

Description of Images

Leftmost Image: Altogether, to symbolize elements of the slavish man/morality.

-Background: Worms, referenced in Essay 1, Section 10. "A [strong man] shakes from him, with one shrug, many worms which would have burrowed into another man." The worms then being representative of the 'other man,' presumably the weaker, slavish man.

-Foreground Upper: Taken from painting of the storming of The Bastille. To symbolize the victory of the weaker, slavish man, (Nietzsche specifically talks of the French Revolution in the Essay 1, Section 16).

-Foreground Lower: Taken from a painting depicting the crucifixion of Christ. Taken to reference again the victory of the slavish, Christian morality. "This Jesus of Nazareth, as the embodiment of the gospel of love, this 'redeemer' bringing salvation and victory to the poor, the sick, to sinners." (Essay 1, Section 8)

Second From Left: Symbolize elements of bad consciousness, when God is introduced and the internalization turns to a repayment, or punishment for God (Essay 2, Section 21,22). As such, to symbolize this, the angry face of God presiding over the torture of a man on the wheel (during the Spanish Inquisition).

-Upper Outside Images: The angry face of God.

-Lower Center Image: Man on the wheel being tortured, presided over by agents of the Church during the time of the Spanish Inquisition.

Third From Left: Elements of imagery to symbolize elements of the 'Noble'.

-Uppermost Outside Image: Vikings landing, from Essay 1, Section 11, (also noted in Supplemental Materiel, Section 260).

-Upper Inside Image: Painting of Pericles' funeral oration, mentioned in Essay 1, Section 11. Pericles in his funeral oration brings attention for Nietzsche to elements of the character of the noble.

-Middle Height, Middle Width Image: An eagle clutching a lamb which it has plucked from the ground (photograph). This is an obvious reference to the 'bird of prey,' especially in contrast to the 'lamb.' (Essay 1, Section 13)

-Bottom Centre Image: Napoleon on a stallion. To reference Nietzsche's characterization of Napoleon as "synthesis of Unmensch (brute) and Uebermensch (overman)." (Essay 1, Section 16)

Fourth From Left: Imagery to represent elements of Nietzsche's ideas of internalization of punishment, and bad conscience in its more favorable light, for Nietzsche, that is, in contrast to the ideas of the Second From Left Image.

-Upper, Central Image: Painting of the burning of Troy. This is to reference some of Nietzsche's comments regarding the Greeks; "What final, fundamental meaning did the Trojan War and similar tragic atrocities have? We can be in no doubt: they were intended to be *festivals* for the gods" (Essay 2, Section 7).

-Lower, Outside Image: Painting depicting Lupercalia festival, a festival in which one element is the idea that the striking of women (although not necessarily as depicted in the painting) would increase fertility. This is to represent both the idea of

punishment, punishment of self (in this case represented by the willful submission to pain/punishment), as well as the pregnancy element (Essay 2, Section 19).

Fifth From Left (Rightmost) Image: Meant to represent in some form elements of Essay 3. Entire image is taken from Basch's paintings regarding the seven deadly sins and 4 scenes. This is the scene of the sinner's punishment in hell. The reference to the 7 deadly sins was meant to allude to the idea of vices which are to be denied by the ascetic, and in contrast, the hell meant to refer to Nietzsche's comment that "anyone who has ever built a 'new heaven', only mustered the power he needed through his *own hell*." (Essay 3, Section 10)

Explanation

Despite the detail provided above, the 5 images and the images that comprise them are not intended to be the main thrust of the argument presented by this piece. The piece was meant to be first viewed in small segments, appropriate for viewing the constituent pieces of the 5 larger compositions. The idea was that by viewing in minute detail, one would be best able to appreciate the small constituent images and reflect upon their significance. However, and intentionally, the viewing in such a restricted manner prevents a viewer from noticing the compositions each in their entirety. This is meant to be an argument by analogy, making what I would say could be a too focused and in depth reading of Nietzsche analogous to viewing the piece in small, restricted segments.

