



---

## War from the Perspective of Nietzsche and Kant

---

Mohammad Nasiri<sup>1</sup>, Garineh Keshishyan Siraki<sup>2\*</sup>, Seyed Ali Mortazavian Farsani<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2\*</sup>Department of Political Science, South Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University,  
Tehran, Iran

<sup>3</sup>Department of Political Science, Central Tehran Branch, Islamic Azad University,  
Tehran, Iran

---

Received: 10 Dec 2021 ; Accepted: 20 Jan 2022

---

### Abstract:

Kant believes that war should be considered a last resort with the utmost respect for human life and dignity. War should only be used when all other means of conflict resolution have been exhausted. Nietzsche considered morality as a human structure that has been used throughout history to suppress and control people, so peace is a sign of weakness and degeneration and a product of herd mentality. Real strength comes from conflict and struggle. Nietzsche considered peace as a necessary part of life, but only if it is based on power. Understanding and formulating the criticism of these two important thinkers on peace and what war is and how they interpret these concepts is the central issue of this article. Nietzsche believed that peace is not an end in itself, but a means to an end, and argued that peace is necessary for the development of higher forms of culture and civilization, but it should not be pursued at the expense of creativity and progress. On the other hand, Kant believed that countries should strive towards a more peaceful world order in which conflicts are resolved through dialogue instead of violence.

**Keywords:** Nietzsche, Kant, War, Peace, Interpretation of what being means

---

---

\*Corresponding Author's Email: [g.keshishyan71@gmail.com](mailto:g.keshishyan71@gmail.com)

---

## Introduction

Hegel believes that Kant's moral theory is abstract and without content. Kant's moral principles present a morality that is impossible and impossible due to its inherent contradictions. Schiller agrees with Kant's opinion that the moral foundations must be general, unconditional, and prior, and the morality of the act cannot be dependent on its result; But it is against Kant's conclusion that the "material content" of moral experience has no place in the moral determination of the act. Sir David Ross, H. A. Prichard and John Rawls were also supporters of Kant's moral theory.

Since the beginning of the 20th century, Nietzsche's philosophy has attracted the attention of scientific circles and assemblies. Thinkers such as Karl Jaspers, Martin Heidegger, Ernst Jünger and Walter Kaufmann played a significant role in identifying Nietzsche's views and ideas. By analyzing Nietzsche's thoughts from the perspective of aesthetics and philosophy of art, Heidegger took an important step to understand Nietzsche's thoughts, so that after that John Salis, Julian Young, Daniel Conway and Salim Kamal take the next steps in the above field of research. However, it must be admitted that the dispersion of Nietzsche's opinions on the one hand and the wide range of issues raised by Nietzsche, as well as the complexity of his view and expression in philosophical and thought issues, have faced thinkers with problems in deciphering and fully understanding Nietzsche. And it still leaves

some dark and untouched places in Nietzsche's foundations and philosophy. Many articles and books about Nietzsche's work and even analyzes of his works are available to the audience. But in the topic of war and peace, there are a handful of works that are written in a one-dimensional way and not with the view of explaining the place of peace and war in Nietzsche's intellectual foundations. Rebecca Pierri's book titled "War in Nietzsche's Thought" focuses on the nature of war in Nietzsche's philosophy with a small volume. Another work is the book "Nietzsche, the philosophy of conflicts in his thinking and his philosophical conflicts" by Müller-Lauter, which discusses the place of the phenomenon of the struggle of opposites in Nietzsche's philosophy.

But the main topic of this article is the explanation of the concept of war and the criticism of the peace debate from the point of view of the two aforementioned thinkers, Kant and Nietzsche; As far as the writer of these lines has checked in various sources, there is no record and writing for the specific investigation of these two thinkers in the above topic.

In this article, we will try to examine these concepts in the thought of these two important and influential thinkers and compare the difference in their views on the concept of war.

## Research background and literature

Ahmadvand and Solgi (2014) in the article "Fundamentals of Nietzsche's and Iqbal Lahori's Thought with an emphasis on

Anthropology and political philosophy" examine Nietzsche's and Iqbal's thought in the four dimensions of epistemology, ontology, methodology, and anthropology. Due to the lack of a comparative study on the topic of this article, it is clear that in this article, the way of interpreting the world and human life based on a network of concepts, in the cultural-social context of the time and political situation, has been investigated.

Shadpour et al. (2014) believe in "a critical analysis of Nietzsche's view on the meaning of life"; Nietzsche tries to design the meaning of life in line with the will directed to power and earthly life, the result of which is overcoming the all-encompassing nothingness.

Mosleh et al. (2013) in the article "Origins of Deconstruction in Nietzsche's Thought" state that Nietzsche attacks the past and sees the future as utterly different from the past.

In an article, Barzegar et al. (2012) investigated the similarities and differences between the over man from Nietzsche's and Iqbal's point of view, which, of course, has many differences from the present article.

Dolattari et al. (2010) in "Discussion of Ethics in Nietzsche's Works" consider the issue of ethics and values in the modern world to be Friedrich Nietzsche's most important intellectual concern and believe that he sought to create new deals in order to escape the crisis of nihilism.

Khademi (2010) in his article "Iqbal and the Politeness of Western Philosophers towards teleological theory" explained the robust solutions of religion and its role in

the individual and social destiny of man from the perspective of Iqbal. It also examines the sensitive mechanism of reason in the realm of religion and compares the cases with Nietzsche; This article also has many differences with the current research.

Kellner also states (1999) about Nietzsche's critique of Tudeh culture; Nietzsche was one of the first people who considered mass culture as the main element of the process of social reproduction in the modern period and considered it as the basis of the distinctive features of modern societies, that is, tudehism the destruction of individuality. About Kant, however, the matter is almost different. Because there are many books, articles, and treatises about Kant's sustainable peace, although, in these treatises, the explanation of Kant's views, especially on war, or the investigation of peace and war from Kant's point of view have not been addressed in a multi-dimensional way. But Ali Zekavati, in his article Kant and Social-Political Responsibility, "examines his important theory about antinomies. The theory of antinomy is always a fundamental axis in Kant's thought. In this article, by examining Kant's views in the field of social life, his views on wisdom and morality can be well understood. In the article "Peace-oriented in Kant's philosophy", Mohsen Qadri examines the peace-oriented curriculum in the philosophical field from Kant's point of view. Hamidreza Ayatollahi in his article "Philosophical thinking, a prerequisite for any world peace" states that if we consider peace as a necessity in human

interactions, it should be checked what kind of thinking can provide the necessary platform for this human necessity. In the article "Relationship between Man and truth according to contemporary philosophers", Qodratollah Ghorbani examines the relationship between man and truth from the point of view of thinkers such as Descartes, Kant, and Nietzsche. Of course, as it is clear from the research materials and background, almost no serious work has been done regarding the comparison of Kant's and Nietzsche's views on war and criticism of peace, so both the necessity of doing this research and its innovation is clear.

