

Nietzsche's 'will to power' and its Egotistic Character: Focus on Santayana's Critique of Nietzsche

Dr. Muhammad Ateeq¹

Abstract

Nietzsche's idea of 'will to power' is one of the most influential concepts of history of philosophy that emerges out as a result of his criticism of certain knowledge and tradition morality. The rejection of certain knowledge and traditional morality lead Nietzsche to regard human interest and 'supremacy' as most prior. Nietzsche conceives 'will to power' as act of 'free spirit'. He believes that 'will to power' being act of 'free spirit' is an inner potential by virtue of which men overcome their false beliefs which are barriers in human projection and authenticity of self. Santayana argues that 'will to power' is a mistaken concept. He believes that 'life' is not necessarily assertion of power to get supremacy over others. He raises an objection that the idea of 'will to power' ultimately leads to admiration of 'egotism' that takes superiority of human for granted and creates disharmony between human and reality. Santayana links Nietzsche's thought to German philosophical tradition that pursues 'free spirit' and authenticity of self but embraces egotism. For Santayana, one can pursue authenticity of self through his wisdom and creativeness like Greek who had been supporter of 'free spirit' but always had harmony with reality. This paper aims to explore Santayana's question that inquires how authenticity of self can be achieved without egotistic implication. I will revisit the notion of authenticity of self by giving an analysis of Nietzsche's theory of 'will to power' and Santayana's critique of this theory.

Keywords: 'will to power', 'free spirit', 'authenticity', 'good conscience', 'egotism'

Introduction

Nietzsche does not appreciate traditional philosophy² and morality as he believes that the traditional thought sets barrier in human projection and possibilities of joyful life. His 'will to power' is one of the most influential concepts of history of philosophy. He regards 'will to power' as act of 'free spirit'. What Nietzsche advocates is that man should strive for overcoming his weaknesses. In his major works, the spoke Zarathustra,

¹ Assistant Professor, Department of Philosophy, University of Karachi

Email: muateeq@uok.edu.pk

² Traditional philosophy presumes that there are absolute social and moral principles that must be followed by human. From Plato to modern philosophy, philosophers have been followers of this thought.

Nietzsche explicates that the survival of man is carried out through the idea of 'will to power'. He highlights 'will to power' as an inner potential; a non-rational agency³ in all individual by virtue of which they move towards different ends. He conceives man as 'Uber mensch' or 'overman' who rejects false beliefs and creates his own values by his 'will to power'. Nietzsche's idea of 'will to power' emerges out as a result of his criticism of certain knowledge and tradition conception of good and evil. He believes that there is no intrinsic good and evil. What is good for him is merely human 'utility' and power that is required for exploring the authentic life. In his major works, Nietzsche explores how 'will to power' leads human to discover his authentic self that rejects conventional thought. He hopes that if we emancipate ourselves from for granted beliefs, we can explore what we really are.

Santayana, who is one of the renowned critics of Nietzsche, develops the critique of Nietzsche's theory of 'will to power' in his remarkable work *Egotism in German Philosophy*. Santayana argues that 'will to power' is a mistaken concept because it stands on the baseless idea that the whole life is necessarily assertion of power for dominance over other. He maintains that such principle ultimately leads to admiration of egotism that takes superiority of human for granted. Santayana is completely dissatisfied with egotism as it promotes 'self-centered' mind. He believes that a 'self-centered' mind frames such ideas which do not have coordination with reality and promotes strife for supremacy. Santayana holds that Nietzsche's 'superman' is such an idea. Santayana argues for an idea of mind that frames such ideas which have coordination with common life and do not promote strife to become master. In most of his work, Santayana argues for knowledge that has compatible with nature. Although Santayana does not believe in absolute knowledge and admires human creativity, he believes that human ideas should not be mythical. Such ideas should be consistent with reality.

This study analyses Nietzsche's theory of 'will to power' and explores Santayana arguments against this theory. I have divided this study in two sections. In section one, I explore following questions.

