

Abuse of Will to Power in Nietzsche vis-à-vis Buber's I-It Relation: A Critical Evaluation

By

Umezulike Johnpaul Ekenedilichukwu & Raphael Olisa Maduabuchi, Ph.d

Department of Philosophy
Chukwuemeka Odumegwu Ojukwu University
Igbariam, Anambra State
09167451097/09022999724

umezulikeekenejp@gmail.com, ro.maduabuchi@coou.edu.ng

Abstract

Human existence appears to be influenced by so many known factors, which two of these known factors include – Power and Human relationships. These two factors seem to be key factors in making the world a better place. However, the negative approach to the two known factors brings about the existence of a broken world, which cannot be denied. Human beings must accept the fact that this broken world is caused by human beings themselves. Majority, in ambition to dominate the world and be at the top or have people under their command; sees power as a means to an end. To achieve this end, people are used or manipulated which indirectly caused them unforgettable harm. This act of using or manipulating people is seen as a will to power in a negative or abusive manner; which also relates clearly to Martin Buber's I-It postulation on human existence. This work argues that the use of human beings as means to an end in the matrix of power and human relationship remains a problem which results to the broken world. Using the analytical method (that is, the philosophical method of analysis), this work reveals that the existence of a broken world reflects in the abuse of will to power and seeing human beings as objects rather than as subjects. The work concludes that adopting Martin Buber's idea of *I-Thou* postulation on human existence, the issue of a broken world will be solved and a better world achieved.

Keywords: Abuse of will to power, Broken world, Nietzsche, Buber, I-Thou, I-It.

Methodology: Analytical method.

1.0 Introduction

We live in a world where the desire for some kind of power butts up against some code of behaviour that have gotten stricter and stricter particularly in the 21st century (about what is acceptable, and about what is politically correct). In his theory of the *will to power*, Nietzsche asserted that the primary aim of life is not survival but the accumulation of power of strength, of resources, the drive to master one's environment, and most importantly; the desire to discharge one's energy and strength into the world (Kaufmann 1968, 341). For him, it is only when life is severely weakened, sick, injured, distressed; that it falls into a state of mere survival and loses the drive, the ability, the strength to overcome itself through the accumulation of power

The researcher's idea of power is not about this kind grand concept of political or war power, it is based on a very individual level; because, every organism has the desire to expand itself. As human beings, the desire that we have for wanting to expand beyond our limit, makes us feel like we have some degree of ability to influence other people we can control. But the feeling that I don't have any power or influence over people, is deeply unsettling and it causes all kinds of attempts of negative power, passive aggression, etc. As human beings however, we are supposed to be paragons of virtue, paragons of fairness, just as Martin Buber will have it in his I-Thou postulation on human existence; which points to the fact that we have to be extremely careful in this world.

Using the analytical method, this paper focuses on expanding more on Nietzsche's conceptions of will to power and Martin Buber's I-Thou and I-It postulations on human existence; pointing out the misconception people have about power and the negative encounter people experience in human relationship through which we have a broken world.

2.0 Nietzsche and The Will to Power

Friedrich Nietzsche was a 19th century German philosopher. He was most famous for being a critic of Western metaphysics, religion, and morality (Stumpf and Fieser 2008, 359). As a young man, Nietzsche was a strong admirer of Schopenhauer's work, although he later broke with Schopenhauer over the idea of "the will". Schopenhauer wrote that the world was the result of the will. By the will, Schopenhauer meant human wants, desires, and efforts. It is through the will according to Schopenhauer, that human beings find suffering, because their desires can never be satisfied (Klemke, 1981). Thus, he advocated for an "ascetic" morality, meaning that he thought it best to minimize one's desires.

However, Nietzsche appreciated that Schopenhauer rejected an interpretation of human beings as aloof and contemplative beings. But Nietzsche did not endorse the idea of "ascetic morality". In his own theory, Nietzsche advanced a notion of "the will to power"; rather than the will to live that Schopenhauer used.

