

2013

# Nietzsche and Darwin

Babette Babich

*Fordham University*, [babich@fordham.edu](mailto:babich@fordham.edu)

Follow this and additional works at: [https://fordham.bepress.com/phil\\_papers](https://fordham.bepress.com/phil_papers)

Part of the [Evolution Commons](#), [History of Science, Technology, and Medicine Commons](#), [Intellectual History Commons](#), [Philosophy Commons](#), and the [Race, Ethnicity and Post-Colonial Studies Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Babich, Babette, "Nietzsche and Darwin" (2013). *Working Papers*. 4.  
[https://fordham.bepress.com/phil\\_papers/4](https://fordham.bepress.com/phil_papers/4)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Hermeneutic and Phenomenological Philosophies of Science at DigitalResearch@Fordham. It has been accepted for inclusion in Working Papers by an authorized administrator of DigitalResearch@Fordham. For more information, please contact [considine@fordham.edu](mailto:considine@fordham.edu).

# Nietzsche and Darwin

## Babette Babich

As a natural scientist however, one should get out of one's human corner. ... in nature it is not distress which rules but abundance, squandering, indeed to the point of senselessness. The *struggle* for survival is only an exception, a temporary restriction of the will to life; the great and small battles turn around us on preponderance, on growth and expansion, on power, corresponding to that will to power that is indeed the will of life.

— Nietzsche, *The Gay Science*, §349

At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilised races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace throughout the world the savage races. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes, as Professor Schaaffhausen has remarked, will no doubt be exterminated. The break will then be rendered wider, for it will intervene between man in a more civilised state, as we may hope, than the Caucasian, and some ape as low as a baboon, instead of as at present between the negro or Australian and the gorilla.

Darwin, *The Descent of Man* (1874), p. 201

### Abstract

I argue against the popular view of Nietzsche as Darwinist and focusing on the then-historical context for both Nietzsche and Darwin, I concur with other Nietzsche scholars who have also noted that other authors worked in Nietzsche's thinking in association with Darwin, not only Spencer and Malthus but also Roux and Haeckel among others which also for Nietzsche included Empedocles and other ancient scientists. I argue for the cogency of Nietzsche's condemnation of Darwin's views but note that he continue to associated with Darwin owing to Darwin's racism, often conflated with Nietzsche's notion of rank-order. I conclude with an emphasis on style and Nietzsche's reading of antiquity to highlight the distinction he sought to make between the popular ideal of the higher human (which he called the last man) and a perspective beyond the human, the post-human, the *Übermensch*.

### Whose Darwin? Which Nietzsche?

It is commonly supposed that Nietzsche was a Darwinian. This assumption also constitutes the *mainstream* view and to be mainstream is rather like (but not completely like—this is a metaphor) the selective pressure of nature: very nearly the *only* game in town. To be the only one is what the mainstream is all about. Thus we argue metaphorically that mainstream views “vanquish” other views, be it in science or philosophy or history or just pop culture, a triumph that is, analogically speaking, a quasi-sign of divine grace, speaking as Calvin would speak of “grace.” So too, so the argument went in the economy before capitalism turned out to require

massive bail-outs from public resources, just to shore it up against its own failures, in the case of the economy it was supposed that viable enterprise vanquished the competition.

The eliminative dynamics of this grace accords with the “exterminator’s” analogy as Charles Darwin uses it in 1874 to predict the extinction of species, human and otherwise:

At some future period, not very distant as measured by centuries, the civilised races of man will almost certainly exterminate and replace throughout the world the savage races. At the same time the anthropomorphous apes, as Professor Schaaffhausen<sup>1</sup> has remarked, will no doubt be exterminated.<sup>2</sup>

Nor and to be sure, just considering the fate of today’s gorillas and other primates down to the slow loris, was Darwin wrong about the competitive outcome of the particular struggle for survival he describes. If we are to go by the fate of the chimpanzee and the orangutan (as *all* anthropoid apes are on one side or the other of the brink of extinction in the wild and *all* have already been driven from the greater portion of their environmental range, and some species that explorers could count in Darwin’s day are already long extinct),<sup>3</sup> that is to say, if we take his own prediction literally, Darwin must be judged correct.

Note that I am still talking about the evolutionary success of mainstream views but be it science or philosophy or the mutable field that is called ‘theory,’ as “dominant” points of view or not

---

<sup>1</sup> Hermann Schaffhausen was a German physiologist and comparative anatomist at the University of Bonn who was among the founders of today’s discipline of paleo-anthropology. Elsewhere Darwin acknowledges, among others, Schaaffhausen, as those who anticipate his theory of natural selection: “Here is a curious thing, a M<sup>r</sup>. Pat. Matthew, a Scotchman, published in 1830 a work on Naval Timber & Arboriculture, & in appendix to this, he gives *most clearly* but very briefly in half-dozen paragraphs our view of natural selection. It is most complete case of anticipation. He published extracts in G. Chronicle: I got Book, & have since published letter, acknowledging that I am fairly forestalled.— Yesterday I heard from Lyell that a German D<sup>r</sup> Schaffhausen has sent him a pamphlet published some years ago, in which same View is nearly anticipated but I have not yet seen this pamphlet.— My Brother, who is very sagacious man, always said you will find that some one will have been before you.—“ Darwin to Wallace, May 18<sup>th</sup> 1860. Ian Tattersall argues that it is odd that the discovery of the Neanderthal bones in 1856 and Schaffhausen’s published anatomical account of these in the ‘Little Feldhoffer grotto’ near Dusseldorf would not (in fact) have come to Darwin’s attention (perhaps and indeed as Darwin’s letter here to Wallace attests, via Lyell). See Tattersall, “Charles Darwin and Human Evolution,” *Evo Edu Outreach*, 2 (2009): 28–34.

<sup>2</sup> Darwin, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* (New York: D. Appleton, 1874), p. 201.

<sup>3</sup> Extinction, if science popularizers prefer to point to the adaptability of infectious organisms or cockroaches, etc. And indeed the escalation of pesticide use counts as one of the soundest confirmations of natural selection. So too the generation of antibiotic-resistant pathogens.

(paralleling Paul and Anne Ehrlich's name for humanity as *the* dominant species),<sup>4</sup> might does not make right, even when the "mainstream" press continues to dismiss, refusing to print or better still refusing to footnote or, heaven forbid!, even to *mention* dissonant views. As a family friend once said dramatically in less tolerant times after a son had married a non-Jewish girl, *He's dead to me*. We still do this in our university professions. In philosophy, for example where the mainstream is the analytic mode even when professing about typically continental types like Nietzsche, some professors, and Brian Leiter is among them, in fact he has an entire blog that is all about this called the Gourmet Philosophy Report, caution their students about what names to include in (and thus exclude from) their bibliographies.

This point about pruning one's bibliography is not a sidetrack. Instead it bears directly on the topic and is thus relevant for the philosophy and history of science and ideas because Darwin himself deployed this very same and very carefully "selective" sensibility.

Darwin thus mentioned some and famously failed to mention many others who had been influential on his thinking or who offered parallel, competing, or alternative views. Nor is it surprising that a great many Darwin controversies turn on this very same failure to mention. This is in part (but not only) because precedence is where it's at when it comes to scientific (and everyday) fame. We will return to Darwin's failure to give credit where it was due (and to overstate it, thus putting his contemporaries off the scent (as has been argued that it is this that Darwin when he credits Malthus).

Despite the popular view, the identification of Nietzsche as a Darwinian contradicts Nietzsche's overt or explicit criticisms of Darwin<sup>5</sup> but most importantly contra the substance of his own thinking.

---

<sup>4</sup> Paul Ehrlich and Anne Ehrlich, *The Dominant Animal: Human Evolution and the Environment* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2008).

<sup>5</sup> Richardson, *Nietzsche's New Darwinism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004) as well as his "Nietzsche contra Darwin," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, LXV, 3 (2002): 537-575. See too Greg Moore, *Nietzsche, Biology, and Metaphor* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002). Moore gives an excellent overview of the context of the German reception of Darwin, but see too, usefully centering on the theme of Rée's Spencer (and only thence to Darwin), Robin Small, "What Nietzsche Did During the Science Wars," in Brobjer and Moore, eds., *Nietzsche and the Sciences* (Aldershot: Avebury, 2004), pp. 155-170. Small notes that "Nietzsche concentrates not on the idea of natural selection ... but rather on the struggle for existence" but Small's distinction elides the role of struggle in Darwin's own writings as the very mechanism of natural

Now it is true that no mainstream philosopher worth his or her mainstream salt has ever let the text — that is to say, the trivially hermeneutic detail of what Nietzsche actually said — get in the way of anything. Still the facts can help us. Nietzsche opposes or precisely *makes fun of* Darwin from the first of his early *Untimely Meditations*. Writing of David Strauss, the naturalist theologian:

He announces with admirable frankness that he is no longer a Christian, but he does not wish to disturb anyone's peace of mind; it seems to him contradictory to found an association in order to overthrow an association — which is in fact not so very contradictory. With a rude contentment he covers himself in the hairy cloak of our ape-genealogists and praises Darwin as one of the greatest benefactors of mankind — but it confuses us to see that his ethics are constructed entirely independently of the question: “What is our conception of the world?”