- (i) How does Nietzsche relate 'will to power' to 'free spirit'?
- (ii) How is 'will to power' autonomous for Nietzsche?
- (iii) How does Nietzsche conceive an authentic individual?

³ Nietzsche's 'will to power' can be understood by a comparison of it with 'rational agency'. 'Rational agency' merely seeks principles that must be followed, whereas 'will to power' strives to become master.

Through exploring these questions, I will show how the idea of autonomy of 'will to power' begets authenticity of man for Nietzsche. In section two, I focus on Santayana's critique of 'will to power'. Here I discuss how Santayana relates Nietzsche's line of thought to 'egotism'. In this section, following questions will be discussed.

- (i) How does Santayana argue that 'will to power' is a mistaken idea?
- (ii) How does Santayana argue that 'will to power' ultimately leads to admiration of 'egotism' that takes superiority of human for granted and creates disharmony between human and reality.
- (iii) How does Santayana show that authenticity of self can be achieved without egotistic implication?

Through exploring these questions, I will show how authenticity of self can be achieved without egotistic implication. I revisit the notion of authenticity of self through an analysis of Santayana's critique of 'egotism'.

Section I:

1. 'Will to power' as Free Spirit

Nietzsche represents 'will to power' as a human urge to become master to all (Nietzsche 2006, 88-90). Nietzsche argues that in order to become master, one requires to overcome his weaknesses by employing his potential. He identifies that most of human weaknesses are due to their submission to mob-rules. For Nietzsche, humankind is of two types; one is herd of interdependent people who follows existing moral or leaders, and other is people who strives to become 'Uber mensch' or 'overman' by eradicating imposed laws through their 'free spirit' (Earnshaw 2006, 48).

For Nietzsche, 'free spirit' is the act to go against imposed laws. He explicates that imposed laws and systematic traditional knowledge creates barriers in fulfillment of desires⁴ which are ultimate priority of men. Nietzsche urges that man should go to 'strange things' to actualize his desires. Question that arises here is that what Nietzsche implies by 'strange things'. For Nietzsche, 'strange things' are unusual or unconventional thought; a new way to explore one's own self (Earnshaw 2006, 49). Nietzsche advocates that one should go beyond the limit imposed by mob-rules as such rules ultimately promote slave morality or herd mentality. Such mentality encourages man to hold the convention that men must be commanded (Schacht 2002, 308). The act to go against usual or normal is the act of 'free spirit' in Nietzsche's thought. He argues

⁴ In traditional thought desires are supposed to be a barrier to the higher ideals. For Nietzsche, fulfillment of desires is also a higher ideal for human.

that what is usual or normal is merely conventional and for granted. It teaches us what one must do. But for Nietzsche, authenticity of an individual is that individual should think about what he can do (Earnshaw 2006, 50). He regards the authenticity of an individual as an effort to liberate his 'true self' from for granted and conventional thought as Franco explains (Franco 2018, 54-55). Franco explains that the consciousness of an 'authentic man' tells him that he has a unique individuality. Nietzsche explains that this unique individuality is the manifestation of 'will to power'. That is why he frequently uses 'will to power' for authenticity of an individual.

As far as roots of the term 'will to power' is concerned, Nietzsche develops it in relation of Schopenhauer's 'will to live'. He replaces 'will to live' with his concept of 'will to power' (Nietzsche 1968, 369). 'Will to live' is Schopenhauer's response to meaninglessness of the world. Schopenhauer argues that as there is no intrinsic meaning of universe therefore meaning of life for an individual is merely that he has a blind and irrational impulse to live. That is an inner sense of 'will to live' as Schopenhauer believed. Steven Earnshaw explains Nietzsche's position that 'will' is choice whereas life or existence is matter of fact. Being a matter-of-fact life cannot be one's choice, so how can there be 'will to live' (Earnshaw 2006, 50). Nietzsche thinks that 'will to power' is a choice that makes man's life authentic. As 'will to power' is a human drive which opts to go beyond the limit of conventional and what is beyond conventions is infinite, therefore there is good reason to say there is no limit of the projection of 'will' or 'self' in Nietzsche.