#### **War in the thinking of Philosophers and old thinkers**

Sun Tzu, a famous Chinese Confucian thinker who lived in the 6th century BC, can be called the first philosopher of war. In his famous work called "The Art of War", he defines military strategies and ways to deceive the enemy. According to him, war starts when any possibility of peace fails. Therefore, war is an operation to conquer a territory and the best conquest is conquest without physical conflict and violence (Jahanbeglu, 1999, p. 5). According to him, creating asymmetry in war is the key to victory, so discovering asymmetries and dissimilarities between the parties will lead to victory. In fact, during the conflict, the political, diplomatic, economic, and even spiritual dimensions will not be removed, and he warns that only the military aspect should be considered in the

war. As a result, he pays attention to commitments, national infrastructures, political, economic, and military leadership, and he pays special attention to the coherence of links in the unity of war leadership and trust between military leaders and troops (Jahanbeglu, 1999, p. 6).

In ancient Greece, sophists were people who are argumentative and fallacious and tried to prove their opinions by any means. Thales, Anaximander, Pythagoras, Heraclitus, Parmenides, etc. were among the thinkers who founded the intellectual foundations of the West and are known as the seven sages. Their main problem was nature and its relative recognition. The sophists tried to express what the previous philosophers had obtained are conflicting ideas and thoughts about the first principles of the world and material nature, and to fight the ideas with other theories. The philosophical approach to the general nature of war in ancient Greece is more visible in two pre-Socratic thinkers. Anaximander believed that from the heart of the infinite and indeterminate (Apeiron), which is the basis of the universe, opposites appear and each element of the universe violates the other (Copleston, 1983, p. 40). And Heraclitus says: war is the father and king of all, we must know that war is for all and justice is in conflict and everything is created and used by conflict (Pirouz, 2020, p. 27).

If Anaximander believed that the war of opposites emerges from the heart of the infinite as the principle and basis of the universe and dissolves in it once again;

Heraclitus considers the origin and foundation of the world, which is expressed by the simile of fire, to be nothing but constant war (Copleston, 1983, p. 61). Therefore, the foundation of existence is based on continuous war between different things, war is both the cause of the creation of the world and the cause that causes the survival of beings after the occurrence. War is a fire for the light of the world. The wish for the disappearance of war is the wish for the end of the world and life. The war of seasons is the war of survival. Fire does whatever it can from its species to survive, man invades trees, animals, and earth to eat its fruit, eat meat, plant seeds, build houses, and dig wells to survive. Heraclitus believed that Homer, with his desire to end the war between gods and men, wished for the destruction and destruction of the world (Copleston, 1983, p. 60).

Heraclitus also believed that the world is the result of a battle between opposites, and this battle will never lead to stability. And since there is no stability, the parts and the whole of the world are subject to change. In a way, the winner is always an anti, and after a while, it also goes out of the cycle with failure. Therefore, if the battle is constant, two opposites must have the strength to not be destroyed during the battle, because the complete destruction of one of the opposites will destroy the other as well. It is obvious that if a force is continuously engaged in a constant battle, it will soon suffer from weakness and deterioration. Therefore, there must be a law that guarantees the eternal existence of

two opposites, and without this law, one of the opposites will eventually be destroyed or weaker than the other, and this will be the end of the world of opposites. This is why Heraclitus introduces a rule called Logos, which commands and controls the world and the opposites and the current between the two opposites (Brieh, 1995, pp. 90-92).

Niccolo Machiavelli was a famous Italian philosopher, poet, historian, and playwright who had a realistic approach to world political issues. The center of his attention was the man himself and the political situation of his time. He explained the forgotten meaning and value of war to the princes of the country by rereading the philosophy of army recruitment in ancient Rome. It is for the ruler to have no goal in front of him and no thought in his head except for war and order (Machiavelli, 2004, p. 76).

He believed that Shahryar's strength in the war gives him the ability to suppress internal and external riots and restore order. Also, the most important consequence of being at the center of war is promoting the spirit of recklessness and bravery, which are the most valuable goals because reckless men are able to arrange the fate of the times as they want. Fortune is a woman and if you want to dominate her, you have to be strong, and I have seen that she entrusts herself to reckless men, not those who do not have salt in their heads; And also, like women, he likes young people who are more careless and attack him more forcefully and fearlessly (Machiavelli, 2004, p. 115).

Like Nicola Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes examines war only in the sphere of life. He believes that every human being seeks his own survival and prosperity, this struggle causes his competition, suspicion, and selfishness and ultimately leads to his intense conflict with others (Copleston, 1996, pp. 46-47). Hobbes believed that as long as humans are not under the command of a common power called law and government, they live in a natural state of war, and this means that war is in the nature and institution of every human being, and it is his natural passiveness. People take weapons with them when they travel. At night, they lock their doors and hide their valuables in a safe place. The natural situation, war, makes human life short and miserable, isolated and cruel. According to Hobbes, the solution is to establish the rule of law. This law will be effective when the majority of people agree on its status, in such a case, the rule of law will change the natural state of war to peace and civilization. Hobbes stated that as long as they have the hope of achieving peace, people should try to secure it, and when they cannot get it, they will be allowed to follow all the possibilities and remedies of war and resort to it. Humans should agree to give up their right to everything if others are willing and as much as they think it is necessary to maintain peace and defend themselves; and to have as much authority in front of others as he wants others to have in front of them (Copleston, 1996, p. 50).

