

# C1-CE-485087\_Final-2026-05-02-jj6q8 1.docx

 Rashtriya Raksha University

---

## Document Details

**Submission ID**

trn:oid::30110:137481709

**Submission Date**

May 3, 2026, 1:40 PM GMT+5:30

**Download Date**

May 3, 2026, 1:41 PM GMT+5:30

**File Name**

C1-CE-485087\_Final-2026-05-02-jj6q8 1.docx

**File Size**

2.1 MB

8 Pages

1,864 Words

10,472 Characters



## 0% detected as AI

The percentage indicates the combined amount of likely AI-generated text as well as likely AI-generated text that was also likely AI-paraphrased.

**Caution: Review required.**

It is essential to understand the limitations of AI detection before making decisions about a student's work. We encourage you to learn more about Turnitin's AI detection capabilities before using the tool.

### Detection Groups

-  **0 AI-generated only 0%**  
Likely AI-generated text from a large-language model.
-  **0 AI-generated text that was AI-paraphrased 0%**  
Likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI-paraphrase tool or word spinner.

#### Disclaimer

Our AI writing assessment is designed to help educators identify text that might be prepared by a generative AI tool. Our AI writing assessment may not always be accurate (i.e., our AI models may produce either false positive results or false negative results), so it should not be used as the sole basis for adverse actions against a student. It takes further scrutiny and human judgment in conjunction with an organization's application of its specific academic policies to determine whether any academic misconduct has occurred.

### Frequently Asked Questions

#### How should I interpret Turnitin's AI writing percentage and false positives?

The percentage shown in the AI writing report is the amount of qualifying text within the submission that Turnitin's AI writing detection model determines was either likely AI-generated text from a large-language model or likely AI-generated text that was likely revised using an AI paraphrase tool or word spinner.

False positives (incorrectly flagging human-written text as AI-generated) are a possibility in AI models.

AI detection scores under 20%, which we do not surface in new reports, have a higher likelihood of false positives. To reduce the likelihood of misinterpretation, no score or highlights are attributed and are indicated with an asterisk in the report (\*%).

The AI writing percentage should not be the sole basis to determine whether misconduct has occurred. The reviewer/instructor should use the percentage as a means to start a formative conversation with their student and/or use it to examine the submitted assignment in accordance with their school's policies.

#### What does 'qualifying text' mean?

Our model only processes qualifying text in the form of long-form writing. Long-form writing means individual sentences contained in paragraphs that make up a longer piece of written work, such as an essay, a dissertation, or an article, etc. Qualifying text that has been determined to be likely AI-generated will be highlighted in cyan in the submission, and likely AI-generated and then likely AI-paraphrased will be highlighted purple.

Non-qualifying text, such as bullet points, annotated bibliographies, etc., will not be processed and can create disparity between the submission highlights and the percentage shown.



**Writing Assignment 3: Nietzsche, Modern Marriage, and the Decay of  
Institutional Instinct**

Name of Author

Instructor Name

Institutional Affiliation

Course Code and Number

Date of Submission

### **Writing Assignment 3: Nietzsche, Modern Marriage, and the Decay of Institutional Instinct**

Liberalization of social institutions can be confused with material political achievements, but in fact can indicate structural and physiological disintegration. Nietzsche decries the fact that the modern society has weakening ability to support the intergenerational institutions and support the organizing instincts amid the corrosion of traditional order. Nietzsche, by pointing to modern marriage as the ultimate example of this failure, demonstrates that the very rationality upon which an institution is based is destroyed by contemporary marriage. In case the diagnosis of Nietzsche is true, then the conclusion is the consequent abolition not only of marriage, but of all contemporary liberal institutions, since they are essentially devoid of any lasting drives which would project power and ensure order over centuries. After all, though Nietzsche is right in pointing out that political institutions cannot survive on the whims of the momentary passion, his fatalistic insistence that society must regress to relying on the primitive motivations of property and domination fails to acknowledge the fact that the rationality of institutions can evolve to synthesize legally bound partnership with intergenerational stability.