According to Nietzsche, the idea of limit of projection of 'will' or 'self' is mistaken idea. It is instigated in 'slave mentality' that presumes that one should be commanded by someone. He argues that 'slave mentality' always frames such rules that limit projection of self. He defends 'free spirit' in opposition to this approach. Nietzsche explicates that when man emancipates himself from slave mentality and opts the way of 'free spirit' or 'will to power', he begins to take interest in verities of possibilities⁵ (Schacht 2002, 309). This 'free spirit' is human potential of 'will to power'. Once 'free spirit' is utilized by someone, he chooses the way of 'self-determination' and becomes ready to leave his beliefs (Earnshaw 2006, 51). In short, 'will to power' is human inner potential that may be used for self-conquering and self-overcoming of his false beliefs that have origination in the idea of absolute and certain knowledge. Nietzsche regards such knowledge as mistaken idea.

⁵ For Nietzsche, possibilities of new experiences and exploration in human life are open ended. Slave mentality does not strive for these possibilities.

Limitation of Certain Knowledge and Autonomy of ‘Will to Power’

Nietzsche has been an opponent of grand philosophical system and morality. The analysis of history of rational thought leads Nietzsche to say that no philosophical system is free of contradictions and contradiction is a fact of rational life. Therefore, to believe in absolute rational and certain knowledge is merely a passion of a mind. It leads Nietzsche to conclude that there is no intrinsic good or evil which can be justified by knowledge in absolute sense. Therefore, morality being ‘what ought to be’ or ‘what not to be’ is an obsolete idea for him (Nietzsche 2006, 132). The denunciation of traditional morality ultimately leads Nietzsche to say that ‘Uber mensch’ is beyond good and evil. In explanation of Nietzsche’s ‘Uber mensch’, Spink holds that ‘Uber mensch’ overcomes the morality of all previous form of life. he is beyond good and evil and lives an authentic life (Spink 2003 ,92). Nietzsche is of the view that an authentic individual does not surrender his will to any concept of good which is imposed by mob or society.

He creates his own values or interests. As good and evil are not intrinsically good or evil, therefore truth and knowledge are merely ‘utility’ or interest of man for Nietzsche (Earnshaw 2006, 52). He implies that there is no organ for knowledge; neither subjective nor objective (Nietzsche 1968, 276). What Nietzsche clarifies here is that “truth is that there is no truth”. He is not interested in theories of truth as Gemes explains (Gemes 1992, 48). Thus, for Nietzsche, what is there as knowledge or truth is nothing but a utility. Even ‘utility’ or interest is merely our belief because utility is not substantially a value. Value is human interest and interest does not remain an interest for all time as Steven Earnshaw explains (Earnshaw 2006, 52).

Nietzsche scrutinizes traditional idea of objective truth. He does not agree with Philosophers’ assertion that ‘will to truth’⁶ is highest good. He argues that this idea does not guarantee that the objective truth exists. For Nietzsche, ‘will to truth’ is misleading idea as truth is not something there that might be discovered but is something that is created as Keane explains (Kean 1975, 72). Nietzsche explicates that ‘will’ is prior to truth and subjective. That is ‘will to truth’ for one may be ‘will to untruth’ for another (Earnshaw 2006, 52). Search for objective truth is nothing but a baseless justification of philosopher’s own subjectivity for Nietzsche. Here Nietzsche endorses Kierkegaard who firmly believes that subjectivity cannot be objectified. Philosophers cannot be able to escape from individual mode or passions (Earnshaw 2006, 53). What Nietzsche makes clear here is that a philosopher creates his own world by utilization of his ‘will

⁶ Traditional philosophers assert that man has a strong desire to seek absolute or objective truth. For this ‘assertion’ Nietzsche introduces the term ‘will to truth’. Nietzsche argues that philosophers’ idea of ‘will to truth’ does not guarantee that objective truth exists. So, ‘will to truth’ cannot be highest good for Nietzsche.

to power'. The truth of their philosophical systems cannot be justified objectively. They need no explanation for truth of their knowledge as they know what they know is true (Kaufmann 1974, 80-81).

