

Knowledge: A Basis of Will or Reason?

Patrick Neil M. Santiago

Abstract:

Scholars and many great thinkers attempt to reveal the deep things about knowledge but are failed and remained unsearchable as it is viewed as skeptical. Through vulnerability, knowledge becomes a tool to fulfill selfish desires. Absurdity came into place to someone who desperately urged to achieve absolute truth. This paper investigates the nature of human knowledge and how the mind works, interprets and processes towards will. This paper further discusses the consciousness and unconsciousness of man to understand the rational and irrational state of mind. It also explains where the initiative of a person should be founded; the endeavors of man in continuous search for truth and possession of knowledge; and the causes of man's absurdity. The findings shed light that the mind will always have a potent faculty over reason to pursue will.

Keywords: *absurdity, knowledge, reason, self, will.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Man is considered as the peculiar being and superior among all forms of species. In the course of evolution of mankind, from its origin and creation, from pre-life (mineral) to life (organism), from instinct (animal) to intelligence into intuition (man) the called man has been elevated as the capable and powerful being. Above all other creations, man has been endowed of the faculty to think, act and change. It is through this state man receives peculiarity that other species do not possess. What made man transfigured to be superior and powerful is his distinct capability to deliberate his actions and exercise his capacity through mental and physical effort. Man possesses the knowledge that is found in the inner self and virtue.

A. Socrates Virtue

The Greek philosopher Socrates (470-399 BCE) believed that the care for the human soul is the greatest concern of an individual. Most of his life was spent by examining the essence of humanity. Socrates espoused that the unexamined life is not worth living.[1] He believed that "wealth does not bring excellence, but excellence makes wealth and everything else is good for men, both individually and collectively." [1] He is more concerned about knowing oneself and search for the things one does not know. [1] He postulated that knowledge is virtue and ignorance is harmful in which such a thing is the cause of evil.[1] When Socrates spoke to Meno, he said that:

Furthermore, those other things we are mentioning just now, wealth and the like, are at times good and at times, harmful. Just as for the rest of the soul the direction of wisdom makes things beneficial, but harmful if directed by folly, so in these case, if the soul uses and directs them right it makes them beneficial, but bad use makes them harmful? - Quite so

The wise soul directs them right, the foolish soul wrongly? - That is so.[1]

This reflects that the act that knowing good is the consequence of doing good. Similarly, evil is the absence of knowledge. This only shows that the search for knowledge is an opportunity for each individual. The state of ignorance becomes an absurd excuse that man can abuse. From the above premise, it is clear that knowledge begins with knowing oneself.

B. Empiricist Hume

From the viewpoint of the Scottish philosopher, David Hume (1711-1776), the content of the mind is confined within the very narrow limits of the universe.[2] Although our mind can conceive and produce forms and ideas relating to unreal or supernatural substance, object through imagination, the mind can be reduced to the capabilities endowed to humanity.[2] This is what Hume called *perception*. He postulated that nothing is present in our mind but perception.[2] Hume distinguished perceptions as products of impressions and ideas.[2] For instance, the sense to feel pain is an *impression* while the memory of this sensation is the *idea*. These two constantly correspond to each other.[2] From this simple principle, the process of human knowledge can infer the concept of Hume's *perception*. Knowledge comes the first from the impression on a particular object and consequently constituted by the idea through sensation that is derived from the memory which precedes knowledge and understanding.

Hume also responds to the notion of the self. In his inquiry, he pointed out that self is reflected on a certain level of impression. He stated that:

When I turn my reflection on myself, I never can perceive this self without some one or more perception; nor can I ever perceive any thing but the perception. It is the composition of these, therefore, which forms the self.[2]

He further stressed that every idea is derived from preceding impressions.[2] As he dealt with the notion of self or substance, he argued that we have no impression on them, as something simple and

individual.[2] Hume asserted that objects exist distinctly and independently, without any common simple substance or subject of inhesion.[2] This simply means that any form of *substance* features a concept that is continuously changing. Therefore, there is no idea of a substance that is distinct from the collection of particular qualities which form a substance.[2] Hence, Hume postulated that there is no idea of self or substance in a sense.[2]