Strauss has not yet even learned that no idea can ever make men better or more moral, and that preaching morals is as easy as finding grounds for them is difficult; his task was much rather to take the phenomena of human goodness, compassion, love and self-abnegation, which do in fact exist, and derive and explain them from his Darwinist presuppositions [...] according to Darwin, he is precisely a creature of nature and nothing else, and has evolved to the height of being a man by quite other laws: precisely, in fact, by *always forgetting* that other creatures similar to him possessed equivalent rights, precisely by feeling himself the stronger and gradually eliminating the other, weaker examples of his species? (UM I: 7; my emphasis)

As it goes with continental philosophy, so it goes with Schaffhausen's Neanderthals (Schaffhausen compared the Neanderthals the native American “flatheads” — and there is an

---

selection, hence Darwin himself points to Malthus as his own decided inspiration, a claim which has launched any small number of tempest in a very closed Darwinian teapot. Thus Small despite his attention to the context of the German debate quite mistakes Nietzsche's point when he says with reference to Nietzsche's *Twilight of the Idols*, in the section entitled (hard to miss!) “Anti-Darwin,” quite mildly, and therefore quite devastatingly: “Nietzsche's comments here are not particularly well-directed — for example, his observation that nature exhibits “profusion, riches, even absurd squandering” is not only consistent with Darwin but in fact part of his argument for the universality of the struggle for existence.” Small then goes on to dismiss Nietzsche's concluding warning “One ought not mistake Malthus for Darwin.” (TI, *Anti-Darwin*) as “inevitable and quite conventional.” (Small, “What Nietzsche Did During the Science Wars,” p. 166) Thus Small, like Richardson and many other analytic writers, manages to have his Darwinian steak while carving it up with Nietzschean implements, precisely because at stake for such authors is never Nietzsche's critique of morality (this is how one might read his genealogy of morals — namely and as Nietzsche's subtitle would suggest in a polemical voice) but Nietzsche's genealogy very flatly interpreted as evolutionary tractatus. Thus Small explains that “Nietzsche's account acknowledges the importance of materiality in the evolution of morality, and thereby of contingency, insofar as this is located in what escapes the power of reason to extend its former realm over reality in general.” p. 167. The problem, and it is not a small one, is that Nietzsche is not in fact offering an account of the “evolution of morality.” By contrast of course, Paul Rée was engaged in just an enterprise — as, of course, Small knows very well indeed. See Small, *Nietzsche and Rée: A Star Friendship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

importantly forgotten world of research there, even for John Gray, in parsing that term), and so it goes with the aboriginal peoples Darwin observed on his voyages, and so it goes with non-human primates and other, perhaps all other, animals as well.

And shall we name this evolution? Shall we call it the survival of the fittest?

Fitness, which we called grace above is what is at issue. By their fruits you shall know them.

Nietzsche's problem with the theologian David Strauss is that he was a *Hegelian and a naturalist and a Darwinian*. And all these things go together for Nietzsche. And to this Hegelian, naturalist, Darwinian constellation we can add natural science itself in certain of its general tendencies where he writes (Nietzsche is fond of using this language for science): "*Die Verdummung, auch in die Wissenschaft*" [The stupidification, in the sciences too] which for Nietzsche is to be set parallel to „*die Verehrung Darwins*.“ [the admiration of Darwin] (KSA 11, 131) Thus in *Beyond Good and Evil*, Nietzsche can point to evolution as an instantiation of what he takes to be natural science's fondness for what he describes as the „least possible force" together with the "greatest possible stupidity." (BGE §14)

Unlike the very coordinate Hegel and Darwin (as Nietzsche underscores in *The Gay Science*: „*Ohne Hegel, Kein Darwin*“ — that is, „Without Hegel, no Darwin“ or just a bit more precisely said, echoing the ethnic Vaudeville joke about the urban Chinese cleaner's *No tickee, no laundry*: “No Hegel, no Darwin” [GS §367]), Nietzsche was not interested in either the survival or the perishing of the “Species” but much rather in what he called “rank-order” (cf. KSA 13, 480), a conception that needs explaining for by it Nietzsche refers to the very idea of genius, of the height of culture (i.e., ancient Greece by contrast with Germany), as found in the artist, the poet, especially as conceived on the model of the Greeks or the troubadours as knight-poet. And this, as we shall see, was the heart of his critique of Darwin, in concord with his analysis of the threat of nihilism: “the lowest values” he writes in a non-Darwinian, non-evolutionary declaration, tend to flourish, while and by autonomic contrast with Darwin, “the highest devalue themselves” (KSA 13, 321)

In this way, the mere textual happenstance that Nietzsche criticizes Darwin or rather unmistakably — again, let me correct that: *seemingly, apparently*, unmistakably — writes contra

Darwin, including just as explicitly as one pleases a long aphorism in *Twilight of the Idols* entitled “Anti-Darwin” (one would think this would be hard to mistake: one would be wrong), is irrelevant to the Darwinian Nietzscheans (and I include those who denounce as well as those who celebrate this so-called Darwinism).

What Nietzsche said is rather less important than what he “meant” to say or “should” have said or “really said” (the really here means properly parsed) once one paws through (or re-writes) Nietzsche’s unfortunate verbiage. John Richardson, my very mainstream analytic friend and New York City colleague, has written a book entitled *Nietzsche’s New Darwinism*<sup>6</sup> (this is a riff, I need to say this as I suspect that it may not be obvious, on the “non-Darwinian revolution,” noting here that such ‘revolutions’ are often all the Darwinism one needs). And in what I regard as a true tour de force, New Zealand friend Robin Small (who also happens to enjoy broadly mainstream formation and writes in this fashion) manages to parse Nietzsche’s “Anti-Darwin” as proving just the opposite.<sup>7</sup> In Small’s reading, Nietzsche should be seen, actually, as an “ultra-

---

<sup>6</sup> See, again, Richardson, *Nietzsche’s New Darwinism*.

<sup>7</sup> Small, “What Nietzsche Did During the Science Wars,” p. 167. Although Small notes that “Nietzsche concentrates not on the idea of natural selection ... but rather on the struggle for existence” (ibid.), Small’s distinction elides the role of struggle in Darwin’s own writings as the very mechanism of natural selection, hence Darwin himself points to Malthus as his own decided inspiration, a claim which has launched any small number of tempest in a very closed Darwinian teapot. Indeed, Small despite his attention to the context of the German debate quite mistakes Nietzsche’s point when he says with reference to Nietzsche’s *Twilight of the Idols*, in the section entitled “Anti-Darwin,” quite mildly, and therefore quite devastatingly: “Nietzsche’s comments here are not particularly well-directed — for example, his observation that nature exhibits “profusion, riches, even absurd squandering” is not only consistent with Darwin but in fact part of his argument for the universality of the struggle for existence.” Small goes on to dismiss Nietzsche’s concluding warning “One ought not mistake Malthus for Darwin” (TI, *Anti-Darwin*) as “inevitable and quite conventional.” (Small, p. 166) In this way, Small and Richardson and many other analytic writers, manages to have their Darwinian steak while carving it up with Nietzschean implements, precisely because what matters for such authors is never Nietzsche’s critique of morality (this is how one might read his genealogy of morals — namely and as Nietzsche’s subtitle would suggest in a polemical voice) but Nietzsche’s genealogy very flatly interpreted as evolutionary tractatus. Thus Small explains that “Nietzsche’s account acknowledges the importance of materiality in the evolution of morality, and thereby of contingency, insofar as this is located in what escapes the power of reason to extend its former realm over reality in general.” p. 167. The problem, and it is not an insignificant problem, is that Nietzsche is not offering an account of the “evolution of morality.” Paul Rée, by contrast, *was* engaged in just an enterprise (and thus Nietzsche’s *Genealogy of Morals* begins with a diatribe contra Rée’s undertaking) as Small himself has detailed. See Small, *Nietzsche and Rée: A Star Friendship* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Darwinist.”<sup>8</sup> Along this continuum, there are others, such as Werner Stegmaier, who similarly insists that Nietzsche was a “decided Darwinist throughout every phase of his creative work.”<sup>9</sup>

And therewith such mainstream philosophical analyses accord with popular accounts linking Nietzsche with Darwin along with more political accounts emphasizing *both* Nietzsche’s *and* Darwin’s influences on Hitler, convicting Nietzsche and Darwin of an horrific political *Wirkungsgeschichte*, maybe, so goes the argument, not Nietzsche’s or Darwin’s “fault” in the sense of intention or will, but nonetheless influential and therefore duly culpable and consequently “dangerous.”<sup>10</sup>

Such readings, philosophical, popular, and political ignore Nietzsche’s overt statements contra Darwin because they have to do so in order to function.<sup>11</sup> The same distinctions can be found in those who read Darwin either as a racist and proto-facist (using similar arguments contra Darwin as are used against Nietzsche — thus both Nietzsche and Darwin can be happily hoisted on the same racist, proto-fascist and Nazi petard). One proceeds as one commonly does, this is a standard because standardizing move in mainstream scholarship, by simply claiming that one reads “sloppily” if one draws any conclusion other than the received or accepted view. And to be sure: this is the point of having a received view. Thus one argues against Darwin’s racism despite its patent character, i.e., in spite of the text, despite what Darwin unfortunately did say, because the great majority of academics (including, to be sure, the current speaker and even

---

<sup>8</sup> Small, “What Nietzsche Did During the Science Wars,” p. 167.