To see why Nietzsche refers to marriage as the final victim of modernity, one would first have to find his criticism within his overall scorn of what he sees as the political structure of the modern spirit (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). To Nietzsche, the modern age is a period of deep physiological and societal decadence, a period of degradation of exactly those instincts which enable societies to construct a future. Modernity mistakenly equates living "very quickly" and "very irresponsibly" with the concept of "freedom" (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). This quick, short-lived life is a natural rejection of the long-term perspective and harsh training needed to create and sustain the structures of society. Nietzsche does not see the moralism of the individual as a precondition to any meaningful human progress, but rather

sees the organization of politics and society as the precondition to any meaningful human progress. By making individuals more comfortable and independent than structural duty, the modern society instinctively hates what is making institutions become institutions (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). Even the very pronunciation of the word "authority" is experienced by the modern mind as a menace of a new slavery, showing how the value-instincts of the modern politician instinctively incline towards such policies and ideals as dissolve them (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). This undermining of foundational horizons resembles the existential disorientation which Nietzsche discusses in *The Gay Science*, in which the loss of overriding, unifying values leave humanity wandering, as though through an infinite nothing (Nietzsche, 1882, p. 120). The lack of a centralizing power, an overall instinct of the future, prevents society from establishing institutions that can help to bridge the generations.

It is against this backdrop of modern destruction that Nietzsche isolates marriage as his main political case study, arguing that it has completely lost its rationality (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). He is keen not to mention that this is an objection not to marriage, but to modernity (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). He contends that the conventional institution of marriage was politically palatable since it was founded on three unshakable, harsh pillars. The former was the "unilateral legal liability of the husband," which gave the institution a clear, definitive, center of gravity (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). This special legal duty created definite authority in contrast to an egalitarian partnership, which would be seen by Nietzsche as a corrupting halfway measure of democratic authority. The second pillar was the principle of strict indissolubility of marriage bond (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). The institution had a gravitas and a tone of voice that could override the sheer accident of feeling, passion, and the moment (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). Lastly, the third pillar was the strategic "responsibility of families to choose mates," such that marriage was in service of the greater, long-term

interests of the social order and maintenance of power, rather than the whimsical desires of the individual (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76).

Modernity, on the other hand, substituted these harsh structural pillars with a growing decadence of marrying for love, which, in the first place, made marriage an institution (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). The fundamental thesis of institutional engineering that Nietzsche came up with is that an institution can never, ever, be based on an idiosyncrasy (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). In his opinion, love is very idiosyncratic, a temporary, volatile state of feeling that cannot be depended upon to organize the political and social base of a state. Rather, real institutions have to be pegged on primitive and durable forces. According to him, marriage has to be based on the sex drive, the drive towards property, as well as the drive towards domination (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). By viewing the wife and child as property, and by organizing the family as the "smallest unit of domination," the institution leverages these basic, unyielding human drives to secure power, wealth, and influence even on the "physiological level" (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). And it is this implacable pursuit of conquest that creates a kind of instinctual solidarity among centuries (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76).

The implications of the critique by Nietzsche, in the case that his diagnosis of institutional preconditions holds, are disastrous to the modern liberal state. And, when institutions are inherently in need of the heavy dominating forces of property and subjugation to bear them, then the modern society is entirely incapable of supporting the long-term political organization. According to Nietzsche, marriage harbors the affirmation of the greatest, most lasting form of organization (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). This structure can be directly related to what Chouraqui (2024) calls the use of the size of future history as a normative criterion of value. To be politically or philosophically meaningful, an institution must have historical size, the ability to shape, secure, and dominate the future. When a society is unable to vouch for itself as a whole to the most distant generations, then its

institutions, such as marriage, have no meaning whatever (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). The immediate result of this loss of intergenerational meaning is that modern society is systematically losing it (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76).