Hume arguably contended that humanity is nothing but a bundle or collection of different perceptions.[2] The account for what is thought of the self was derived from the memory that gives all the impression of their continuous identity. For Hume, the mind can be seen as analogous to a kind of theater where several perceptions successively make their appearance; pass, re-pass, glide away and mingle in an infinite variety of postures and situations.[2] However, he added that humans had not possessed yet the most distant notion of the place where these scenes are represented or composed of certain crafts.[2]

The imagination of individual runs easily from the idea of others that resemble in the course of thinking and endless revolution of ideas. Although the empiricists like Hume remained complex as they interpreted their theory of knowledge, they failed to achieve the heights of seeking for the truth. Apparently, the realization of the incapacity of human faculty brought particularly by Hume to rely on the fact that human cannot achieve it and accept his/her limitations.

C. Rationalist Descartes

The French philosopher René Descartes, (1596-1650) who was considered as the “father of modern philosophy” believed in the innate knowledge of man about God. He was not into the concept of *senses* because human senses are sometimes deceiving the self.[3] He supposed that nothing is exact as it appears. He assumed knowledge as *a priori*. He remains analytical as to dealing with knowledge of man. In the presence of doubts, knowledge becomes uncertain. Descartes stated that:

But how do I know there is not something else, over and above all those things that I have just reviewed, concerning which there is not even the slightest occasion for doubt? Is there not some God, or by whatever name I might call him, who instills these very thoughts in me? But why do I think that, since I could perhaps be the author of these thoughts? Am I not then at least something? But I already denied that I have any senses and any body. Still, I hesitate; for what follows from this? Am I so tied to a body and to the senses that I cannot exist without them? But I have persuaded myself that there is absolutely nothing in the world: no sky, no earth, no minds, no bodies. Is it then the case that I too

do not exist? But doubtless, I did exist, if I persuaded myself of something. But there is some deceiver or other who is supremely powerful and supremely sly and who is always deliberately deceiving me. Then too, there is no doubt that I exist, if he is deceiving me. And let him do his best at deception, he will never bring it about that I am nothing so long as I shall think that I am something. Thus, after everything has been most carefully weighed, it must finally be established that this pronouncement "I am, I exist" is necessarily true every time I utter it or conceive it in my mind.[3]

He found out that what he wished and what he had been searching for is nothing but the truth. For him, even if God is deceiving him in many countless ways, he knows that he exists and lives. Without any evidence that corresponds through senses, Descartes was more into the fact of affirming his very existence in this world.

Descartes proved his existence and lived by the question, "but what am I?[3] He assumed paradoxically that if there is thinking, then there must be a thinker. He considered the self as a thinking thing. He stressed that *I think therefore I am* “*cogito ergo sum*.”[3] Descartes emphasized that he was a substance- thinking the thing that the whole nature of his being is to think, and for the existence, there is no need of any place nor does it depend on any material thing”.[3]

The connection between the ideas of the empiricists and the rationalists strongly shows a distinct contradiction on the nature of the self. The empiricists provide a great hint on the skeptical reality to pursue truth as they deal *a posteriori*. On the other hand, the rationalists satisfy the affirmation of a substance without referring to any material thing in dealing with *a priori*. Empiricists fall in their end to skepticism while the rationalists fall into dogmatism. Hence, what is clear now is the fact that the failure to achieve the desire aims to the limit of reason as they both exist on the single view of this physical world.

D. RESPONSE OF KANT

From the profound idea of the German philosopher, Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) who was considered as the "greatest of modern philosopher" asserted that the claims between rationalist and empiricist are both wrong. Although he agreed at some point of empiricist particularly Hume's idea on the knowledge that begins with an experience or *a posteriori*; however, Kant postulated that there was a missing point in which there is also the knowledge that comes out of experience from mental faculty of rational judgment- *a priori*. The problem between the rationalist and the empiricist can be categorically stated in a concept of sentence elements.[4] The rationalist is the *subject* and

the empiricist is the *predicate*. For instance, if we say Athena is beautiful, the subject and predicate appear as a separate and independent part. However, the connection between the subject and predicate is necessarily needed to form sound understanding.

To some degree, the rationalists and the empiricist share common arguments. Kant argued that both beliefs must be combined. He insisted that knowledge comes from the synthesis of experiences and concepts. The process of knowledge relied heavily on the interaction that unified one single thought involving perception, imagination, and understanding. It is senseless to say how a simple sentence becomes complete without the harmony between the subject and its predicate. For Kant, “*thoughts without contents are empty, intuition without concepts are blind.*”[4] The pure thought of experience complements each other, and behind human thoughts and sensation, stands an unknown *sage* that lives and exists in every individuality.