<sup>9</sup> Werner Stegmaier, “Darwin, Darwinismus, Nietzsche: Zum Problem der Evolution,” *Nietzsche-Studien* 16 (1987): 247-275; here p. 269.

<sup>10</sup> Richard Weikart, *From Darwin to Hitler: Evolutionary Ethics, Eugenics, and Racism in Germany* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004) and Weikart, *Hitler’s Ethic: The Nazi Pursuit of Evolutionary Progress* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009) is the most recent example of this trend but see for an historical introduction, Tracy Strong, “Introduction,” to Strong, ed., *Friedrich Nietzsche*, (Avebury: Continuum, 2009). There are exceptions to such historical readings: see in particular, Lewis Call: “Anti-Darwin, Anti-Spencer: Friedrich Nietzsche’s Critique of Darwin and ‘Darwinism’,” *Hist. Sci.* xxxvi (1998): 1-22.

<sup>11</sup> I have written on some of the complexities behind Nietzsche’s reading of Darwin and more generally physiology and biology in Babich, *Nietzsche’s Philosophy of Science: Reflecting Science in the Light of Art and Life* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1984). See for a broader discussion of the notion of progress, Wolf Gorch Zachriat, *Die Ambivalenz des Fortschritts: Friedrich Nietzsches Kulturkritik* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2001). I also discuss, more broadly, the phenomenon of this particular ambivalence in an online interview and in response to Nicholas Birns’ incisive and insightful questions: “Between Impossible Wishes” [[http://www.nietzschecircle.com/AGONIST/2009\\_07/PDFs/AgonistJUL2009Birns.pdf](http://www.nietzschecircle.com/AGONIST/2009_07/PDFs/AgonistJUL2009Birns.pdf)] and

Nietzsche himself as he himself underscores: albeit *assuming* his critique of Darwin) tend more to agree with rather than to *disagree* with Darwin.

The problem is being either pro-Darwin or Anti-Darwin in Nietzsche's terms. To spare an explication of Nietzsche's antipathy to the language of pro and con, we can say that what is at issue is the "great man" theory of science (and philosophy and history in general), a theory that is as pernicious as it is unavoidable: it is the heart of the Whig or presentist tendency in mainstream history, including and still dominant today, the history of science.

If, so goes the "great man" reconstructionist schema, Darwin is a "great man,"<sup>12</sup> and if great men are not, and by definition, racist/fascist/proto-Nazi, then Darwin cannot have been racist/fascist/proto-Nazi. In the same way, if one also happens to wish to make the mainstream case "for" Nietzsche (one way or another), one arranges one's terms, this is what arguments and argumentative strategies are good for, until they come out as one would have them come out.<sup>13</sup> From such an interested perspective, re-visioning Nietzsche appropriately is not all that hard, offending passages are presented as "really" otherwise than they appear, Nietzsche's own *great man* status (which means that and in the end Nietzsche pretty much thinks what the interpreter thinks) plays a role.

But things are far more complicated. And they always are but in this case we are dealing with two authors who happen to inspire dramatically opposed readings. As with Nietzsche, the problem with Darwin on evolution (or on breeding and racial differences) is all about what one takes to be key to Darwin's position. Here although one can agree to allow some differences, I am going to take it that the issue of natural selection will be key and that the issue of fitness, however rendered, will be essential.

The late and great Ernst Mayr — great both in the context of biology *and* the philosophy of biology and who has also been called the Darwin of the 20<sup>th</sup> century — observed in his *One*

---

<sup>12</sup> I following Robert Bernasconi here who pointed to this argument as it may be found in the literature on Heidegger and Nazism. Bernasconi also writes on race. See Bernasconi, "Who Invented the Concept of Race? Kant's Role in the Enlightenment Construction of Race," in Bernasconi, ed., *Race* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2012), pp. 11-36.

<sup>13</sup> And philosophers are good at this, thus I have heard the complaint, that I use logic and am thus myself to be called an analytic philosopher, as if one were forbidden the use of logic as a continental philosopher. This is (trivial, as opposed to what Alasdair MacIntyre distinguishes as "great") silliness.

*Long Argument* that we tend today to simplify Darwin by speaking of his theory of evolution as if this were any sort of unitary theory.<sup>14</sup> “In reality,” Mayr emphasizes, “Darwin’s ‘theory’ of evolution was a whole bundle of theories, and it is impossible to discuss Darwin’s evolutionary thought constructively if one does not distinguish its various components.”<sup>15</sup> Nor is Mayr alone in insisting upon such an emphatic distinction. Even if few philosophers are precise enough to keep company with him, nearly every biologist will emphasize this, certainly my own biology teachers at Stony Brook did so.

It is the issue of natural selection that is problematic for Nietzsche precisely as rendered, and Nietzsche challenges precisely this articulation, as the “*Kampf um’s Dasein*”, i.e., in Darwin’s English, as “the struggle for life.” In fact numerous scholars who work on the history of the life sciences in the 19<sup>th</sup> century or else the genetics community in Germany at the turn of the last century, have claimed that the focus on the “*Kampf um’s Dasein*” stems from Ernst Haeckel<sup>16</sup> or indeed other scientists, some of whom were very influential on Nietzsche, like Wilhelm Roux, who also gets the word “*Kampf*” into the title of his 1881 *Der Kampf der Teile im Organismus*<sup>17</sup> as

---

<sup>14</sup> Ernst Mayr, *One Long Argument: Charles Darwin and the Genesis of Modern Evolutionary Thought* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993).

<sup>15</sup> Mayr, *One Long Argument*, p. 36. Mayr goes on to partition “Darwin’s evolutionary paradigm into five theories, but of course others might prefer a different division. The selected theories are by no means all of Darwin’s evolutionary theories; others were, for instance, sexual selection, pangenesis, effect of use and disuse, and character divergence. However when later authors referred to Darwin’s theory they invariably had a combination of some of the following five theories in mind: 1. *Evolution as such*. This is the theory that the world is not constant or recently created nor perpetually cycling, but rather is steadily changing, and that organisms are transformed in time. 2. *Common descent*. This is the theory that every group of organisms descended from a common ancestor, and that all groups of organisms, including animals, plants, and microorganisms, ultimately go back to a single origin of life on earth. 3. *Multiplication of species*. This theory explains the origin of the enormous organic diversity. It postulates that species multiply, either by splitting into daughter species or by “budding,” that is, by the establishment of geographically isolated founder populations that evolve into new species. 4. *Gradualism*. According to this theory, evolutionary change takes place through the gradual change of populations and not by the sudden (saltational) production of new individuals that represent a new type. 5. *Natural selection*. According to this theory, evolutionary change comes about through the abundant production of genetic variation in every generation. The relatively few individuals who survive, owing to a particularly well-adapted combination of inheritable characters, give rise to the next generation.” Ibid.

<sup>16</sup> See in particular, Robert J. Richards, *The Tragic Sense of Life: Ernst Haeckel and the Struggle over Evolutionary Thought* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1981). But see also Timothy Lenoir, *The Strategy of Life. Teleology and Mechanics in Nineteenth-Century German Biology* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1982).

<sup>17</sup> Wilhelm Roux, *Der Kampf der Teile im Organismus* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1881).

well as William Rolph<sup>18</sup> and, and this is perhaps the most incendiary claim, like Rudolf Virchow (who was arguably rather less influential). All are held to have influenced Nietzsche's reception of Darwin. On the one hand, all such claims are "true" or factual to the very extent that Nietzsche had a keen interest in the then-current debate on biological development and Darwinian evolution, especially with regard to Hartman<sup>19</sup> (and as he was also more broadly interested in the whole panoply of the sciences of his day). The problem is the other hand and this hand (and foot) goes to the heart of source scholarship as such, a problem Nietzsche for his own part regarded as our nigh-on incorrigible because very scholarly tendency to come up philologically short indeed and as philologists, even schooled with the best.

To begin with: one "positive" citation (or even two or ten) does not exhaust what is always inevitably a 'climate' of influence, what is at times and infamously called, because we do this in English, the *Zeitgeist*. Hence the particular provenance of Nietzsche's invocation of the *Kampf um's Dasein* is tendentious to the very obvious extent that Heinrich Georg Bronn (1800-1862), a German paleontologist, fossil zoologist, and natural historian dedicated a considerable bit of time at the end of his life to paying Darwin the kindness of translating Darwin's 1859 publication of *On the Origin of the Species by Means of Natural Selection* into German, just one year later, in 1860.<sup>20</sup> Alas, at least for history, Darwin had no thought of returning the favor by encouraging the reception of Bronn's research in England. Here the relevant point for discussion is that Bronn rendered Darwin's subtitle: *or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* as *oder Erhaltung der vervollkommneten Rassen im Kampfe um's Daseyn*. Thus the phrase *Kampf um's Dasein* is very literally or even ultra-Darwinist in a German context just to the

---

<sup>18</sup> William Henry Rolph, *Biologische Probleme zugleich als Versuch zur Entwicklung einer Rationellen Ethik* (Leipzig: Engelmann, 1884).

<sup>19</sup> Eduard von Hartmann, *Wahrheit und Irrthum des Darwinismus. Eine kritische Darstellung der organischen Entwicklungslehre* (Berlin: 1875).