Friedrich Nietzsche's concept of the will to power is one of his most provocative and influential ideas, and it serves as a cornerstone of his philosophy. This concept is complex and often misunderstood. However, Nietzsche's will to power refers to the idea that the fundamental motivation behind all human actions is the drive to assert and expand one's influence (Kaufmann 1968, 341). But it is not just about external control or domination, it is about self-mastery growth and the ability to shape one's own life and values in a world that no longer provides fixed truths or transcendent sources of meaning, and the desire to overcome and transform. The will to power is the force that propels individuals towards self-improvement, transformation and growth (Kaufmann 1968, 347).

Zarathustra (one of Nietzsche's protagonists) delivers the idea that humans must become what they are, which is a call to embrace our true nature – which also, is always in a state of flux (constantly evolving and striving for higher states of existence). Hence, the will to power is the fuel for this constant process of becoming (which is the creative impulse). Furthermore, in order to understand Nietzsche's theory of the *will to power*, there are some categories we will consider; which we will look at one after the other.

2.1 Categories of The Will to Power

In making Nietzsche's theory of the *will to power* more understandable, there are five (5) categories to dwell on in order to understand his theory, which include – (1) Will to Power as a Force of Creation, (2) Expression of the Will to Power, (3) The Drive for Mastery (Overcoming External Constraints), (4) The Übermensch (The Embodiment of the Will to Power), and (5) The Will to Power and The Eternal Recurrence. Let's look into these five categories one after the other.

2.1.1 Will to Power as a Force of Creation

Nietzsche's will to power is not just destructive or domineering force, it is also a creative force. This creative force drives individuals to produce new ideas, creates new works of art, invent new technologies, and forge new paths in life. For this, Nietzsche saw artists, philosophers, and other creators as the purest embodiments of the will to power; because they are able to shape reality, and create new meanings, values, and worlds. Thus, he described the will to power as the "unexhausted procreative will of life" (Kaufmann 1968, 419).

2.1.2 Expressions of the Will to Power

Through their works, creators impose their own will onto the world; thereby pushing society and culture forward. Thus, the will to power calls for the creation of new values, values that are life affirming, and values that celebrate strength, vitality and growth (Kaufmann 1968, 419).

2.1.3 The Drive for Mastery (Overcoming External Constraints)

Nietzsche's will to power is deeply tied to the human desire for mastery over the world. It is the drive to master one's environment, to shape and transform it; rather than merely being shaped by it (Kaufmann 1968, 500). Mastery here is not about domination or control in the traditional sense, but about the ability to act freely and shape one's surroundings according to one's own will. This idea is especially relevant in Nietzsche's critique of modernity (where in a world where traditional, religious, and moral systems are crumbling – people feel lost and disoriented). Thus, the will to power according to Nietzsche, provides a way to overcome this sense of disorientation by asserting mastery over one's self and one's environment. Therefore, individuals can create their own meaning and purpose in a world that no longer offers these things automatically.

Nietzsche believed that the will to power is what drives individuals to overcome the structures and institutions that hold them back – whether these are social conventions, political ideologies or religious doctrines. Nietzsche, however, saw the modern world as an age of upheaval (a big change that causes a lot of confusion, worry and problems) in which traditional forms of authority were breaking down (Kaufmann 1968, 197). He therefore believes that the will to power could lead individuals to redefine what it means to live authentically, and to take charge of their own destinies.

2.1.4 The Übermensch (The Embodiment of the Will to Power)

The concept of the übermensch in Nietzsche's philosophy is often translated as "the overman or the superman" (Kaufmann 1954a, 493). The übermensch represents the ideal person who has fully embraced the will to power. He is someone who has transcended the conventional values and moral system of the society, and creates his own life and meaning. The übermensch is not someone who seeks power for the sake of domination; but someone who seeks power in order to transform himself or herself and the world around him or her. Also, the übermensch chooses the individual who has undergone self-overcoming, who lives with authenticity, who has the strength to face the hardships and challenges of life without resorting to weakness or dependence on external authorities as either his friend or advisor. Lastly, the übermensch chooses a person who embraces the creative power of the will, crafting his or her own destiny, values and purpose in a world that is indifferent to human needs and desires.

