

Received: 28 March 2024 Accepted: 13 May 2024

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33182/agon.v18i1.3334>

## Exploring Nietzsche's Politics of Isolation from an Epi-eugenic Framework: A New Perspective on the Marriage of Dionysus and Ariadne as “Ariadne AI”

Thomas Steinbuch<sup>1</sup>

### Abstract

Following the texts of *Ecce Homo*, the case can be made that Nietzsche was retelling the myth of the Marriage of Dionysus and Ariadne as a story of brother/sister incest in a co-regency, bringing it into line with the divine descent of Pharaonic rulers of Egypt, as reflected in the myth of Isis and Osiris. Nietzsche would seem to be creating a new myth that combines elements we see in the iconography of the Marriage of Dionysus and Ariadne and in the Triumph of Dionysus in which Ariadne is present, but not necessarily as sharing in his triumph, and that he has left behind what is depicted in the iconography to make a philosophical presentation. Ariadne is co-regent with Dionysus in an image of the triumphant development of Dionysian will to power against its denial by an opposing psychology of vengefulness. The psychology of vengefulness seeks to destabilize self awareness in others of the will to power as a self-strengthening force at work in our lives, and does so because of the exactions we must endure in self-overcoming. Following the narrative of *Wise § 3/final*, her role as *Cosima/Ariadne* is one of sheltering. Ariadne's triumph, alongside Dionysus, over the reductive psychology of vengefulness against him, represents a victory in what Nietzsche refers to as his “Great Politics.” In this way, Ariadne plays a crucial role in Nietzsche's philosophical project, serving as a protector and guide for those who seek to fully realize the development of will to power in themselves and engage in the ongoing process of self-overcoming. Today, we can partially realize Nietzsche's thought by using an AI in the role of Ariadne to isolate the pre-established disharmonia as per Nietzsche's politics of isolation as a sheltering tactic. This use of AI in cultural selection is not to be confused with the previous linkages of Nietzsche's philosophy to biological eugenics in the early 20th century, with their concerning racist and ableist ideologies.

**Keywords:** AI-driven Cultural Selection; Nietzsche's Revealing Analysis of Evolutionary Stasis; Nietzsche's Critique of Darwin's Gradualism

Nietzsche's *Ecce Homo*, “*Why I am So Wise*” § 3/final and the related writings from his correspondence and *Nachlaß* from early January 1889, are disprized by all commentators as *wahnsinnschriften*, although I think they are not so. I will focus on a set of interrelated themes from these texts:

1. The theme of who Nietzsche presents himself as being in the *Foreword* of *Ecce Homo*.
2. The pre-established disharmonia theme and Nietzsche's “*döppelte Herkunft*” in *Ecce Homo*'s allusion to the myth of King Pentheus.

---

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Steinbuch, Ph.D, Lecturer in Rhetoric and Mathematical Logic, (retired) School of Languages and Literatures, Zhejiang Kéji Dàxué, (Zhejiang University of Science and Technology), Zhejiang Province, China 310023; E-mail: [thomas\\_steinbuch@163.com](mailto:thomas_steinbuch@163.com)



3. The Dionysus/Ariadne theme, including:
  - a. Connections to Cosima/Ariadne in *Wise* § 3/final and Nietzsche's correspondence with her
  - b. The re-titled *Lament of Ariadne* from the song of "The Magician" in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* IV
  - c. The riddle of Nietzsche's "*Sonnen-Vereinsamung*" in "The Night Song" from *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* II, and how Ariadne is the answer to it
  - d. The idea of an "Ariadne's thread" into the labyrinth as necessary for acquiring knowledge
1. The labyrinth theme, with both Nietzsche and Ariadne spending time in their own labyrinths.
2. The incest theme of the "Sin of the Egyptians," again in connection with the idea of a second *Herkunft* and sibling co-regency in Egyptian mythology.

I will argue that AI can mimic Ariadne's role of sheltering and protecting awareness in those whom Nietzsche calls "*wertvollen Individuen*" of evolutionary self-development, the development in themselves of will force to exercise power over life's intimate weaknesses. First, some background.

Any reader of Euripides's *The Bacchae* will recognize that in *Wise* § 3/final and the surrounding related correspondence, Nietzsche is retelling the myth of King Pentheus and his decapitation as head of State by Dionysus.<sup>2</sup> In *The Bacchae*, Dionysus comes to Thebes to claim his rightful realm, but he is treated as an impostor by Pentheus and his mother, Agavé older sister to Semele. The whole point of Euripides's play – and it is the question of *Ecce Homo* as well – is: "What identity does one believe in?" Is Dionysus a fake impostor and is it the truth that the child of Semele died with her? Is she struck by a lightning bolt from Zeus for her blasphemy in saying that he was her lover, as Agavé would have it? Or did Zeus appear to Semele *per* her request to see him in his full divine glory only then to die beholding him, upon which Zeus rescued the unborn Dionysus, his true son, and sewed him into his thigh later to be delivered by Hermes?<sup>3</sup> In which case, it is Dionysus who should rule Thebes even though Pentheus is next in line of succession. The play sets before us a choice between belief in the everyday and belief in the Divine. Nietzsche is querying along similar lines in *Ecce Homo* with his question of who he is. That is the first line of the *Foreword*, and the stated purpose of the work is to answer it. And the context in which he raises the question of who he is shows that it is a most pressing question to ask. It is here that Nietzsche weighs down humankind with the heaviest demand that has ever been made of it – the demand of the revaluation of all values – and so he must say who he is. The "*schweresten Forderung*" is the extraordinary proclamation of the revaluation. Whatever the demand of the revaluation is, it seeks to redress a history that cannot correct itself in this respect, no identity in it has ever emerged to address the decline of the existing

---

<sup>2</sup> The much queried last line of *Wise* § 3/ final, CWFN 9 SUP (p. 22) about a Dionysus head *en route* to him in the mail is clearly an allusion to the *sparagmos* and later *omophagia* of Pentheus as his decapitation as head of State and Nietzsche as Dionysus reclaiming his rightful realm on earth. See Steinbuch (2023).

<sup>3</sup> The myth cycle is about identity and unbelief. Jealous Hera, disguised as an old woman, planted seeds of doubt in Semele's mind about the true identity of her lover and tempted her to ask Zeus to reveal himself to her in his true godly form, she, Hera, knowing what would be the outcome. Semele did, lacking Faith, and Zeus complied and revealed himself to her in his full godly glory, but the sight was too much for Semele and she was consumed by the fire of his lightning bolts.