<sup>20</sup> Darwin, *On the Origin of the Species by Means of Natural Selection; or the Preservation of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life* (London: John Murray, 1859) translated by Heinrich G. Bronn as *Über die Entstehung der Arten um Their- und Pflanzen-Reich durch natürliche Züchtung, oder Erhaltung der vervollkommneten Rassen im Kampfe um's Daseyn* (Stuttgart: E. Schweizerbart, 1860). As Sander Gliboff reminds us, "Bronn's version of *The Origin of the Species* appeared in 1860, mere months after the original. It was the first foreign-language edition on the market, and it immediately provoked debates and challenged German scholars to think about morphology, paleontology, embryology, and other biological disciplines in new ways." Gliboff, *H.G. Bronn, Ernst Haeckel, and the Origins of German Darwinism A Study in Translation and Transformation*, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2008), p. 4.

extent that it renders Darwin's own *Struggle for Life*, the phrase often yoked with the "struggle for survival" characteristic of what is often named "Victorian" or "Social" Darwinism (in order not to have to label Darwin with it).

It was the competitive struggle for life that Nietzsche refused in Darwin's selective sense: and this may surprise those who find Nietzsche an enthusiast of all things bloody and war-like. Isn't the "struggle for life," the "*Kämpfe um's Daseyn*," the very meaning of the will to power? Yes and no. Yes, if a tension or contest or *agon* is what is intended. Decidedly not, if the result of that contest is "selection" in Darwin's sense, "preserving" as Darwin speaks of preservation, the "favoured races," i.e., what Bronn translates as *Vervollkommnung* (rendering the "favoured" among the races, i.e., as a progressive perfecting tendency). For Nietzsche emphasizes that the will to power, 'Verily' as his Zarathustra says, is to be found everywhere but that it hardly distinguishes excellences and is found perhaps most strikingly among the least among us.

"Hearken now unto my word, ye wisest ones! Test it seriously, whether I have crept into the heart of life itself, and into the roots of its heart!

Wherever I found a living thing, there found I Will to Power; and even in the will of the servant found I the will to be master. (*Z II: On Self-Overcoming*)

In other words, Nietzsche was fairly sure that (like the strongest, i.e., and the most "favoured"), the weakest too were replete with "the will to be master." But not only this. As Nietzsche emphasizes, paralleling Hegel, contra Hegel, it will be the slaves, the weaker who also qua weaker (this is Nietzsche's brief contra slave-morality) and always but always accede to mastery. Nietzsche differs from Hegel in that he regard the weak and the mediocre *as* continuing to be weak *and* mediocre, claiming that it is only with and including such weakness and such mediocrity that humanity has come to be what it is and indeed to be as rich and as interesting as it is. When it comes to dominance, to being mainstream, and hence to survival and perdurance, there is, Nietzsche argues, only one type who does and can manage to survive in the face of all odds: "the incurably mediocre..." [*die unheilbar Mittelmässigen*] (BGE §262)

This last pronouncement appears in *Beyond Good and Evil* and literally addresses nothing more Darwinian than the question of the "species" in the section entitled "What is Noble." He even

includes a very Darwinian discussion of “breeding” and of “variations,” as of the conditions that “favour” them, and it is not difficult to see how one might be inclined to take Nietzsche to be an “ultra-Darwinist” if Nietzsche did not come to rather excessively *anti-Darwinian* conclusions: emphasizing that “nothing is capable of enduring” — to repeat Nietzsche’s indictment/celebration of mediocrity one more time — “beyond the day after tomorrow, one species of humanity excepted, the incurably mediocre.” (BGE §262) When Nietzsche goes on in *On the Genealogy of Morals* to talk about the slave revolt in morality as a victory over the nobles he endeavors to make the same point, again, and at greater length.

Contra Darwin, Nietzsche’s claim is that a suspiciously providential thinking survives under the guise of Darwinism, thus Nietzsche emphasizes the Darwinian habit of asserting the connection between “happiness” [*Glück*] and “virtue” [*Tugend*] (KSA 12, 457)

The insight into the ultimate tendency of the slave to triumph, and to triumph every time, over the strong, over the noble — which noble is, in the end, anything but swift on his or her calculating or defensive intellectual feet, and thus always fails to cover his or her back so that in the Hobbesian war of all against all, it is never the “stronger” who wins but always the weaker, à la Swift’s Lilliputians or à la the social contract. As Nietzsche fills in the bits Hobbes leaves blank: “they are more numerous, they are also smarter.” (EH, *Streifzüge*, §14)

All this is very Darwinian, even “ultra-Darwinian” as Small contends, apart from Nietzsche’s conclusion that the favoured are not the fittest, not the best, but only the most common, the vulgar.

This is the key to Nietzsche’s conception of the ingenious resources of *ressentiment* and the world changing efficacy of the ascetic ideal, i.e., the human-making achievement of discipline and intelligence that drives his reflections contra a range of British and English “psychologists” or natural historians of morality (this would include Mill and Spencer but also his friend Paul Rée as Nietzsche nicely explains in his preface to *On the Genealogy of Morals: A Polemic*).

As Nietzsche writes, *Darwin hat den Geist vergessen*. (EH, *Streifzüge*, §14) “Darwin forgot the mind — this,” he adds “is English!” What Darwin overlooks is the advantage of mind, i.e., intellect, i.e., spirit, as the very specific advantage of the slavishly moral, greater number.

But in addition, for this would make of Nietzsche little other than a more puckish champion of the Peter Principle, i.e., the well-known tendency of power to concentrate in the least competent, Nietzsche took especial issue with the key mechanism of natural selection: namely the dark and dismal narrowness of nature's books, the spare economy of the world (this grey outlook is the source of the famous description of economics as the "dismal science") by Nietzsche's favorite English historian, Thomas Carlyle.<sup>21</sup> In his book *Nature's Economy*, the environmental historian, Donald Worster, draws out this aspect of Darwin detailing, in an understatedly non-presentist opposition to the tradition of hagiography that has Darwin as a liberal minded democrat of our age, promoting the equality of all humanity, Europeans and original native inhabitants alike,<sup>22</sup> the extreme and visceral repugnance Darwin conceived with regard to the life style and the physical aspect of the autochthonous or aboriginal inhabitants of Tierra del Fuego.

But we can go Worster one better by quoting Darwin's 1932 remarks from his *Voyage of the Beagle*, remarks that echo the epigraph already quoted once above:

While entering we were saluted in a manner becoming the inhabitants of this savage and forbidding land. A group of Fuegians partly concealed by the entangled forest, were perched on a wild point overhanging the sea; and as we passed by, they sprang up and waving their tattered cloaks sent forth a loud and sonorous shout. In the morning the captain sent a party to communicate with the Fuegians. . . . It was without exception the most curious and interesting spectacle I ever beheld: I could not believe how wide was the difference between a savage and civilized man: it is greater than between a domesticated and wild animal, inasmuch as in man there is a greater power of improvement. The chief spokesman was old - and appeared to be the head of the family; the three others were powerful young men about six feet high.. The old man had a fillet of white feathers tied round his head, which partly confined his black, coarse, and entangled hair. His face was crossed by two broad transverse bars; one, painted bright red, reached

---

<sup>21</sup> Although Carlyle is alluding to Hobbes, and uses the term dismal in other contexts, the locus of this quote derives from an occasional text given in 1849 with the wretched title, "The Nigger Question," from Thomas Carlyle, *Miscellaneous Essays* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1888), vol. 7, pp. 79-110. See for a discussion and further references to this issue, Peter Groenewegen, "Thomas Carlyle, 'The Dismal Science', and the Contemporary Political Economy of Slavery," *History of Economics Review*, 34 (Summer 2001): 74-94. It is not clear that the substance of current debates on ecology and economics in a global context have moved beyond this perspective, on one side of the other.

<sup>22</sup> But, as noted, Darwin certainly sees the races in terms fairly straightforwardly "Darwinian." See too Diane B. Paul, "Darwin, social Darwinism and eugenics," in Jonathan Hodge and Gregory Radick, eds., *The Cambridge Companion to Darwin* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 2003), pp. 214-239. See too: Steve Jones, *Darwin's Island: The Galapagos in the Garden of England* (London: Little, Brown, 2009) and Adrian Desmond and James Moore, *Darwin's Sacred Cause: Race, Slavery and the Quest for Human Origins*, (London: Allen Lane, 2008)

from ear to ear and included the upper lip; the other, white like chalk, extended above and parallel to the first, so that even his eyelids were thus coloured. The other two men were ornamented by streaks of black powder, made of charcoal ... Their very attitudes were abject, and the expression of their countenances distrustful, surprised, and startled.<sup>23</sup>

Here it ought not be forgotten, although the political battle about this one of very many other and similar historical colonializing details is far from over (how are colonies made? and how ought we memorialize the consequences of the same?), is that not too far distant from the place where Darwin described such a patently “unfavoured” race (as he described it), the extermination of the native or aboriginal Tasmanians was proceeding apace.

