



On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life

Friedrich Nietzsche , Peter Preuss (Translator)

Download now

Read Online ➔

On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life

Friedrich Nietzsche , Peter Preuss (Translator)

On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life Friedrich Nietzsche , Peter Preuss (Translator)
(Part II of Thoughts Out of Season)

"Moreover I hate everything which merely instructs me without increasing or directly quickening my activity." These are Goethe's words with which, as with a boldly expressed ceterum censeo, we may begin our consideration of the worth and worthlessness of history. Our aim will be to show why instruction which fails to quicken activity, why knowledge which enfeebles activity, why history as a costly intellectual excess and luxury must, in the spirit of Goethe's words, be seriously hated; for we still lack what is most necessary, and superfluous excess is the enemy of the necessary. Certainly we need history. But our need for history is quite different from that of the spoiled idler in the garden of knowledge, even if he in his refinement looks down on our rude and graceless requirements and needs. That is, we require history for life and action, not for the smug avoiding of life and action, or even to whitewash a selfish life and cowardly, bad acts. Only so far as history serves life will we serve it: but there is a degree of doing history and an estimation of it which brings with it a withering and degenerating of life: a phenomenon which is now as necessary as it may be painful to bring to consciousness through some remarkable symptoms of our age."

On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life Details

Date : Published June 15th 1980 by Hackett Pub Co (first published April 1st 1874)

ISBN : 9780915144945

Author : Friedrich Nietzsche , Peter Preuss (Translator)

Format : Paperback 70 pages

Genre : Philosophy, Nonfiction, History, European Literature, German Literature, Classics

 [Download On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life ...pdf](#)

 [Read Online On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life ...pdf](#)

Download and Read Free Online On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life Friedrich Nietzsche , Peter Preuss (Translator)

From Reader Review On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life for online ebook

Steve says

On the Usefulness and Disadvantage of History for Life

Between 1872, when his first book *Die Geburt der Tragödie* appeared, and 1876, when he left the University of Basel to write in Italy, Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900) wrote an enormous amount of prose, most of which he did not bring to a satisfactory completion. However, he did publish, singly, a series of short books/pamphlets he called *Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen* (Untimely Considerations), which at one point he had projected to include as many as 21 parts. In the end, he published 4.

It is of note that during the manic phases of his manic-depressive cycles he viewed these publications as a process of tearing down the many aspects of 19th century life he hated, a clearing away of encrustations to enable him to see clearly the visions he knew were going to come (he already had intimations of them, but these he kept in his notebooks and did not publish).

One of the *Unzeitgemässe Betrachtungen* I find interesting is *Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der Historie für das Leben* (On the Usefulness and Disadvantage of History for Life).(*) For Nietzsche historians' history was one of these encrustations which had to be chipped away. As one of my esteemed GRamazon friends has pointed out in a review of this book, in the early 21st century almost nobody knows or gives a damn about (historians') history, so now Nietzsche would be preaching to the choir. Of course, precisely the same people wouldn't give a damn about Nietzsche, either.

In view of the fact that the word "historicism" has been used in a dozen mutually contradictory ways since Karl Popper took up the word (and incorrectly ascribed his meaning of the word to Hegel), I won't use it. I doubt the word has any fixed meaning now, except in the discourse of certain schools of adepts among each other. I have read claims that in this text Nietzsche made the first criticism of historicism. Maybe, if you search around in the many meanings of that word, this could even be true. But what did he actually say?

He begins by explaining why both forgetting and remembering are necessary for mankind. Why remembering the right things at the right times is necessary is clear; but he sees forgetting the past and entering fully into the moment are necessary both to experience happiness and to act. Mankind needs history - memory - but not too much.

He then distinguishes three kinds of history, which he calls the monumental, the antiquarian and the critical. The first is necessary for the doers and the mighty, in order for them to learn from the past acts and examples of similar men. And this is good for life because only such men can make changes for the better (he says). Nietzsche sees in this kind of history something eternal and über-historical (manifestations of Greatness, of Genius), and this almost immediately after distancing himself from über-historical thinkers who see the eternal in every moment (a point of view he seems to associate with Eastern thought). This is curious because it is evident from the longing in his description of these mighty doers (and from his other writings) that he wants to be among them; he also uses almost the same language in describing the disdain both feel for their own bodies. I suppose he views the "Eastern" kind as passive and inactive, and those attributes he finds repugnant.