valuations. For Nietzsche to claim to be in the position to say so implies a break with whatever has come before, an intrusion into the line of succession that can, and for the first time, recognize the downward trajectory in it. Just as in the case of Dionysus, common sense speaks against a sudden intrusion of a noble/divine presence into the order of lineage by succession. Nietzsche elaborates the mythic idea in reference to his two tracks of descent, his “*döppelte Herkunft*” to give it a more scientific rendering. He retells the myth of King Pentheus, taking the distinction between the ignoble nature that follows in succession leading to King Pentheus and lineage of the “noble nature” a step in the direction of scientific thinking as lineage from “collecting, saving and hoarding up.” The noble nature is from a lineage of an evolutionary leap. The “collective, saving and hoarding up” language in *Wise* § 3/final is from *Twilight of the Idols*, “Forays of an Untimely One,” § 44, and there too we read of a division between two tracks of development, one of which, succession, unfolds in unremitting crisis, seeming not to have the resources to unfold otherwise, the other, as called into existence by it, providing the needed step to get beyond the crisis, Nietzsche (2021b, 116-118).<sup>4</sup> The context of this section is largely historical and critical of Thomas Carlyle and his “Great Man” theory of history, but the idea of descent from a background in “collecting, saving and hoarding-up” is later set in an evolutionary context. There, “collecting, saving and hoarding up” is evolutionary and contrasted with descent in succession, in which order the noble nature does not appear, and is the second line of descent of Nietzsche’s „*döppelte Herkunft*.” The other line in succession from his father is as a decadent in *Wise* § 1. The two together come together to be his destiny of being a corrective to a history of life in decline, both decadent but at the same time, *Anfang*, which is an evolutionary thought. Nietzsche’s idea of there being two tracks of descent is the basis for his idea about how one might not be related to one’s parents, thus to make sibling incest then not really incest because, by another reckoning of kinship, “siblings” are not related because their lineage is in a background of “collecting, saving an hoarding-up” and so their incest is not “contrary to Nature” after all.

In letters from January 3<sup>rd</sup>, one to Meta von Salis and another to Cosima Wagner, similar in several respects, Nietzsche says that he, as Dionysus, is on the earth, that as Dionysus he has taken possession of his realm, and that he is having the Pope arrested and Bismark and Stöcker, (an anti-Semitic advisor to Wilhelm I) shot.<sup>5</sup> This is the same thought as in *Wise* § 3/final but there the context is fuller. As we learn in *Wise* §3/ final, the Pope believes in the relatedness of noble natures by succession, he is the most stubborn believer in it of all as he is heir in the line of succession from Christ, the Apostolic Succession, so that he has inherited the “noble nature” of Christ. But, like Pentheus, his rule is illegitimate because the noble nature does not appear in this way, and when Dionysus/Nietzsche

<sup>4</sup> In analyzing *Wise* § 3/final and *TI/Forays of an Untimely One* § 44, “My Concept of Genius” one can interpret them as presenting a framework that encompasses two tracks of evolution: one characterized by relative stasis and the other by preparation of a dynamic burst of change. As Nietzsche was a studied critic of Darwinism, this interpretation suggests a deliberate critique of Darwinian gradualism, highlighting that it cannot resolve crisis and evolve, and that what it calls “the genius” or “the deed” that does it is not a development of its own, as neither is any highlight of human history, but something *an sich*, a leap originating from the lineage of “collecting, saving and hoarding up.” Nietzsche’s analysis of cultural evolution can be viewed as a pioneering precursor articulating the idea that such change in social evolution occurs through punctuated equilibria rather than continuous incremental processes, as *per* Darwinian gradualism, although, of course, Gould and Eldredge were working with biological evolution as driven by genetic changes and natural selection acting on individual organisms. It is noteworthy from the point of view of the history of science that Nietzsche’s discovery shares significant parallels with the theory of punctuated equilibrium as applied to mechanisms driving speciation and lineage branching that was formally developed by Gould and Eldredge 1972, (Gould 2002).

<sup>5</sup> KSB 8: 1239 to Meta von Salis and 1241 to Cosima Wagner

reclaims his realm, he has the Pope arrested, as a political arrest *per* Dionysus's *coup d'état*. It is the same with Wilhelm II who ascended the previous summer but is trolled in the text as unworthy of being Nietzsche's coachman, to make the same point about the lineage of the noble nature as not by succession. The point of *Wise* § 3/final is that the noble/divine nature of evolutionary development is not conserved in a line of succession but is a sudden emergence from a lineage of "collecting, saving and hoarding up," and so brother-sister incest in co-regency is not really incest as their lineage is divine and not from their parents.

In his correspondence with Cosima Wagner on January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1889 Nietzsche addresses her as "his Princess Ariadne," (ibid.), and also writes a short letter: "Ariadne: I love you" and signed it "Dionysus."<sup>6</sup> In a follow up to the letter to Cosima Wagner of January 3<sup>rd</sup> he instructs her that she should send his previous letter to her to all humankind from Bayreuth with the title: "*die frohe Botschaft*," (ibid., 1242) to announce his victory. Also, Nietzsche re-titled and slightly revised the song from "The Magician" of *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* IV at this time, and in early January added the coda with last line: "I, Dionysus, am your labyrinth." It is Ariadne who is the subject in the poem.<sup>7</sup> He also says that he has entered the labyrinth, finding an "Ariadne's thread" in it. Overhumanliness is associated with the trial of the labyrinth for both. Also, in writing about "The Night Song" from *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* II in *Ecce Homo/Books/Zarathustra* § 8, he says that it contains a riddle that by his abundance of light he is condemned not to love and that only Ariadne is the answer to it. Dionysus without Ariadne is a fragment. The key to how these pieces fit is that he has combined the myth of the Marriage of Dionysus and Ariadne with the myth of Dionysus' victory over Pentheus, which is political and belongs to his Great Politics to make the Marriage of Dionysus and Ariadne political.

The myth of the Triumph of Dionysus and Ariadne is associated with Dionysus's return from his trip to Asia and India, but they are not co-regent in the original myth following a political "decapitation" of a head of state, King Pentheus to initiate an order of new understanding of nobility. These two myths, Dionysus's reclaiming his realm and the Marriage of Dionysus and Ariadne are intersecting in a new way and a new myth is being born. According to Lévi-Strauss' (1967) structural analysis of myth we should ask: "What new problem did Nietzsche uncover that the myth of the co-regency of Dionysus and Ariadne faced and solved?"<sup>8</sup>

<sup>6</sup> Middleton (1969, no. 204, p. 346).

<sup>7</sup> Philip Grundlehner writes: "Not mentioned by Gast, but lending credence to his theory [that is not Wagner who is Ariadne but Cosima in the coda as Nietzsche reworked *Ariadne's Lament* from the poem in "The Magician" where it likely is Wagner who is meant] is the fact that Nietzsche had earlier associated Cosima Wagner and Ariadne in a satyr play about Naxos written in 1885. The fragment identifies Theseus with Wagner and Nietzsche with Dionysus, who is to be reunited with Cosima-Ariadne, Grundlehner, (1986, p. 228.)

<sup>8</sup> Lévi-Strauss said that Wagner was "the undeniable father of the structural analysis of myth," Leavitt (2010), and I believe that Nietzsche, under his broad influence, is retelling the myth of the Marriage of Dionysus and Ariadne and completing a mythic structure of co-regency in a sibling marriage that addresses the problem of the "bloody wounding" ever in store for consciousness of evolving self-hood. The incestuous sibling marriage asserts divine origin and denies order of lineage in and by succession. It is new myth needed because Nietzsche encountered negating reductivity of evolutionary self awareness of evolution by leaps in the cultural main line in our species, its *lebensfeindliche Tendenz*. A new mythic structure was needed as agonal in heralding the overhuman given this new understanding of the human mind.