As John Gray, we mentioned him above in connection with Schaffhausen from whom Darwin took so much, and his reference to the American “flatheads,” who uses the example to illustrate his *Straw Dogs*,<sup>24</sup> emphasizes, one had not (not quite) decided that such wretches counted for anything more than servitude and rape and elimination or extermination. The aboriginal Tasmanians (parallel to the aboriginal Fuegians or Australians in Darwin’s references above):

had been used for slave labour and sexual pleasure, tortured and mutilated. They had been hunted like vermin and their skin had been sold for government bounty. When the males were killed female survivors were turned loose with the heads of their husbands tied around their necks. Males who were not killed were usually castrated. Children were clubbed to death. When the last indigenous Tasmanian male, William Lanner, died in 1869, his grave was opened by a Member of the Royal Society of Tasmania, Dr George Stokell, who made a tobacco pouch from his skin.<sup>25</sup>

---

<sup>23</sup> Darwin, December 17th, 1832. Darwin later recounts a closer visit: “These poor wretches were stunted in their growth, their hideous faces bedaubed with white paint, their skins filthy and greasy, their hair entangled, their voices discordant, and their gestures violent. Viewing such men, one can hardly make one's self believe that they are fellow-creatures, and inhabitants of the same world. It is a common subject of conjecture what pleasure in life some of the lower animals can enjoy: how much more reasonably the same question may be asked with respect to these barbarians! At night, five or six human beings, naked and scarcely protected from the wind and rain of this tempestuous climate, sleep on the wet ground coiled up like animals. Whenever it is low water, winter or summer, night or day, they must rise to pick shellfish from the rocks; and the women either dive to collect sea-eggs, or sit patiently in their canoes, and with a baited hair-line without any hook, jerk out little fish. If a seal is killed, or the floating carcass of a putrid whale is discovered, it is a feast; and such miserable food is assisted by a few tasteless berries and fungi.” Etc.

<sup>24</sup> John Gray, *Straw Dogs: Thoughts on Humans and Other Animals* (London: Granta Books, 2002).

<sup>25</sup> Gray, *Straw Dogs*, p. 91. Gray cites: Lyndall Ryan, *The Aboriginal Tasmanians*, 2nd ed., (St Leonards: Allen & Unwin, 1996).

Now historians debate this, the Tasmanians much more vigorously than others, and as well they might.<sup>26</sup> As Nietzsche would point out in his own remarks on history, the victorious have all the evidence on their side. It is hard to point to the dead; and the many and grievous things one's forbears did to those lesser than our selves are lost to history. All things we take for granted today were built on the backs of all such things. Great things, even and especially great things are as Nietzsche reminds us, thoroughly soaked in blood and that for a long, long time — the fruit of practices that simply went without saying, things never recorded. If some historians estimate that some 6000 Tasmanians were alive in 1803 at the beginning of the conflicts with the British settlers, and some say: 4000 and some say: 8000, what is indisputable is that European colonialization proceeded apace and at the end of the day there were none — not in the sense of the full-blooded Tasmanian — how convenient our politically correct language is, and how deep-going, Nietzsche speaks of our unteachable down-deep (especially with regard to women) as our ultra-stupidity, that is “our” still ongoing fear of miscegenation. If the native men were killed and if at the same time the native women were kept and used sexually, their children could still be counted as Tasmanian aborigines, ah but without the benefit of transmitting the full genetic complement of their forbears. And in terms of natural selection this is indeed the mechanism whereby some races come to be “favoured” over others. Like the grey squirrels currently being hunted in England for the crime of interbreeding (they drive out the red coated squirrels, say the English, as if the grey outcompeted them for nuts and such, but all the greys do is interbreed, although this miscegenation is vigorously denied (they are another species they say, like human and Neanderthals). What is certain is that the red is evidently recessive, though English “greys” viewed with this New Yorker's eyes, used as she is to the robust and very grey greyness of American greys, have far more “red” traits, including coloring but also including

---

<sup>26</sup> See Anne McMahon, ‘Tasmanian Aboriginal Women as Slaves’, *Tasmanian Historical Research Association: Papers and Proceedings*, Vol 23, No 2, June 1976, pp. 44-49 as well as Ryan, *The Aboriginal Tasmanians*. See too for the general notion of the “Aborigine,” Bain Attwood, *The Making of Aborigines* (Sydney: Allen and Unwin, 1989). More recently for a specific focus, see Kay Merry, “The Cross-Cultural Relationships Between the Sealers and the Tasmanian Aboriginal Women at Bass Strait and Kangaroo Island in the Early Nineteenth Century.” *Counterpoints* Vol. 3, No. 1 (2003): 80-88. Further, see Mitchell Rolls, “The Changing Politics of Miscegenation,” *Aboriginal History*, 29 (2005): 64-76 and for one among several reactionary responses — I say reactionary just to the extent that the debate is now characterized as the “Historians War,” and is so in a textbook sense: such things could not have happened, so they must not have happened: where are the history books, how can one trust aboriginal accounts (a good question, were it not for the converse) — Keith Windshuttle, *The Fabrication of Aboriginal History: Volume One: Van Diemen's Land 1803-1847* (Paddington: Macleay Press, 2002).

morphological characteristics like the shape of their ears, tufted to boot, tail character and body type, than English eyes evidently are able to see for themselves. I may be imagining things, for far and wide, everyone (interested in the “squirrel question”) insists not: but I note that we are talking about species change, one way or another and breeding (and selective pressures) are never easy things to replicate in captivity.

What is certain is that the method currently in use in England is one well-known from the last century: the effort is towards increasing *Lebensraum*, in this case: *Lebensraum* for the ‘native’ English red, and the means to be used to such an end is the killing of the greys. And don’t get me wrong: I too favor the reds. The problem for me only concerns the “final” solution or cost of that same favoring of the reds when it comes to kind of remedy or solution in use against the greys.<sup>27</sup>

Like Manhattan on the Hudson, I do not know how many Indians lived in what we now call Boston when most English colonists arrived and it is unclear exactly how many died by direct extermination, slaughter and murder (if one refuses as some will do to count disease, malnourishment, uprootedness, etc.), but any method of elimination is biologically effective. Hence today there are as many “full-blooded” Indians living as they once did on the same locus on the banks of a river they did not for their part call the Charles<sup>28</sup> as there are cougars and wolves in greater Boston. There are no cougars today: none of these last non-human aboriginal beings, who dwelt once upon these shores, gazes today upon the Boston’s New England harbor or indeed its river. And what aboriginal humans there may be are not, so it goes in history, “full-blooded” Indians.

If the English do not want unmixed squirrels, the distinction of aboriginals as full-blooded becomes both increasingly bootless as an issue over time and politically problematic as a concept.

If, to return from Darwin’s dark visions of the selected fate of unfavoured races, Nietzsche refuses the darkness, Darwin emphasizes just this dire note, lending it indeed to the economic

---

<sup>27</sup> And indeed, this past July in London for a meeting I shall abbreviate as the Royal Music Society, and although July should have been a great time to watch squirrels Russell Square, I visited the several different little square parks in a good ambit about it, without seeing a single grey squirrel in any of them. Trees that grew into glorious interconnectedness, highways vertical and horizontal for squirrels were solitary when I came.

<sup>28</sup> Charles the 1st, named the river after himself.

vision of ecology, as is expressed with rather more color in the popularizing vision: “nature red in tooth and claw.”

It is this economic, existentially straitened vision that did not, for Nietzsche, square with what he saw all around him. And if he argues famously against the Stoics’ ambition to live in concord with the order of nature, by pointing to nature’s cruelty and utter lack of measure, he also emphasizes over and over again — it is his image of the heart of existence as the *Ur-Künstler* or what the ancient Greek nature philosophers called *nous* — nature’s profligate abundance.

### **On Truth and Stylizing**

In the next section of this paper, I turn to address the more personal commonalities between the two men. For both Darwin and Nietzsche have profited enormously from the cult of personality, a cult that is arguably indistinguishable from scholarship and similarly indispensable for culture. This cult Nietzsche took as the subject of his inaugural lecture on Homer in Basel, a lecture exploring the so-called “Homer Question. For many of us, the entire problem consists in grasping just exactly what the “Homer Question” would have been about for German philologists and that from the inception of philology onwards.<sup>29</sup> The Homer Question turns out to have nothing whatever in common with the Woman Question, the Irish Question, the Jewish Question but only, and this “only” constitutes the antipode of complexity itself — with the question of *Who then was Homer?*

Or still better said, Was there *even*, Was there *ever*, a Homer?

Regarded from a German point of view and no less from the art-historical (and indeed, if we count Hume and Kant, philosophically “aesthetic”) perspective of *style*, Nietzsche’s lecture would appear to turn upon biological and even architectural convention. The question of style is the question of form, the very heart of the morphological (and as it turns out classically

---

<sup>29</sup> I discuss this in a related context in the first section of Babich, “Towards a Critical Philosophy of Science: Continental Beginnings and Bugbears, Whigs and Waterbears,” *International Journal of the Philosophy of Science*, Vol. 24, No. 4 (December 2010): 343-391 and “On Nietzsche’s Judgment of Style and Hume’s Quixotic Taste: On the Science of Aesthetics and ‘Playing’ the Satyr,” *The Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, 43.2 (2012): 240-259.

hermeneutic) issue of demarcation and identification. Which bone is this? what fossa is cognate with what? turns out to be related to the attribution of fragments to ancient authors. Where indeed (and here we can draw a connection here between Ivan Illich and Nietzsche but also between Nietzsche and Ludwik Fleck would ancient philosophy and philology have been failing such elementary intimations of style?<sup>30</sup>

There is a good deal more to Nietzsche's invocation of style and taste, inasmuch as he used it to challenge the very scientificity or scholarly rigor of his own profession in terms of the genetic and generic, i.e., of the classification and distinction of kinds (in this case, of Homeric and non-Homeric texts or fragments).<sup>31</sup> But here I limit myself to the concept of style as such as it also very relevant to the history and philosophy of science both with reference to August Crombie as Ian Hacking rightly notes but also in the debates around Kuhn in the history and philosophy of science.<sup>32</sup> This is particularly so, as I have argued, if one counts in another biologically minded