Here it is important to make clear that, for Nietzsche, knowledge is not caused by a separated Cartesian self or 'I'. He critically examines Descartes' "I think, therefore I am". Nietzsche argues that Descartes disassociates 'I' from 'thinking' or 'thought' by assuming that 'I' is a self-determined substance and a cause of thinking (Pearson 2006, 261). Nietzsche observes that Cartesian 'cogito' is a continuation of tradition of subject object dichotomy that firmly believes in existence of thinking substance as a separate identity. According to Nietzsche, Descartes does not give any substantial reason to suppose that 'I' is a 'real substance' and a separate identity. For Nietzsche, 'I' is merely requirement of logic and language (Earnshaw 2006, 54).⁷ Moreover, he argues, 'I' is not cause of thinking because 'thought comes when thought wants; not when 'I' want (Earnshaw 2006, 54). One considers 'I' as cause of thinking because he believes that 'I' is 'being'. For Nietzsche, 'self' is not 'being'. It is 'becoming' that continuously changes because of potential of 'will to power' (Pearson 2006, 65). What actually manifests 'I' is nothing but 'will to power'. Therefore, 'I' is not prior to 'will to power'. If 'I' is conceived prior, it will become 'real substance'; that is a baseless idea for Nietzsche. He believes that 'I' as a 'thinking substance' or 'subject' is a fabricated idea (Nietzsche 1968, 294). 'Self' or 'I' as a unity is not determined by a 'real substance' or by certain subjective attribute. It is determined by 'will to power' that is executed by free spirit (Earnshaw 2006, 53). This analysis of 'self' leads Nietzsche to say that 'self' as 'being' is mistaken idea. What is relevant for Nietzsche is 'self' as 'becoming'. What Nietzsche implies by becoming is the continuous process of projection of self that is carried out by 'free spirit'.

In Nietzsche, the projection of self through free spirit is basically a way of appreciation of all human emotion including the negative emotions like hatter, lust for domination and jealousy as Steven Earnshaw explains (Earnshaw 2006, 54). Most of traditional ideas about projection of self discourages negative emotions and impose limit by introducing absolute values. Whereas Nietzsche takes interest in the removal of absolute ideas and limits. He appreciates those who test their potential against imposed limits. Such tests show how the act of man is authentic.

⁷ There is a limitation of logic and language that for an action they suppose that there must be an agent or actor. For Nietzsche, 'I' is merely an agent or actor rather than a 'substantial being' or substance as Descartes proposed.

Authenticity of Self and Good Conscience

The central theme of Nietzsche's project is the idea of 'projection of self'. Most of his work inquires how projection of self through 'free spirit' creates an authentic self. However, we do not find the term authentic or authenticity in Nietzsche's work explicitly, but the way in which he describes human self has a clear link with the concept of authenticity which is used in existentialism as Golomb explains (Golomb 2005. 46).⁸ For Nietzsche, strive for authenticity should be the real aim of self. He critically examines traditional concept of self. Such a concept of self is defined by an absolute essence that dictates human life. Nietzsche regards it an inauthentic concept of self. He argues that inauthentic self creates such conscience that always ready to submit to norms imposed on him.