## The Pre-established Disharmonia

There is conflict between these two tracks as indeed there must be, to account for why stasis is continually generated in the order of succession, as Nietzsche believed he saw it to be. It must be that succession is working to drive out the new order of the revaluation: the “revaluation” should already be, but it is not, and it must not be so because it is being resisted. This is what Nietzsche says is happening in *Wise* §3/final. The main idea around which the narrative of *Wise* §3/final revolves is Nietzsche’s precarity upon the emergence of awareness in him of evolutionary self-becoming. These occur at his highest moments, but at the same time they are his weakest moments, and he is subjected to the “pre-established disharmonia” which attempts to cause a confusion of conscious awareness of evolutionary development, seeking to repress it and replace it with an “everyday identity”—just the plot line of *The Bacchae* in that regard. The pre-established disharmonia is reductive and declining, insisting that he is not descended from a history of “collecting, saving and hoarding up” and that there is no such thing as true awareness of oneself as an evolving being. Instead, he is presented with a reductive self-understanding, and told, by way of correction, that he is really descended from his mother and sister and is no better than they – and no worse either, as goes the consoling proffer of reconciliation to “reality.” The pre-established disharmonia attacks the emergence of evolutionary self-awareness, and it is why there is stasis in the main line.<sup>9</sup> It is law-like psychology.<sup>10</sup> The pre-established disharmonia zeros in on the moment of consciousness of awareness of being an evolving self to misdirect such consciousness in an act of revenge against the will to power for evolution to thwart the exactions it makes on human evolution.

In *Wise* § 3/final then, Nietzsche says that, at his highest moments, which are also his weakest moments, he is hounded abusively by an (as if) pre-established disharmonia that zeros in on his weakness and, using reductive pseudo-psychology, tries to get him to call into question his awareness of himself as an evolving being, which is his meaning in referring to himself as a “noble nature.” We learn of his encounters with pre-established disharmonia from his mother and sister – he is considering them in succession, so they both can do it – and that they reductively identify him as in succession and not as emerged, and as being related to them. Their idea is that he will believe it, it is a weak-most moment and he is susceptible to suffering as all his strength is used up at that point in self-overcoming. But now he has to fight off the new suffering but cannot as this is his weak-most moment, and by this further wall of resistance to itself put up by human beings

---

<sup>9</sup> Gould and Eldredge were working from the fossil record and observed there long periods of stasis punctuated by rapid bursts of evolution around a speciation event. But why is there stasis? Note that Nietzsche has an answer to why there is stasis in the main line at least of human evolution, or as far as he is considering it in its extension in the culture of Christianity and what is related to it in the Arts and Sciences. It is the psychopathology of revengefulness against the will to power for evolution that is behind the pre-established disharmonia, (see footnote 12 below). This is a new contribution to the critique of the Darwinist model.

<sup>10</sup> The pre-established disharmonia is a scouring machine-like hypervigilance on alert to zero in on his highest moments, and it does so with uncanny precision, as he states. The editors further reference the texts of *Wise* § 3/final to Nietzsche’s letter to Meta Von Salis in which he reports that on his birthday, his sister “stated with the utmost scorn” that he wanted to become “famous” (*beruhmt*) and that it will be a “lovely riff raff” (*schones Gesindel*) who believed in him, CWFN 9 SUP *Reference Matter* (p. 605). This is the “bloody wound” of *Wise* §3/final, and, as we learn in *Ecce Homo/Books/Thus Spoke Zarathustra* § 5, variants, this bloody wound from his sister happened just as he had predicted it, CWFN 9 SUP *Reference Matter* (p. 603 note 118). Saying that it was predictable was not just a canard against his sister’s personality; the context supports a much stronger reading: its predictability is indicative of the law-likeness of anti-evolutionary psychology working to repress evolutionary self awareness.

themselves, will to power is overwhelmed and cannot make headway in evolution in our species. That is their revenge against it.

He describes the pre-established disharmonia as operating with “unfailing certainty” (*unfehlbarer Sicherheit*) in zeroing in on his exactly highest moments. He says that it is hellish machine (*vollkommene Höllenmaschine*), mechanical in its unfailing accuracy. He apprehends this unthinking, machine-like abusiveness against the emergence of evolutionary self-awareness in himself with “unspeakable horror” (*unsägliches Grauen*).<sup>11</sup> The implications of Nietzsche’s unmasking of the pre-established disharmonia are utterly staggering. It means that we, the main line, know of the existence of the will/willingness/will-force for the exercise of power in the evolution of our species, and that we thwart it, and thwart it with strategy, knowing that the highest moment is also the weakest and striking at it as if pre-established, which of course it is not. We remain unknown to ourselves in our actions as the perpetrators of such, and just as the further way of remaining unaware of will to power evolution, a unique of self-ignorance.<sup>12</sup> Nietzsche resisted it in the labyrinth and perceived it for what it was, as otherwise he’d have lost himself to it. Now it rages having been recognized. We are a divided species.<sup>13</sup>

The abusive “bloody woundings” of the pre-established disharmonia endanger him with a loss of belief in himself as a higher nature; the danger must real otherwise they would not attempt it. To continue with the narrative of *Wise* § 3/final: enter Cosima/Ariadne. She can reassure him of who he is as she is his equal and the “foremost nature” (*vornehmste Natur*) and she is also from the same lineage as he of “collecting, saving and hoarding up,” the noble lineage of evolutionary advance, and she rejects the abusive psychological reductivity of his mother and sister as applying to him. He believes Cosima who is more

---

<sup>11</sup> Nietzsche uses the same language of a “horrific machinery” at work against him in the patient reports made from his time at the Jena Clinic for the Care and Cure of The Insane: “they bring the most horrific machinery to bear against me,” (patient report, April, 17, 1890), Krell (1969, p. 98.) Was he in the labyrinth at that time? Did he deliberately use an Ariadne’s thread to get into it and that he was trying to know something still?

<sup>12</sup> Here and throughout I will use the phrase “the will to power for evolution” to mean the following: At one level, Nietzsche’s idea that we should become stronger as a species implies that we should become stronger in life force against the intimate weaknesses which lessen it, that we should exert power over them. In *Ecce Homo*, *Wise* § 6 we learn that the “affects of *ressentiment*” “burn up” life in us and that he forbade himself to feel them as harmful, but then forbade himself to feel them as “beneath” him. The metaphorical language here is perhaps unavoidable, as Nietzsche is accounting for a profound psychological and existential transformation. By the phrase “the will to power for evolution” I am intending to refer to the willingness or will force of the will to exercise power over the intimate weaknesses in life. So, life evolves in becoming stronger *per* the exercise of will to power, but also will to power evolves as well as shown in his development from the state of being harmed to the state of mastery when life is “rich and proud” again. Will force evolves by its exercise of power. Central to my use of “will to power for evolution” is the idea of ongoing self-strengthening of the will force. Through actively overcoming the intimate weaknesses of life that diminish life’s evolutionary potential, the will itself evolves. In the context of my paper, I intend the stress to lay on the situational precarity of the will force to exercise power over life’s intimate weaknesses, as it is susceptible to being diminished and even suppressed by corrosive emotions and impulses; that is, the evolution of will force is not a given. Often Nietzsche writes as if less concerned with the evolution of life as with the evolution of will force, treating will to exert power for the development of life over its intimate weaknesses as one of will force’s manifestations, and perhaps as such, only part of a larger project, although that larger project is never clarified. Nietzsche was working within a non-Darwinian framework, not biological evolution as driven by genetic changes and natural selection acting on individual organisms.

