoleon, alexander the great, julius caesar

also consider shakespeare, goethe

also consider mooses or muhammad or buddha

all these individuals have somehow been responsible for the production of a horizon that a great many people have wrapped themselves in and have used as a point of departure

what is true about all these horizons is they define what is right and wrong, good and bad, moral and immoral, respectively, for every member of it
only when you know without any doubt what is right and wrong in an automatic sense can you act decisively without hesitation without qualms
that is precisely what he is talking about on page 10 - superhistorical standpoint