Marco Brusotti, Michael J. McNeal, Corinna Schubert,
Herman Siemens

European/Supra-European: Cultural Encounters in Nietzsche's Philosophy

Introduction

In an aphorism of the *Wanderer*, Nietzsche draws a clear distinction between a *geographical* and a *cultural* concept of 'Europe.' Neither is assigned sharp boundaries. However, the cultural concept, while not comprising the whole of geographical Europe, includes even America as "the daughter-land of our culture" (WS 215). Hence this cultural concept of 'Europe' may be considered roughly equivalent not only to "modernity" (WS 215), but also to 'the West.' Nietzsche's *political* concept of tomorrow's united Europe, which likewise is not sharply delimited, does not coincide with either the geographical or the cultural concept of Europe.

Beyond Good and Evil sees "the most unambiguous signs" that "Europe wants to be one" (BGE 256). And the author of *The Wanderer and his Shadow*, like other pro-European nineteenth-century thinkers, envisions something like the United States of Europe. With Switzerland as a model, he foresees "a European federation of peoples [*Völkerbund*] within which each individual people [...] will possess the status and rights of a canton" (WS 292). Actually, however, Nietzsche's vision is even more ambitious than full-blown federalism, let alone a 'Europe of fatherlands.' Against nationalism, he declares in *Human All Too Human*, "one should not be afraid to proclaim oneself simply a *good European* and actively to work for the amalgamation of nations" (HH I 475). The aphorism is entitled "*The European and the abolition of nations*": the "amalgamation" or "fusion" [*Verschmelzung*] of nations will result in nothing less than their "abolition" or even "annihilation" [*Vernichtung*].

The 'good Europeans' that promote this fusion of nations anticipate a form of existence still belonging largely to the future: the Europeans of tomorrow who, like "the one Europe" (BGE 256) itself, will constitute a "new *synthesis*" (BGE 256). Like these Europeans of tomorrow, already the "good Europeans, and free, very free spirits" (BGE Preface), among whom Nietzsche counts himself, are not merely citizens of any European country who stand out with their definitely pro-European stance. They are supranational existences leading a "nomadic life" (HH I 475) and crossing borders and other national restrictions as well as overcoming cultural boundaries. Their supranational character implies that they be able to synthesize in themselves different European cultures. Actually,

Nietzsche requires even more: in their thinking, they must even be ‘supra-European.’

Our volume – like the conference to which it goes back – takes its title from Nietzsche’s *Nachlass*: “Europäisch und über-europäisch,” “European and supra-European,” is the last of a list of titles in a notebook of the period of *Beyond Good and Evil*.¹ “Über-europäisch” (sometimes written “übereuropäisch”) is one of the many terms that Nietzsche builds putting the famous prefix “über” (over, super, supra) before what he thinks must be overcome. To the multifarious uses of the prefix correspond heterogeneous figures of overcoming. The “Übermensch” proclaimed by Zarathustra is undoubtedly the best known and most radical of them; but there is indeed a whole series of adjectives, mostly neologisms, constructed similarly to “übermenschlich” [*overhuman/superhuman*]: “supra-German” [*überdeutsch*], “supranational” [*übernational*], “supra-Christian” [*überchristlich*], “supra-European” [*übereuropäisch*] and even “supra-Asian” [*überasiatisch*]. None of these terms stand for an increase or a radicalization, but rather for an overcoming: thus ‘*übernational*’ does not mean ‘extremely national,’ but, on the contrary, ‘supranational’; it stands for what is beyond the national and/or leaves it behind.

The good Europeans must not only be “supra-national”; in their last consequence and at least occasionally and “temporarily,” they must be capable of thinking “in a supra-European manner” (KSA 11, 35[9]); they must have what Nietzsche calls his “supra-European eye.” The concept of “supra-European” stands for ‘beyond cultural Europe’ and thus for ‘beyond the West.’ The ‘good Europeans’ must be able to gain distance from the now declining European i. e. Western morality and overview it from afar. Then making oneself free from one’s national narrowness by becoming “more supranational” and thus “more European” is just the beginning. Europe too may still be a restriction. Thus Nietzsche envisages a whole series of successive overcomings: one has to “become step by step more encompassing, more supranational, more European, more supra-European, more oriental, and finally *more Greek* – for the Greeks were the first great binding together and synthesis of everything oriental, and