Once you view the 5 larger compositions without such a focus, one may notice that the compositions are somewhat reminiscent of Rorschach (inkblot) images. I attempted to make this connection to the Rorschach images by making the compositions, dark, largely greyscaled, somewhat amorphous, and perhaps most noticeably, symmetric. The use of images that were meant to be similar in some ways to these inkblot images was for 3 reasons. First, it allowed for the use of the smaller constituent images, and so was useful in a practical way. Second, the Rorschach influence immediately gives a notion of significance, to ensure that the compositions are seen to have a more significant connection, rather than just a method of grouping that may be aesthetically pleasing. And third, the Rorschach connection provides a quite intentional and important significance.

Rorschach tests are meant to trigger an immediate response. An image is presented, and one is asked what one sees in the image immediately. There is a certain emotive element to the images, and the interpretation of the answers is thought to be important and telling. Furthermore, the actual form of the inkblots is secondary to what is seen. This is again meant to be an argument by analogy. I believe Nietzsche ought to be viewed in some ways as Rorschach images are. That is, Nietzsche's writings are emotive, they are powerful and perhaps one's interpretation may be telling. Furthermore, I believe that the actual specifics (analogous to the literal shape of the parts of the inkblots) in Nietzsche are less important than the general form it takes, with all of its emotive power there to be interpreted, and perhaps most importantly, interpreted differently by all. I believe and this piece was in some ways meant to express the idea that what is more

important is not the intended specific meanings of the creator, but instead, what is produced in the viewer.

While I recognize that the argument which this piece attempted to advance is contrary to typical approaches to philosophy, as well as logically unsound, using both an argument by analogy, and (as you are about to read) a circular argument, I believe that Nietzsche's writing, perhaps more than others' warrants or at the very least, ought to be more permissive of such interpretation. This is broadly because of Nietzsche's focus on individuality, and perspectives. To attempt to find a doctrine within Nietzsche would seem counter to his project. Circularly, because I read Nietzsche in such a way to find it permissive and even encouraging of adding oneself to what one perceives and encounters (in this case, the Genealogy of Morals), even should that miss the mark to some degree, whether an incomplete reading or a mistaken one, because I accept that I can add myself though interpretation, I have (circularly) argued that I can read that in, even should it not be present. This is obviously hugely problematic in a philosophically rigorous way, but this is a large reason why an argument by analogy and through art is more appropriate. At its most basic level, I believe that Nietzsche answers one of the most difficult questions in one of the most satisfying and emancipatory ways; one can always continue to ask "but, why?" and I believe Nietzsche presents the answer "because I will it to be so." Because I believe Nietzsche provides this answer, I see it as contrary to the spirit of his work to attempt to answer instead by appealing to "because Nietzsche says it is so," without adding ones own influence to the answer.

Process

I wanted to use a non-traditional medium in expressing this argument because of the obvious non-traditional nature of the argument itself. I thought that this non-traditional argument would indeed be very difficult to capture in any satisfying way through regular philosophical argumentation. This has perhaps been shown to be true in part by the hopelessly bumbling attempts to explain in words the argument in this explanatory essay.

In creating this piece, I encountered a couple of 'technical difficulties'. While I don't believe either detracted hugely from the power of the argument, they are nonetheless worth explaining briefly. First, the mechanism to allow a view of only a small slice of the piece at a time was a huge, cumbersome, hassle. It did not perform as desired, and while I believe the spirit of it was effectively conveyed, admittedly, some level of accessibility was lost. Secondly, printing was at such a quality, and size that the printed product actually showed some imperfections (mostly in the form of edges) that were otherwise imperceptible during its digital creation. Again, because these imperfections are subtle, and because they do not get in the way of the most important images, this difficulty did not seem to be a significant detriment, nor detract from the general power of the argument.