2.1.5 The Will to Power and The Eternal Recurrence

In one of his most challenging ideas, Nietzsche introduces the concept of eternal recurrence. That is, the idea that all events in life may repeat themselves infinitely in the exact same form (Kaufmann 1974, 246). According to him, the will to power intersects with the concept as he suggests that we should live in such a way that we would be willing to repeat our lives eternally,

to embrace life fully, and without reservation. The will to power for him, is the force that enables individuals to affirm their lives, even in the face of suffering and hardship; knowing that their existence may eternally repeat (R. Speirs, 1999). The idea of recurrence is a test to one's capacity to affirm life, to embrace it fully and with passion. Thus, if people can live in a way that they would be willing to relive their life forever; they have truly affirmed the will to power, and they have transcended the notion of life as a burden, and have embraced it as a continuous (that is, ever evolving expression of growth and self-creation).

Nietzsche's will to power challenges us to embrace the full potential of our existence, to break free from the constraints of external authority, and to create meaning in a world that offers none. For him, by embracing this powerful drive; we can transcend nihilism and shape a life that reflects our deepest desires, values and potential.

3.0 Martin Buber's Understanding of the Human Existence

For human beings to embrace the full potential of their existence (as pointed out by Nietzsche), he or she must come in contact with people from the same environment or from other environment as the case may be. By so doing, human beings form a kind of relationship among themselves. This points to the fact that no man is an island, which means that man needs others in order to determine his or her existence. Hence, it is by knowing people, coming in contact with and forming a good relationship with others; that one gets to know how his or her environment operates, and develop the self-mastery over his or her environment.

Moreover, one may keen to ask, how can human beings come in contact and develop a good relationship with themselves? In response to this question, Martin Buber gave us his clear idea or understanding of human existence.

According to Buber, life is an encounter; and in the encounter, there is a dialogue and such dialogue are characterized either by I-Thou or I-It (R.G. Smith 1981, 26). In such premise, Buber recognized that life is never lived alone. But life is a society, life is a community or a family, life is with others. Every day we encounter other people and we communicate, then develop a relationship and form a society or community (Smith 1981, 26). Thus, society is built upon relations and dialogue. There is no society, no community or family without relationship and dialogue. And that is why Buber argued that if there is no dialogue among people, there is nothing human. However, the quality of relationship depends much on dialogue because in the dialogue people start revealing themselves to one another. How one reveals himself/herself to the other in a dialogue and how one treats the other in a dialogue is important to establish a genuine relationship and a genuine community. After all, according to Buber, society or community is not a bunch of objects but a bunch of subjects or human persons and therefore; one should know the proper way how to deal and relate to one another as persons with dignity.

3.2 Characterization of Relationship and Dialogue according to Buber

Buber argues that human existence may be defined by the way in which we engage in a dialogue with one another, with the world and with God (Smith 1981, 28). In the relation, we may adopt two kinds of attitude toward existence: The I-Thou and The I-It Relationship.

3.2.1 The I-Thou Relationship

He used the I-Thou to describe relationship between man and man and God. This is a subject to subject relationship; in the sense that, people enter into a relationship with the whole of their beings, as genuine persons with their own uniqueness and accept each other as they are (Smith 1981, 38). One treats the other as subject with dignity, not to be used or manipulated for one's advantage. Therefore, the specific characteristic of this relationship is reciprocity and mutuality. As a result of such relationship, both parties who enter into a relationship grow

together. Also, there is a mutual benefit that both parties received from such relationship thus, one is not taking advantage of the other.