However, a focus on this one kind of history, while good for the small number of powerful doers, is bad for history and most everyone else - it reduces history to a few special cases surrounding a few special men and

leads to illusions and false analogies. We all know how this kind of history has been misused.

The antiquarian history is that of the conservatives and the pious - those who look with faithful love to whence they came and wish to preserve that for those who will follow. This is the history for almost everyone (for the "less gifted" as he says); this is the history of *Blut und Boden*; this is the history which keeps most people contentedly in one place, preventing dissatisfied searches for greener pastures which would lead to conflict. (Except that it didn't always, as we know all too well.)

This kind of history is too narrow, too provincial, too limited in ways we are all so well aware of that I will leave it at that.

The critical history is not what one would expect. It is not the history of the critical, judging intellectual, far from it. It is the critical, judging history of life itself, which, right or wrong, just or not, puts an end to everything that emerges into existence, whether it be an individual, a mountain, or the Roman Empire. Of course, this critical history can manifest itself through the actions of men. It is necessary for renewal, though he finds the renewal to be generally weaker than the healthy form of the original, at least in the case of human societies.

Clearly, critical history is harmful where it is not absolutely needed.

One must admit that this is an idiosyncratic division of history into types. These types of history all serve life, though they can also hurt it, as mentioned. But all are to be contrasted with the history of the historian, whose science has stepped between life and history and cut their bonds. Here Nietzsche is revisiting in some detail a thesis he already touched upon in *Die Geburt der Tragödie*: science and its concomitant abstraction have sucked the lifeblood, the instincts, out of modern man. He is skinning just one of their manifestations in this text, the history of the historian, but he is whetting his knife for them all.

He details five ways this history is inimical and dangerous to life: it weakens personality through overexposure to foreign cultures and history (I should have about zero personality by now, if this thesis is correct); it gives the illusion that the current culture has the greatest virtue and justice; the instincts are destroyed and both the individual and the whole cannot fully ripen; it gives the illusion that one is late-born, that one is an epigone; it leads mankind into self-irony, cynicism and egotism.(**) He gives a lengthy discussion of each of these points, taking the opportunity to knee many of his most despised objects - bureaucrats, functionaries, contemporary philosophers, historians' pretensions to objectivity, etc. - in the groin.

Reading over the other reviews of this book, it is clear that each reader has his own Nietzsche. I don't agree with many of his philosophical opinions, and I **abhor** his cult of genius. But then I am an early 21st century intellectual who has willingly, nay gleefully saturated himself with history and foreign cultures and is disdainful of the antiquarian history into which he was born. I am his *Flachkopf* made corporeal. And yet I still am reading his texts, because, as I briefly indicated in another review, Nietzsche went where no one else before him went, and he never came back. He went there with a megalomaniacal verve and an astounding prose style. Some of the things he told us on the way are valuable; the course of his travels to wherever he went is fascinating.

A word concerning Nietzsche's prose style: In this text Nietzsche jettisons the purple Romantic prose of his previous writings and offers us something closely approximating his mature style - a fluid, flexible, eloquent prose strongly influenced by Greco-Roman writers. For in this and all subsequent texts Nietzsche is not writing for an academic audience, but rather for a general educated readership, as did those earlier writers. And as they did, Nietzsche tries to make his points to such a audience by telling little stories, using extended metaphors, etc. He even uses a quote from Jonathan Swift to generate a belly laugh and to reduce a target *ad absurdum*. When he starts going on about the "German soul" or about how his ideas are manly and those of

(**) Is it not the case that nearly every one of these is manifested in our age, an age in which history, insofar as it is known to the general public at all, is known only under the guise of monumental, antiquarian or critical history? And if this is true, then what is left of the criticism Nietzsche levels at historians' history?

<http://leopard.booklikes.com/post/677...>

???? ? ? ? ? ???? ? ? ?????? ??? ? ???? ???? ???? ? ? ? ? ???? ???? ? ???? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?
 ? ? ???? ? ? ? ? ???? ???? ???? ???? ? ? ???? ? ? ???? ? ? ???? ? ? ???? ? ? ???? ? ?

???? ????? ????? ????? ?? ??????? ?? ?? ??????? ??????? ??????? ?? ????? ?? ??????? ??????? ?? ??? ?????? ??????? ??????