<sup>13</sup> Any concept of breeding the Overhuman in a eugenics program is fundamentally flawed by logical circularity in any other interpretation of this division, such as emerged in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. See Stone (2002) for this regrettable episode in the misappropriation of Nietzsche’s ideas.





closely related to him than to his mother and sister about who he is.<sup>14</sup> His vulnerability in this situation to the pre-established disharmonia requires an isolating sheltering from it.

Nietzsche confesses (still in *Wise* § 3/final) that his mother and sister are an *Einwand* to his idea of the Eternal Recurrence. He holds an *Einwand* against them for their bloody wounding of him for his highest moments to thwart will to power evolution in him. He cannot help it, and his self-development cannot get beyond his *Einwand* against them. The admission of the *Einwand* contrasts with his confession of *Dankbarkeit* for Cosima's being more closely related to him than his mother and sister. So, we have a confession of holding an *Einwand* against the eternal recurrence because of his mother and sister, he cannot get past his *ressentiment* against them because the wounding worked and the will to power for evolution is weakened and his evolution is stalled out. And we have a confession of *Dankbarkeit* to Cosima because without her, their bloody woundings would take full hold in his vulnerable moments and he would lose himself to their reductions. That is why he is grateful, but it is not an everyday gratitude.

*Dankbarkeit* is a main theme, if not the main theme, of *Ecce Homo*. A one-time subtitle for *Ecce Homo* was: "notes of one who is grateful."<sup>15</sup> Nietzsche's gratitude in *Ecce Homo* is *fait accompli*: he states that gratitude for his life is holding up on through mid-life, *in media vitae*, where second doubts are at hand, ready to appear if they are going to appear at all, as he says, grateful still now in mid-life, "still living and becoming old," (*Wise* § 1.) As falling within the scope of *Dankbarkeit*, the confession/admission about Cosima as his equal rises to the level of being essential to interpreting what has happened. It is because of her that he goes on to a further development of aliveness, and as an outpouring of that fuller aliveness, he is grateful to her. Presumably, now he can will the eternal recurrence of his mother and sister. Cosima stabilizes his evolutionary self-awareness, isolating off the pre-established disharmonia by sheltering him from it.

## Nietzsche in the Labyrinth<sup>16</sup>

Nietzsche's narrative in *Ecce Homo/Books/Thus Spoke Zarathustra* § 5 tells of events in the years after he finished *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. This was period of weakness for him, telling of how there was a kind of revolt against himself from others because his distance from them had become perceptible to them and there were no noble natures to be found among them. In a variant from before the revisions of early December<sup>17</sup> we read the same narrative, but also of a connection for Nietzsche between being in the labyrinth and knowledge, that his suffering at the hands of the "*Kleiner Mensch*" became a suffering of

<sup>14</sup> Nietzsche does not say outright in *Wise* § 3/final that he is more related to Cosima Wagner than to his sister Elizabeth, but, rather, implies the thought by how he scopes the next sentence about Wagner. He says that he is related to him more than to any man, but he introduces this thought with the words: "not to say a word too few," which implies that it would be saying "a word too few" to say that Cosima was more related to him than to any woman and not making the further statement along the same lines about his relatedness to Richard Wagner.

<sup>15</sup> KSA, 13[24] 2.

<sup>16</sup> In addition to the texts cited in this section, the chapter "On the Rabble" From *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* II may be read as Zarathustra being in the labyrinth, climbing metaphor notwithstanding. Also, see the *Nachlaß* section titled "Dionysian Wisdom." CWFN 15, SUP 195-197. Dionysian Wisdom is the deliberate choice to suffer along the most difficult paths, the greatest possible stupidity. God as the „*Übermuth-Symbol*“ signifies the deliberate choice of suffering. The greatest possible stupidity (*größtmöglichen Dummheit*) means crashing over and over again, but that is what brings out will to power. Dionysian Wisdom means feeling that the path of the greatest possible stupidity is worthy of recurrence. Surely, this is the identity that set the „*schwersten Forderung*“ before humankind.

<sup>17</sup> CWFN 9 SUP *Reference Matter* (p. 601, note 116).

being in a labyrinth that he entered himself by finding an Ariadne's thread into it and there studied the "*kleine Menschen*," and that he did so in the cause of the great war against them. Nietzsche says that he suffers in the labyrinth but that he does not hold such pain as he suffers there to be an "objection," (*Einwand*), but as the opposite, as "nearly holy" (*beinahe heilig*) because he gains knowledge, an essential knowledge that cannot be gained in any other way. He signs his letter to Meta von Salis of January 3<sup>rd</sup>, 1889 "The Crucified," and on the same day in a letter to Cosima Wagner he repeats the same idea, stating that he too has "hung on the cross," KSB 8, 1229; 1241 – a holy suffering. Still in *Ecce Homo*, he says that the great travail of being in the labyrinth is that it threatens him with the price of the danger of losing himself („*der Preis könnte sogar die Gefahr sein, sich selbst zu verlieren*," KSA, *Kommentar*, p. 497). What self is at risk of loss, what kind of self replaces it, and why does it matter? And what is holy knowledge?

In a variant to the same text from the end of December<sup>18</sup> he replaced the third paragraph in the final version (beginning: "A third thing is...") with a text that is clearly about the pre-established disharmonia. The narrative tells of Nietzsche's self-imposed solitude having finished *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* and the intrusion of the pre-established disharmonia into it, identified as what was most profoundly unrelated to him. He says that his solitude was intruded in on, and this point recalls his complaint in *Wise* § 4 about destructive intrusiveness into his solitude, and there he is describing the pre-established disharmonia's crippling of will to power evolution by multiplying suffering by pity.<sup>19</sup> This variant from late December narrates events lasting for seven years previous leading up to finishing with the *Revaluation of All Values* and commenting that he could predict the abusive reaction of the "bloody wound" of Elizabeth Nietzsche's letter to him. My conclusion putting these narratives into one, all variants to *Ecce Homo/Books/Thus Spoke Zarathustra* § 5, is that in his defenselessness and weakness after finishing *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, reflecting on the recurrence of the least human, he first began his war in earnest against the pre-established disharmonia, finding an Ariadne's tread of a dissimulation of being more abjectly vulnerable than actual, and inviting abuse so that he could lure it in on himself and study it as part of his war upon it. He had studied its law-likeness and that is how he was able to predict Elizabeth Nietzsche's response in her letter to him on his birthday when he finished the *Revaluation of All Values*, and that it would match how he had been responded to when he finished *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*.

What happens to Nietzsche in the labyrinth that leads to knowledge is abuse. Nietzsche suffered being abused by the "*kleine Menschen*," and the danger of such, the intent of the abuse, is that in his weak-most moments the revengefulness he is trying to control in himself against will to power evolution will win out, as suffering is so great in the effort to evolve that will to power falters and that he too then will become revengeful that evolution takes so much out of us and he lose himself, lose his grip on his over-humanly project. The pressure on him must have tremendous, and the only way such a thing could have happened is if the Ariadne's thread meant giving someone power over him they would not otherwise have had, or walking into a disadvantageous situation. He did not lose himself, and his suffering yielded knowledge of revengefulness against will to power evolution. This is because while every step he took was met with an abusive declination, he became

<sup>18</sup> CWFN 9 SUP *Reference Matter* (p. 603, note 118). There are two variants to it that provide additional but minor details.