Saint Simon, another famous thinker, believes that there is a relationship between war and industrialization, and in sociologists' view, the industrial society is the society of modernity and is the opposite of the traditional society, so with the industrialization of societies, the phenomenon of war fades away and finally disappears. The main reason for this theory, from Simon's point of view, was that in primitive or traditional societies, the main cause of war is the economic function, that is, getting slaves for production, so when the society becomes industrialized, there is no need for slaves anymore because technology will take its place. So, the phenomenon of war is dependent on industry (Dadgar, 2004, pp. 322-341).

Another thinker and philosopher who is very important in the field of the concept of war is Clausewitz, who was born in 1780 in the city of Burg in the state of Mecklenburg. He rejects any attempt to compare war with mechanical techniques such as engineering, which are based on objective laws about all physical systems, or the fine arts, which, in his opinion, are not based on any solid principles despite the general acceptance of the masterpieces they create. According to him, war belongs to the realm of social life. War is a conflict of great interests, which is accompanied by bloodshed and is different from other conflicts only in this sense. It is better that, instead of comparing it with any kind of art, we liken it to a job competition, which is also a conflict of interests and human works. War is more like

government policy, which can also be considered a kind of job competition on a large scale. The fundamental difference is that war is not a work of will that is applied like mechanical techniques on inanimate matter or like fine arts on a living but passive and submissive subject; Rather, it is an action that acts against a living and reactive force (Gali, 2012, p. 62).

In fact, it can be said that the interests, goals, means and warring movements that make up the war continuously and mutually affect each other, and most importantly, the parties try to hide their intentions and deceive each other. The result is that the ideal of a completely logical or adequate answer to any war issue is pure deception. Of course, this does not mean that no theory and rules can be stated about war, but this is important when we have an overly narrow view of the theory and its function. Clausewitz discusses many principles of war, but the remarkable thing is that he does not try to derive these principles from a single source or establish a logical relationship between them (Gali, 2012, p. 64).

In general, in his most important book called "About War", he first describes the nature of war and states that war is a kind of duel between two combatants. Of course, a much bigger and wider duel than the usual duel between two nobles, but the goal of both is the same because in each of them the opponents try to make the other submit to their will by using their power. And this means that two key elements play a role in the nature of war, the use of power and the imposition of will on another, so

the result is that war is a violent act whose purpose is to deprive the opponent of any resistance and submit to our will. (Clausewitz, 1955, p. 51)

Where the political will cannot be achieved without violence, war comes. War, as an art, consists of two parts, tactics and strategy, tactics is the art of leading a battle, and strategy is the art of coordination between different battles. In tactics, military forces are used like art materials for the purpose of victory, and in strategy, the battles themselves are used as fine arts in order to realize the greater art, which is the goal of war. He mentions the strategy under the title of harmonizing different struggles for the benefit of the war goal (Jahanbeglu, 1999, p. 24). Hegel believes that war occurs when governments violate agreements concluded at the global and international levels, and conflict results, resulting in many oppressions and losses. But the rational necessity of war cannot be ignored. War is a means through which the dialectical conflict of history proceeds in such a way that a dull political system is removed by war and replaced by a powerful manifestation full of spirit (Copleston, 2003, p. 217). According to Hegel, war is a factor that can strengthen the social consciousness of any nation by protecting its spiritual unity, against any individualism, if individualism moves to selfishness, the life of the society and the individual will be endangered. Therefore, war is a superior political activity. This sentence means that war is the sense of moral-political responsibility of citizens towards the independence and sovereignty of the

government and eliminates the distance between the individual and the government in the field of private property. War is the stop stage of human-citizen's excellence in front of his needs. The war is an effort against remaining fixed and unmediated by the material values of civil society, which takes a person away from his most sublime goal, which is the achievement of true freedom. War brings the transience of the existence of finite beings before the eyes of man and in this way directs his mind to the existence of the absolute. Of course, considering that the soul's destination is self-awareness, and as the soul approaches self-awareness, confrontations such as war also end (Pirouz, 2020, p. 34).

#### **War in the thinking of Philosophers and new thinkers**

The famous Russian writer Leon Tolstoy is one of those who writes about war and peace. Tolstoy's preoccupation with war has two contrasting phases. In his rebellious youth and at the beginning of middle age, he is full of feeling, perception, and judgment. From his masterful reports about the battle of Sebastopol to the period of his mental and nervous crisis, which he believed he tried to save only by converting to his own version of Christianity, which was based on the commandment not to resist the criminal. Therefore, it is natural that he describes his previous approach to the issue of war with this description. Tolstoy describes the life story of five aristocratic families in the wars

between Russia and France during the years 1805-1820 in the relatively long novel "War and Peace", which consists of four volumes; But what can be taken from the novel is the futility of frequent wars, which are followed by unstable states of peace. Wars that do not achieve anything except killing and being killed, except for destruction and sorrow and hardship; So, we can conclude that Tolstoy condemns war in his novel. He believes in the repetition of history and considers learning from history as one of the achievements of ending war and peace (Gali, 2012, pp. 147-155).

Antoine-Henri Jomini, the famous theoretician of modern wars, also, unlike many optimistic libertarians of the 19th century who considered war to be a human deviation from the path of history, considered it an inseparable part of the history of human civilization (Shahlaei and Valivand, 2009, p. 124). He considered war to be a great theater in which six factors are involved in its design and execution: strategy, tactics, logistics, minor tactical engineering, and diplomacy (Jomini, 1862, p. 13). In his theory of war, one of the most important features is the development of the meaning of war from hard conflicts to soft conflicts, that is, fighting through changes in a person's emotions and spirit. He considered war not a science, but basically an art. He accepted the similarity of some war strategies with fixed laws that are common in empirical sciences, but he also believed that such laws cannot be generalized to the entire phenomenon of war. A struggle may

be completely independent of positivist scientific laws and instead rely entirely on the personality traits of human beings, among poetry, drama, literature, and a thousand other things. War is able to stimulate and direct people's emotions, spirits, and emotions in such a way that the result of the struggle turns in favor of one side (Pirouz, 2020, p. 38). In the 20th century, especially with the end of the Second World War, Jomini's view in the form of considering art as an effective weapon in the field of soft wars, such as psychological warfare, cultural warfare, and the like, was strongly noticed by the great powers of the world (Pirouz, 2020, p. 39).