?? ???? ?? ? ???? ???? ??? ???? ?????? ?????? ?????? ? ???? ????? ???? ????? ? ? ?
 ??? ????? ????? ?? ?? ?????? ????? ?????.

"??????????????? ??????? ???? ?????? ? "????? ??????" ????? ?????? ??????????. ?????????? ???????????
 ??????????? ??? ?????? ?? ????????????, ?? ?????? - ?????????? ??????. ??? ?????? ??? ????????? ??????????
 ???????????, ??????? ?????????? ????????????, ?????????????? ?????????? ?????????? ?? ?????? ????????????, ?????????
 ???.

?? ?????? ????? ?????? ?????? ??????????, ??????, ?????, ?????????????????? ?? ???????? ?? ??????????
 ???????????????? ?? ?? ??? ?????????????????? ??????????. ??????????, ?????????? ?????????? ??????????, ??????????,
 ?????????? ?????????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????? - ? ???? ?????????? ?????????????? ???

?? ?????, ?? ??? ?????? ?? ?????????: ?????? ??? ?????????? ?????????? ?????????? ??????????

????????? ??????????, ?????????, ?????????? ?????????? ?????????????? ?????????????? - ??????????????????

????????, ????????? ?????????? ?? ?????? ?????????? ??????????; ?????? ?????? ?? ??? ??????????
????????? ?? ?????????????? "?????????" ?????????? ?????????? ??????????; ?????????? ?????????? ??? ??????
????????? ?????????? ?????????? ??????????; ?????????????? ?? ?????????????? ?????????? ?? ??????????????
??????.

?? ?? ?????? ?????? ?????????? ?????????? ??????????, ?? ?????? ?????????? ?????? ?? ?????????? ?? ??????????
????????? ?????????? ?? ?? ?????? ?????????? ??? ?????? ?????????? ?????? ?? ?????? ?????????????? - ??????
????????????? - ?????? ?????? ?????? ?????????? ??????????. ?? ??????, ??? ?? ?????? ?? ?????????? ?? ??????????
????????.

E. says

Nietzsche hits on some real dilemmas related to academic history, but his attempts to address them are less than helpful--to put it mildly. To be fair to Nietzsche, and also to annoy him, it is worth placing the work in its historical context. Nietzsche was writing in the early days of academic history, which initially developed in Germany. I'm not familiar enough with the historiography of Nietzsche's time to be able to know how accurate some of his complaints about academic history really were, but academic history was an immature discipline at the time. Adjusting to a new method of historical writing was not always easy for people of Nietzsche's day (or to people since, for that matter), and the hiccups involved in developing a new discipline might have influenced Nietzsche's negative opinion. Certainly historians since his time have grappled with most of the questions he raises in a variety of ways, and I doubt that anyone would be able to publish a similar work today.

Nietzsche complains throughout the book that being overly saturated in history hampers people from being capable of action. The problem is that the tension is less between history and action, and more between thought and action. Some people will have a tendency to think more than act, or vice versa, depending on their personality. Yes, thinking when action is needed can be dangerous or even hamper someone's personal development (the latter seems to be Nietzsche's main concern here). But history is not the source of the tension.

Nietzsche seems to want history to only function as an art, not as a science. After all, that is how history was written for most of history, and only in the late 19th century did that begin to change. Unfortunately, it is history's scientific aspect--that is, the fact that history has a strict methodology now--that makes history at all reliable. While Nietzsche is right that perfect objectivity is impossible, and that history is an art as well as a science, rejecting historical methodology because it is too complicated and includes more detail than people can make use of does not solve the problem. (His complaints about historians treating the modern era as the pinnacle of progress are probably accurate, however, and highlight a very real historical fallacy. Modern historians are usually aware that this attitude is a problem, but some are more effective than others in keeping it from coloring their own work.)