According to Buber (1923), I-Thou relationship can be established if there is a genuine dialogue. Genuine dialogue is when both parties open themselves up to each other without wearing any mask. There are no secrets to be hidden but one opens herself/himself up to the other, for the other to understand him/her and the other should accept the person as he/she is. Buber further claimed that genuine relationship is the foundation to build relationship with God (Kramer, & Gawlick, 2003). Buber argued that the meeting between I-Thou is not just between two people because, every particular Thou is a glimpse through the eternal Thou. In other words, our genuine dialogue and relationship with the other and the world is an open window to the eternal Thou. Hence, every I-Thou relationship opens up a window to the ultimate Thou or God (Wood, 1969). This means that one cannot approach God without having a good relationship with fellow human beings. Also, one cannot be holy unless one has also good relationship with other fellow human beings, and it is only based on such relationship that one can enter into dialogue with God. Therefore, the present world which is marked by brokenness makes it hard for human beings to reach God.

Thus, I-Thou relationship describes the relationship between subject to subject. This relationship recognizes the uniqueness of the other and welcome the other as the other is. One is not using himself/herself as a standard to measure the other but accepting the other as a unique being and respect his/her uniqueness (Smith 1981, 38).

3.2.2 The I-It Relationship

Buber recognized that achieving genuine human relationship may become difficult when people fall into I-it relationship. I-It relationship is a relationship between subject and object. It is a relation of person to a thing, of subject to object, involving some form of utilization, domination or control (Smith 1981, 56). This is not equal relationship because the other is treated as object to be manipulated or exploited. One is subject, while the other is object. This kind of relationship is not founded on mutual trust but suspicions or mistrust. Thus, man enters into this relationship not with the wholeness of his being, but part of it. Each still wearing mask and does not open themselves up to each other. Consequently, one cannot fully open himself/herself to the other because of mistrust and prejudices. Within the I-It relationship, there is no dialogue but only monologue. People pretend to be in dialogical relationship but in reality there is no real dialogue because one is only emphasizing his/her points and not listening to what the other has to say or offer.

Within this seeming relationship, one cannot fully understand the other because their perception toward each other is limited; and such situation always causes misunderstanding. They pretend to be in dialogue but the dialogue is full of personal interest, not common interest. They also enter into dialogue with the self-interest agenda in the sense that one enters into dialogue because one wants to get something out of such relationship. According to Buber, there is a movement from relation to separation, a growing crisis of human existence in modern society. He believed that the relationship between individuals, people and creation was increasingly that of I-It. As a result, it is becoming more and more difficult to encounter God (Smith 1981, 67).

Hence, the I-It relationship describes the relationship between subject and object; a relationship that treats the other as objects. One's uniqueness is not recognized, rather one is accepted conditionally. Thus, the I-It relationship is the kind of relationship where one dominates, controls, and exploits others.

4.0 Evaluation

4.1 The Existence of a Broken World

It appears too idealistic to think or dream of a perfect world where all people are living in harmony; no wars or conflicts among individuals, races, religions and countries. However, when one is still inside one's mother's womb, the world seems perfect; but when born into this world, one does not see a perfect world as earlier seemed. In the time past, many philosophers and scholars like Immanuel Kant, Soren Kierkegaard, Arthur Schopenhauer, Friedrich Nietzsche, Albert Camus, Gabriel Marcel, Martin Buber, Jurgen Habermas, and so on; viewed the life and experience of their time and dwelt critically on analysing the human existence of their time.

Gabriel Marcel in his life and time (1889-1973), wondered about our life and experience; and he pinpointed a fact that we live in a broken world. He emphasized that the world we live in is essentially broken, fractured by events in history. For him, this situation of the broken world is a state where the sense of being is lost. Thus, its consequence is the degradation of being; which in our own case, has indirectly contributed to the worsen insecurity and destruction of lives and properties in Nigeria.

Moreover, some philosophies of being have considered being from the perspective of something within human manipulation and control. Thus, man is considered as any objects out there that can be tooled or used. This theory of being is often referred to as "*manipulationism*" with the philosophy of causation, where causes are seen as "handles" that can be used to control effects, essentially treating existence as something that can be actively manipulated by humans to a certain degree (J. Wood, 2003). Josef Stalin for example, used a live fowl to illustrate how to dominate and control people irrespective of their aggression towards your chains of power or how you rule them. Stalin illustrated that when you strip a live fowl of its feathers, it bleeds and cries; but when you drop some grains on the ground for the fowl after stripping off its feathers, the fowl begins to use its beak to pick up the grains from the ground and eat them. This clearly means that, when you want people under your control to respect you irrespective of their aggression towards you, give them what or something they love or desire; then, they will do whatever you want them to do and their agitation towards you dies. In this sense, human dignity is judged by one's social output, and human relationship is built on utility.