Concerning man’s search for knowledge, the question remains the same if the truth really exists, can human being achieve the zenith or the absolute truth? How far can human knowledge extend and achieve truth? How does human deliberate his/her will? How does human grasp rationality from deception? And where should human depend on his/her initiatives?

Individuals rely on the existing accounts of knowledge brought by predecessors of the past to present civilizations. The actions and decisions of human-derived their beliefs in dealing with their everyday living. Moreover, there was the knowledge that had been documented, theories that were developed and beliefs that were adopted from our ancestor's thousands of years ago. But the question now is how we can be sure that our knowledge, beliefs, or theories are accurate, consistent and consistent in a sense that it is pure truth. If not, then that is a complete deception, irrational and absurd.

II. METHODOLOGY

This study utilized a critical analysis method of understanding, analyzing and synthesizing issues about knowledge to explore and affirm its present notions, perceptions and effects to humanity. This method was adopted from J.L. Beyer. According to [5], “critical analysis is subjective writing because it expresses the writer's opinion or evaluation of a text which was broken down into parts.” The chief intent of this inquiry is to identify and explain the problem on the notion of knowledge that appears absurd and to provide substantial insights, inspirations and illumination to its readers.

III. ANALYSIS AND EVALUATION

A. Limit of Knowledge

It is said that the roots of all dilemmas in this world start with “knowledge.” The word “knowledge” does not fall into an exact and universal definition. According to Aguas, one can just refer to this notion as “I KNOW SOMETHING.”[6] These three words cohere in referring to knowledge and must not remove any of the elements. For instance, if one says “KNOW SOMETHING,” to whom does this *know something* refer to? It is always necessary that the “I” should be asserted “I KNOW.” Then it demands the “SOMETHING” that refers to what *I know*. Hume explained that knowledge is a bundle or collection of perceived qualities through senses and can just refer to as nothing more than perception.[2] However, one cannot extend far to his limitations unless he cannot give certainty and will that need another cognitive sense above the given senses which humans possess in order to grasp the truth.

B. Power of the Mind

The question remains the same - how can knowledge be a source of evil? It is possible to reverse the concept and ideas into a new interpretation. The fact about knowledge remains unresolved and it is not certain but just an assumption. This limit of reason can be devised as faculty of choice.

For Lao Tzu, “the way to do is to be.”[7] This principle precedes knowledge. It is true to say then that the mind is responsible for the knowledge it contains. Knowledge depends on our approach that is derived from eminent perception. Knowledge is unknowable and is just derived from certain approach to gain constructed truth through a single belief, degree of coherence and collection of belief. The objective of truth is based on cogency that depends on a certain course of approach or purpose. To concretize this, an analogy of fried ice cream by Sophia may be seemingly unthinkable. This may sound impossible in human’s basic instinct but might be true if nature corresponds and satisfies this assumption. For instance, Sophia puts the liquid egg in a *pan* with required heat to form the egg into solid formation in order to produce fried egg or scrambled egg. Sophia then mixes flavored cream and puts it onto the *pan* and continuously stirs it up in necessary cold temperature to solidify its form. Paradoxically, any set of rules can be broken or reconstructed like the analogy of fried ice cream. Lao Tzu said that the way to do is to be, the way how ice cream is done is the purpose of how it is to be. Now, the term *fried* emancipated from just using heat or fire to freezing or using cold temperature. But it can be assumed false as it depends on one's interpretation or assumption to the substance. Moreover, coherence provides intensity and cogency that constitutes belief and satisfies knowledge. Since

human knowledge can reconstruct the essence of man, then it could lead to perversion or absurdity as his gained knowledge can intoxicate his being. The degrees of intense coherence dominates the adaption and comprehension of the individual concerning his apprehended knowledge. Nevertheless, knowledge can be changed to accord with human will.

