

## The Man in the Animal

*There is only a perspectival seeing, only a perspectival knowing; and the more affects we allow to speak about a matter, the more eyes, different eyes, we know how to bring to bear on one and the same matter... (The Genealogy of Morality, Nietzsche, pg. 85).*

In *The Genealogy of Morality*, Nietzsche seems to claim that truth is *perspectival*. *Perspectivism*, broadly construed, is the position that there are many possible perspectives in which a judgment of truth can be made. Consequently, in order to criticize a truth judgement, one must enter the perspective from whence the judgement originated. In *The Genealogy of Morality*, Nietzsche attempts to construct a genealogical account of the moral values, “good and bad,” and “good and evil”; his account, however, seems to be laden with normative and prescriptive claims which beg the question; as a perspectivist, who is Nietzsche’s intended audience? Who is he trying to convince with his genealogy?

There are various places in *The Genealogy of Morality*, which, one might argue, make it quite explicitly clear who Nietzsche’s genealogy was intended for. At the end of aphorism 9, for example, Nietzsche directly addresses an individual who he calls “a free spirit”: “This, the epilogue of a “free spirit” to my speech, an honest animal, as he has richly betrayed, moreover a democrat; he had listened to me up until then and couldn’t stand to hear me be silent” (19). Is the “free-spirit” Nietzsche’s target audience? Nietzsche mentions the “free spirit” once again near the very end of the genealogy:

*These negating and aloof ones of today, these who are unconditional on one point-the claim to intellectual cleanliness-these hard, strict, abstinent, heroic spirits who constitute the honor of our age, all these pale atheists, anti-Christians, immoralists, nihilists, these skeptics, ephectics, hectics of the spirit (all of them are the latter in some sense or other), these last idealists of knowledge in whom alone the intellectual conscience today dwells and has become flesh-in fact they believe themselves to be as detached as possible from the ascetic ideal, these "free, very free spirits": and yet, to divulge to them what they themselves cannot see-for they stand too close to themselves-this ideal is precisely their ideal as well... (The Genealogy of Morality, Nietzsche, pg.108-109).*

Although Nietzsche mentions the "free-spirit", one may argue, this does not mean that the free-spirit is Nietzsche's intended audience as such; he also mentions a wide variety of other characters, such as the Christian, much more frequently. Consequently, isn't it more likely that his audience is the latter? This may be the case; however, I think there are other more subtle aspects of Nietzsche's genealogy, specifically his use of language, which establish that his intended audience is indeed the "free-spirit", "the atheist," "the anti-Christian" (108-109).

As Nietzsche, argues, the free-spirit is often guilty of setting science up as the opponent of Christianity, which Nietzsche believes is not truly the case. I shall not go into the details of his argument here; what I am trying to get at is, supposing the free-spirit professes the ideals of science which seeks truth in the natural world, should he not be more easily swayed by the use of scientific or naturalistic language? Subsequently, *The Genealogy of Morality* is absolutely riddled with naturalistic language, especially metaphors and similes. In the first 15 pages of the genealogy, for example, one can find an abundant use of words such as "growth...land...roots... [and] soil" (5, 13, 15). At one point, Nietzsche even refers to his mind as "a secret garden": "I divided up my problem; out of the answers came new questions, investigations, conjectures, probabilities: until I finally had a land of my own, a ground of my

own, an entire unspoken growing blossoming world, a secret gardens as it were" (3). Nietzsche's most striking use of naturalistic language, however, seems to come with his incessant use of metaphors and similes which relate human beings to other animals drawing us into our evolutionary past and into engagement with Darwin, a veritable god for the atheistic, anti-Christian, and above all else scientific, free-spirit. He says of the English psychologists, for instance, that they are "old , cold, boring frogs who creep and hop around on human beings, into human beings, as if they were really in their element there, namely in a swamp"(9). In addition, he often refers to nobles as "great birds of prey" (25) or "blond beasts of prey"(58) and to slaves or Christians as "herd animals"(91, 96-99) or "lambs"(25). Furthermore the ascetic priest of the genealogy is a "fox" (90) and the sinner "a hen around whom a line has been drawn" (101). Subsequently, I doubt that Nietzsche's genealogy could be intended for the Christian; a Christian, the alleged opponent of science, (at least according to the free-spirit), would not be swayed by naturalistic language.

Hence, making use of Nietzsche's language it has been my project to supply some illustrations for his audience, the free-spirit, as I see latter, as an additional persuasive tool. I have prepared eight illustrations in total, each depicting a human character as an animal, with the exception of the sovereign individual; most are based on Nietzsche's own metaphors and similes. Consequently, I don't think it is necessary to explain the illustrations individually for the most part; they are intended to be complementary to the text and should speak for themselves. There are a few things I will mention, however.

Stylistically, the illustrations have been executed in black and white with clean and relatively simplistic lines intended to mimic those drawing often found in biology text books. In addition, each illustration has been titled like a biological drawing with a figure number followed by a description. I believe that this helps to lend an objective scientific feeling to the drawings which would be persuasive

for the free spirit who values the “objective truths” produced by scientific investigation. Pertaining to subtleties, one will notice that there is no drawing for the illustration titled “The Sovereign Individual”; it has been intentionally left blank. There is some debate whether Nietzsche’s sovereign individual as ideal could ever be realized. Nietzsche says of the sovereign individual that they would have to be able to promise “even against fate” (36). Subsequently, I think it dubious that this ideal could be achieved; thus, the sovereign individual is an undocumented animal and does not have an image. Science can only study “reality”; the sovereign individual is not a reality.

I have taken some creative liberties with “Mr. Wanton Curiosity and Daredevil”; Nietzsche does not associate him with an animal, however, he does depict him as investigating the dark work places of “cellar animals” (27, 36) which breed resentment. Rats are animals which typically dwell in cellars, thus what better animal to investigate a rat than a cat? Curiosity is even in his name!

For the drawing of the “The Noble” I chose a wolverine; although Nietzsche often refers to nobles as “birds of prey”(25) he also refers to them as “blond beasts” (58). Wolverines are among the most vicious of animals; in addition, they have beautiful golden patches of fur.

Last but not least, “The Ascetic Priest” is depicted against a snowy background; this is intended to represent his use of narcotics to force the slaves or the sickly herd into “hibernation”.