In response to the above philosophy of being, Kant in his categorical imperative put forward the following definitive formulation – act in such a way that the subjective maxim of your will can at the same time always be valid as the principle of a general law (B.O. Egboh 2005, 72). Thus, whenever human beings are in doubt; they must ask themselves – what would happen to mankind if everyone acts according to his subjective principle or maxim? However, the author does not agree with Kant on his categorical imperative theory because; there are many morally good acts which could not possibly become a universal law. For example – the duties of a healthy man as against those of a sick man. In some cases, some actions remain morally only for as long as they do not become universal law; for example – the vow of celibacy.

Soren Kierkegaard on the other hand, lamented that this world is irrational, in the sense that we do not understand how it operates. Many things happen not according to human calculations because it cannot be understood by reason. According to him, this world is marked by dread or anxiety, guilt, absurdity, paradox, despair, death and nothingness. Arthur Schopenhauer also viewed the world of his time as dark world, the world that is full of sufferings. For Schopenhauer, it is the nature of the will to fulfil its desires and needs that life is full of sufferings. This claim of Schopenhauer can be seen vividly among politicians in our country Nigeria, where politicians fight for power and influence which often results in incessant killings or loss of valuable resources in the country (all in the name of campaigning for the throne of power).

With the above postulations made by different philosophers, one might ask the following questions: Who is to be blamed? Did God plan for the broken world? In response to these questions, God never planned for a broken world but a perfect world, a peaceful world, a world of harmony. However, the possibility of a broken world or society is imbedded in who made humans and the human blood. Thus, the Latin proverb that says, "*homo homini lupus*" which means that "*a man is a wolf to another man*" may be true. Such proverb reminds us of the social contract theory of Thomas Hobbes - that prior to social contract a man lived in the state of nature. Thus, man's life in the state of nature was one of fear and selfishness. Man lived in chaotic condition of constant fear of another because man wanted to dominate another man (Elahi, n.d). Though we all are living in a civilized world under the social contract but it seems that life before the social contract (that is, life in the state of nature) is still the dominant force in human relationship. Today, man lives in fear of one another and, therefore, no one is open to the other. Thus, the current state of affairs which is characterized by insincerity or hypocrisy is blamed on human beings themselves. However, the solution is as well with the human beings themselves. They should be the one to restore peace and unity among human beings by establishing genuine relationship and dialogue as proposed by Martin Buber.

4.2 Critique of Nietzsche's Idea of Will to Power

People a kind of misunderstood Nietzsche on his drive for or will to power, especially in his critique of conventional morality beyond good and evil. In defining the good and evil (bad), Nietzsche claimed that the good is all that heightens the feeling of power, that is, the will to power (the power itself in man); while the evil (bad) is all that proceeds from weakness (Kaufmann 1996, 443). Thus, in Nietzsche's critique of conventional morality beyond good and evil, he argues that conventional morality particularly Christian morality was life denying that is, suppressing the natural impulses and instincts that drive individuals to achieve greatness and self-realization.

Nietzsche presents the idea that moral values are human inventions and not universal truths. For him, the will to or drive for power is the drive to create new values, to go beyond conventional morality, and to live according to one's own instincts, creativity, and strength (Kaufmann 1954b, 450). Thus, he believes that the will to power is the means through which individuals can transcend the limitations imposed by traditional morality and live a more authentic and liberated life.