C. WORDS AND INTERPRETATION

Human comprehends words and conceives different interpretations. Words do not literally signify one meaning. The interpretation of one person might be different from the others. For instance, an interpretation of ten people in a single word might conceive ten different beliefs. No form of interpretation is exact, certain as truth and universal as a principle. Such interpretations can formulate deceptions for others. They become predators and master of their own will. In the writings of Lao Tzu, *The way of life* reveals some vital points to ponder on:

*Existence is beyond the power of words
To define:
Terms may be used
But none of them absolute.
At the beginning of heaven and earth, there
were no words,
Words came out of the womb of matter;
And whether a man dispassionately
Sees to the core of life
Or passionately
Sees the surface,
The core and the surface
Are essentially the same,
Words making them seem different
Only to express appearance.
If name is needed, wonder names them both:
From wonder into wonder
Existence opens.[7]*

As explained by Bynner, Lao Tzu espoused that man's life has origin and meaning. He declared that no explanation of man is ever absolute.[7] Interpretation is nothing but just an expression of the physical world. Words may be pragmatically needed but never capture the precise thought nor the perfection of the expression. The existence of thought is always in the mind of man and the words name things that surround in this physical world.

To some extent, knowledge is viewed as a transcendental substance and is seemingly absurd. No one can ever achieve heights of perfection and zenith of certainty of knowledge. This occurrence is due to man's feebleness, limitations, impotencies and incapacity to acquire knowledge. It comes out only in the construction of the mind and self-perceived understanding. Moreover, Carl G. Jung described knowledge as an assumption. He believed that any theory based on experience must be *statistical*. [8] Statistical truths formulate ideal average that explains universal facts. [8] Generally, there is no such absolute

truth or false. For instance, science can just provide concrete answers to various predictions, but it is still human that constructs knowledge which serves as theories, postulates, hypotheses, or assumptions. The structures of those concepts are just set as standards in order to cohere such ideas; therefore, there is no absolute knowledge. Knowledge depends on the one who perceives it. Everything can be broken down into rules and can be given another interpretation. The worse phenomenon is that, as an individual or group of people compromise to the assumed truths of any doctrine of religious faith or political affiliation, man becomes a victim of his own fiction and slave of his own fabrication.

D. DESIRE

Anyone that loves has a certain drive for something else. The love to be loved, the love of money and power, the love of reading and education, and the love to grow and be empowered. The *will* to love begins with man's most basic inquiry about himself, and the question stands the same – how knowledge becomes the source of evil? The etymology of the word *philosophy* is derived from the Greek word *Philos*, which means love and *Sophia*, which means wisdom or knowledge; this refers to the love for wisdom or knowledge. The one who loves pursues and seeks knowledge and wisdom is called a philosopher, inquirer, thinker and educator. Love has been regarded as a strong urge to pursue philosophy. Love is the core of will. [9] It is the kind of virtue that appears to be dangerous. Love, like knowledge, is also a source of evil and this is not new today. This reality governs people and drives everyone for certain desires. The booming of technology, expansion of knowledge and information, and the advent of cyberspace are some of the pressing evidence of man's love for knowledge, a thirst for education and a hunger for learning. Historically, this concept had begun in the classical epochs of Socrates between sophist and stoics. For Socrates, it is the sophist that devised philosophy as a profession and stoics that stressed philosophy as a way of life.

Socrates viewed knowledge and virtue as the same thing. [1] Knowing good, simply sequences to do good. [1] Man has an opportunity to make his soul as good as possible. Moreover, philosophy is rationally derived from love. However, man continuously acquires, explores, interprets and expresses knowledge but often falls into the snares of deception. Man has a passion to some degree of his will, a will that is self-centered, immature and a result of his irrational actions. Actions are man's will to control something in order to satisfy his own desires. Stephen Hawking asserted that it is not the ignorance that is seen as the enemy of knowledge but the illusion on it, the illusion that is coming from the dark pit of humanity that is to rule and become a god.

The capacity of a man as a rationally good individual is a gift. Through this, he is capable to deliberate and

exercises his power and rights such as to make choices, to decide for his own, and to make concrete judgments. Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1712-1778) described that "man is naturally good, yet only by the institution, he becomes evil." [10] Institutions, whether of knowledge, beliefs, or spiritual aspects, have been held responsible for the corruption of the human mind being the primary source of his needs to satisfy his beliefs. To achieve each of the desires, such institutions often deceive people, thereby making them evil. Institutions that set rules and break them dictate and control power, pervert knowledge and morale to transform humanity to be more like animals. It is from these imperatives that out of rational being comes irrational traits. The gift to make a choice, decision and judgment have been diverted to the immoral foundation of man's faculties.