And finally, after the collapse of the Soviet Union, which was another expression of the failure of communism on the one hand and the failure of Western theories before the end of the Cold War, new analyzes came out; But two theories drew more attention. First was the optimistic theory of Francis Fukuyama, who considered the future world to be a unipolar system under the control of Western liberal democracy; And another theory of Samuel Huntington's opinion, who believed that the modern world has reached a stage where instead of countries and politicians, civilizations and culture builders will play a role. According to this theory that the clash of civilizations became famous with the end of the Cold War, the era of ideological conflict has also ended and the main conflict is between civilizations. Based on several cultural indicators, he identifies seven main civilizations and one marginal civilization, Western civilization,

Confucian civilization, Japanese, Islamic, Indian, Slavic-Orthodox, Latin American and African marginal civilization. Therefore, culture, religion and civilizational self-awareness become the main determinants in new relations. So, as a result, political boundaries give way to faults between civilizations and crisis points emerge. He believes that the main focus of conflicts will be between Western civilization on the one hand and Islamic and Confucian civilizations on the other.

Having said that, the factors of instability in the future are:

- 1- Ethnic conflicts that are either local and within civilizations or between civilizations.
- 2- Islamic movements with the political motive of fighting against the rule of foreigners or returning to authentic Islam.
- 3- Asian countries become arrogant and aggressive due to economic growth and strength in the world

In the end, the Islamic and Confucian civilizations, with their existence, aim to achieve superior military power. (Louis Bernard, 2003, p. 17-26)

### **War and Peace from Kant's Point of view**

In his treatise on sustainable peace, Kant talks for the first time about the practical conditions that nations and governments must use to approach the idea of sustainable peace. Kant, do you think about why people fight each other? What causes all people not to live peacefully together? With the help of Hobbes and Rousseau, he states that a state of peace is not as natural

as a state of war, and in a state of peace, there is always the threat of war. He believed that "a peace that is achieved through the establishment of law will be a lasting peace." (Covell, 1998, p. 2)

Kant's theme of lasting peace is not only relevant to the whole world but also true at all times. Kant makes a distinction between the reality of man and what should be, and this led him to separate the study of man in nature in the critique of pure reason and the study of his metaphysical and ideal aspects in the critique of practical reason. Kant's political theory, which was developed in *Sustainable Peace*, is a continuation of his ethics and practical reason, so if a law is to be established at the global level, this law must be based on ethics, and this ethics is rights, not individual ethics. Lasting peace is achieved when each nation recognizes the other nation and behaves as it expects other nations to treat itself. Global morality and international law make nations live peacefully together (Covell, 1998, p. 3). Morality is true for free people, so sustainable peace is also possible for free governments. Kant only likes republican government for the internal politics of countries because in this government the freedom of individuals is transferred to the freedom of the state. If they are not a democratic country, the premise of establishing sustainable world peace will not be achieved. In order for the world to be governed by law, there must be law within the countries as well, and this means republican government. Finally, lasting peace will be established

between countries where people have accepted to live in peace by recognizing each other.

Another basic condition is that countries, like humans, who abandoned the natural state and accepted the law and contract in order to live with security, must enter into a legal contract together. This creates what Kant calls a federation of free states. This is a global agreement that governments pledge by joining to not be a threat to sustainable peace and in return, there is no threat to them. Only free states, that is, moral states, can enter such a federation (Mahmoudi, 2004, pp. 390-393). Therefore, as can be seen from Kant's words and writings, Kant mostly describes the anti-war situation and this situation is compatible with sustainable peace.

#### **War from Nietzsche's Point of view**

Nietzsche's approach to war, like many other subjects, is multifaceted. Just as he categorizes beings into weak and strong, forces into action and reaction, ethics into the ethics of lords and nobles, humans into Dionysian and Apollonian, culture into high and low, and philosophy into tragic and theoretical. It also divides war into good and bad, right or wrong. Jaspers believes that Nietzsche considers the harm of war to be a fool of the conqueror and the evil of the vanquished, and its benefit is to return man to his natural nature (Nietzsche, 2005, p. 444).

Of course, it seems that the division of war into good and bad can be examined more comprehensively from Nietzsche's point

of view in comparison with the profitability and loss of war. For the first time, he mentions two goddesses of war in Homer's treatise on war, one of which is the manifestation of good and the other is the manifestation of evil. The auspicious goddess of war attracts people to compete and fight to benefit more from life and develop power. Nietzsche said this in the passage about war and warriors from the book Zoroaster writes about the good war, it is the good war that sanctifies every motive. Nietzsche is considered as an example of goodness, heroic character, and good war, the kind of war combined with the passion of life, which is formed not for the sake of longer survival, but for the domination of man. And what is meant by domination over man is that he sees man not as an end, but as a bridge towards over man. In fact, man is a creature that can fall to the limit, and on the other hand, man may be upgraded in power to emerge as a perfected being called over man. Domination over man means overcoming man-centeredness and means using man and turning him into a tool for the rise of over-man, and the war whose foundation is this kind of domination is the greatest and at the same time the greatest war. (Pirouz, 2012, p. 111)

Nietzsche considers over man to be a symbol of the abundance of energies and heightened forces of life. Copleston believes that the interpreters of Nietzsche's over man consider Nietzsche's physical, mental and intellectual strength perfect, which has extraordinary skill and education (Copleston, 2012, 403-404). over man is the real embodiment of Dionysus and

the greatest defender of life (Copleston, 1992, p. 151). This is why Nietzsche considers over man the superhero of his philosophy and considers the most important and good war to be the war to dominate man in the direction of the emergence of over man. Because this war is the result of Dionysian and masculine forces, and the emergence of the most complete form of Dionysian forces is defined in the form of over man.

Therefore, if we consider the good war to be the domination of the heightened forces of life, then the bad war is the conquest and domination of the aforementioned forces. From the above points, we understand that in order to understand the war between good and evil, we must know what kind of creature is going to develop itself through dominance. Therefore, any kind of victory over health and valor, masculinity and life indicate the desire of fear, femininity, disease, and the development of degeneration, and this war is bad. And a war that is against despair and destruction, fear and disease is a good war that is necessary. What should be fought with all the strength is the spread of degeneration to healthy organs (Nietzsche, 1998, p. 41).