One can say that Nietzsche is wrong when he said that the Christian morality was life denying; that is suppressing the natural impulses and instincts that drive individuals to achieve greatness and self-realization. This claim points to the denial of the fact that there is an animal in all of us, and if the Christian morality is not there to suppress the animal in us; then the natural impulses and instincts that drive individuals to greatness and self-realization may be controlled by the animal in us. One might try to be good in achieving greatness and self-realization, but when the good is not working in favour of the individual; he or she might try switching over to his or her animal side. And if this occurs, there will be hatred, chaos, human relationships will be destroyed and a broken world as a result.

However, in evaluating Nietzsche's concept of the will to power, his postulations can be viewed or analysed in a negative sense or manner. Using a thief or an armed robber as a case study, Nietzsche's idea of creativity, forging new paths in life, imposing their own will onto the world, mastery of one's environment, shaping one's surrounding according to one's own will, becoming an overman or superman, and choosing a person who embraces the creative power of the will (either as a friend or advisor) – all in the name of crafting and creating meaning, values, destiny, and purpose in a world that no longer offer these things; can give a negative or dangerous idea/meaning to a thief or an armed robber.

In a geographical area where people's properties are being taken or stolen without their consent, the people who are living in that area are being caught up or instilled with fear (fear of losing their properties or even their lives) because, damages or tragedy do occur in various homes where operations have been carried out which often times has led or resulted to killing and death, and also, destruction of lives and properties. Thus, in a world that does not give or provide positive values, meaning, and helping one to create a positive purpose; some individual persons (like the thieves, armed robbers, kidnappers, cultists, and so on) now commit many atrocities like theft, incessant killings and murder, cybercrimes or money-frauding, kidnapping, house invasion, money rituals, sexual assaults, and so on; all in the name of forging new paths and creating new ideas, meaning or purpose for themselves. However, Zarathustra's idea that humans must become what they are (which seems to be a call to embrace our nature) is seen as a supporting idea and telling criminals (both in government offices and outside government offices) to continue in their ways and that the paths they are following are right towards creating meaning, values, and purpose for themselves.

4.2.1 Nietzsche's Theory of God is Dead

Coming down to his idea of God is dead, his conceptions of *will to power* originated from here. In his *God is dead* theory, Nietzsche posited that there is a natural explanation for belief in God. For him, belief in God ensures that no loss is inconsolable, no injustice unrequited, and that we can finally have everlasting peace; no matter the misery gone through to get there. Thus, God is a psychological fabrication created to soothe distress, ease trauma, and provide companionship in the face of suffering. But Nietzsche proposed that we do not need to believe in God to address these challenges. Rather than try to escape suffering by embracing some outworldly entity, Nietzsche believed that we should utilize suffering to better ourselves. A better example to this claim are people like Nelson Mandela, Emma Goldman who achieved greatness by acing down hardship. This however, leads us to the popular question asked in *Ethics* which states that – Will there be morality without religion (which involve knowledge of and believing in God).

Using Nietzsche's idea, belief in God sustains weakness, and it hinders greatness. Thus, walking with God is like walking with a crutch. Hence, if we face suffering on our own, we are stronger and have greater potential for excellence. Nonetheless, in analysing Nietzsche's ideas (both the idea of will to power and God is dead); some individual persons will see it as an encouragement to live an authentic life, while some (like the thieves, bad politicians, and so on) will see it not only as an encouragement, but as opportunity or motive to exhibit the evil actions they have willed or planned in their mind – all in the name to achieve greatness or become a legend). Those who see it as an encouragement to exhibit their evil actions does not carry out their action to achieve greatness alone, but to dominate the world and control people in a negative or abusive sense. Thus, they nurture the idea that they are entitled to something.

4.3 The Abuse of Will to Power and Its Consequences

We live in a world where some people if not everybody, often believe that he/she is entitled to something (be it power or position in a state or community). This entitlement even goes down in human relationships especially where one believes that he/she is entitled to be receiving one or two things from the other (as sometimes, seen in boyfriend and girlfriend relationships today). Following the basic concept of Buber, we have a simple conclusion that the world is broken; and this broken world is being caused by having or forming negative ideas towards having power, control, domination or self-mastery over people which result to having selfish interest, dishonest relationship, unauthentic relationship. Each one is taking advantage of the other as object of manipulation. Such relationship can cause conflict because of conflicting interest.