There is a certain sense in which Nietzsche's hostility toward academic history is understandable--most historians would tear his idealization of the classical era apart. His developing philosophy appears to be deeply anti-historical, dependent more on a certain interpretation of classical literature than on anything empirically verifiable. So perhaps it is no wonder that Nietzsche delivers such a stinging attack. His ideas about the importance of great men to history, likewise, would be taken to pieces by any historian today. People who advance radical ideas when society is not ready for them--an approach Nietzsche seems to applaud--are typically ignored, if not burned at the stake. English society was not ready for John Wycliffe's ideas, but two centuries later, Germany was ready for Martin Luther's. Luther was definitely a significant figure, and he stamped his own personality on the Reformation--it might not have unfolded exactly as it did

without his involvement. But by Luther's time enough changes had occurred in society that some sort of religious shakeup was waiting to occur. And his concern with assurance would not have occurred to anyone several centuries earlier. Was Luther a "great man" in Nietzsche's sense? Sure. But he was still formed by the society he came from. History is complex. Individual people don't have much power to turn it in an entirely different direction; a lot of individuals doing the same things are another story. Nietzsche's elitism is really starting to show here, and it leads him in entirely the wrong direction.

DeadWeight says

I think we're so used to a sorta Hegelian dialectical understanding of history that it can be really exciting to read a book like this that so totally upends that understanding of history by its very roots.

Timothy Ball says

"One who cannot leave himself behind on the threshold of the moment and forget the past, who cannot stand on a single point, like a goddess of victory, without fear or giddiness, will never know what happiness is ; and, worse still, will never do anything to make others happy. The extreme case would be the man without any power to forget, who is condemned to see "becoming" everywhere. Such a man believes no more in himself or his own existence, he sees everything fly past in an eternal succession, and loses himself in the stream of becoming. At last, like the logical disciple of Heraclitus, he will hardly dare to raise his finger. 'Forgetfulness is a property of all action ; just as not only light but darkness is bound up with the life of every organism.'"

Luka Antoni? says

Rano Ni?eovo djelo o istoriji podstaknuto je ujedinjenjem Njema?ke, potragom za njema?kim nacionalnim identitetom, a samim tim i tadašnjom preokupiranoš?u istorijom. Ni?e ne piše klasi?nu filozofiju istorije; on piše *nesavremenu* filozofiju tragaju?i za vezom izme?u istorije i života.

?itanje jednog ovakvog teksta pruža posebno zadovoljstvo, jer je napisano prije Ni?eove nervne rastrojenosti i sloma, ali sadrži naznake ideja koje ?e poslije razraditi u poznatijim djelima. Najzanimljiviji dio relativno kratko je pomenut u uvodu. Ni?e pravi razliku izme?u istorijskog i neistorijskog bi?a. Istorijsko bi?e, ?ovjek, je ono koje razmišlja o prošlosti, nadahnjuje se velikanima iz istorije, dela u sadašnjosti i na taj na?in svojom voljom daje oblik budu?nosti. Neistorijsko bi?e, na primjer pas, je ono koje živi samo u sadašnjosti i za sadašnjost. Na?in na koji ?ovjek postiže sre?u je da u trenutku živi neistorijski, odnosno da zaboravi sve ono što može štetno uticati na njega i da koristi samo ono iz sje?anja što može služiti njegovom životu. Ni?e ovaj posljednji koncept postavlja kao jedini koji opravdava istoriju; istorija je ?isto breme, masa ?injenica kao uzrok tromosti, ukoliko ona ne služi ?ovjekovom životu, odnosno njegovom aktivnom djelovanju u

sadašnjosti.

Niže razlikuje tri vrste istorije: monumentalnu, antikvarnu i kritičku. Nijedna ove tri vrste nije apsolutno i *per se* ispravna ili neispravna. Ona biva takvom samo u odnosu na način na koji se koristi. Monumentalna istorija se bavi najizuzetnijim i najuzvišenijim trenucima, likovima i djelima istorije, koje treba koristiti kao model za sopstveni život. To ne znači da se ti "monumenti" ponavljaju ili čak bivaju sličniji više puta u istoriji (kao kod pitagorejaca). Upravo ta težnja za ponavljanjem istorijskih veličina je najštetnija, ona stvara samo ništavne epigone, a osim toga obezvrjeđuje prvobitne uzore.