#### **Man's war against himself**

Man's war with himself or the self is one of the most important wars in Nietzsche's view, this war can be the highest war or the lowest war. If we consider war as a struggle and an effort to dominate one force over other forces, and if we define the main criterion of war as good or bad as the analysis of the nature of domination and its content, it is important to find out

what is trying to dominate what else. So, the inner war of man is evaluated based on the above. Nietzsche considers self-mastery as a good war between a person and himself, that part of the human being that has the life force and the will directed to power is supposed to overcome the weak and weak will power and the war will lead to the reign and rule of the supreme power. In mastering oneself, the two components of ruling and being obeyed in war are internal, and it is the individual who commands himself; With the stipulation that the leader who seeks domination is the peaked energies of life or the Dionysian forces of a person, which serves other parts of the person's existence. (This is what Zoroaster said, part two, about self-mastery). Gaining power over oneself means the integration of all parts and existential forces under a single will is a sign of perfection, and the highest level of perfection is manifested in the overman, which is the highest level of unity and harmony of forces under a commanding will displayed in his existence. Nietzsche considers self-mastery to be power in its true meaning and as an undeniable condition for the realization of perfection (Nietzsche, 1996, pp. 200-204).

The war of self-assertion is a continuous and endless war because at every level of power it is necessary to reach a higher level or in other words to step from one stage to another. With this interpretation, the desire to move forward and higher should be continuous and overcome our old self. Man's war with himself also takes

a negative form. A bad war is whenever, instead of the supreme and unifying force that is the fundamental order of the existence of every being and has dominion over the whole, different internal forces, in the form of passions and tensions, have conflicts and wars with each other. And each one has its own goal and the result is the internal disintegration of man (Nietzsche, 1998, p. 778). So, if decadence and collapse dominate the individual, the will to relax and lose oneself will overcome any desire and will, and the end result of this is fatigue and relaxation, exhaustion, depression, and disability. (Nietzsche, 1996, p. 201)

#### **War and warriors (who is the warrior)**

Nietzsche spent his whole life in a struggle with European nihilism, Christianity and German culture, and in the book "I am so wise" in the book "Why I am so wise" he elaborates on his battle strategies and tactics in the field of life. There are few texts that he wrote that are free from the ideals of German warriors and warriors. In his thinking, warfare has a very special place. Many people can become a soldier, but a warrior is a position that only reaches an elite group (so said Zarathustra, Part I, about war, warriors).

Nietzsche believes that warriors are few and limited to the upper classes of the culture pyramid (Nietzsche, 2006, p. 75). In many cases, he uses the word ritter meaning warrior, knight or knight instead of kriegsvalke meaning warrior or warrior in many cases to refer to warriors. Warriors

are a special group of warriors who have proved their worth. In different cultures, warriors, whether they are called knights, samurais, or warriors, are chosen people who have reached this position with a special course and behavior and overcoming difficulties and tests.

Nietzsche also considers chivalry to be honor as the main indicator, and in other words, only soldiers who prove their honor can reach the rank of chivalry. Virtue or *vornehmheit* is one of the main words of Nietzsche's thinking, which occupies a significant part in his three prominent works, "Beyond Good and Evil", "Genealogy of Morals" and "The Will to Power". Over time, this word was also used with the meanings of great birth, honor, decency and racial purity. In Nietzsche's philosophy, noble people are in front of lowly people; They are the lords and these are the subjects. Aristocrats are the active forces of society who have inherited extraordinary power and they are inherently fruitful and full of power and are considered creators of the true meaning of values (Nietzsche, 1998, p. 2). A warrior soldier deserves to be called a warrior when he proves his belonging to the upper class, and in Nietzsche's thought, this class consists of honorable people.

Regardless of critical or affirmative views, honor in Nietzsche's opinion has at least 43 characteristics that can be extracted in the texts "Beyond Good and Evil", "Genealogy of Morals" and "The Will to Power" and they are:

The inherent power to rule over oneself and others.

steely will

The mental energy of Ziyal and La yanzal  
(It goes down and does not go down),  
barbaric and savage institution,  
strong body

A fiery desire to conquer,

dominance and self-expansion,

Post counting fear and trembling,

Counting the post of flattery and flattery,

Post counting the inability to deal with oppression,

The power of value creation instead of surrendering to imposed values.

Helping the unfortunate, of course, out of excessive energy and inner strength, not out of pity and compassion.

Self-esteem,

self-respect and self-esteem,

mastery over oneself

The desire to be hard on yourself and impose iron discipline on yourself.

Innate and permanent fighting,

Firm faith and fundamental self-confidence,

Resolute adherence to fulfilling one's duties and responsibilities.

Always wearing a mask on your face and hiding your inner secrets.

Living with a huge and proud memory,

To have or not to have affection at one's own will,

to speak or not to speak

Being the Lord of four virtues: courage, insight, empathy, and loneliness.

Avoiding coexistence with the herd or common people.

Strength and determination in making decisions.

Loyalty to your thoughts

Being a refuge for the weak, the suffering,  
the oppressed, and the animals,  
always armed

A nobleman gives and forgives more than  
he takes.

Firm belief in the difference between hu-  
man ranks in terms of power and firm be-  
lief in the unequal rights of humans.

desire to teach others

Tolerating poverty and disease,

Avoiding small honors,

politeness and culture forever,

Tolerating persistent hostilities and lack of  
easy reconciliation.

Not looking for happiness and peace and  
constantly searching for a fierce battle,  
not wanting any praise,

Being ready at any moment to bravely sac-  
rifice one's life and health,

A strong desire for great risks that require  
revealing the true strength of man.

aggressive and hunting spirit,

adventure and practical experience,

respect for your ancestors and elders,

Saying yes triumphantly to yourself,

Activeness and activeness in all verbs.