Here, we shall categorize the abuse of the will to power into two segments – (1) The political abuse of will to power and (2) The individual abuse of will to power. We shall look into them one after the other.

4.3.1 The Political Abuse of Will to Power

Coming to the aspect of power or positions in a state or community, some individual persons who are seen and known as politicians; often see themselves being entitled to a particular political position or power (be it the office of the president of a country or nation, governor of a state, senate and so on).

This sense of entitlement comes from the will and desire to attain anything irrespective of the means (whether good or bad). This entitlement when attained through negative means, becomes an abuse. An abuse in the sense that the will or desire to power, is not attained or achieved through positive and transparent means (whereby every actions are carried out and communicated to the public). The negative means through which the will to power is achieved especially in Nigeria's political setting, contradicts Nietzsche's idea of will to power. Thus, the will to power in Nigeria political setting, is seen as a desire to control or dominate people with the intention to gain from the sweat or labour of the citizens in Nigeria. Using Josef Stalin's ideology for example, if the minors tries to react against the powerful, the minors will be controlled and manipulated either by bribing them with a huge sum of money or giving them what they desire; so as to silence their agitations and keep them under check and never do anything that will jeopardize their negative political agenda. Therefore, power is based on the dichotomy between "the powerful" and "the powerless" (individual, state, society, and so on). In Nigeria also, we experience some individuals doing good for selfish interests (which however, is seen among some Nigerian politicians). When an individual person (who seems to be a politician) is seeking for political power or influence he or she goes to the poorest geographical areas within his or her reach. In his or her visits to those places, the politician gives them empty promises of what he/she is going to do for them and the society at large. The politician might even start doing things for the poor geographical community, either by procuring food stuffs, constructing water boreholes or making various community roads to be good. By so doing, the politician is being loved and cherished by the poor people and, thus, creates a kind of relationship and support for himself or herself. However, problem arises when the politician in question gets the political power or influence he/she desired and do not fulfilled the promises made to the poorly geographical people he/she met. As such, the politician builds a gang of enemy for himself or herself. And when the same politician comes to the same place to perform the political campaign he or she did before again, the politician is not welcomed and may be chased out of the community by the members of the community as being observed today. This however, signifies that doing good for selfish reasons; does not make you good, it does makes you good at being selfish. It is so because, even when you try to do something good, you cannot seem to understand where your selfishness ends; which however, leads to continuous manipulation of people in order to achieve your selfish desire.

4.3.2 The Individual Abuse of Will to Power

Coming to the aspect of human relationships where one believes that he/she is entitled to be receiving one or two things (be it money, gifts, clothes, etc.) from the other. This entitlement is mostly seen in a boyfriend and girlfriend relationships, where some girls think that the yardstick for measuring that their boyfriends love them is based on how many fancy or even expensive things they have received from their boyfriends or how their boyfriends do spend lavishly on them. This kind of entitlement projects us to Buber's idea of I-It relationship, where the uniqueness of the boyfriend (who is now considered as the object) is seen by how much the girlfriend (who is now considered as the subject) had received from the boyfriend. However,

problem or misunderstanding arises when the boyfriend stops giving because there is no backup to get and give things to the girlfriend. Thus, instead of the girlfriend to maintain the relationship they started, she gets frustrated and annoyed with the boyfriend. If this gap of not receiving something from the boyfriend continues, the girlfriend begins to dislike the boyfriend. And this will result in her leaving the boyfriend for another person who seems to be better for her and richer than her previous boyfriend. Some will use the Igbo terminology – *O biara uwa ita ahuhu?* or *Ejiro ahuhu anya isi* (which literally means – Did she come to earth to suffer? or It is useless to be boastful using suffering). Some girls who use this Igbo terminology as their principle for relationships unfortunately fall in the hands of very dangerous boys who will use them for their own purpose – either for sex, money ritual, selling of female parts and so on; which we have seen or do see in the internet or social media.