1 NL Autum 1885/Autumn 1886, KSA 12, 2[36]. On Nietzsche’s concept of “supra-European” cf. Marco Brusotti: “Europäisch und über-europäisch.” Zarathustra, der gute Europäer, und der Blick aus der Ferne,” in: Mathias Mayer (ed.): *Also wie sprach Zarathustra? West-östliche Spiegelungen im kulturgeschichtlichen Vergleich*, Würzburg 2006, pp. 73–87. A first version of this paper is: “Europäisch und über-europäisch”. Nietzsches Blick aus der Ferne,” in: *Tijdschrift voor Filosofie* 66 (2004), pp. 31–48.

thus the beginning of the European soul, the discovery of our ‘new world’.”² Here the supra-European itself is not the ultimate achievement, but only a middle stage, a preparation for an “oriental” perspective, which is apparently that much broader since it requires a further distance from national and ethnocentric narrowness. But why “finally *more Greek*”? Should the European and even the supra-European standpoint be just single steps on the way back to ancient Greek culture? And why? In Nietzsche’s lecture on *The Divine Service of the Greeks*, Greek syncretism and especially cultic feasts and festivals are a model for the creation of a new culture. For the classical philologist, a look at the Greek beginnings shows that what one may call “the European soul” is not an original and peculiar essence that has always defined Europe (or the West), setting Europeans apart from the rest of the world. On the contrary, this “European soul” is at first a blend of apparently foreign elements, a great “synthesis of everything oriental.” Wasn’t even the Dionysian of Asian origin? Did the Apollinian Greeks not incorporate and transfigure it in their tragedy? This approach to Greek antiquity does not only show that there is no unhistorical essence peculiar to Europe or the West. Besides this, the ancient “Greek synthesis of all that is oriental” is a model that shows how to acquire the basis for a future cultural synthesis, for a possible new supra-European synthesis. In order to become “more Greek” and in particular get re-acquainted with the Dionysian, the good Europeans – a synthesis themselves – must not only connect and ‘synthesize’ multifarious European elements, but, like the erstwhile Greeks themselves, must even rise to a supra-European point of view.

Promoting the unity of Europe and transgressing the boundaries of the West: the two tasks Nietzsche sets himself are still unachieved today. To what extent has his philosophy, which belongs to an entirely different historical situation, preserved its diagnostic, critical and utopian potential for the current challenges confronting Europe? The papers in our volume engage with these problems as well as with Nietzsche’s new syntheses and boundary-transgressions.

The volume is divided into two parts, corresponding broadly to the aforementioned two tasks of promoting the unity of Europe (Part One: European

² KSA 11, 41[7]. On Greek syncretism as a model of a future supra-European cultural synthesis cf. Marco Brusotti: “‘Der Cultus wird wie ein fester Wort-Text immer neu ausgedeutet’. Nietzsches Betrachtungen über den Synkretismus im *Gottesdienst der Griechen* und die Genealogie der Moral,” in: *Nietzscheforschung* 14 (2007), pp. 159–169. On the synthetic character of the Hellenic culture of the festivals cf. Marco Brusotti: “Nietzsches ‘höhere Kunst, die Kunst der Feste’,” in: G. Gödde, N. Loukidelis, J. Zirfas (eds.): *Nietzsche und die Lebenskunst. Ein philosophisch-psychologisches Kompendium*, Stuttgart 2016, pp. 255–264.

Views) and of transgressing the boundaries of the West (Part Two: Beyond Europe: Nietzsche's View from Afar).

Part One of the volume deals primarily with Europe as a cultural and a political project. The contributors therein examine Nietzsche's opposition to nationalism and (German) militarism, his disgust with and condemnation of anti-semitism, as well as his controversial criticism of democratization and socialism. They variously engage the question of how Nietzsche's cultural and political diagnoses and philosophical aims relate to one another. Good Europeanism pertains to the instinctive disposition with which Nietzsche identifies himself and which he ascribes to those "Europeans from the day after tomorrow, we firstborn of the twentieth century" (BGE 214). Prompted by "the darkening and increasing ugliness of Europe" (BGE 222) afflicting the continent in the wake of the 'death of God,' he conceives of 'good Europeans' as those free spirits who, with their supra-European outlook, possess the resources needed to initiate Europe's recovery from decadence and eventually overcome nihilism. In so doing they show that far from being an inconsequential aspect of Nietzsche's thought, the 'good European' synthesizes key themes in it.