Being scary for a spiteful person (Pirouz,  
2012: p. 125-123)

### **Terms of Warrior ship**

warrior ship is a position that is obtained  
by power (Nietzsche, 1998, p. 94). The  
important premise of warrior ship is hav-  
ing a strong body and benefiting from  
abundant health, which manifests itself in  
a person's desire for war and adventure,  
hunting and combat (Nietzsche, 1998, p.  
7). Nietzsche believes that a warrior has a

strong nature and always seeks to fight and  
dominate others and avoids conflict with a  
weak opponent. (Nietzsche, 1995, p. 7)

A warrior must be a hunter deep down, ea-  
ger to conquer and loot. Homeric warriors,  
Vikings, Muslim knights, Roman heroes,  
samurai, and German warriors were all  
like this (Nietzsche, 1998: p. 11). The best  
warriors are constantly boiling and roaring  
and fighting because of the mass and ex-  
cess force. When the warrior seeks his  
happiness in the fight and loves the fight,  
he proves his honor. Therefore, the pres-  
ence of warriors in the battlefields is not  
for self-defense or because of an external  
stimulus, but it originates from their war-  
rior nature and their whole character can  
be likened to a weapon. (Nietzsche, 1998,  
p. 923).

A warrior is a soldier before any defini-  
tion. The most desirable thing in all situa-  
tions is strict discipline at the right time.  
Discipline makes both a good soldier and  
a scholar, and if we look at it closely, there  
is no good scholar who does not have the  
instincts of a good soldier in his field and  
composition (Nietzsche, 1998, p. 912).  
After the most prominent features of a  
warrior is the discipline that he uses as a  
super soldier. The birth of powerful men  
depends on establishing a disciplined pro-  
gram for the mind and body. Finally, the  
basic condition of a warrior is strength,  
and this condition requires that a warrior  
be the leader of all soldiers in discipline  
(Nietzsche, 1998, p. 1981).

### **Self-mastery**

Although a warrior is a soldier, his most important war that gives him the status of a warrior is the war with himself. The continuity of chivalry and Greek culture shows the continuous practice of self-mastery and the expression of the will to shape oneself (Nietzsche, 1998, p. 94). The war with oneself is for harmony and a goal, the whole existence of the individual is under a commanding will, which is the will of the power of the whole group. Therefore, it is necessary to remove all the old and outdated parts and elements to take a new shape and be reconstructed and find a direction. Parts that are not coordinated or work independently must learn to serve the single will (Nietzsche, 1998, p. 94). Dominating laziness and laziness and dominating inconsistency and lack of coordination lead to the greatness of the ruler's will and the development of personal power. A large part of the warrior's power comes from his victory in the inner battlefield and the conquest of himself.

### **Courage**

The most important weapon in a warrior arsenal is courage. A weapon that is defined by the essence of a warrior and Nietzsche also introduces it as the strongest weapon of man (so said Zarathustra, Part III, The Displaced). The valor and bravery of a warrior creates courage and pride in him to overcome any fear. Brave is the one who knows fear but overcomes fear, who sees the abyss but with pride (so said Zarathustra, Chapter IV, about the superior man). Warrior, with his power as an aristocratic human being, seeks a high life, not

a long life. That is why he is always looking for big risks. Elevating life in courageous independence is one of the greatest risks, not in peace (Nietzsche, 1998, p. 283). The more difficult, harder and bigger the war, the tougher, firmer and truer the person becomes. A warrior is like a bow, the more it is stretched, the arrow it shoots will become more powerful and agile, and the wounds also make the warriors stronger.

### **War and culture**

Nietzsche is famous as a philosopher of culture. This is why the role of culture and dealing with it is significant in his works. Nietzsche considers culture as a unity that governs many thoughts, desires, and actions of people in society (Nietzsche, 1996, p. 46). The origin of this unity is the destination or task that aligns and harmonizes the various desires of society in the form of a single desire. The understanding of the culture of any society depends on the understanding of that single desire that rules over all the desires of the society, and the valuation of each culture depends on the valuation of this single and dominant desire. Nietzsche does not accept the existence of society for the sake of society, he sees the whole society as a means for the emergence and growth of a higher species than man (Nietzsche, 1996, p. 258). He believes that the ultimate goal of the culture-creating unifying desire is to produce superior human beings such as geniuses and, at the highest level, the birth of over man. In high culture, a person is not important simply because he is a human

being, nor is a formless mass of herd humans, but everyone is valued and respected based on his distance from the superior human being and also on the basis of the amount and type of service he performs on the way to the emergence of superior human beings. Therefore, the desired cultural structure is a pyramid structure based on hierarchy (Nietzsche, 1996, p. 57).

High culture is essentially a manly culture. It means that what will cause a higher rank in the pyramid of culture is courage, creativity, increased physical strength, vitality, mental freshness, aggressive spirit, decisive will, adventure, and risk-taking, which are all male attributes. The existence of these characteristics in the people of the upper classes of culture causes the lower classes of culture, which belong to weak people, including women and effeminate men, to always be afraid of their higher class (Pirouz, 2014, p. 133).

#### **The role of conflict in high culture**

Nietzsche believes that the pyramidal structure of culture, whose purpose is to produce superior people, and superior men emerge from this culture to guide weak people to their true position at the bottom of the cultural pyramid, can only be achieved through war (Nietzsche, 1998, p. 856). And the precondition for the existence of any sublime culture will be war. (Nietzsche, 2005, p. 477). On the other hand, if a culture forgets the value of war, it will fall into corruption and disease (Nietzsche, 1998, p. 221). In Nietzsche's

literature, the good war is defined in the field of culture and he expresses it with the phrase *Wetkampf* or conflict. In his treatise "Homer's Struggle", he goes to the first educational poem of the ancient Greeks, Hesiod's "Acts and Days", which tells about the existence of two goddesses named Evil Ares and Good Ares. Both of these goddesses motivate humans to fight; Both Ares are the goddess of war and struggle. However, the goal of the war and struggle that Evil Ares is motivated by is simply the destruction of creatures by hand. For this reason, despite the respect they had for Evil Ares as the goddess of war, the Greeks were afraid and evasive of her. But the purpose of the fight that Good Ares is the motivation for is to outdo each other in the development of power. The flaming of the desire to overtake big rivals and rivals forces a person to be more active and active in the way of expansion and development of his power and as a result, it causes him to progress and win. Therefore, while the Greeks considered Evil Ares to be the cause of the destruction and destruction of man, they saw Good Ares as the cause of happiness and development of human life (Nietzsche, 1998, p. 12-15). Langstrum and Sauer believe that Nietzsche considers the origin of man's illness in recent centuries to be thin orange and his pampering, and this disease appeared when man fled from the battlefield; Because a great and healthy culture is achieved through struggle, and it is this struggle that, through the establishment of healthy, serious, creative and non-

oppressive competition, provides the possibility of developing and upgrading human capabilities in various fields. (Sauer & Langstrum, 1997, pp. 1-8)

The fields of conflict are the fields of intense and cruel conflicts. But the important point is that these struggles are neither for fighting nor with the intention of destroying the opponent, but an organized and structured conflict, which basically emphasizes on always maintaining some kind of strong opponent or rival as a stubborn obstacle and as a power driver. On this basis, Dale Wilkerson in the book "Nietzsche and the Greeks" introduced the Nietzschean conflict as a sublime form of conflict aimed at destruction (Wilkerson, 2006, p. 79).

