

ENIGMATIC THOUGHTS ON LOVE BY NIETZSCHE

ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED

I have *Nietzsche on Love* and am curious to know whether he is right about some of these things. Ulrich Baer is the editor, and his analysis of Nietzsche's position on love is this, and for my purposes, I will just accept Mr. Baer's position as authoritative because I am not going to attempt a Nietzsche interpretation and I am interested in the actual issues and not Nietzsche himself.

Love, in Nietzsche's mind and experience, has been stripped of its radical dimensions and has been corrupted by Western morality and religion in particular. By clearing up the sedimented beliefs that shape contemporary culture, Nietzsche discovers in love something that allows us to be ourselves despite the oppressive weight of civilisation, and to be true to others as well. Love, for Nietzsche, is not the truth of our existence nor a solution to failed politics, but it harbours the potential for self-awareness that is the basis for true recognition of others as well.

Let's start from this as authoritative. The first problem here is that Nietzsche is insufficiently familiar with when love became an object of thought in the first place. Romantic love was not an object of thought before Avicenna 980-1037, and so Nietzsche is getting the order of developments wrong. There was no primitive and great *idea of love* that got sedimented over and corrupted by Western morality and religion at all. As a matter of fact the notion of romantic love came to corrupt Western morality and religion and not the other way around. Here Father Denomy's *The Heresy of Courtly Love* is based on more accurate history.

Second, Nietzsche was continuing on the Romantic tradition that elevated love as well as something that is great and pure. It is true that from Plato's Socrates that romantic passions were denigrated, and moral virtues elevated. But it was not Christianity that began this tradition. Nietzsche's point of view was not recovering any primitive state from sedimentation of Civilisation in the ordinary way. Avicenna's theories about romantic love were quite coherent with moral virtues and not antagonistic to them. Avicenna was promoting the ennobling qualities of romantic love that promote virtues. Nietzsche was far more destructive in denigrating moral virtues altogether in order to promote a replacement. This sort of tendency of Nietzsche's, in my view, was a bit more devious. His zeal in disrupting Christianity had gotten the better of him as well as his ambition to promote value-creation. I personally am not impressed by Nietzsche in those aims because he was wrong about them. My work on Virtue-Eudaimonia show that his basis in understanding morality was in error; morality did not arise as the slave herds followed some arbitrary leaders who enshrined values that others obeyed. Moral Values are much more universal than that.

1. TWO OF MY MAJOR DISCOVERIES STRONGLY REFUTE NIETZSCHE'S OUVRE ON MORALITY

I have two great discoveries that strongly refute Nietzsche's oeuvre on morality. One is my discovery of universal human moral nature, where I show that for moral virtues (not having to do with mating, sex, marriage), there are universal invariant distributions. The other is my discovery that moral virtues correlate with higher life satisfaction, that vindicate virtue-eudaimonia theory of Aristotle for non-mating moral virtues. For both I have empirical verification. These, together, assure us that Nietzsche's oeuvre about morality is wrong.

Nietzsche was a creative genius with great poetic abilities, and he followed Jean-Jacques Rousseau in the theme that Western morality and religion and trappings of civilisation had corrupted something primal and pure that is within individuals. This sort of idea is not true; it's wrong. This sort of idea is part of Christian theological thinking where Man lives in some sort of perfection until calamity befalls him which produces a bad state. Before Nietzsche, this sort of idea was strong among Wordsworth and the Romantics too. They were nostalgic for an imaginary past which is idyllic corrupted by various modern innovations.

Another sort of idea that Nietzsche had which was wrong is that great and strongly autonomous geniuses create values for herds of followers who follow them. This might have given his own vanity a certain assistance, but it cannot be true, for otherwise I would not have discovered ethnicity and location independence of moral values.

To be fair, Nietzsche died in 1900 long before 1953 when DNA was discovered, and it was only since 2000 that we know that genetic code is common, G_c is common among all human beings on Earth and accounts for 99.9% of everyone's genome. This then did not allow him to consider evolutionary genetic explanations for morals.

Regardless, he is a great creative genius whose ideas are worthy of examination for insights after refactoring them.

He says that a full and powerful soul improves *blissfulness of love* and can surmise why Dante wrote "I, too, was created by eternal love." I am interested in this. I experienced this not in a romantic way but in my great love for my beloved people the human race after intense adversity due to various illegitimate oppressive power exercises by Bill Gates that led to a delivery in the end for my extension of Aristotle's Virtue-Eudaimonia past moral virtues to identification of virtues of romantic love which include hope, gratitude, zest, and love.