This kind of absurdity is rampant to mankind. This has become a virus in the human blood that is seemingly incurable; a velum that kills the essence of man; cancer that rots and corrupts the mind and action; and illness that paralyzes the entire system of the society. Knowledge should cure such illnesses that are rooted in the perversion of mankind. Through learning, a man finds essence and comfort. This kind of learning serves as an inspiration not to seek or achieve absolute truth but to have a deeper understanding of life as a whole.

E. THE PARADOX OF UNCONSCIOUS MIND

It is essential to think of the mental apparatus of an individual that leads to the solution so to be conscious in this present condition. The German philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche (1844-1900), believed change must start from within to analyze the *self*. To some extent of human consciousness, it is paramount to understand and examine how far you know about yourself. Who really are you? What are you capable of doing and not doing? Nietzsche illustrated human consciousness under the spirit of wine that brings man to the world of drunkenness and unconsciousness. He enlivened this allusion in the character of Dionysus, a Greek-god of wine. In his book *The Birth of Tragedy*, he described him as the pessimist, drunk, and madman. [11] The epitome of the one who leads chaos is with the impression of an adversary. However, despite notorious character of Dionysus, his spirit can be devised to strip concealment and lead to a false belief, forgetfulness, and corrupted mind. His spirit will lead to awakening the real self and the captured truth from darkness to light. The unconsciousness of being intoxicated is the reverse reality of real consciousness. Therefore, the spirit of Dionysus is the true friend and the true self.

The pessimistic perspective of drunkenness is a complete paradox. The state of being intoxicated is the way of transition into unconsciousness, the absence of *ego*. The Austrian neurologist Sigmund Freud, (1856-1939) who is the founder of the modern theory of psychoanalysis discovered the unconscious mind that

resides in the conscious self. The area of an individual's mental process determines a kind of behavior transformed into character to attitude. The mental apparatus of the individual in which Freud divided into threefold schemes are *id*, *ego*, and *super ego*. [12] In comparison, this Freud's mental apparatus is seen as similar to Plato's three parts of the soul, namely: appetite, reason and temper. [13] Hence, the *id* is the unconscious animal part of our nature. [12] This corresponds to the source of desires for food and sex, which Plato calls appetite. [13] The *ego* is the rational self-preservative part of the mind [12] which dictates to self in a rational way in order to abstain from its action. For Plato, it is quite usual with the faculty of reasoning, attached with reality and has a task of controlling instinctual desire. [13] The *super ego* is a hidden conscience which attempts to control the *id* and serve as auxiliary to the *ego*. [12] It reflects Plato's temper, which are both irrational and punitive faculties, a part of the soul which is passionate, the source of shame and self-directed anger. [13] This *ego* is a representation of man's will, which everyone exercises and observes. Through this *ego*, man has been partitioned in two counterbalances – the good and the evil, strong and weak, the predator and prey, the master and slave or rational and another. The Yin is female and Yang is male. The fusion of these two elements bring a balance to achieve harmony. The two elements revolve into circular form and can switch into transition and deep perversion, the good becomes evil and the evil becomes good. This is again a clear cut of an absurd mind, a product of vanity that results in wallowing confusion and brings drastic effect to mankind.

The *ego* balances the scalar harmony of *id* and *super ego* within the self. However, the *ego* is a rational apparatus that restrains the self. It is a blind truth as its rational context derived from custom, norms, cultures that have been set by the institution. The basis of *ego* in man's assumption of being rational came from the constitution of custom. Eventually, as *ego* processes, it becomes *super ego*, which leads to some degrees of intensity to become abusive and impulsive. Conscience, therefore, conceals evils within, and man becomes the enemy of himself.