According to Nietzsche, Real self is 'good conscience' (Earnshaw 2006, 55). A 'good conscience' trusts in 'will to power' and does not submit to norms which are imposed. What Nietzsche wants to explain is that authentic self gets direct experience of life through 'free spirit' and explore more and more possible ways of life (Golomb 2005. 47). A genuine and authentic self does not think what is usually thought. It guides one to opt 'yourself' by denying for granted knowledge (Franco 2018, 54). Through direct experience, self gradually unbinds limits and becomes more and more authentic. Acquiring real self is ongoing process in Nietzsche's scheme. This is the way of controlling and conquering self. It makes man authentic. According to Nietzsche, 'good conscience' makes one's character good. Person having 'good conscience' has no guilt and always satisfies himself because what he chooses, he chooses by his own. He exercises his 'free spirit' to reject limits imposed on him. This character is opposite to bad character which does not satisfy his own self because what he chooses is imposed upon him (Earnshaw 2006, 55-56). He does not exercise his 'free spirit' and hence falls in distress. For Nietzsche, the most important consequent of projection of self through 'free spirit' is that such a self has no shame, sorrow, and guilt because it takes responsibility of his action as an authentic self.

Section II:

2. Santayana's Critique of 'Will to Power'

Like Nietzsche, George Santayana also believes that there is no absolute and permanent good. However, he does not agree with Nietzsche's idea that good is merely

⁸ Existentialists believe that the traditional idea of 'priority of essence over existence' ultimately discourages man to utilize his inner potential to explore new possibilities. According to existentialists, such a man lives an inauthentic life.

strength or 'power'. For him, good is 'life of reason' that integrates various kinds of interests and sketches mutual cooperation for mutual good life (Spriggee 2002, 14). What he explicates here is that good is not 'will to power' but it is 'life of reason' that seeks good of collective life. He critically examines the notion of power that Nietzsche frequently uses. Santayana observes that although Nietzsche's notion of power has great range of meaning, but what he mainly intends by power is domination over natural forces and people. We have seen that according to Nietzsche, the survival of man is carried out through 'will to power' which is an inner potential and a non-rational agency in all individual. Santayana standpoint is that Nietzsche confuses the biological inner potential of survival and depicts the principle that whole life is necessarily assertion of power for domination over other (Santayana 1916, 125).

Santayana argues that Nietzsche's 'will to power' is a mistaken idea. Nietzsche emphasizes the specific role of 'power' that enables someone to become 'master' or 'Uber mensch. He believes that domination over nature and people is true strength of human. Whereas for Santayana, strength of man is not necessarily to get power to dominate over others or to become master to all. He explains that strength may be strength bestowed by goodness or acquired by practices of arts and such kinds of strength do not aim to rule anybody. Moreover, ability to control passions and wisdom are also strength and those obviously are not helpful in conquering the world (Santayana 1916, 127). What Santayana wants to make clear here is that human assertion of power cannot be reduced to a specific role of dominance over others. Human 'will' is not necessarily inclined to get power to become master to all. He maintains that such principle ultimately leads to admiration of egotism that has anti humanitarian consequences (Santayana 1916, 125-126).

Egotism and its Critique

As we have discussed, Nietzsche's doctrine of 'will to power' stands on his belief that truth and knowledge are merely 'utility' or interest of man. He regards objective truth a baseless justification of philosopher's own subjectivity. What Nietzsche insists is that human mind ultimately pursues its own interest through quest of power. Responding to Nietzsche, Santayana argues that although it is true that a mind without personal preferences and subjectivity is hard to imagine, but it is not fully rational to say that human mind is absolutely 'self-centered'⁹ and only takes interest in itself (Santayana 1916, 128).

⁹ A 'self-centered mind' is supposed to be a mind that only prefers what is best for it and ignores the interest of others. Santayana argues that 'self-centeredness' is only an aspect of human mind. All human minds are not absolutely 'self-centered'.

Santayana links Nietzsche's idea of 'self-centered' mind to German philosophical tradition. According to Santayana, the German philosophical tradition embraces romantic egotism that presumes that human mind is superior and omnipotent. German idealist tradition propagates that world is merely an idea of mind. This tradition maintains that the role of omnipotent mind is not to pursue objective truth but is to create such new ideas those can satisfy its own. This tradition regards human will or ego as superior to all and upholds that truth is nothing, but an expression of human 'will' (Santayana 1916, 130). Whereas Santayana conceives human mind in connection with nature or reality. He believes that Cartesianism ultimately leads philosophy to idea of transcendental mind (Flamm 2006, 268). For Santayana, the idea of transcendental mind mistakenly begets the idea of omnipotent mind.