Ostale dvije vrste istorije, antikvarnu i kritičku, posmatram kao međusobno suprotne i danas preovlađujuće upotrebe istorije. Njihova uloga se možda može proširiti van ovih shvatanja pojmova, ka opštijim tendencijama koje djeluju u društvu. Antikvarna istorija je ona koja se prema prošlosti odnosi sa pijetetom, čuva i njeguje sjećanja, tako veličaju i postojanje poštovaoca čuvanjem njegovih korjena. Mislim da je upravo prekomjernost ove vrste istorije bila ključna da navede Niče da se bavi ovim problemom. Usko povezana sa reakcionarnošću iz analognog političkog aspekta, pretjerano njegovanje antikvarne istorije, može se posmatrati i u kontekstu savremenog Balkana kao način da se opravda šovinizam i koji društveni razvoj. Kritička istorija se trudi da pronađe greške u istoriji i da pod tim uticajem stvori novu tekovinu. Ovo je, vjerujem, danas najčešće tumačenje smisla istorije u akademskim krugovima. Međutim, pitanje je u kojoj je mjeri ovakav stav samo besadržajna fabrikacija, a koliko uistinu može uticati na unaprijeđenje sadašnjosti.

Do prekomjernosti istorije, koju Niče oštro kritikuje, dolazi kada istorija postaje nauka - kada nastaje želja da se istorija posmatra objektivno. Niče koristi metaforu zmije koja ne može da se kreće nakon što je progutala zeca. Velika količina informacija, znanja, po njemu stvara čovjeka koji je samo blijedi odraz prošlosti, a u estetskom smislu filistar. Zatrpao prevelikim teretom usaglašenih gotovih činjenica on gubi sposobnost da sam stvori bilo šta originalno, autohtono. Niče preporučuje mladima (ko su ti mladi prema Niču?) da pokušaju da žive neistorijski ili nadistorijski, jer će na taj način, iako mnogo manje obrazovani, stvoriti nešto što ima mnogo veću vrijednost, jer potječe od stvarnog života, a ne iz sirove istorije. Ovo pitanje je najsavremenije iz ove knjige (savremenije nego u trenutku njenog pisanja) i moj odnos prema njemu je ambivalentan. Ono otvara nova pitanja o odnosu pasivnog i aktivnog u stvaranju, o odnosu između stvaranja i uništenja i slično.

Justin Evans says

One star's a bit harsh. Popular history can still be understood in terms of the categories he comes up with here: all the biographies of Churchill and Reagan? Lifeless monumental history. The obsession with Americana and 'authentic,' 'simple' living? Lifeless antiquarianism. Post-colonial/post-structuralist/post-modernist history? Lifeless critical history.

But then, Nietzsche was harsh, and it's only fair to be harsh back.

He describes three types of historiography- 'monumental' history, which can either provide examples of greatness for the present, or refuse the possibility of greatness in the present; 'antiquarian' history, which can either make us comfortable in our own time and place by showing its historical context, or encourage us to live in the past and forsake the present; and 'critical' history, which criticises the past and attempts to create a new one for itself, or makes us ignore our own descent, leading to a conflict between our actual and our created pasts.

In the good versions (the former in my list), it is studied for the sake of 'life.' In the bad versions (the latter in my list), history is studied for the sake of itself, or for utilitarian ends. This leads to a people with weak personalities, which believes itself to be more just than other ages, is immature, leads to a melancholy belief

that we are nothing more than the children of the great, irony and eventually the cynical inversion of this belief - that, rather, we are the great descendants of the weak.

That's the meat. It's surrounded by a bunch of rants against the late nineteenth century. I'm sure it's all very entertaining when you're young, but by the time you're working or a grad student you know pretty darn well that academics cut off from 'life' is a farce. You know that appeals to 'life' are more or less completely empty: what sort of life? What will you do with this life? And you probably have a hunch that life, whatever it is, might not even be possible.

So, what are we doing when we read Nietzsche's essay? First, we're engaging in monumental history against the present: lauding Nietzsche when we could, for instance, be reading about the crisis in health care, or the destruction of the environment, or the ongoing economic crisis. Second, we're engaging in an antiquarian history which is interested in the past for its own sake, since there's little in this book which isn't common knowledge these days. Third, it will probably encourage us to believe that we've left behind all the old, lifelessness of the nineteenth century when, of course, we've done nothing of the sort. By its own lights, this essay should not be read by the young. In Nietzsche's time history really was over-studied. Today it's all but ignored. Skip this and go straight to Hobsbawm's history of the long nineteenth century.

Chrissy says

My first foray into Nietzsche has left me shaken to the core.

For better or worse, he was an expert rhetorician; even as one shudders to recognize the seeds of justification for later historical atrocities in his philosophies, one cannot help but feel enamoured by his prose and the undeniable *style* of his arguments. So many times I gave audible way to awe, reluctantly putting the book down to copy some choice phrases into a notebook.