Drunkenness plays a significant role in the unconsciousness state of man that awakens his sleeping sage. This stage of unconsciousness, the *id* is the real self, the sage that is freed has been concealed by ignorance. The awakened self to the reality is corrupted by the predators for a long time. The bad conscience of the beast that intends to fetter human, to torture and to capture him by its hidden traps and lethal velum becomes stronger and more dominating. When one is in drunkenness, he/she experiences some sort of freedom, the real self; the genius sage continuously burst in his/her being. The rational and irrational feeling and reason counterbalance the harmony of the self. As an example, your neighbor is not your true friend nor the real enemy you could ever

encounter.[14] It is only the self that speaks facts and discovers solutions to its problems. Similarly, only the self is the mortal and spiritual enemy you could ever have. When you experience a problem, your neighbor gives you pieces of advice, a sort of ideal things, and relieving utterances. However, this is fake advice from them, a bad conscience that truly deceives. The only element that resolves such things is the self, your true best friend and real enemy. The devils inside you tend to defeat you and the only best friend that saves you from the shackles of slavery and suffering is nothing but the self.

Nietzsche spoke:

But you will always be the worst enemy you can encounter; you lie in wait for yourself in caves and forests.

Solitary man, you are going the way to yourself! And your ways leads past yourself and your seven devils![14]

Many people intend to get drunk to become unconscious and numb, invulnerable to pain while giving themselves a great relief to forget problems and lessen their burdens. Some assert that this is absurd practice. The problem is truly difficult to overcome, truly inevitable, devouring, tormenting, deceiving and really disturbing. Everyone must not be reluctant to accept change and remove the masque of pretentions. These problems could be resolved, but it all depends on the beholder as to how he is capable of managing such circumstances. By interpreting and analyzing the transition and function of mental faculties allow the self to be free.

How unconsciousness is transformed into consciousness state? It is due to the absence of the phantoms that torture the self. The phantom is a representation of scary devil-like that is not real and exists only in a person's mind. The ego serves as a rational manner of a person as the voice that controls the mind. The phantom is the being that becomes a ferocious and anxious substance in mind. For instance, a reputable person gets drunk on an occasion and exhibits misbehavior due to his drunkenness. He may express his feelings and freely do everything he wishes for without referring to its good manners in mingling with other visitors. Obviously, the action of this reputable person may be unusual to the eyes of others. It may result in being shameful to others because he violates the norms of social grace or the ethical manners at that particular place. After this reputable person has realized what he committed due to the influence of alcohol, he would realize that those shameful acts of misconducts were the phantom that tortured the self and that is the voice of the ego. Apparently, the action of a person immediately interacts in its mental operation that hinders a person to do or not to do and the phantom will always be the shadow of man's action.

The state of unconsciousness brought by the spirit of wine is the absence of such phantoms. In this state, the

ferocious and anxious phantom is then stripped. The ego that is responsible for man's conduct that hinders the instinct will clash from the chain of its fetters. From this condition, the man has led to thinking freely without the phantom that hinders or controls his actions and that is why the unconsciousness becomes the real consciousness.

F. INITIATIVE

Human nature has no set of moral standards. This resembles in the personality of Lao Tzu who laid no rigid laws for behavior and spoke that man's conduct should depend on his instinct and conscience.[7] There is no constant standard on what is good and evil. Only institution or civilization does, as rules or laws are created by such people that formulated and implemented them become mere preferences for others to follow or disobey. For instance, the dogmatic teaching of Christianity renders human perspectives and influences knowledge, laws, and norms in the various community. The belief of man about morality serves as a system in his perception that initiates decision making. But that is the past that everyone must overcome and move on. Life is in constant changes. Man's belief of the past is not fitted in the present. Man "must" create more than him. According to Nietzsche, man is a bridge toward to new species the *Übermensch* (Overman).[14] The tablet given by God from the past is something that man should be overcome. The human valuation in this present time is once and for all and must go beyond good and evil. Are you wondering why Jesus came down and revealed something? Jesus is something –like revolutionizing as he broke the rules of the tablet. When he came to us, he summarized the ten Golden rules into two which *love thy neighbor* and *love thy God* but before He left humanity, He reduced into single teaching which is *love one another*. What does it mean to us? It is not about the rules of a tablet but simply about the conduct of man must surpass good and evil. Jesus had to die and intended to die. He broke the laws of science, metaphysics, biology and death. Man must go on his own way and should not be dependent on God. This interestingly constitutes what Nietzsche intended to espouse that *solitary man; you are going the way to yourself!*[14] No influences or any forms of cage or forms of violence and corruption should entrap the will. In Gilles Deleuze's (1925-1995) interpretation on Nietzsche's main project, the "Will to Power," *will* is pressing to power.[15] "*Power is the motor to will. Power is not desired for power, but that power is what wants in the will*".[15] Meaning, life is not just meant live but to exercise its power and purpose, a being into becoming. Man must not refrain from *being* a man but from forcing more into *becoming*, to elevate his species into *Übermensch*. It is the essence of morality, where conduct is commanding rather than reacting. Thus, life is will to power.

