

NOT NIETZSCHE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ARGUS.

Sir.—One would expect writers like Mr. Bernard Hall and "Anti-Kultur" to avoid the vulgar error of "saddling the wrong horse," and ascribing to Nietzsche the malefic influence wielded by Bernhardi, who founded on Treitschke. It is "the half-educated," as Professor Heinrich Weinel, of Jena, has remarked, "who misunderstand Nietzsche." I am no follower or champion of the "mad philosopher," but must protest against the present vogue of crediting him with the conduct of "Kaiserism" in Europe to-day. Nietzsche, says Professor A. Beth, of Edinburgh, "repudiates that devotion to the State which formed so large a part of ancient virtue. He is fierce in his polemic against modern attempts to revive this conception, whether they take the form of socialistic Utopias or the military Chauvinism of the new German Empire." He himself writes:—"My readers must be honest in intellectual matters, even to sternness, in order to endure my seriousness, my passion. They must be accustomed to live on mountains—to see the wretched ephemeral gossip of politics and national egotism under them. They must become indifferent; they must never ask whether truth is profitable or will prove a calamity to them." Proof is wanting of Nietzsche and his writings ever being acceptable to Wilhelm and his "junkers," and it is obvious that there is much in what he wrote that would be most obnoxious in those quarters. On the other hand, it is well known that Treitschke was a favourite at the Prussian Court, and Bernhardi was distinctly "persona grata."

May I, in lieu of amplifying these remarks, refer readers to Mr. McCabe's little book, just published, entitled "Treitschke and the Great War," to Helevy's "Life of Nietzsche," to Mugger's "Nietzsche, His Life and Work," and to Mr. W. M. Salter's dispassionate study of the same philosopher in the "Hibbert Journal" of October last.—Yours, &c.,

W. W.

St. Kilda, Jan. 9.