To my view, this essay was a call to action for generations stuck in an obsession with existing fact and history, as pushed by then-modern education, which Nietzsche felt robbed them of their own culture and personalities and *very beings*, and led them to be easily ruled. The philosophy limits the value of history to that which stirs active improvement in the present, and warns us against becoming slaves to information--taking art and feeling to be the better virtues. I agreed with much of it, but recoiled at other times, as when the ugly heads of classicism and xenophobia poked through the poetry; Nietzsche argued, for example, that the infiltration of other cultures into Germany left its citizens overwhelmingly fascinated with irrelevant ideas and histories and further moved them from a unified culture. Of course, I may have brought hindsight to the reading and tarnished his original meaning...

Nevertheless, the arguments in the essay, while generally compelling and endlessly fascinating, are a bit messy. There's a lot of self-contradiction and even meta-acknowledgement of it, alongside scathing critiques of irony that bring the effort full circle to meta-irony. A reader recognizing himself as slavishly reading a historical text that both critiques the slavish attention to history and admires the unhistorical virtues of ancient Greek culture soon finds himself in a tangle of recursion, no longer sure which way is up.

Frankly, I loved that facet of the reading. It made me think. Hard. It tickled my beautiful-prose button and mercilessly challenged my intellectual capacities, my own assumptions and philosophies, and my core beliefs as a scientist.

Nietzsche is ultimately, it seems, against science-as-a-search-for-truth, arguing that it only considers what is "true" and "right" and thus "finished and historical." He writes that science "hates the forgetfulness that is the death of knowledge." Whereas I appreciate his point within the context of what he calls the historical

malady, I think he has a diminished understanding of what science *is*. At least to me, science is incredibly fluid and creative, and is **never** finished. It must adapt to current understandings and must give up the constraints of ego to permit the reality of a constantly shifting truth. Forgetting is as central to science as it is to the beast who "goes into the present, like a number, without leaving any curious remainder," except that for science, the curiosity that remains is precisely the point.

Lovely food for thought. Will chew again.

Paolina Daniele says

Sull'utilità e il danno della storia per la vita è un breve scritto nietzschiano. Qui il filosofo manifesta aperto disgusto verso il suo tempo che esprime con sarcasmo piccante e sincero. Il tema centrale, come si evince dal titolo, è il rapporto vita-storia che mette in risalto l'antinomia felicità-infelicità. Nietzsche accusa il suo tempo dichiarandolo ipertrofico dal punto di vista storico, domina cioè l'eccesso di storia che rende giovani e intellettuali enciclopedie ambulanti, farciti di nozioni storiche ma fissi in questo schema sterile che produce il niente. In altre parole la cultura del suo tempo, impregnata dall'eccesso di storia, blocca il processo creativo del vivente bloccandolo in una palude di vuote definizioni. Sì, l'essere umano è l'essere storico per eccellenza, il suo passato costituisce la sua identità e la storia in generale sta alla base del suo "essere nel mondo" per dirla con Heidegger, ma ciò rende infinitamente infelici. La forma prevale sul contenuto e la libera creazione del vivente, essendo la storia generata dall'azione umana, muore soffocata dal peso di un volume che racchiude solo parole e non azioni. L'unico modo per essere felici è l'oblio, la dimenticanza di questo enorme passato, per vivere solo il presente al modo delle bestie e degli antichi popoli che trionfavano nell'agire. Vivere quindi in modo non-storico, essere presenti nell'attimo, appare questo il senso dello scritto nietzschiano, ed è questa la speranza riposta di Nietzsche nei giovani.

La lettura del testo non è semplice, occorre avere una certa esperienza con le opere di Nietzsche, così interessanti ma imperversate da un linguaggio molto sofisticato, quasi poetico. Vi lascio con una frase ripresa da Nietzsche da Hans Sachs: " Così è poi di tutte le cose grandi, che mai riescono senza un pò d'illusione".