Santayana observes that Nietzsche rejects those doctrines that undermine omnipotence of human mind and bring it under the control of some kind of absolute authority. We have seen that any idea or rule that restrict human is uncomfortable for Nietzsche. He entails that the noble thing for human is nothing but his 'will to power'; 'power' that can help someone to break all barriers in fulfillment of his desires. Moreover, Nietzsche regards 'free spirit' as a true excellence that does not hesitate to live with what is unusual. For Santayana, Nietzsche's line of thought is a succession of egotism of German philosophical tradition. He is of the view that Nietzsche as at the culmination of this tradition¹⁰ is a naive egotist who is completely dissatisfied with world and reality (Santayana 1916, 136).

According to Santayana, when one dissatisfies with reality, he frames or creates such ideals that can satisfy his ego. These ideals are supposed to be better than 'actual'. Problem that Santayana identifies here is that due to frustration an egotist mind can frame vague and inconsistent ideals which may have horrible consequences for humanity. Santayana holds that Nietzsche's 'superman' is such an ideal (Santayana 1916, 136). Santayana agrees with the fact that human mind has an inner potential of creativity. Man can create things which are better than actual.¹¹ Associating such a mind with a mind of an artist, he says that a master artist does not merely break existing convention but creates new conventions that have more harmony with nature (Santayana 2004, 318). Santayana differentiates between solid ideals and mythical ideals. He believes that the solid ideals can only be created by such a 'master-

¹⁰ German philosophical tradition focuses on human emotions, potential and his power of imagination to pursue knowledge.

¹¹ What Santayana means by 'actual' is human existing conditions and his relation to nature.

workman'¹² who can shape the existing things through his aspiration and has an ability to separate what is glorious and what is peevish in his ideas. In other words what Santayana wants to clarify is that for 'master-workman' only those ideals are considerable which are consistent with reality and are not merely mythical. For Santayana, Nietzsche's superman is a mythical idea for the reason that it is not consistent with human being as such. This idea neither represents man of the past nor incorporates conditions of common men of the present (Santayana 1916, 138).

What Santayana wants to explain is that man of the past was interested in collective meaning and spiritual superiority of life. While Nietzsche's superman strives for individual aims and seeks power to get control over others. So, there is good reason to say that Nietzsche's superman does not represent man of the past. Similarly, 'superman' has no similarity with existing common men who live in community with loyalty and pursue happiness in mutual relation. Santayana gives importance to build a synoptic vision of human situation (Scott 1979 ,200). He is interested in life of common man. Whereas Nietzsche's superman has no coordination with common men. He prefers individualistic life.

As we have seen that the life of common men is enslaved life for Nietzsche. He believes that men must not be commanded by what is usually supposed to be rational or moral as rational and moral have no justification at all. They are merely means to restrict 'free will' and to dictate course of life. Therefore, 'will to power' is only way to live with joy for Nietzsche. Whereas Santayana believes that Nietzsche's idea of betterment of life is egocentric whose ultimate concern is to acquire personal interests and dominance over others. He argues that without sense of modesty, reverence, sanctity and friendship in mutual relation, life cannot be joyful (Santayana 1916, 140).

What Santayana makes clear is that men live in community comprising common conditions and belief-system. Without analysis of their common conditions and belief-system one cannot create such ideas that can be helpful to improve mutual relation. Without improvement in mutual relation, we cannot live a joyful life. Santayana observes that Nietzsche's urge to transcend conventional life ultimately transform him to a naive egotist whose ideals have no compatibility with real world. 'Superman' is such an ideal that is above to nature and human being. Human being has a bound with nature and enjoys life in mutual relation, while 'superman' strives for unbound freedom and simply concerns his own self. That is why Santayana regards

¹² 'Master workman' is the term that Santayana uses for an intelligent mind which has ability to learn from nature and reality

Nietzsche's superman a 'utopia'.¹³ What Santayana believes is that it is unrealistic to expect that men can be a 'superman'. Superman is not a possibility; it is only a reaction of an egotist mind (Santayana 1916, 143).