Part Two of the volume is dedicated to Nietzsche's view from afar. The disparate subjects its contributors examine are spurred by questions including how inclusive is Nietzsche's concept of the 'good Europeans' of non-European values? How effective might it be in trying to think beyond the horizon of Western culture? How does this ideal of the 'good European' relate to classical (Kantian) cosmopolitanism and the putatively universal values commending it? Why 'good Europeans' and not simply cosmopolitan individuals? Is 'good Europeanism' perhaps something like the nationalism of tomorrow? Is it only a first, shy step towards a more inclusive cosmopolitanism? To what extent does Kantian cosmopolitanism belong just to the Western horizon which Nietzsche intends to leave behind?

Opening Part One of the volume is Gary Shapiro's chapter "Times of the Multitude and the Antichrist." In Nietzsche's Europeanism Shapiro discerns key resonances of his "great politics of the Earth" out of which those capable of "rethinking the direction of the earth" may ultimately deploy a "philosophy of the Antichrist" to realize their vision of the future. In considering how philosophers of the future may create the opportune moment in which to revalue all values in such a new direction, Shapiro accounts for Nietzsche's rejection of the priestly philosophers' teleological conception of time. He also explicates Nietzsche's notion of the multitude (*Menge*), whose diversity contrasts with the homogenous masses and mitigates against the reactionary state.

Chapters 2–4 deal each with an aspect of the enduring presence of ancient Greece in the thought of the former classical philologist. The formative influence

of the Greeks on Nietzsche's understanding of history and vision for Europe prompts Paul Bishop (chapter 2: Goethe, Nietzsche, Varoufakis: Why Did the Greeks Matter – and Still Do?) to examine Europe's contemporary decadence, itself rooted in trends Nietzsche identified in late nineteenth-century Europe. Specifically, Bishop considers the significance of Nietzsche's thought to economics and applies it to an analysis of the European debt crisis, the economic collapse of Greece in the last decade, and the predations of capitalism. He reflects upon the emphasis German officials placed on the debt and guilt of Greeks in negotiating with Greek officials and their insistence upon punishing austerity measures over arguably more rational alternatives.

Against the rationalism informing contemporary liberal social contract theory William Winstead (chapter 3: Nietzsche, Liberalism, and the Future of European Democracy) argues that Nietzsche's political thought entails a commitment to overcoming the enduring Platonism in contemporary politics. In Nietzsche's thought he identifies "an image of politics rooted in the pre-Socratic Periclean democracy of Athens" intended to recover the Greek rhetorical tradition. In reviving that tradition Nietzsche hoped to empower individuals to overcome asceticism by fostering experimental forms of citizenship. Winstead claims that Nietzsche's rhetorical understanding of the political, expressed through Zarathustra, is capable of supplanting dissipative contractual forms of political association by opening Europe to novel forms of democratic citizenship.

From the model of life that nineteenth-century German scholars identified in the pre-Socratic Greeks, George Papandreopoulos (chapter 4: *How Does One Become Greek?* Nietzsche and the Rediscovery of the South) argues that Nietzsche saw an example of socio-political organization capable of fostering complexity and creative agonism. By applying this rediscovery, a comparable model could master the reductive version of life that modernity – itself a by-product of the West's Christian heritage – stubbornly enforces. The latter – aided by the (mis) understanding of *Macht* Nietzsche saw in Bismarckian militarism – is bound to further humanity's decline. Papandreopoulos explicates such an *inclusive* model of human life conducive of infinite possibilities that opposes the *exclusive* model propagated throughout the post-Christian West.

Andrea C. Bertino (chapter 5: Europa nach Nietzsche: Integration ohne Identität) investigates the question of European identity. He asks if Europe requires a strong identity, comparable with national identities, and therefore reconstructs Nietzsche's conception of the democratic process. It is depicted as fundamentally ambivalent in its tendency to make people equal and mediocre. On the other hand, it is part of a progress towards a culture of Europe that oversteps national limitations. Bertino argues that Nietzsche's geographically based (as opposed to ethnic) concept of a European race challenges the concept of nations. It aims to

create a European culture that preserves distinctions to make individuality possible.

Daniel Conway (chapter 6: Nietzsche's Europe) considers the viability of Nietzsche's response to the emerging global reach of European politics. Nietzsche recognized that the dawning world order would require leaders capable of governing it according to "a post-moral appreciation of the planet." This would require overcoming Europe's decadence to invigorate its culture. Therefore, Nietzsche sought to "breed" such a ruling caste through the amalgamation of Europe's national types, specifically the German, French, and English, and the Jews, for whom he "reserved an indispensable role." According to Conway, Nietzsche held that Europe's future cultural greatness depended upon it offering a permanent home to the Jews.