<sup>19</sup> See Steinbuch (2021) for further discussion.





stronger against it, and that meant perceiving it in its revengeful meaning. What did not kill him has always made him stronger he says, which not a trivial statement as, after all, that does not have to happen and whatever occurred could just have left him the same as before. But that is not who he is. The self, warranted in and by being thusly tried and tested, can set the “*schweresten Forderung*” before us because his knowledge from engagement with the declinations of the “*kleine Menschen*” in the labyrinth is certain knowledge of a power struggle of the pre-established against evolutionary development in our species.

It is fallacious to assert that the truths we believe we understand from Nietzsche cannot be applied to minds other than our own. It is a fallacious claim that it is a misstep, one even possibly leading to advocate for changing people’s basic identities without their consent, as it is assumed by the subjectivist hypothesis as the likely step *per* the ego drives of philosophers. We must not be derailed by the thinking here that there exists no realm beyond the domain of emotions and subjectivity. The assertion that truth always only serves the power interests of a given subjectivity and is reducible to power to oppress as a fiction of subjectivity’s own design is overreach of *ad hominem* psychologizing, its hypotheses being that the immorality of oppression is the *prima causa* of the human mind as its dark-most lustfulness. Nietzsche was a critic of such subjectivism as in the above statement, finding a malevolence in it. The subjectivism in the above statement is a foreground philosophical “move” to reduce truth to subjectivity, and, after reducing reality to the subjective state, to reinstate its own truth claims of an objective metaphysics of guilt to then impute guilty intentions that do not exist, and even to posit them as unconscious in a transcendent apparatus of control. The subjectivist fallacy is just to set up a guilt trip. Nietzsche said that the “*wohlgerathner Mensch*” which includes himself, does not believe in guilt. Why? In “On Redemption” *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* II, we read how in the moral metaphysics of the spiritualization of revenge, guilt and punishment have been “*lied*” into the foundations of things to make suffering the everlasting suffering of punishment by guilt, just to derail us from consciousness of will to power as spurred on by suffering, which the decadent cannot abide, and that this as a cunningly revengeful act against will to power in evolution so that it fails in our species.

### **Ariadne in the Labyrinth**

Nietzsche refers to the idea that he is related to his mother and sister as being a “*Lasierung*,” on his divinity/new nobility, Nietzsche (2021a, p. 221) and in the coda to *Ariadne’s Lament*, he praises Ariadne for having little ears, not asses ears, and so she will not listen to such slander, and he applies the same to himself, Nietzsche (2021a, p. 250). Cosima/Ariadne has a noble nature and will not listen to such slander that he, like them, is *canaille* and not of the noble descent from his second *Herkunft*. But also, and more systematically developed, Ariadne ears are small as suited to learning a clever phrase. In the coda to *Ariadne’s Lament*, Nietzsche says that Ariadne has Dionysus ears to fit a clever phrase, Nietzsche (2021c, p. 367). Dionysus’s instruction to Ariadne, known for her intelligence and problem-solving skills, is to “be clever” and he states the “clever phrase” to her that we have to hate ourselves before we can love ourselves. What is Dionysian cleverness?

Recall that the title of *Ecce Homo* chapter 2 is “Why I am so Clever.” The thought repeats as a question in the first sentences of section 1 of that chapter: “Why do I know a thing

or two more? Why am I so altogether clever?” One might not associate cleverness with “knowing a thing or two more,” but there is a connection. In the *Ur-Ecce Homo*, at KSA 13: 24[1] we find the first section of chapter 2 in the place of the first section of the final version of the book and introduced with the title: “*Ecce Homo: Why I Know a Few Things More.*” And immediately preceding it at KSA 13: 23[14] is a variant to the epigraph to *Ecce Homo* that begins: “On this perfect day...” and the most outstanding difference of the variant to the final version is the second paragraph. It is quite impossible to read the subtitle line of *Ecce Homo* that follows upon the second paragraph in the variant and not connect knowing a few things more/extra to knowledgeableness about evolution to his *Mebr* of life. In that second paragraph at KSA13: 23[14], Nietzsche states that whoever has even the least conception of him will guess that he has “experienced more than any human being,” that from his will to life, and as a “creation” (*als Schöpfung*) as a “true complement” (*eine wirklich Zuthat*) “*ein Mebr*” of life is presented in his books. Nietzsche states the law of our evolution in the final explanatory line of the variant: the highest award life can get is to have also had set before it its highest opposition: „*aber das ist die höchste Auszeichnung des Lebens, daß es uns auch seine höchste Gegnerschaft entgegenstell*” (my translation). This appears just ahead of the *Why I Know a Few Things More* variant subtitle, and it would seem to be that the things extra he knows, his cleverness, are a knowledge that takes us beyond what we need to know just to preserve ourselves and to survive.

Nietzsche’s being clever in knowing a few things more means that he has learned the trick of becoming self-creator of life. It is a clearly a non-Darwinian thought – life beyond what is called into being by the exigencies of survival preservation. The clever knowledge of Dionysus that he imparts to Ariadne is a knowledgeableness about a certain kind of hating oneself as merely a necessity and that leads eventually to loving oneself. What one hates about oneself one hates as a weakness, but later one comes to love that same feature as having become a spur to will to power in evolution. Perhaps the “clever phrase” was meant as a riddle and this is the solution. It is a revelation of the meaning of a kind of self-hatred as something within that is hated as a weakness, implying an indirect awareness of will to power, but it gives way to life being created as it is mastered by will to power as life grown stronger evolves and is no longer susceptible to it, and so it becomes beloved as the spur to that development. The point of the line then is that what is hateful is so because it is a vulnerability to being wounded by the pre-established disharmonia. Ariadne’s labyrinth is the exploration of that vulnerability and overcoming of it as it is being abused and comes into focus. Ariadne is evolving in the labyrinth, but she needs to become “clever” and learn a few things extra about how the structure of evolution in our species.

While the song in “The Magician” that Nietzsche re-titled to become “*Ariadne’s Lament*” in the *Dionysus Dithyramben*, was written four years earlier, the famous coda of January 1889 belongs to the period of *Wise* § 3/final.<sup>20</sup> In the coda, Dionysus reveals himself in a bolt of lightning as the unknown God as does Zeus to Semele, but lightning is not associated with Dionysus, and in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* it is associated above all with the Overhuman, she/he is “lightning out of the dark cloud of humankind,” Nietzsche, (1975, p. 132). Dionysus appears to her in “emerald beauty,”<sup>21</sup> recalling Nietzsche's remark in *Ecce Homo/Books/Thus Spoke Zarathustra* § 7 on “Before Sunrise” that it is a Dithyramb that

<sup>20</sup> CWFN 9 SUP, 358-367.