---

<sup>30</sup> See Catherine Osborne, *Rethinking Early Greek Philosophy* (London: Duckworth, 1987) but see also the debates on the Derveni papyrus between Luc Brisson/Glenn Most and Richard Zanko. For references and for a discussion of issues related to Nietzsche see, Babich, "Nietzsche's Philology and Nietzsche's Science: On the 'Problem of Science' and 'fröhliche Wissenschaft,'" in: Pascale Hummel, ed., *Metaphilology: Histories and Languages of Philology* (Paris: Philologicum, 2009), pp. 155-201. Hummel herself in her "Hammer Philology or How to (Meta) Philologize with a Hammer," in Hummel, ed., *Metaphilology*, pp. 289-310, offers an account of Nietzsche and classics, surprising and seemingly based solely on James Whitman's "Nietzsche in the Magisterial Tradition of German Classical Philology," *Journal of the History of Ideas* 47.1 (1986): 453-468, and including an extended review of James Porter's books on Nietzsche and philology, fails to address these issues in her reading, including indeed, the question of Nietzsche's "singing" as opposed, significantly for Nietzsche, to his "speaking" text. I emphasize the relevance of Nietzsche's hammer, by contrast, as a musical metaphor, and in this sense "sounding" out idols and connect this with his revolutionary discovery of the pronunciation, i.e., the "musical sounding," of ancient Greek. See Babich, "The Science of Words or Philology: Music in *The Birth of Tragedy* and The Alchemy of Love in *The Gay Science*," in: Tiziana Andina, ed., *Revista di estetica. n.s. 28, XLV* (Turin: Rosenberg & Sellier, 2005), pp. 47-78 and the third part of my forthcoming book on music and the politics of music, digital culture and Nietzsche's idea of the spirit of music, Babich, *The Hallelujah Effect: kd lang's Desire, Adorno's Ghosts, and Nietzsche's Beethoven* [*Popular and Folk Music Series*, Editor: Derek B. Scott] (Surrey: Ashgate, 2012 or 2013).

<sup>31</sup> See Babich, "Towards a Critical Philosophy of Science: Continental Beginnings and Bugbears, Whigs and Waterbears," *International Journal of the Philosophy of Science*. Vol. 24, No. 4 (December 2010): 343-391 as well as, in German, Babich, "Nietzsches hermeneutische, phänomenologische Wissenschafts-philosophie. Unzeitgemäße Betrachtungen zu Altphilologie und Physiologie" in: Günter Abel and Helmut Heit, eds., *Nietzsches Wissenschaftsphilosophie. Hintergründe, Wirkungen und Aktualität* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012), pp. 291-311.

<sup>32</sup> See Alistair Crombie's three volume *Styles of Scientific Thinking in the European Tradition* (London: Duckworth,) and Hacking's "'Style' for Historians and Philosophers," *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 23 (1992): 1-20; pp. 178-199. Hacking's reading brought Foucault into the mix but did not address the historical limitations of analytic philosophy of science especially with regard to Duhem. For further discussion including the relevance of continental philosophy of science, see Babich "'Continental Philosophy of Science:

theorist, the serologist, Ludwik Fleck who used the term *Denkstil* where Kuhn more delicately (and more politically, so I have argued) preferred talk of paradigms.<sup>33</sup>

What has any of this to do with Darwin?

Well, at least morphologically speaking, rather a lot, especially in a German context.<sup>34</sup>

But readings of the history of German (and other) ideas are themselves enormously complex and not always soluble. The contrary assumption is an Anglophone predilection and perhaps it is the consequence of routine prejudice or what one calls, as victors in two world wars, “ideological convictions,” and I say this with a good conscience while meaning at the same time to note its dangers for scholarship or what Nietzsche himself would call science, *Wissenschaft*. Nevertheless, such historical emphases, do not exhaust my reasons for bringing up the scientific question of *style*. For Nietzsche, fond of style (the German word for stylizing, *stilisieren*, also describes deception or prevarication), also wrote an enormously influential little essay, *On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense*.

Only — to recall the kind of arch-philosophical distinction as Plato makes such distinctions in the *Republic*, punning on a stone that is no stone (as a piece of pumice) in turn thrown by the man who was (as a eunuch) no man, was pelted but was not pelted (inasmuch as the non-stone, qua pumice, missed), at a bird that was no bird, etc. — Nietzsche didn’t *write* it. Nietzsche didn’t write it, firstly, because he *dictated* it to his amanuensis Heinrich Köselitz. But, secondly, Nietzsche also cannot be said to have written it inasmuch as he didn’t originally conceive it either, if an original conceptualization or original “invention” is what’s meant by *writing* inasmuch as much of the substance of Nietzsche’s *On Truth and Lie in an Extra-Moral Sense*

---

Mach, Duhem, and Bachelard” in: Richard Kearney, ed., *Routledge History of Philosophy: Volume VIII* (London: Routledge, 1993), pp. 175-221.

<sup>33</sup> See for a discussion of style in Kuhn and Fleck, and further references, Babich, “From Fleck’s *Denkstil* to Kuhn’s Paradigm: Conceptual Schemes and Incommensurability,” *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 7 1/1 (2003): 75-92.

<sup>34</sup> See, among other studies, Lynn K. Nyhart, *Biology Takes Form: Animal Morphology and the German Universities, 1800–1900* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 1995) many of which are coordinated to certain accounts of German (as opposed to French) vitalism especially Goethe. See Robert J. Richards, *The Romantic Conception of Life. Science and Philosophy in the Age of Goethe* (Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press, 2002) as well as Richards, *The Meaning of Evolution. The Morphological Construction and Ideological Reconstruction of Darwin’s Theory* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992) and his “Ideology and the History of Science.” *Biology and Philosophy* 8 (1993): 103–108.

was borrowed, even verbatim (as teams of scholars have demonstrated), from one Gustav Gerber, the author of a very compendious book on *Die Sprache als Kunst [Language as Art]*.<sup>35</sup> But once one finds a whiff of plagiarism, scholars are off in search of other instances. And one already has such other instances on hand. But this is another way to speak of the history of ideas or what we today call source scholarship.

The point here is that and in fact one pretty much has to quote verbatim at least in some way — this is the morphological issue of style I noted above with reference to Nietzsche’s own discussion of this same topic in his inaugural lecture — just in order that subsequently scholars can find and identify the source as such (by definition unattributed).<sup>36</sup> One can be more subtle, one can emphasize another author one likes or does not mind or cannot help mentioning in order to put folks off the scent. This last is what Darwin has been accused of doing and the list of those Darwin fails to mention is capacious indeed, even if here I am only talking about, because cognate in a metonymic way with Nietzsche’s Gerber, a pharmacist and ergo amateur ornithologist, Edward Blyth.

Now Roy Davies who would not seem to be short of popular influence as a former BBC writer/producer, is the author of a recent book that takes the rather standard charges of Darwin’s plagiarism (standard since Loren Eiseley’s *Darwin’s Century*)<sup>37</sup> to a more specific height writing on *The Darwin Conspiracy: Origins of a Scientific Crime*.<sup>38</sup> As noted, the notion of a “conspiracy” is hardly new, if hardly accepted, and it derives from the charges, which accompanied Darwin’s renown from the start: Darwin borrowed or stole from some contemporaries and overshadowed many others.<sup>39</sup> Eiseley’s popular account (which is hard to

---

<sup>35</sup> I list much of this literature and its complications in Babich, *Words in Blood, Like Flowers: Philosophy and Poetry, Music and Eros* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2006).

<sup>36</sup> We all tell our students this to encourage them to go out and find a book and read it (in fact they simply go off to the internet and pretend they have found and “read” said book).

<sup>37</sup> Loren Eiseley, *Darwin’s Century: Darwin’s Century: Evolution and the Men Who Discovered It* (New York: Anchor, 1961).

<sup>38</sup> Roy Davies, *The Darwin Conspiracy: Origins of a Scientific Crime* (Goldensquare: London 2008).

<sup>39</sup> Much of the debate turns on the use of terms like Blyth’s ‘inosculate’ a botanical term which Blyth has recourse to and which appears, along with other indices, in Darwin. Schwartz, taking Darwin at his word, traces the use to William S. MacLeay, *Horae Entomologicae or Essays on the Annulose Animals* (London: S. Bagster, 1819). See Joel S. Schwartz, “Charles Darwin’s Debt to Malthus and Blyth,” *Journal of the History of Biology*, vol. 7, no. 2 (Fall 1974): 301-318, here p. 312.

better) has been updated for contemporary tastes in accounts like Peter Bowler.<sup>40</sup> But the notion of conspiracy also follows on the very language of revolution and this is where the political and historical philosophers come in the fray it is also where the philosophers of science find themselves squaring off.

Hence Michael Ruse's captivatingly titled *Darwin Revolution: Science Red in Truth and Claw* tries to untangle the associated threads around the famous name of Darwin. What is patent is that if Darwin meant to crowd out his competitors, as Davies for one, following Eiseley as well as Bowler's aptly titled, *Non-Darwinian Revolution*, argues, he certainly succeeded. But that selective distinction would have been anything but natural (note that the aptly named 'Darwin awards' assume otherwise).