Referring to Heraclitus' conflict-oriented philosophy, Nietzsche considers conflict as a cosmological principle in the eyes of the ancient Greeks; which appeared everywhere in the world and in the culture and life of the Greeks, including in the stadiums and fields of sports competitions, in the competition between artists, the competition of political parties and the competition of cities (Nietzsche, 1999, p. 5). In Greek culture, they sought the happiness of the society by giving importance to the struggle. To the extent that education was formed by being in the field of struggle, and both the teacher and the learner were obliged to be present in this field, and every natural gift should be developed in the process of struggle (Nietzsche, 2008, pp. 19-23). Undoubtedly, the field of conflict is the field of enduring difficulties, fighting with strong opponents and

fighting with determined and ruthless rivals is a painful, difficult and dangerous task. But these dangerous situations have always been an effective tool in the hands of every great culture. Nietzsche considers the greatness of a person to be the product of his overcoming the greatest pains and hardships. It is from overcoming terrible and crushing hardships that a human being reaches a higher degree of strength and perfection (Nietzsche, 1998, p. 1030). Hard situations in the war fields are the place of extreme pressure on people; Such situations may destroy a weak person's soul or make him dislike life, but for a strong person, these same situations have the effect of a spirit-enhancing and strength-giving syrup. Such a person becomes stronger after going through all the dangerous adventures and incidents that take him to the brink of destruction (Nietzsche, 1998, p. 1003). A strong man, as a Dionysian being, not only overcomes losses, losses and excruciating pressures, but also comes out of such difficult situations with greater ability. In fact, the battlefield is like a furnace in which a weak person melts, but a strong person turns into tempered steel.

In Nietzsche's eyes, war seems to be an event caused by the will directed to power, based on the principle of will directed to power. The direction of domination refers to the existence of various types of war in various spheres of life. War is valued according to the service it provides on the way to the rise or fall of the Dionysian forces. The best war starts with the intention of conquering man, with the intention

of the appearance of over man, and the prerequisite for this movement is the presence of warriors who have conquered their inner war through self-conquest. A good war in the field of culture refers to the opening of the battlefield (Wetkampf) and the invitation to participate in it; Conflict is the author and founder of the pyramidal structure of culture and the factor of increasing power until the realization of the ultimate goal of culture, i.e., the rise of man (Pirouz, 2014, p. 141).

### Conclusion

Immanuel Kant and Friedrich Nietzsche are two of the most influential philosophers in history. Their works have shaped modern and postmodern thinking and are studied by researchers today. While their philosophies are different in many ways, they have a common point in questioning the nature of reality and ethics. Kant's philosophy and Nietzsche's philosophy specifically deal with views on ethics, knowledge, and the nature of truth. Kant is mostly known for his moral philosophy based on his famous saying. According to Kant, morality is based on universal principles that all rational beings must follow. Contrary to Kant's theological approach to ethics, Nietzsche advocated what he called "the will to power". The belief is that people should strive for power over others to achieve their goals. According to Nietzsche, ethics was not based on universal principles, but based on individual desires and values. Kant also believed that knowledge can only be obtained through

reason, while Nietzsche argued that knowledge is subjective and can only be obtained through experience. According to Kant, the truth was absolute and immutable. For Nietzsche, the truth was relative and constantly changing depending on one's perspective. These two different views of knowledge are reflected in their respective approaches to philosophy. Kant favored an analytical approach, while Nietzsche welcomed a more interpretive approach.

Despite their differences in philosophical views, both Kant and Nietzsche shared a common interest in exploring the nature of reality. Both philosophers sought to understand how humans interact with the world around them and how they understand everything. Both of them believed that understanding reality requires examining our own beliefs about it as well as our own actions within it. Ultimately, both philosophers sought to discover underlying truths about reality in order to better understand our place in it.

In his writings on war, Kant argued that war should only be used as a last resort and should be done with the utmost respect for human life and dignity. He argued that it was wrong to use war as a tool to achieve political or economic gains and instead advocated peaceful negotiation and compromise between nations. Kant also argued that any war should be fought with the utmost respect for human life and dignity. War should only be used to protect the rights of citizens and maintain peace and justice in the world. He argued that it is

wrong to use force or violence against another nation, even if it is in self-defense. Countries should try to resolve their differences through peaceful means such as diplomacy and negotiation. Aggressive wars are immoral because they violate the rights of citizens and cause unnecessary suffering and death. Peace and justice in the world are emphasized through diplomatic means and not through military force or aggression.

But in Nietzsche's eyes, war seems to be an event caused by the will directed to power, based on the principle of will directed to power. The direction of domination refers to the existence of various types of war in various spheres of life. War is valued according to the service it provides on the way to the rise or fall of the Dionysian forces. The best war begins with the intention of conquering man, with the intention of the appearance of the overman, and the prerequisite for this movement is the presence of warriors who have conquered their inner war through self-conquest.