In a nutshell, we can say that Santayana gives two basic lines of arguments in his critique of egotism. First is that an egotist mind cannot frame solid ideas because egotists mind does not incorporate common conditions of human life and relies on his indiscipline ego. Santayana believes that better ideas can only be created by an intelligent mind. Such a mind has ability to learn from nature and has coordination with conditions of life (Santayana 1916, 142). Second is that an egotist mind stands on false belief that human mind can transcend nature in an absolute sense and can be independent. Santayana is of the view that mind cannot transcend nature. He explicates that mind as an inherited psyche lives in natural conditions or environment due to interaction of which mind must have a belief system (Spriggee 2002, 50). Because of environmental circumstances and condition of life, men live in various cultures with different sets of beliefs and conception of good. Santayana regards mind as an 'awareness' that cannot be evolved in isolation. It is evolved through development of natural conditions or environment (Cory 1995, 53).

According to Santayana human 'awareness' gets maturity with the development of natural condition and thus leads men to frame new ideas. These ideas are proposed through critical analysis of existing belief system, conception of good and condition of life (Coleman 2009, xxxviii). For Santayana, projection of new ideas is like work of an artist who creates things by reshaping of existing things. That is why he prefers the term 'master-workman' for an intelligent mind who creates solid ideas through his inspiration and creativity. Thus, Santayana believes, 'master-workman' does not transcend nature and always has coordination with nature and tries to learn from nature.

Authenticity of Self Revisited

Here a counter argument can be given that Nietzsche's 'will to power' is not for the pursuit of dominance over others but it is for the pursuit of authenticity of self. We have seen that how Nietzsche wants to pursue an authentic self that gets direct experience of life and does not submit to norms which are imposed on him. Moreover, he wants to opt the way of authenticity of self through his 'free spirit' and creates new norms or ideas. But what may be argued here is that the rejection of existing norms and strife for

¹³ Due to power of imagination one can imagine anything that has no place in this world. For Santayana, human has a place in this world. Human potential and possibilities can only be understood in relation to reality.

new norms must require a systematic knowledge or criterion. But we see that for Nietzsche, such knowledge does not exist at all. He merely regards knowledge as a 'utility' or interest of man. Such kind of attitude towards knowledge presupposes that man is supreme to all. For Santayana, egotistic attitude or false belief in superiority of men leads to hostility towards truth of material world without which human collective good cannot be explained (Coleman 2009, 43). As we have seen, one of the most ultimate consequents of this attitude is that Nietzsche categorically endorses 'master morality'; morality that teaches that 'will to power' is only good. It shows that how 'power' and dominance is central in Nietzsche's project of authenticity.¹⁴ This is the point that leads Santayana to conclude that Nietzsche's 'will to power' is necessarily assertion of power for domination over other. He maintains that such principle ultimately leads to admiration of egotism. For Santayana, one can pursue authenticity of self through his wisdom and creativeness like Greek who always had harmony with reality. They were supporter of free thought but had a continuous urge to learn from nature. They are not egotist at all (Santayana 1916, 142). What Santayana wants to clarify is that this kind of creativity is also a projection of self that can provide authenticity without egotistic implication.

Conclusion

Nietzsche's denial of possibility of objective knowledge inevitably leads him to regard knowledge as merely 'utility' or interest of man. Such a way of thinking presumes that man is supreme to all. It leads Nietzsche to endorse 'master morality' that teaches that 'will to power' is the only good and prior to all principles. Therefore, Santayana was right to maintain that power and dominance is central in Nietzsche's project of authenticity of self and ultimately promotes 'egotism'. His reservation is plausible that 'egotism' begets such a mind that has hostility towards 'common life of man' and cannot promote harmony among nature and others fellow beings. Santayana's argument is convincing that if we pursue authenticity through our wisdom and free thought with an urge to learn from nature like Greeks, we can create such ideas those are helpful in projection of self without egotistic implication. In the result of such a 'projection of self' one can definitely overcome his false beliefs and limitation and can live an authentic life.