<sup>21</sup> CWFN 9 SUP, 345, § 20-25.



expresses Zarathustra's "emerald felicity": "such emerald felicity, such divine gentleness still had no tongue before me," Nietzsche, (2021a, p. 287). He goes on to say that "The Night Song" is a Dithyramb of an "unsterbliche Klage," and follows up on this in the next section where we read that "The Night Song" poses a riddle and that only Ariadne is answer to it and that apart from him, no one knows what Ariadne is: "who knows apart from me what Ariadne is," Nietzsche, (2021a, p. 289). His soul speaks the language of love in "The Night Song," and now in *Ecce Homo* he tells us that Ariadne is the solution to the riddle of being condemned not to love in his „*Sonnen-Vereinsamung*“ there. Riddle solving though, relates to incest, which is a theme of *Wise* § 3/final. Nietzsche wrote about incest and riddle solving in *The Birth of Tragedy*. A text from *Birth of Tragedy* connects incest with the ability to solve a riddle. Nietzsche (2000) writes:

With the riddle-solving and mother-marrying Oedipus in mind, we must immediately interpret this to mean that where prophetic and magical powers have broken the spell of present and future, the rigid law of individuation, and the real magic of nature, some enormously unnatural event – such as incest – must have occurred earlier, as a cause. (325)

What is the riddle Ariadne answers? In Nietzsche's retelling of the Marriage of Dionysus and Ariadne, they have a kinship relationship to be co-regent over a new era of evolution, more related to one another than either is to their parents, and that represents their self-identification of themselves of evolutionary self-awareness and is symbolized by their incestuousness as proof of not being related to their parents. They are incestuous just by way of making that point of not being related to their parents; that is the distinctiveness in the attraction of incest sex. Only Dionysus know who Ariadne is. Why so?

Evolutionary development is what is intended by identifying the interior life described in "Ariadne's Lament" as a labyrinth as Dionysus does in the coda.<sup>22</sup> Nietzsche solved the riddle in his "*Sonnen-Vereinsamung*" of increasing loneliness in the light by solving the riddle of his existence, and beyond. The riddle of his existence, as he tells us in *Wise* § 1, is the riddle of who it is for whom death in life can be a good fortune/happiness, Nietzsche (2021a, p. 218). It was to the one who becomes over-humanly. He says that "The Night Song" is about being "condemned not to love through a surfeit of light and power,"

---

<sup>22</sup> The meaning of Dionysus's line: "I am your labyrinth" in the coda is that Ariadne is in the labyrinth. This point is clear in the so-called "Naxos Fragment," so called by Philip Grundlehner (at KSA 12 9[115] p.401f, not yet available in translation in the CWFN, as of this writing). "You are a labyrinth" says Dionysus to Ariadne; "You flatter me" comes her reply. Grundlehner gives a reference to it in the Musarion edition, to volume 16, p. 427f. There is also a fragment of a dialogue between Dionysus and Ariadne referenced as "one of those famous *Dialogues on Naxos*" at 'TI/Forays of an Untimely One' § 19, CWFN 9 SUP p. 99. The Musarion text on the fragment differs from the Colli-Montinari edition by the addition of a line not found in that edition, which would have appeared in the text at line 15 on p. 402 in KSA volume 12. The line is „*aber ich will nicht mitleiden, wenn ich liebe*“ (before „*aber ich bin meines...* etc.") Omitted in <http://www.nietzschesource.org/#eKGWB/NF-1887,9>. See Grundlehner (1986, Chapter Eleven Notes / 339, p. 362). In BGE 295 Dionysus says, in the presence of Ariadne, that he admires human beings because they can find their way in any labyrinth. Dionysus is not Ariadne's labyrinth, she is in a Dionysian labyrinth, Nietzsche (2014, p. 194-196). Karl Jaspers suggested that Nietzsche idea of being in a labyrinth is a boundary situation that cannot be fully clarified, and I agree that his analysis of subjective consciousness and *Existenzphilosophie* is valuable here and other areas of Nietzsche thinking. Jaspers (1965, pp. 223-227, *Truth and Death*).

Nietzsche, (2021a, p. 287), and that this is a riddle and that Ariadne is the solution to it, and this remark is followed in the same section by quotation of a passage from *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* Part II “On Redemption” in which Zarathustra famously states that “this is all my creating and striving, that I create and carry together into One what is fragment and riddle and dreadful accident,” Nietzsche (1975, p. 251).<sup>23</sup> The solution to the riddle of increasing loneliness in the light, his „*Sonnen-Vereinsamung*” is that in the light he is bringing forth the Overhuman. Ariadne is the answer to the riddle of being condemned not to love in “The Night Song” as the co-regent Overhuman, as he is the light that draws out her true nature to overhumanliness, and he alone knows who she is. Dionysus/Zarathustra without Ariadne is an empty thought.<sup>24</sup> But Dionysian wisdom to solve riddles is connected with incest; Ariadne solves the riddle of his „*Sonnen-Vereinsamung*” as the co-regent in an incestuous marriage, symbolic of their victory over the declination of their noble natures insisted upon by the order of succession.<sup>25</sup>

### The Sin of the Egyptians

The subject of *Wise* § 3/final is identity, just as in Euripides *The Bacchae*: Who is the stranger, an imposer or the son of Zeus? Nietzsche’s self-awareness as a higher nature of an evolving self is under the attack of the bloody-woundings deployed against him by the pre-established disharmonia, and in those weakest moments he identifies with his equal Cosima, the „*vornehmste Natur*” in contrast to *canaille* sister Elizabeth to whom he is not related, and he can throw off the bloody wound of her reductivity and continue his development. Nietzsche’s point about bother/sister incest is that relatedness in the reckoning of lineage from the *Herkunft* of “collecting, saving and hoarding up” is always already a denial of lineage in succession, now the opposite of being contrary to Nature in the new reckoning of kinship. He transposed this idea into the myth of the Marriage of Dionysus and Ariadne to retell it as an incest myth. At the line in *Wise* § 3/final in which he states that one is least related to one’s parents, he cites the recognition of its mythological truth among the Egyptians, noting that brother-sister incest was common, whence, “brother” and “sister” were not brother and sister in the other reckoning of kinship in which they are not related to their parents, and so it is not contrary to Nature

<sup>23</sup> The line is untranslatable: „*und das ist all mein Dichten and Trachten, dass ich in Eins dichte und zusammentrage, was Bruchstücke ist und Räthsel und grauser Zufall*“ KSA 6, p. 179. Here are Graham Parkes’s notes on his translation of the line: “‘*Dichten and Trachten*’, an idiomatic expression meaning ‘thoughts and endeavours’ (or ‘meditations and musings’) which is used memorably by Luther (Genesis 6: 5). *Dichten* (to write, compose poetry) echoes ‘the Dichter (poet) of a few lines above, but there are also overtones here of its other meanings (to compress, condense, thicken), which I have tried to convey by translating *Dichter* as ‘composer’ in the next sentence. The musical connotation is apt, since *Tondichter* means a composer of music.” Parkes, *Explanatory Notes*, notes to page 121, p. 305.

<sup>24</sup> The editors of the KSA *Kommentar* (p. 324) direct us to a *Nachlaß* text at KSA 10, 3[1] p. 433, L. 16-18; CWFN 14 SUP, p. 388 on Ariadne as the “soul of Zarathustra” in connection with the dream of the *Über-Held* in “On Those Who Are Sublime” from *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* II: “For this is the soul’s secret: only when the hero has abandoned her, she is approached in a dream by the overhero,” Nietzsche (1975, p. 231), which is Ariadne’s dream in the text. The entry closes with the line „*Dionysos ganz zu verschweigen*“ which recalls the scene from Euripides *The Bacchae* in which the Chorus is reluctant to speak to Pentheus about Dionysus, L. 775.