Now because I read, among others, and in addition to Stegmaier and Richardson and Small already cited above, my old teacher Wolfgang Müller-Lauter who has argued that Nietzsche was inspired by Wilhelm Roux but also, as others like Gregory Moore have argued, Haeckel and Virchow and *and and*, it seems to me that one cannot quite coordinate Nietzsche and Darwin and leave it there, unless one does so in the spirit of the great man cult of our times. And this resonant, quotable, memorable greatness is the point or heart of the Homer problem as Nietzsche parsed it in his inaugural lecture.<sup>41</sup> We make claims as others make them, we read what others read. This dependency and lack of originality is what Nietzsche meant by the epithet of "learned cattle" his word for scholars — indeed for those same scholars as he wrote in his own bibliographical auto-biography *Ecce homo* who accused him of being a "Darwinist."

Like the actress Shirley Maclain and others who have been born *before* (not again and again in a Nietzschean whirl that is the eternal return of the same that is because the same exactly indistinguishable from the standing singularity of a one-time lifetime), it happens that everyone is a Ceasar or a Cleopatra, as if no lesser-known human being had ever walked the earth. This is

---

<sup>40</sup> See Peter J. Bowler, *Non-Darwinian Revolution: Reinterpretation of a Historical Myth* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1992) and again, Eiseley, *Darwin's Century*. These are leading accounts, the older now less so than the more recent. But see too, again, on the defence, Schwartz, "Charles Darwin's Debt to Malthus and Blyth," and concluding for Wallace (or Darwin contra Blyth), Barbara G. Beddall, "'Notes for Mr. Darwin': Letters to Charles Darwin from Edward Blyth at Calcutta - A Study in the Process of Discovery," *Journal of the History of Biology*, vol. 6, no. 1 (Spring 1973): 69-95.

<sup>41</sup> This is also the key to the joke to the epigraph that is the historian's howler and delight in *1066 and All That*.

charming in alternative or new age mysticism but it testifies to a lack of what Nietzsche called philology (meaning science) and what we should call scientific scholarship, that is a lack of philosophical research and reflection, but it is also and ultimately and the years make this worse not better: a lack of history.

This means that we only speak of Darwin (as the new-age mystic was Cleopatra in a former life), where we might speak of many others, I have already named (because he is so often unmentioned) Edward Blyth, as well as Alfred Russel Wallace, and it is common to name Lyell and Worster's eminently readable *Nature's Economy*, makes an essential case for including not only Lyell but also Alexander von Humboldt as do others.<sup>42</sup> And here it is important to say and to mean *et cetera, and so on*. But the intention falls short of the deed.

So let's talk about Nietzsche. Like Darwin, I have noted Nietzsche too is accused of plagiarism, that is borrowing, indeliberately or deliberately the work of others, and riding on this thundercloud to the kind of fame, that like Darwin's fame, eclipses others. In Nietzsche's case as in Darwin's case, this has generated small satellite industries of what Nietzsche who had a name for almost everything would call *Ressentiment*. I would put Schopenhauer among these but also Max Stirner, and paradoxically also Wagner (for at least to the Wagnerian mind: Nietzsche is imagined to have been in some way or another an ungrateful epigone), add to this on the nicely New England side one Ralph Waldo Emerson and thence to the materialist and formerly very popular (that is, so one supposes, until the Nietzscheans displaced him from his place of grace) Albert Lange.<sup>43</sup> And so on.

Klaus Rohde argues, and it is my long ago background in biology — and as I write this I mourn as I am currently teaching a course in ecological ethics, the death of a former teacher, Larry Slobodkin<sup>44</sup> — but especially in my enthusiasm for embryology and developmental biology which allows me to take Rohde's argument to heart, and allowing as one must for routine

---

<sup>42</sup> Donald Worster, *Nature's Economy: A History of Ecological Ideas* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.).

<sup>43</sup> See, to begin with, George Stack's studies of Nietzsche (and Lange and Emerson).

<sup>44</sup> It is a tribute to my teacher's accomplishments that I found out about Larry Slobodkin's death not through collegial gossip but through a quarter page notice in *The New York Times*, Sept 22, 2009.

misconceptions (and when one says this one is opening the door to routine elevations of Darwin to contemporary re-articulations and clarifications), that

Nietzsche's views in fact coincide in key points with new developments in evolutionary theory 1) the overall aspect of life is not need but and much more: abundance, opulence, indeed absurd profuseness; 2) the process of evolution is not due exclusively to natural selection (adapting to specific environmental conditions); 3) propagation is for sake of the individual not the species; and 4) there is no general higher development, dependent upon an inner drive to perfection (in this he agreed with Darwin).<sup>45</sup>

Given what we have traced above as the jostling for recognition in the marketplace of ideas, we recognize the elements of what we can be regarded as a kind of Darwinism of ideas and here too it would seem that Nietzsche's point — noting that it is not necessity and lack but abundance and even waste — let us think of the salmon only our greed for energy have hindered in their centuries long return to their spawning grounds (I mean to say that we dam the rivers and thus prevent them from passing, and so damn ourselves to nothing but farmed salmon where ordinary inbreeding and the diseases that are the ordinary results of breeding in captivity generate the 'farmed' salmon that are less and less of what fish traditionally were): but fish spawn to excess, so too insect eggs, so too flowers, and so on. And ecological biologists repeatedly confirm that this is the case, at least until the bull-dozers arrive on the scene.

So, some retort, that means that bulldozers are evolutionary pressures. And so too, one can add, must be counted the effects of the use of carbon fuels (etc.), and of stray bullets in housing complexes, or very intended bullets in the case of hunting: the same bullets that ensure an acceleration of the effects of developing the African savanna, eliminating larger herbivores like elephants and rhinos, that there will soon be, as there no longer are all the along the north eastern seaboard any of the big cats formerly native to North America, and so too elsewhere go lions, tigers, cheetahs, the mystically elusive and now very trivially vanished snow-leopard that I prefer to call the ounce, etc.

---

<sup>45</sup> Citation (following the recommended format): Rohde, Klaus. "Nietzsche über Darwin, und das Urteil der heutigen evolutionären Ökologie: Evolution, Darwin, Darwinismus, Nietzsche. Nietzsches Kritik des Darwinismus" [Internet]. Version 61. *Knol*. 2009 Okt 9. Verfügbar bei: <http://knol.google.com/k/klaus-rohde/nietzsche-über-darwin-und-das-urteil/xk923bc3gp4/88>.

For a fee, for those wildly successful in business and wanting to share in the Harvard Club's display of stuffed trophy animals, one can shoot the largest and the best lion.<sup>46</sup> Natural selection as long as it lasts. Fitness indeed.

If Robert Richards makes a Nietzschean point contra Darwin (without noting it to be sure, in his *Darwin and the Emergence of Evolutionary Theories of Mind and Behavior*), he also emphasizes precisely what Nietzsche does when he notes that the Darwinian who manages to find an evolutionary basis for altruism is merely re-writing the history or genealogy of morals in another fashion.<sup>47</sup> It should go without saying but Nietzsche is careful to parenthesize the point that the same argument goes for selfishness or egoism.

Such a morality tale including ambition and competition turns upon the Darwin question, to which we can add the Nietzsche question. What did Darwin say? (and if Davies and Eiseley and others are right, we also need to ask about What Blyth said? and What Wallace said?). Here I have been asking what did Nietzsche say?

I hope that I have shown in some way that it is not easy to answer questions such as these.

### **Coda: Nietzsche as Darwinist and the Problem of Transhumanism**

I have above argued against the popular view of Nietzsche as Darwinist and I concur with other Nietzsche scholars who have also noted that other authors worked in Nietzsche's thinking in association with Darwin,<sup>48</sup> not only Spencer and Malthus but also Roux and Haeckel among others which also for Nietzsche included Empedocles and other ancient scientists.

---

<sup>46</sup> Matthew Scully, *Dominion*. The current scandal of the Spring of 2012, regarding King Carlos of Spain and his reported (think how much goes unreported) hunting trip and his trophy-pose with a dead elephant, massive ivory tusks and all, ghoulishly propped against a tree to show the size of his "conquest," is a sad testimony to the persistence of the same phantasmic but for the animals all too real cruelty and devastation. King Carlos apologized but not for the killing the elephant only for the apparent callousness of taking an expensive safari at a time of so-called "austerity" which is a political program to strip money from the poor and give it to the banks and the investors or speculators with government sanction to do so.

<sup>47</sup> Richards, *Darwin and the Emergence of Evolutionary Theories of Mind and Behavior*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).