#### References:

- Ahmadvand, Shuja; Solgi Mohsen (2013). Fundamentals of the thought of Friedrich Nietzsche and Iqbal Lahori with an emphasis on anthropology and political philosophy, strategic studies of politics, period 3.
- Barzegar, Ebrahim; Solgi, Mohsen, (2013). A study on understanding the differences and similarities between Friedrich Nietzsche's "Superman" and Iqbal Lahori's "Perfect Man", Politics Quarterly, No. 3
- Brieh, Emil. (1995). History of Philosophy, first volume. Translated by Alimorad Davoudi. Tehran: Academic Publishing Center.
- Clausewitz, Carl Von. (1955). De La Guerre. Paris: Minuit.
- Copleston, Frederick. (1983). History of philosophy: first volume. Translated by Jalaluddin Mojtavavi. Tehran: Scientific and Cultural Publications.
- Copleston, Frederick. (1992). Nietzsche, philosopher of culture. Translated by Alireza Behbahani and Ali Asghar Halabi. Tehran: Behbahani Publications.
- Copleston, Frederick. (1996). The history of philosophy: the fifth volume. Translated by Amir Jalaluddin Alam. Tehran: Scientific and Cultural Publications.
- Copleston, Frederick. (2003). History of Philosophy: Volume Seven. Translated by Darius Ashouri. Tehran: Scientific and Cultural Publications.
- Covell, Charles. (1998). Kant and the Law of Peace: A Study in the Philosophy of International Law and International Relations, Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dadgar, Yadullah. (2013). The evolution of economic thought. Qom: Mofid University Press. First Edition.
- Department of Law and Political Science. (2013). Political thoughts in the West.

- Tehran: Publications of the Department of Law and Political Sciences
- Dolattari et al. (2009). Discussion of ethics in the works of Friedrich Nietzsche, *Fundamental Western Studies Magazine*, No. 2
- Gali, VB. (2012). *Philosophers of Peace and War*. Translated by Mohsen Hakimi. Tehran: Center Publishing.
- Jahanbeglu, Ramin. (1999) *Clausewitz and the theory of war*. Tehran: Hermes.
- Jomini, Antonie. (1862). *The Art of War*. Translated by G.H. Mendel. Pennsylvania: J.B. Lippincott & co.
- Kant, Immanuel (1889). *Critique of Practical Reason*, translated by Thomas Kingsmill Abbott, Longmans, Greens and Co.
- Kant, Immanuel (1909). *Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysic of Morals*, in *Kant, Critique of Practical Reason and other works on the Theory of Ethics (1873)*, trans. Thomas Kingsmill Abbott, 6th edition, London: Longmans, Green and Company, pp. 1-84.
- Kant, Immanuel (1992). *Kant: Political Writings*, ed. Hans Reiss. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, Immanuel (1997). "Idea for a universal history with cosmopolitan purpose", in *Kant: political writings*, 41–51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kant, Immanuel (2003). *To perpetual peace: a philosophical sketch*. Indianapolis, IN: Hackett.
- Kant, Immanuel (2008). *Critique of pure reason (Norman Kemp Smith)*. Google Books.
- Kant, Immanuel. (2001). *Sustainable peace*. Translated by Mohammad Hossein Sabouri. Tehran: Beh Bavaran Publication
- Kellner, Douglas (1999). "Nietzsche's critique of mass culture." *International studies in philosophy*
- Lewis, Bernard (2003). *The roots of Muslim Rage*, Special feature (17-26)
- Lungstrum, Janet. Sauer, Elizabeth. (1997). *Agonistics: Arenas of Creative Contest*. New York: State University of New York.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò (2004). *Shahriar*. Translated by Darius Ashouri. Tehran: Flight Publications.
- Mahmoudi, Seyyed Ali. (2004). *Kant's political philosophy*. Tehran: Negahe Moaser publishing house.
- Mosleh et al. (2012). *The origins of deconstruction in Nietzsche*, *Metaphysics Journal*, No. 2
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (1995). *The human being. Astronomer's dream translation*. Tehran: Fekr Rooz Publications.

- Nietzsche, Friedrich (1996). *Beyond good and bad*. Translated by Darius Ashouri. Tehran: Kharazmi Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (1997). *The case of Wagner*. Interpretation of the dream of an astrologer. Abadan: Publication of questions.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (1997). *This is what Zoroaster said*. Translated by Darius Ashouri. Tehran: Aghaz Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (1998). *Genealogy of ethics*. Translated by Darius Ashouri. Tehran: Aghaz Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (1998). *Hekmat Shadan*. Translated by Hamed Fouladvand. Tehran: Jami Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (1998). *The will to power*. Translated by Majid Sharif. Tehran: Jami Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (1999). *Philosophy in the tragic age of the Greeks*. Translated by Majid Sharif. Tehran: Jami Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (2000). *Wagner in Bayreuth*. Translated by Abu Torab Sohrab. Tehran: Aghaz Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (2001). *Philosophy, knowledge and truth*. Translated by Morad Farhadpour. Tehran: Hermes Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (2002). *Sunset of idols*. Translated by Darius Ashouri. Tehran: Aghaz Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (2004). *Untimely reflections*. Translated by Hassan Amin. Tehran: Iranian Encyclopedia Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (2005). *A very humane person*. Translated by Saeed Firouzabadi. Tehran: Jami Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (2006). *Antichrist*. Translated by Abdul Ali Dastgheib. Abadan: Question Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (2006). *The Birth of Tragedy*. Astronomer's dream translation. Abadan: Question Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (2009). *About music and words*. Translated by Abdul Hasan Pirouz. Qom: Rokhe Mahtab Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (2009). *Homer's conflict*. Translated by Abdul Hasan Pirouz. Qom: Rokhe Mahtab Publications.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich (2011). *Heritage: The first volume*. Translated by Manouchehr Asadi. Abadan Question publications.
- Pirouz, Abdul Hassan. (2007). *Encyclopedia and dictionary of Nietzsche's words*. Tehran: Kavosh Pardaz Publications.
- Pirouz, Abdul Hassan. (2011). *Philosophy of Tragedy: Nietzsche against Aristotle*. show. Number 152.
- Pirouz, Abdul Hassan. (2013). *Nietzsche's philosophy of war*. Tehran: Alam Publications.
- Shadpour et al. (2013). *Critical analysis of Nietzsche's view on the meaning of life*, Naqd & Nazar magazine, No. 4

Shahlaei, Nasser. Valivand, Hossein. (2008). Strategic theories. Tehran: Publications of the Army Command and Staff College

Wilkerson, Dale. (2006) Nietzsche and the Greeks. London: Continuum International Groups.