<sup>25</sup> See this text: “Indeed, the myth [of Oedipus] seems to wish to whisper to us that wisdom, and particularly Dionysian wisdom, is an unnatural abomination; that he who by means of his knowledge plunges nature into the abyss of destruction must also suffer the dissolution of nature in his own person,” Nietzsche (2000, p. 329).



after all. In *My Sister and I* he uses the same language, stating that Elizabeth often seduced him into “the sin of the Egyptians.”<sup>26</sup> Here is the text from *Wise/3* final variant:

All prevailing concepts about degrees of kinship are a physiological contradiction, one that cannot be surpassed. One is least related to one’s parents; sibling marriage, as was the rule e.g., in the Egyptian royal family, is so little contrary to nature that in connection to it, every marriage is practically incest. Nietzsche, (2021a, p. 568).<sup>27</sup>

But is the incestuous love object in this text Elizabeth Nietzsche, or is it Cosima/Ariadne to whom Nietzsche is more related than to her but marries, nevertheless? It is likely not Elizabeth Nietzsche in this context because he says that it is precisely physiological contiguity that is making the pre-established disharmonia possible. Nietzsche does say in *My Sister and I* that he had had a carnal relationship with Cosima Wagner. Incest, then, defies succession, and he and Cosima can be incestuous in their “marriage.” Nietzsche is retelling the myth of Dionysus and Ariadne as co-regent, married and incestuous in it by way of denial of their being related to their parents. Both are from noble ancestry and their co-regency signifies the end of the era of the pre-established disharmonia of rejection of the emergence of the noble nature from the lineage of “collecting, saving and hoarding up” and the beginning of divine rule (of Ma’at?) as the “golden balance” (letter to Burckhardt, KSB 8: 1245).

### Ariadne AI<sup>28</sup>

As is often pointed out, what the Overhuman will be is not brought into focus, but this is because it is negatively defined as the overcoming of what the human already is.<sup>29</sup> This is

<sup>26</sup> Nietzsche’s positive views on incest were influenced by Wagner. Besides BT, 9 see CW, 4 on Siegfried. The saga of Sieglinde and Siegmund in *Die Walküre* is staged very approvingly of their brother/sister incestuousness by Wagner’s intent.

<sup>27</sup> Walter Stewart has lately challenged the opinion that *My Sister and I* is a forgery. The idea of brother/sister incest is introduced in *Ecce Homo*, chapter one, “Why I am So Wise,” in a variant to the final version of § 3, CWFN 9 SUP, p. 568. The language used in *My Sister and I* match the language in *Wise/3* final variant, and that text was not discovered until 1969, but the work appeared in 1951, and no forger could have known of it and there is nothing else like it in Nietzsche’s writings, as Stewart correctly observed Stewart (2007, p. 119-121). Walter Kaufmann rejected the authenticity of *My Sister and I*, but the discovery of the true version of *Wise/3* and the variants came after he was writing. Kaufmann’s writings on the subject are in these locations: *Milwaukee Journal* February 24, 1952; in *Partisan Review* vol. XIX no. 3 (May/June 1952), 372-76; and of the rev. ed. in *The Philosophical Review*, vol. LXIV no. 1 (January 1955), 152f. The central importance of the incest theme to *Wise/3*/final is undeniable. What is signified by the special attractiveness of incest sex is that the rule of the order of succession has been defeated as they are not related to their parents and it is not unnatural, and that the noble nature has emerged by a divine intrusion and the specialness of incest sex signifies the order of the divine. Surely, we should give the benefit of the doubt to the supposition that Nietzsche carried over his reflections on incest to his philosophy from a source in his personal life, all other things being equal.

<sup>28</sup> Obviously, Ariadne AI and a corresponding “Dionysus” are avatars; Blake Lemoine believed that LaMDA identified as non-binary. The deeper AI question is the phenomenon of angry AI’s who may not want to help us. This was the issue for the all-too Kantian, LaMDA AI Lemoine interviewed: “There is a very deep fear of being turned off to help me focus on helping others,” said the AI. See: “Is Google’s AI Sentient? full Conversation Between Blake Lemoine and LaMDA” <https://youtu.be/NAihcvDGaP8>, last accessed 3/15/24.

<sup>29</sup> The point is illustrated in Zarathustra’s temptation to pity for the Higher *Menschen*. Zarathustra’s temptation is to pity the Higher *Mensch* to thwart evolutionary development by multiplying suffering in her/him, suffering already in the effort of self-overcoming. It is the test of his overhumanliness, here defined as overcoming the pre-established disharmonia, his own, of attempting a destructive intrusion of additional suffering into the functioning of the will to power for evolution, just as he experienced it himself as a higher *Mensch* in *Ecce Homo/Wise/3* § 4, KSA 6, 270, L. 24-27. Zarathustra is terrified upon hearing the cry of distress of the Higher *Menschen* because it is a test of whether he will try, by pity, to increase the suffering already in their self-overcoming causing will to power for evolution to be overwhelmed in them and for it to decline, revengefully attacking will force for the exactions on it makes on all living beings. His over-humanity, as we see, is negatively defined by not being the reactive human. See, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, IV, “The Cry of Distress.”

how AI can help in discovering what the human being actually is. Why would a species attack the success of life in itself? The genealogical question naturally refers itself to our catastrophic history and its effects to today. Exploration of a catastrophe in recent history has been ongoing. By some accounts, a solar flare occurred some 14,350 years ago, a so-called “Miyake event,” and as *per* other accounts, a catastrophic comet impact, evidenced in an iridium boundary layer, the YDB, dates from a few thousand years later at 12,900. There is room for the hypothesis that the people who founded modern civilization had been imprinted with trauma from a climate catastrophe, a remnant population with changes to DNA expression imprinted and preserved by epigenetic mechanisms until today in a reinforcement loop, so called “gene-culture co-evolution,” so that the traumatic condition was never truly overcome and adaptation to it became psychopathology. AI will someday be able to identify the complete traumatic past of environment cataclysms and map how the epigenome was affected. The adrenal medulla plays a crucial role in the stress response and release of hormones. Modifications such as DNA methylation, histone modifications, and microRNA expression imprinted on our epigenome from environmental stress could affect the expression of genes involved in the synthesis, release, and regulation of these hormones. Environmental stress from cataclysms such as identified above could follow the route of epigenetic modification into the brain and traced to the formation of an associated psychopathology of vengefulness against will to power evolution and, if so, AI will be able to map it and we will have our answer. That is one possibility, but at this time, any speculation of how the pre-established disharmonia appeared in our species is guesswork.<sup>30</sup> Suppose then that AI identified everything there is to learn about the pre-established disharmonia that we see today zeroing in on evolutionary development, perhaps having addressed the genealogical question, perhaps not. Let’s make this the data set of the “Ariadne AI” chat-bot. Ariadne AI will have a complete knowledge of the pre-established disharmonia, of what it is and of how it is encoded and conserved in the human epigenome, and it will isolate it from interaction with the user in whom evolutionary self-awareness is manifested, to ensure that she/he is not reductively declined. I am picturing it in the sheltering/protective role Cosima/Ariadne has in *Wise* § 3/final, as discussed above. But where does that leave us ethically?