<sup>48</sup> I cannot wish to say that Nietzsche had not or could not have read Darwin, For here I differ from my positivist minded source-hunting colleagues who believe that Nietzsche could only have read books he marked up. But,

To the extent that a great part of the conviction that Nietzsche is to be associated with Darwin stems from a particular and particularly infamous translation of a terminus that is historically associated with fascism and which was itself and for its own part not quite Nietzsche's own text. I am speaking of the *Übermensch*, once all-too-dangerously translated as the superman, and sometimes left for good measure in German, today more popularly rendered as the overman, or post-human as I have named it or increasingly as the transhuman. The transhuman is popular today in connection with the techno- or digital fantasies of those hoping to escape the world we have made and 'evolve' instead (this is a projective evolution of the unreal kind that Baudrillard named hyperreal or virtual) into so many World of Warcraft avatars, perhaps, or some other social networking pretense (a facebook or Twitter picture will do) rather than flesh and blood of life as we seem to prefer digital interaction and digital reality today. Yet the current longing for a digital transcendence of the ordinary, what science fiction writers and tech investors call the "singularity" is just another version of what Nietzsche called the latest instantiation of the ascetic ideal.<sup>49</sup>

In its original constellation, *The Will to Power* may be counted as Nietzsche's most famous book but [again think of Plato's puzzles], this is a book that is not a book, as a concocted or invented book, composed in several different instaurations and that means scope and articulation by Nietzsche's sister, Elisabeth Förster Nietzsche.<sup>50</sup> As *Der Wille zur Macht*, this book is also held to be the causal factor in not only Hitler's war but also the first world, which was also called, instructively, fatally enough, "Nietzsche's war" by journalists of the day as William MacIntire

---

and this should go without saying and I am repeating it again because it manifestly does not. One has no more than positive proof that Nietzsche could have "read" (all of or just some part of? skimmed or studied) a book featuring his marginal comments. Certainly so. But the lack of such "evidence" demonstrates not Nietzsche's innocence of the book but and only the book's innocence of such markings. No more, no less. Just so, the lack of positive records "proving" his knowledge of a given book, or the lack of mention in Nietzsche's writings does not allow us to conclude against his knowledge of the work in question, only that we have no evidence. But having no evidence is not itself positive evidence. Darwin as we noted at the start, was common stock in Nietzsche's Germany, not least inasmuch as he had been translated into German. The issue of translation as we have also noted this point above is key not because it facilitated the possible/plausible direct reading of Darwin for Nietzsche but because Nietzsche's own reflective terms are drawn from this same tradition of translation (and the conceptual difference translation makes). Cf. Nietzsche BGE § 28. There is a reason Martin Heidegger emphasizes that a translation is always also an interpretation.

<sup>49</sup> See Babich, "Nietzsche's Post-Human Imperative: On the "All-too-Human" Dream of Transhumanism," *The Agonist*, Vol. IV, Issue II (2012). This is an online publication and may be found at the following link: [http://www.nietzschecircle.com/AGONIST/2011\\_08/Dream\\_of\\_Transhumanism.html](http://www.nietzschecircle.com/AGONIST/2011_08/Dream_of_Transhumanism.html).

<sup>50</sup> See for a discussion, Babich, *Words in Blood, Like Flowers*, chapter 14.

Salter already reminds us.<sup>51</sup> Thus speaking of the philosophy that generated the language of the master-race, we are talking about the *Übermensch* as opposed to the *Unter-Mensch* as Nazi terminology also speaks.

Nietzsche himself uses both terms. Yet as I have shown now, what Nietzsche means by the *Übermensch* is satiric, adumbrated as it is via Lucian of Samosata, a just-about contemporary of Diogenes Laertius, and an author who, like Diogenes Laertius Nietzsche alludes throughout his writing. The primary (effectively the only) source for what we know of the Menippean satire tradition to which Nietzsche also refers and which matters too given Nietzsche's focus on the parodic character of his Zarathustra.

If Recent scholarship inspired more by French than German or Anglophone philosophical and sociological thought (such as Bergson, Lefebvre, Simondon) read Nietzsche as invoking the transhuman condition (a conditional reference that is more Donna Haraway than Hannah Arendt), their pro-cybernetic vision moves in the direction if not of the robotic than the very modest cyborg that is a kid texting a friend, a man masturbating with an internet connection, or just contact lenses or a pacemaker, and so on.

But Nietzsche's reference is not the present day paraphernalia of the tech stuff of our lives. Instead he is talking about the human and the animal and as he writes he is not persuaded that we are either "other" or "higher." In this sense, one might want to consider the kinship with nature than can make us accuse Nietzsche of a Goethean *Naturmystik* but and even there we miss the point Nietzsche seeks to underscore with his notion of the *Übermensch*.<sup>52</sup>

What Nietzsche takes from Lucian of Samosata's *Downward Journey or the Tyrant*, is the provocative contrast (as this belongs to what I call his reflection on perspective, not his

---

<sup>51</sup> William MacIntire Salter, "Nietzsche and the War," reprinted in: Strong, ed., *Friedrich Nietzsche*, pp. 3-26. See too Strong's introduction to this collection, as well as my own contribution here, originally published as Babich, "Habermas, Nietzsche, and the Future of Critique: Irrationality, The Will to Power, and War" in: Babich, ed., *Nietzsche, Habermas, and Critical Theory* (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 2004), pp. 13-46.

<sup>52</sup> , a notion already borrowed (and hence and again! not Nietzsche's notion), a borrowing attribution known by every Nietzsche scholar, drawn from Lucian's *Kataplous* or "Downward Journey" or "Descent into Hades" or the Underworld. See, for discussion, Babich, « Le Zarathoustra de Nietzsche et le style parodique. A propos de l'*hyperanthropos* de Lucien et du surhomme de Nietzsche. » *Diogène. Revue internationale des sciences humaines*, 232 (October 2010 [2011]): 70-93. Forthcoming in English later this year.

perspectivism as the analysts say, but his *perspectivalism*: namely) between the values we have given our circumstances in life, our culture and our tendency to take these values (shades of Butterfield's presentism) not only as universal but as timeless.

When Nietzsche writes that the human being is something to be overcome, or when he characterizes the span of human life in a discussion of artists of grand passion as constituting “— a hiatus between two nothingnesses —” (KSA 12, 473), he points to a perspective beyond the here and now, one which asks us to consider not the immediate, whether in terms of economic advantage or personal delight or pleasure, but rather the scope or scheme of the world.

Thus when Nietzsche writes *The world is will to power and nothing besides* he refers in his own context to nothing other than to the collective whole of existence in the cosmos. In this sense, he has recourse to biological metaphors and from this same perspective he also emphasizes that the aim of life is expression not survival (only, he says, rather unkindly, the Englishman strives for life at all costs). Thus we have note Nietzsche's emphasis upon the artistic play of life — not as a drive common to starfish and to humans alike, or also and better said common to the morphology of Haeckel's *radiolaria* and human beings, at least as Leonardo displays them,

For Nietzsche as noted is speaking of what he calls the *Urkünstler*, which was to be sure what the Stoics and the pre-platonic thinkers called mind or *noûs*. For his part, Nietzsche follows the developmental schemes of Empedocles more than he does those of Darwin (and before one dismisses this as the last word, as a throw away, wherever we turn to biological insights, we do well to include their pre-platonic precursors).<sup>53</sup>

If that be design, then Nietzsche must be aligned those who argue for intelligent design in the sense then not of the Judeo-Christian God and not of Gaia but of another schema altogether, one that Nietzsche once called *aeon*, reminding us that the child had kingship, ah, playing with chance.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>53</sup> I discuss this more generally in Babich, “Early Continental Philosophy of Science: 1890-1930” in: Keith Ansell-Pearson, ed., *The New Century Volume Three: History of Continental Philosophy* (Chesham, UK: Acumen Press, 2010) but see too, again, the introductory section on cladistics and related references in Babich, “Towards a Critical Philosophy of Science.”

<sup>54</sup> And here, we might start again, with the elusive image of the necessary 500 hands needed to take chance or τύχη by the forelock (cf. Nietzsche's BGE §274). This paper was presented as the first listed of a series of papers

## Acknowledgments

This article grew out of a lecture presented as the first listed in a series of papers and of panels dedicated to Darwin in 2009-2010 at the Boston Center for the History and Philosophy of Science. I am grateful to Fred Tauber for the invitation and to Bob Cohen for his friendly encouragement over many years. I also thank my own teachers in biology at the State University of New York at Stony Brook, teachers who included Edwin Battley, the late Larry Slobodkin, as well as the influence of the late Maynard Dewey of the Department of Anatomical Sciences and my friend at the start of my career at Fordham until his death, Erwin Chargaff. I am also deeply grateful to Boston University's Center for the History and Philosophy of Science. My education is utterly non-analytic inasmuch as I 'ruined' — to use Bob Cohen's term — what might have been a perfectly good career in the philosophy of science by going to Boston College, which I did simply because Hans-Georg Gadamer was there and that was enough for me. But I got to hear Cohen's views because I was a frequent visitor to the Boston University colloquia on the History and Philosophy of Science during my grad school days. And I am the kind of philosopher that I am because of both BC and BU, including the peripherality that was Harvard and MIT — and the lectures and discussions in greater Boston is among the reasons I count myself first and foremost a philosopher of science.

---

and panels dedicated to Darwin in 2009-2010 at the Boston Center for the History and Philosophy of Science. I am grateful to Fred Tauber for the invitation and to Bob Cohen for his friendly encouragement over many years. But I am also deeply grateful to Boston University's Center for the History and Philosophy of Science. My education is utterly non-analytic inasmuch as I 'ruined' to use Bob Cohen's terms, what might have been a perfectly good career in the philosophy of science by going to Boston College, which I did simply because Hans-Georg Gadamer was there and that was enough for me. But I got to hear Cohen's views because I was a frequent visitor to the Boston University colloquia on the History and Philosophy of Science during my grad school days. And I am the kind of philosopher that I am because of both BC and BU, including the peripherality that was Harvard and MIT — and the lectures and discussions in greater Boston is among the reasons I count myself first and foremost a philosopher of science.