Employing Nietzsche's critique of the ascetic ideal, Katherine Graham (chapter 7: *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* and a Europe Yet to Come) claims that the free spirits of late nineteenth-century Europe were – and that their contemporary inheritors continue to be – mired in and uncomprehending of "a moral-metaphysical interpretation of the world" that hinders them from overcoming Europe's Christian inheritance. Following Nietzsche's statements in the *Genealogy* she maintains that Nietzsche's vision of Europe lies in *Zarathustra* and provides a vision capable of contending with the ascetic ideal that goes beyond Europe. Graham asserts that the re-naturalizing counter-ideal Zarathustra expresses in 'The Sublime Ones' provides a prescription through which future free spirits might transmute Europe's post-Christian decadence.

Allison Merrick (chapter 8: "What Renders Our Sores Repugnant": Reconsidering Nietzsche on *Ressentiment*) elucidates the features of *ressentiment* by examining its structure. In so doing she aims to clarify its conceptual form. Regarding the usual emphasis upon the affliction's psychological structures she argues that "more attention must be paid to the social conditions that engender *ressentiment*." The ascetic priest's redirection of *ressentiment*, which served to alleviate the suffering that the slaves' inadequacy caused them while providing them with a way of denying their deficiency, point to *ressentiment's* physiological origin. Merrick's exposition of the structure of *ressentiment* offers a more complete account of the concept and indicates how it may be overcome.

According to Daniel Rosenberg (chapter 9: Two Visions of Europe: Nietzsche and Guizot), Nietzsche's conception of Europe is illuminated via François Guizot's seminal account of European civilization. Nietzsche's radical vision responds directly to the aspiration Guizot's idea birthed, namely that European identity exceeds national origin and cultures, and that a common educational framework could integrate those narrow, often divisive features. In Nietzsche's vision of Europe Rosenberg sees the advancement of an educational model cen-

tered on active forgetting under which individuals and groups would be trained to subordinate their particular identities. Through it, and despite their superficial differences, good Europeans would share in a supra-European culture with harmonious political concerns.

Steffen Dietzsch (chapter 10: Nietzsches Europa. Überlegungen zu einer neuen geistigen Landschaft) takes Nietzsche as the first German philosopher who/that continuously emphasized the need for a supra-national culture, while nationalism and patriotism were to become more and more dominant. In particular, Dietzsch shows that Nietzsche, who strongly criticized the Germans, attributes to them the ability to interpret and connect different people. Furthermore, he reflects on the wide acceptance of Nietzsche's arguments regarding Europe and their inspiration for thinkers like Ernst Jünger, Stefan Zweig or Ortega y Gasset.

The contributors in Part One offer a broad spectrum of approaches and reach different conclusions. Thus the next two chapters present a more critical evaluation of Nietzsche's thought. In his close reading of "*The extent to which things will become ever more 'artistic' in Europe*" (GS 356), Armin Thomas Müller (chapter 11: Die "freie Gesellschaft" als 'hölzernes Eisen'. Gesellschaftliche Perspektiven Europas im Abschnitt 356 von Nietzsches *Fröhlicher Wissenschaft*) investigates the aphorism's pattern of reasoning, textual structure and literary form. In order to broadly contextualize it, he considers the section's source material as well as its textual variants and parallel passages. The challenging heterogeneous content of the section combines artistic, sociological, anthropological, and political aspects. Müller reconstructs two competing models of European society given in the text: the stability of illiberal hierarchy on the one hand and the vicissitude of democratic societies on the other. In his opinion, Nietzsche would depict the latter as less effective and would reject it.

Framing the tension between cultural determination and individuality in its Nietzschean sense, Richard Elliott (chapter 12: Transgressions of the Lawgiver: Nietzsche, Culture and the 'Good European') argues that despite his denouncements of nationalism as symptomatic of 'petty politics,' Nietzsche's cosmopolitanism possesses limited scope. Elliott maintains that as Nietzsche's prescription to engage in 'grand politics' is aimed only at those he considers to be superlative individuals, the tendency in the secondary literature to view his internationalism as possessing a far-reaching imperative is misguided. While the motivation to characterize it thusly may stem from a desire to distance Nietzsche from pernicious misappropriations, Elliott alleges that elitism and transgression are interwoven in Nietzsche's 'good European.'