Kyle van Oosterum says

In this book, Nietzsche laments over a condition that he is finding in the youth of Germany: they are lacking a personality. They have an encyclopedic knowledge of everything and are chained to the past. "The past must be forgotten if it is not to become the gravedigger of the present", he says. He identifies five problems that excess history presents for living a good life:

1. Excess of a contrast between the inside and the outside. We have far too much content and too little form to present it in.
2. We think ourselves more just than people from the past. The same will happen to us in a few years. Our instincts then become denatured.
3. The more knowledge we have of life, the less life we actually have. Living things cease to live when they have been dissected.
4. Too much knowledge of history makes us feel like latecomers who missed the greatest thinkers. When we try to be like them we are like shitty imitators (epigones).
5. We surrender our personality to the world-process. Hegel and Marx both believed in the dialectical process by which human behavior is assimilated and processed into new ideas or social strata. Nietzsche saw the problem being that we would one day attempt to achieve an objective history and then lose our subjectivity.

He finishes by saying we need the power to forget just as much as we need to remember what happened in the past. Nietzsche goes against Descartes by saying that it should be: *vivo, ergo cogito* (I live, therefore I think). With Descartes, only thinking is guaranteed us, with Nietzsche life is guaranteed us.

Sunny says

I had totally forgotten what it was like to read some Neechy and now I remember what it was that I loved about reading his stuff. It's like an alien mentality. Some of the points he makes and his insights into human nature seem as though they come from an alien that has been secretly observing us for a few hundred years. This book is about the burden with which we transpose the lessons and the fetters of history into our reality today. His point is that the real superman is the iconoclast who can throw away, no, destroy the ballast of history and look at the world as though with a fresh pair of eyes and almost in a history-agnostic kind of way. There were a few very interesting points that he raised:

- Our culture is not so much something that we are continuously improving but rather something that is handed down from generations before and we acquiesce to its norms. Our culture today if truly understood is more knowledge of culture rather than culture itself. A bouquet of words which beautifully describe rather than an explosion of action that actually amount to something real.
 - If we want to progress scientifically as quickly as possible then we are likely to destroy science as quickly as possible also. A more patient approach would be ideal when it comes to scientific progress rather than jump headfirst into the next app, or technological theory that comes our way (internet of things, Ai, robotics, big data, cloud, virtual reality). Patience is bravery as imam Ali once said.
 - Education does not need to follow the historical model that it has always followed. We don't need to have one teacher standing up in a class in front of 30 eager to please imitators. The greatest have always bought their children up differently.
 - Build your homes on the slopes of Vesuvius was one of Nietzsche's famous quotes and if once erupted there are only a few that would dare to build their homes with their loved ones on its slopes and yet we live our lives building our existence around the simmering volcano in ourselves. Our worlds are shattered once in a while by some catastrophic event - we don't crawl into a ball and die but continue to live around the Dantesque inferno that could explode at any time. This takes one away from a mind-set of security and calm and further away even more from the belief in the eternal. How can you look a day in advance when you fear the molten rock rumbling deep within your soul. The superman can Nietzsche says.
-

Matthew W says

This short booklet (basically a pamphlet) was one of Nietzsche's early writings before he became *The Anti-Christ* and contracted a bad case of megalomania where he would sign his letters to people as "The Crucified." The title "On the Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life" summarizes Nietzsche's thesis with this work. Nietzsche criticizes the Germany of his time as without culture and lacking instinct, a place where a sick soulless inwardness prevails and a synthetic pseudo-kultur disguises the real feeling of the country. Nietzsche blames this phenomenon on the typical German's abstract feelings and belief in unharmed inwardness.

Nietzsche also states: "Only strong personalities can endure history: the weak are completely extinguished by it." Nietzsche believed that the modern German no longer trusted and had faith in himself, therefore when looking at history he would think "how am I to feel here" as opposed to the actual reality of the situation. Looking at how absurd the typical American's (and European) irrational (and total ignorance of in general) views on the second World War II certainly proves that Nietzsche's views are still more than relevant today.

peiman-mir5 rezakhani says

????????? ?? ????? ? ???? ?????? ? ???? ?????? ? ???? ???? ????
 ?<????? ????? ? ??????>

Every time I read a book by Nietzsche my mind gets blown and I feel more enlightened. In a mere 60 pages or so Nietzsche totally annihilates Hegelianism and the education system. The thesis of the book is that in our time Knowledge rules Life, and this will result in the end of both Knowledge and Living. Instead, we

must consider Life to be the ultimate value and the thing in which our youth should be skilled.

This is by far the most accessible book by this author I have ever read, so don't be daunted by it.

Highly recommended to anyone. By far the most