¹⁴ As we have seen that an authentic man utilizes his potential to explore all possibilities in his life and does not restrict himself to certain limit. For Santayana, power and dominance are not necessary conditions to become an authentic man.

References

- Daniel. C. (Ed.). (1995). The Birth of Reason and Other Essays by George Santayana. *PhilPapers*, 8(3), 513-517. New York: Columbia University Press.
<https://philpapers.org/go.pl?id=LACTBO&proxyId=&u=https%3A%2F%2Fdx.doi.org%2F10.1017%2Fs0012217300042050>
- Earnshaw, S. (2006). *Existentialism a Guide for the Perplexed*. (1st ed.). London: Continuum. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Flamm, M. C. (2006). Santayana's Critique of Modern Philosophy and Its Application to Work of Nietzsche. *Transaction of Charles S. Peirce Society*, 42(2), 266-278.
<https://philpapers.org/go.pl?id=FLASCO&proxyId=&u=https%3A%2F%2Fdx.doi.org%2F10.2979%2FTRA.2006.42.2.266>
- Franco, P. (2018). Becoming Who You are: Nietzsche on Self- Creation. *Journal of Nietzsche Studies*, 49(1), 52-77.
<https://doi.org/10.5325/jnietstud.49.1.0052>
- Gemes, K. (1992). Nietzsche's Critique of Truth. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 52(1), 47-65.
<https://philpapers.org/go.pl?id=GEMNCO&proxyId=&u=https%3A%2F%2Fdx.doi.org%2F10.2307%2F2107743>
- Golomb, J. (2005). *In Search of Authenticity: From Kierkegaard to Camus*. New York: Routledge. (p. 187).
<https://toleratedindividuality.files.wordpress.com/2015/12/in-search-of-authenticity-from-kierkegaard-to-camus.pdf>
- Kaufmann, A. W. (1974). *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist*. (4th ed). (p. 560). New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Keane, P. J. (1972). On Truth and Lie in Nietzsche. *Salmagundi*, 29, 67-94.
[10.2307/40546854](https://doi.org/10.2307/40546854)
- Martin, A. C. (Ed.). (2009). *The Essential Santayana*. (p. 704). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Nietzsche, F. (1968). *Will to Power*. (Walter, K. Trans.). New York: Vintage Books.
<https://ia803205.us.archive.org/27/items/FriedrichNietzscheTheWillTo>

Power/Friedrich%20Nietzsche%20%20The%20Will%20to%20Power.
pdf

Nietzsche, F. (2006). *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. (Adrian, D. C. Trans). In Robert, P. (Ed). New York: Cambridge.

Pearson, K. A. (2006). *A Companion to Nietzsche*. (p. 33). Malden, MA; Oxford: Blackwell Publisher. DOI:10.1002/9780470751374

Santayana, G. (1917). Egotism in German Philosophy. *International Journal of Ethics*, 27(3), 380-384. The University of Chicago Press London: J. M. Dent and Sons. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2377397>

Santayana, G. (2004). *The Life of Reason*. (p. 477). New York: Dover Publication. <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/15000/15000-h/15000-h.htm>

Schacht, R. (2002). *Nietzsche*. London: Routledge.

Scott, N. A. (1979). Santayana's Poetic of Belief. *Boundary 2*. 7(3), 199-224. Duke University Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/i213361>

Spinks, I. (2003). *Friedrich Nietzsche*. (1st ed). London: Routledge.

Sprigge, L. S. T. & Honderich, T. (2002). *Santayana*. (1st ed). (p. 272). London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203049778>