The last two chapters of Part One insist on the importance of agonism for Europe's future. Paul Kirkland (chapter 13: Beyond Boundaries: Contesting Au-

thorities in Nietzsche's Europe) rethinks Nietzsche's rejection of nationalism and accompanying critique of the hegemonic nation-state as a form of political organization. Nietzsche looks to a pluralist, supra-European ideal to challenge the notion of political orders dominated by a singular vision or essentializing identity to encourage contests that serve as a framework for moving beyond the modern state. Kirkland argues that instead of rejecting singularity in the name of democracy Nietzsche's alternative is an agonistic aristocracy. This latter, radical notion is rooted in his support of the spiritualization of enmity in order to provide a model for a Europe beyond national particularities.

According to Michael J. McNeal (chapter 14: Good Europeanism: The Practice and Pathos of Nietzsche's Good Europeans), Nietzsche's good Europeans embody the *ethos* of his "free-spiritedness," instinctively enacting his cosmopolitan disposition and practicable agonistic strategy for overcoming Europe's dissipative nihilism. Nietzsche's good Europeanism commends life-affirmation to transform its practitioners physiologically and attitudinally, inuring them to the spiritual narcotization of romanticism, nationalism and xenophobia. Therewith, Good Europeans counter myopic statism, create inclusive new values, and generate culturally invigorating forms of life. McNeal demonstrates the contemporary relevance of Nietzsche's pluralistic value orientation – his good Europeanism – via its potential for facilitating recuperation from the bad conscience impairing the modern European project and realizing Nietzsche's idea of Europe.

Part Two of the volume – *Beyond Europe: Nietzsche's View from Afar* – begins with the biographical and historical background of this view. From a biographical point of view Johann Figl (chapter 15: Nietzsches 'übereuropäisches' Denken – Biographische und kulturelle Aspekte) draws conclusions regarding the provenience of Nietzsche's pro-European and supra-European thinking. Figl reconstructs Nietzsche's education and shows its interference with contemporary's perception. By figuring out how non-European people were seen and what was known about them in the nineteenth century, Figl can show that these time-dependent aspects of culture and society influence Nietzsche's approach and terminology. Finally, he accentuates Nietzsche's crises of periodic illness and solitude as existential phenomena that affected his later (supra-)European thinking.

According to Alexey Zhavoronkov (chapter 16: Nietzsches Interkulturalität und die anthropologische Perspektive der Klassischen deutschen Philosophie), Nietzsche's concept of interculturalism is based on his anthropological perspective. In this respect his thinking signifies a vehement critique of German idealism. Especially because of the Eurocentrism of protagonists like Kant and Hegel, Nietzsche stages himself as a philosophical alternative. As illustrated by Zhavoronkov, Nietzsche's ideas on interculturalism explicitly point beyond

Europe and therefore served as a suitable, if implicit reference point for the founders of Philosophical Anthropology of the twentieth century, Max Scheler and Helmuth Plessner.

Andrea Orsucci (chapter 17: Im ‘Zeitalter der Vergleichung’: Nietzsche, das Problem der Wertschätzungen und das Erbe Feuerbachs) draws a line from the thoughts of the left-wing Hegelians around 1840 to the discussion of values at the end of the nineteenth century. Following Eugen Dühring, Nietzsche took terms like ‘values’ (‘Werthe,’ ‘Werthschätzungen’) from national economy and made them to fundamental concepts of his philosophy. Ludwig Feuerbach shares with Nietzsche a materialistic viewpoint, according to which deities and beliefs of the most different cultures are products of a fantastic transfiguration of the ‘existence,’ of the ‘life’ of men, of their instincts and aspirations. Common to these cultures is a logic of mutual exclusion based on an irresistible need to separate and contrast the valuable and the worthless.

In her contribution Sarah Bianchi (chapter 18: Europäisch, übereuropäisch – menschlich? Über Grenzüberschreitungen in Nietzsches Humanitätsverständnis) considers limitations on the possibility of crossing limits, especially when it comes to Nietzsche’s notion of humanity. Firstly, the movement from the European to the supra-European dimension is sketched, and the problem of broadening it to a universal understanding of humanity is raised. While analyzing such figures as the good European, the free spirit and the sovereign individual, Bianchi concludes that Nietzsche’s thinking does not lead into a pathos of humanity.