Where should man depend on his/her initiatives if there is nothing to follow, steps to pursue, or a set of conduct to emulate? The answer lies to the above-stated argument – life should go beyond good and evil. The man reaches not just the heights of intelligence but also elevates in geniuses that called intuition. Intuition is something spiritual rather than sensual force. This idea can be better taken by considering the way of Zen. Intuition, as explained by Suzuki, is like in this formula: X is X, and X is not X then it only realized that X is X, and X is not X.[16] For instance, an apple (literal apple) is an apple (words) then it realized that an apple is just a word that describes it, then, for Zen, this apple is not a real apple. Therefore, to capture the real apple, one must not just describe it, but he has to experience it or take it directly. This intuition that is spiritual is the responsible source mechanism for judgment wherein human must depend on his/her initiatives. After the long search for truth, answers cannot found beyond knowledge, words, or logical reasoning but can only be found within you, within the very self. One thing is found clear in this argument: the self is the friend and enemy of the being, but the one that responsible in all of man's own action is his *will*. For Nietzsche, the self is the unknown sage lives in your body and that is your body. So why someone should suffer and let him be deceived by others?

IV. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This paper discussed the issues of knowledge. According to [17], people are reluctant to accept new things in education because of their lack of lack of knowledge reserves.

Socrates stressed that knowledge is a form of virtue which is about the examination of oneself towards excellence that will result in the quality of living. Ignorance may cause irregularities that are most likely harmful and evil. So, ignorance is viewed as an absurd excuse that man can abuse.

The realization of the ambiguous nature of knowledge and identity of self also appears in Hume's investigation. This is viewed as skeptical and totally absurd. They are nothing but a bundle or collection of different perceptions.

On the other hand, the affirmation of existence is seen on Descartes' examination for searching after truth. It is without any evidence that corresponds through senses; this is more into the fact of affirming existence. Descartes finally assumed that the self is a substance - thinking a thing and that the whole nature of self is to think, and existence does not need any place nor dependent on any material thing.

The claims of both empiricists and rationalists were rejected by Kant's evaluation. The claims were synthesized and became mature. As a result, these became complete and widely understood.

It is clearly shown in the illustration of Aguas that human knowledge has limitations. The words "I

KNOW SOMETHING" resembles an idea that any letter or word in the phrase must not be removed as each word completes and compliments the essence of the whole.

The power of the mind appears that the human mind has the control over reason. In this regard, the mind can be seen as a powerful instrument that can construct, reconstruct, or even deconstruct things and ideas. To some degree, thoughts or ideas could possibly be reversed; for instance, good to evil, right to wrong, beauty to ugly and vice-versa.

Consequently, it appears that words and interpretation are viewed as inconsistent and inaccurate. The translation, interpretation and understanding of one person may be different from another. This explicitly means that words are not exact as translated or interpreted; then truth in words is unachievable.

The love of a man was set as an enthusiastic force to drive for something. Man acquired knowledge but apparently became a victim of corruption and deception. Hence, Rousseau stressed that man is a rational being, but his environment influenced him, corrupted his mind and abused his vulnerability in order to achieve the selfish desire of the few. But the worse and terribly absurd is, this phenomenon led the individual to become evil.

The notion of Nietzsche on the paradox of an unconscious mind explicitly offers a process for awakening the sage-self to grasp the rationality beyond absurdity. The mental apparatus of Freud: id, ego and super ego resembled Plato's three parts of the soul: appetite, reason and temper, which is shown to be the force that controls man's action. In this regard, the *ego* in which we believe rational is then realized as the culprit and responsible in such absurdity. In short, it is only the self that appears to be the worse enemy of his own mind. The spirit of wine, which often possesses a bad impression, is seen to be an effective device to strip the fettered and corrupted mind. Hence, it is the unconsciousness element of the self that is the real conscious.