When the diagnosis of Nietzsche is true, the abolition of marriage is only the initial symptom of a much more extensive systemic breakdown. The modern state, the creation of the shifting sands of individual liberty, of democratic equality, of the appeasement of the masses, will inevitably break because it lacks the will to tradition and the responsibility to centuries to come (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 75). This is evident in Nietzsche's broader critique of liberal institutions, which he claims "undermine the will to power" and result in the "herd-animalization" of humanity (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 74). By making the working class feel like equals, by guaranteeing them the right to form labor unions and the right to vote, modernity has been able to destroy the very basis of the instincts that brought the worker into existence as a functional class within a larger and more enduring societal structure (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 77). The result of being right about marriage is that all contemporary political theories and constitutions, which place the individual above the eternal structure, are nothing but necessary consequences of decline (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 74).

Nonetheless, a strict political discourse should be a critical interrogation of Nietzsche's binary framing. Although he brilliantly reveals the frailty of contemporary institutions that depend wholly on the mercies of human feeling to survive, his conclusion that the state must revert to treating humans as property to survive is unnecessarily fatalistic. In *Friedrich Nietzsche and the Politics of the Soul*, Thiele (2020) points to the fact that Nietzsche advocated a heroic individualism, rigorous self-overcoming, which requires extreme discipline and internal mastery. Nietzsche extends this demand of stern discipline to social institutions, on the assumption that the sole alternative to momentary, decadent "freedom" is open, structural domination of the social order (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). This is a

breakdown of political imagination. Should Nietzsche be mistaken in the claim that domination is the only process by which institutions persist, then the outcome will not be the collapse of society, but rather the evolution of institutions.

In arguing that an institution cannot be based on love, Nietzsche is quite right in his assertion that legal, economic, and social stability cannot be founded on passion. However, contemporary marriage, and consequently, modern liberal democracy, has tried to substitute the drive to domination by the drive to mutual, legally codified, partnership and social contract (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). Although this modern form might not be subject to the brutal, enforced permanence of the aristocratic exemplar, it does not necessarily imply that society can not somehow be vouchsafed. Modernity has been successful in transferring the weight of intergenerational survival within the patriarchal family structure to more general civic, legal and economic models. That modern marriage has not been the smallest unit of domination, that it has not been subjugation, is only fatal to the state, in the case that one assumes Nietzsche strict premise that a society absolutely requires rigid domination and subjugation to project itself into the future (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 76). Human institutions have been shown to be capable of creating the so called will to responsibility and the necessary so called resistance needed to be free, without having to legally and biologically own wives and children as property (Nietzsche, 1889, p. 74).

To sum up, marriage is used by Nietzsche as the best example of contemporary institutional failure since it is the best illustration of the change between the persistent historical motives and the fragile idiosyncrasies of the modern emotion. Modernity has made marriage devoid of its structural rationality and its intergenerational burden in favor of momentary "love" by abandoning strict legal obligations, familial strategy and indissolubility in favor of momentary "love. Assuming that his analysis on the prerequisites of institutions is absolutely correct, the modern society is already doomed to instant political disintegration,



which is fundamentally incapable of surviving into the future centuries since it hates the authority it takes to build them. But his insistence on a revival of property-based domination is an archaic and artificially limited answer to his critique of the structural weaknesses of the founding of civic institutions on short-lived passions. The institutions of politics may, and historically must, be pushed beyond the need of absolute subordination, to find new centers of gravity that will balance the survival of the state and the modern necessity of individual, legally sustained, autonomy.

## References

Chouraqui, F. (2024). Nietzsche and the size of future history as a normative criterion.

*International Journal of Philosophical Studies*, 32(3), 253-271.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/09672559.2024.2390825>

Miyasaki, D. (2022). *Nietzsche's immoralism: Politics as first philosophy*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Nietzsche, F. (1882). *The Gay Science*. (Excerpt provided in course materials).

Nietzsche, F. (1889). *Twilight of the Idols*. (Excerpt provided in course materials).

Thiele, L. P. (2020). *Friedrich Nietzsche and the politics of the soul: A study of heroic individualism*. Princeton University Press.