‘Europe and the Other’ or ‘Europe as the Other’: this topic is the overall thread running through the next chapters. While geographically Russia has both a European and an Asian part, for Nietzsche it definitely symbolizes an alternative and completion to Europe, as Ekaterina Poljakova (chapter 19: Nichteuropäisch oder übereuropäisch? Zur alten Frage, was Russland “versprechen kann”) reconstructs it. She underscores that, because of Russia’s promising history, music and literature, Nietzsche was trying to see in its culture the overcoming of Europe’s contradictions. However, there seem to be some anti-Enlightenment elements in the Russian attitude to life, provoking his critique. In this regard Poljakova accentuates the tendency to believe in self-made ideals or in evidence made merely of wishes.

Nietzsche’s effort to find other perspectives for philosophy and knowledge by going beyond Europe brings Dagmar Kiesel (chapter 20: “Unter Töchtern der Wüste”. Islamische Sinnlichkeit und christliche Sexualfeindlichkeit bei Nietzsche) to Islamic sensualism. Thus, developed as counter-perspective to the ascetic and body-hostile Christian tradition, Kiesel provides a detailed reading of *Among Daughters of the Desert* from Zarathustra. In Kiesel’s view, Nietzsche idealizes Islamic sexual ethics and the appreciation of sensual pleas-

ures just to set it against Christian sexual hostility. As a result, he advocates its internalization in the codex of values of a new Europe.

Despite the fact that very few works on Nietzsche and the Islamic tradition have appeared until recently, Peter S. Groff (chapter 21: Nietzsche and the *Falāsifa*) contends that comparative work on Nietzsche and philosophical traditions beyond the bounds of Europe raises possibilities for productive cross-cultural dialogues. Toward this, he engages Nietzsche with specific Islamic philosophers of the classical period rather than Islam itself. Groff examines Nietzsche's understanding of Islam and its relevance to his critique of Christianity and European modernity. While Nietzsche had little, if any, familiarity with the *falāsifa*, Groff notes their intellectual relatedness, particularly their notions of perfectionism and philosophy as a way of life.

How non-Europeans engage Nietzsche's European and Supra-European thinking is the topic motivating Tsunafumi Takeuchi's contribution (chapter 22: Wer ist der "gute Europäer"? – Aus der Perspektive der japanischen Nietzsche-Forschungsgeschichte). He asks if, despite not being Europeans, they are nonetheless addressed by Nietzsche's diagnosis of a European nihilism and the attribution of being good Europeans. After a discussion of the two main types of interpretation in Japanese research, Takeuchi presents an alternative by transferring structural, nihilistic elements to non-European contexts. In his opinion, both, the explanatory potential of cultural crises and the positive, challenging such concepts as the overcoming of nations, the related plurality of good Europeans and possibilities for the adoption of such principles outside of Europe.

Nietzsche urged philosophers and artists to flourish as 'good-' or 'supra-Europeans,' an invitation Bartholomew Ryan (chapter 23: The Children of Nietzsche: Chaos, Plurality and Cosmopolitanism in Joyce and Pessoa) argues was accepted most brilliantly by two twentieth-century philosophical poets – James Joyce and Fernando Pessoa. In them, Ryan sees 'children of Nietzsche' who appropriated Nietzsche's ideas and styles to transform their literary human subjects into multifaceted, plural cosmopolitans. Ryan explicates these artists' Nietzschean attempts to reconcile the chaos of modernity with the possibility of a cosmopolitan human by fusing polyglot, nomadic existences into a 'chaosmos' of plurality. By challenging the nihilism of their age, Joyce and Pessoa further elaborated Nietzsche's 'good-' or 'supra-' European ideal.

This bilingual volume goes back to the joint conference of the *Nietzsche-Gesellschaft* and the *Friedrich Nietzsche Society* that was held in Naumburg (Germany) on 22–25 September 2016 under the scientific direction of Marco Brusotti and Herman Siemens. The international conference – the 27th of the *Nietzsche-Gesellschaft* and of the *Friedrich-Nietzsche-Stiftung* and the 22nd of the *Friedrich Nietzsche Society* – took place shortly after the *United Kingdom European*

Union membership referendum on 23 June 2016. Against this current background, the conference became even more exciting, but the referendum and its outcome were not the occasion. The two societies had long been planning to hold a joint conference in 2016 and the topic had already been chosen long before the event that gave it and the joint meeting in Naumburg an unforeseen topicality.