On the last issue, it was seen that human nature has no set of moral standards and no rigid laws for behavior and conduct that must be based on something and someone. Realistically, there is no constant standard on what is good and evil; instead, man initiates his/her own decision regardless of the influences of culture. Here, the initiatives of man's conduct must be *beyond good and evil* (tablet) and should not be dependent but rather independent, active but not reactive and not being but rather becoming. Its accordance is not taken from the others or based on the past phenomenon or philosophy of the past accounts and civilizations but grounded on the present situation of this society. A man should depend on his/her initiatives not on others but based on himself, his very self which is carried out through pure intuition.

It can be concluded that knowledge of man cannot deny the constant fact of his incapacity to achieve absolute truth. Human knowledge can be seen as just

assembled fabricated facts. Though knowledge is uncertain and impossible, to reach the zenith; however, the human faculty-mind can control, capable to initiate and manipulate through his free will. Reason and rationale are confined and concealed, and perversion is freed. Consequences and sufferings of man pave the way for his self-centered satisfaction. Knowledge is the slave of the will; therefore, the *will* is much superior to reason. Through this vulnerability, knowledge has been a tool to fulfill the selfish desires of the will. Nevertheless, absurdity occurs in the most basic and complex form of humanity, but this simple comprehension of the context of knowledge may or may not save one from falling from the cliff.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author is delighted in his inspirations in life: his father Orestes, his wife Nenita and his daughters: Sophia and Athena.

The author commemorates his beloved mother Cholita and his daughter baby Avesta, who now rest in the hands of the Great Architect of the Universe. They will always be cherished, treasured and loved. They will ever remain alive in the heart of the author and will never be forgotten.

In the course of this work, the author expresses his unending gratitude to his colleagues, Dr. Ronaldo R. Larioque and Dr. Gener S. Subia for their substantial contribution, willingness in giving their time and effort and for constructively critiquing his work and for giving their significant comments and suggestions, not to mention their stimulating discussions and insightful support.

REFERENCES

- [1] Cooper, John M., Edited, Plato: Complete Works, Indianapolis, IN Hackett Publishing Company Inc., 1997.
- [2] Hume, David. A Treatise of Human Nature: Being an Attempt to Introduce the Experimental Method of Reasoning into Moral Subjects, Floating Press. 2009.
- [3] Descartes, René. Philosophical Essay and Correspondence, ed., with intro. Roger Ariew, Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company Inc., 2000.
- [4] Immanuel Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, trans. and ed. Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [5] Critical Analysis. <https://www2.southeastern.edu/Academics/Faculty/elejeune/critique.htm>.
- [6] Aguas, Jove Jim S., St. Tomas and Critical Thinking, Manila: UST Graduate School, 2005.
- [7] Bynner, Witter. trans., The Way of Life: According to Lao Tzu, New York: The Berkley Publishing Group, 1994.
- [8] Jung, Carl G., The Undiscovered Self, trans. from German by R.F.C. Hull, New York: A Division of Penguin Books USA Inc., 1957, 1958.
- [9] Santiago, Patrick Neil M., "On the Basis of Love: A Critical Analysis". American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research 3, no. 7 (2019): 34-40.
- [10] Rousseau, Jean-Jacques, The Social Contract and The First and Second Discourses, ed. with an intro. by Susan Dunn, New York: Yale University Press, 2002.
- [11] Nietzsche, Friedrich. The Birth of Tragedy, trans. by Clifton P. Fadiman, New York: Dover Publication, Inc., 1995.
- [12] Greenwald, Harold. ed., with intro. and notes, Great Cases in Psychoanalysis, New York: Ballantine Books, Inc, 1959.
- [13] Cornford, Francis MacDonald. trans. with intro. and notes, The Republic of Plato, New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- [14] Nietzsche, Friedrich. Thus Spoke Zarathustra, trans. with an intro. by R. J. Hollingdale, England: Penguin Books Ltd., 1961, 1969.
- [15] Bolaños, Paolo A., On Affirmation and Becoming: A Deleuzian Introduction to Nietzsche's Ethics and Ontology, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014.
- [16] Suzuki, Daisetz Teitaro. An Introduction to Zen Buddhism, New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1964.
- [17] Jie Wang, Xia Chen, Xiao Jiang Chen and Chen Ling Zhang,(2017). The Attitude and Cognition of Higher Vocational Students to Bilingual Teaching in Zoology. SSRG International Journal of Humanities and Social Science 4(5), 58-63.