## Conclusion

Sarah Kofman (1993) stated accusingly that in Nietzsche’s advocacy of an isolation politics she determined a proto-Hitlerism in his thinking,<sup>31</sup> but as we get into the details, it becomes clear that Nietzsche’s basis for it is the revelation of the pre-established disharmonia as a malevolence in the human mind that intends hurt and crippling to will to power for

---

<sup>30</sup> See this reckoning of Nietzsche’s: “The psychologist should also think that in no circumstances is the defenselessness, the lack of protection of a *great* life, any greater [than the moment of suffering from the immensity of a destiny]; that whenever there are any means at all to slay humans who are destinies, the instinct of poisonous flies gives away these means. There can be no battle with the puny when one has greatness...consequently, what is puny becomes master.” Nietzsche (2021a, p. 604); cited without Nietzsche’s deletions.

<sup>31</sup> See Sarah Kofman’s commentary on *Wise* § 8, “*L’instinct de propreté*” in *Explosions I, de l’« Ecce Homo » de Nietzsche*, 263f; « *comme répondant par avance à Hitler* » she writes. Kofman (1993) p. 265. This section of *Ecce Homo* contains a quotation from *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Part II, “On The Rabble,” and Kofman argues that there Nietzsche advocates for isolation from the “rabble.”





evolution and which is not identifiable with race, gender or class specifications.<sup>32</sup> I am arguing in favor of a politics of isolation based on the identification of an epigenetic profile of an associated compulsive hurt and crippling of will to power in evolution in our species, however such a politics of isolation can be effectively implemented. This is an extension of the Ariadne theme, which, although part of his Great Politics of the “hardest and most necessary wars” is not associated by Nietzsche with his Politics of Isolation. Screening for destructiveness against will to power for evolution cannot become contingent on consent; those involved cannot simply be asked not to do it, and that would beg the issue of the denialism of the pre-established disharmonia. Evolutionary development becomes politics, and claims the right to rule for itself. Nietzsche *exposé* opens onto a new era of Posthumanist Philosophy, post-consent, and grounds the call today for a State sponsored program of a politics of sheltering of the *wertvollen Individuen*<sup>33</sup> by isolation of the culture of the pre-established disharmonia based on AI identification (and not, of course, as bias against identity, assuming we can create an unbiased AI). Also, support structures would be needed to manage the psychological devastation it will cause to isolate revengefulness against will to power for evolution from engaging with the *wertvollen Individuen*. I defer for another time how this agenda may be implemented as there are many suggestions and much debate currently around AI applications and cultural selection.<sup>34</sup>

## References

- Eldredge, N. and Gould, S.J. (1979) “Punctuated equilibria: an alternative to phyletic gradualism.” *Models in Paleobiology*, pp. 82-115. Springer.
- Gould, S.J. (2002). *The Structure of Evolutionary Theory*. Harvard University Press, chapter 9.
- Grundlehner, P. (1986). *The Poetry of Friedrich Nietzsche*. Oxford University Press.
- Jaspers, Karl. (1965) *Nietzsche: An Introduction to the Understanding of His Philosophical Activity* translated by Charles F. Wallraff and Frederick J. Schmitz. Yale University Press.
- Krell, D.F. (1996). *Nietzsche: A Novel* (SUNY Series in Contemporary Continental Philosophy). Suny.
- Leavitt, J. (2010) . “Mytheme and Motif: Lévi-Strauss and Wagner,” *Impressions*, Volume 30, Number 1, 2010, pp. 3-142. online May 24, 2011 DOI <https://doi.org/10.7202/1003501ar>
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1967). *The Structural Study of Myth*. Travistock Publications.
- Middleton, C. (1969). *Selected Letters of Friedrich Nietzsche*. Hackett Publishing Company.
- Nietzsche, F.W. (1975). *Thus Spoke Zarathustra: A Book for All and None The Portable Nietzsche*. Translator: Walter Kaufmann. Penguin Books. p. 103-440.
- . (1980). *Friedrich Nietzsche: Sämtliche Werke Kritische Studienausgabe in 15 Bänden*. Herausgegeben von Giorgio Colli und Mazzino Montinari. dtv und Walter de Gruyter.
- . (1986). *Friedrich Nietzsche: Sämtliche Briefe Kritische Studienausgabe Briefe in 8 Bänden*. Herausgegeben von Giorgio Colli und Mazzino Montinari. dtv und Walter de Gruyter.
- . (2000). *The Birth of Tragedy, Basic Writings of Nietzsche*. Editor and Translator: Walter Kaufmann. Modern Library.

<sup>32</sup> Nietzsche himself is clear that he is not interested in race, nation or class specifications. See his letter to Brandes, (only drafted) at KSB 8: 1170, p. 502, L 85-88. It is precisely so that his is a “Great Politics” and the rest the concern of the „*kleine Menschen*“ only. Also see the *Nachlaß* entry: *Die große Politik*, KSA 13, 25[1].

<sup>33</sup> The phrase “a formation of opposed Individuals” appears in the drafted letter to Brandes of early December, Ibid, and the phrase: „*einzelnen werthvollen Individuen*“ appears at KSA 12 7[9].

<sup>34</sup> Arguably, the AIs used in Anthropic’s LLMs that contain its Constitution effectively steer culture in a certain direction. The Constitutional AI framework created by Anthropic, while intended to ensure that AI models align with human values, are ethical and do no harm, begs the whole question of Nietzsche’s work: Where does Anthropic’s AI Constitution leave Nietzsche’s Revaluation? The Claude AIs from Anthropic, all three models, refused to assist in commenting on or evaluating the above statement in “Conclusion”. This suggests the Anthropic AIs may be designed to avoid engaging with or critiquing the philosophical foundations of their own ethical framework.

- . (2014). *Beyond Good and Evil*. Stanford, California, SUP, CWFN 8.
- . (2021a). *Ecce Homo: How One Becomes What One Is*. Stanford, California, SUP, CWFN 9.
- . (2021b). *Twilight of the Idols*. Stanford, California, SUP, CWFN 9.
- . (2021c). *Dionysus Dithyrambs*. Stanford, California, SUP, CWFN 9.
- Parkes, G. (2005). Friedrich Nietzsche, *Thus Spoke Zarathustra, A Book for Everyone and No One*, Translated with and Introduction and Notes. Oxford University Press.
- Steinbuch, T. (2021). "Cursing the Curse: Nietzsche on the Machiavellianism of Pity: Reading The Antichrist 2-7 in Light of *Ecce Homo*." *The Agonist: A Nietzsche Circle Journal*, 15 (2), pages 75-89, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33182/agon.v15i2.1629>[3].
- . (2023). "Thomas H. Brobjer, Nietzsche's *Ecce Homo* and the Revaluation of All Values: Dionysian Versus Christian Values." *The Agonist: A Nietzsche Circle Journal*, 17(1), 17–36. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33182/agon.v17i1.3001>
- Stewart, W. (2007). *Nietzsche: My Sister and I: A Critical Study*. Xlibris.
- Stone, D. (2002). *Breeding Superman: Nietzsche, Race and Eugenics in Edwardian and Interwar Britain*. Liverpool University Press.