4.4 The Way Forward

With the above examples, one can understand or see that man is filled with desires and will to have power or influence no matter what it takes. To gain power is good but the manner to which it is achieved is what makes it look good or bad. Through the above examples, one can say that people do not have the right will or purpose to power or influence; that is why we experience many challenges in our country Nigeria. People are being bought and used to achieve what an individual person wills or desires. Just as Schopenhauer claimed that the will is the reason why human beings suffer in the world; thus, human beings should try to reduce their desires so as to minimize human sufferings and desire for a better world (Klemke, 1981). In doing this, man must start to build an I-thou relationship with people around him; thereby showing the will to build a better world free of too much pain, sorrow, hatred, and suffering.

From the Christian perspective, Nietzsche's ethical theory is subjective since for Nietzsche, the ultimate end of living an authentic life is not God. This is so because, both his theory of *Will to Power* and *God is Dead* show that his idea of living an authentic life resides on what the individual decides and willed to become or do. If individuals decide to become or do whatever they willed or desire without proper discernment which automatically for Christians, requires constant prayers and getting an inspiration from God; this world would not be habitable to live in, because whatever pleases anybody becomes the morality and there will be conflict of interests. Going further, one knows that some decisions carried out from self-interest of an individual may not, many a time, be reasonable and just and so, it cannot be the yardstick for living an authentic life. Thus, individual's view and authority cannot be the standard norm of morality and living an authentic life. It will definitely lead to subjectivism, pessimism, and worst still, breaking of relationships among people.

However, in order to avoid breaking of relationships among people, the author supports that relationship must be a subject to subject, not subject and object. Within such kind of relationship, everyone is treated as equal individual human beings; no one is lower than the other. It is called a reciprocal relationship. From such relationship, an honest and sincere dialogue can be established and in consequence, it can build or heal the broken relationship, the broken world.

5.0 Conclusion

The ability to co-exist with people in harmony depends on one's interpersonal relationship. It is one of the fundamental problems that makes or mars societal development. Thus, numerous crises and wars fought in human society are undisputedly the result of ideological differences, belief systems, decisions and actions. However, man has the natural right to dominate the world. This natural right gives man the inherent power to make meaning out of his existence. For man to achieve this goal, he needs to build a genuine relationship both within himself and with other people around him. By so doing, man determines to solve the existence of a broken

world (where power is abused for self-interest) and promote a long lasting peaceful coexistence among peers, races, and colour.

Moreover, using Buber's idea of the *I-Thou* in the quest to mend the broken world, one can say that he who lives with *It* alone is not a man. Thus, man needs *I-Thou* relationships, where we communicate with our being rather than with words. *I-Thou* is about mutuality, seeing someone in his or her depth, speaking to the other with your entire being, saying *Thou* with all that you are, standing in present relation, in the here and now – not completely separate, not completely fused, but maintaining enough balance between close and distant; so as to retain a sense of who you are. There is nothing inherently wrong with the desire to make money or obtain power. There is nothing inherently *I-It* in economics and politics, it is the way we live them out. Man's will to profit are fine so long as they are not dominated by *It*. That is why Buber envisions a society (community) in which human beings have a loving responsibility to all other human beings including those they have not met. This is a new sort of community built on absolute encounter with the eternal *Thou*, that is, with God.

It is on this reason that Buber believed that the way forward, away from a domination by *I-It* relation, is to build a community based on members' relation to each other and to God. Thus, pointing out that these communities have existed in the past but gradually their need for continuity in space and time resulted in relating to God as *It*. But if we can build a community based on members' relation to each other and to God, the everyday life becomes holy and divine encounter is involved in every act of daily life. We need to bring the holy into everyday life through building of community and relation with God.

We conclude using a scene display in a popular movie known as "Vikings", a father had a sensitive discussion with his son. They went to a serene place to view the world. During the course of their viewing, the father asked his son; what does he see? The son replied, "power; power of a king". Then his father advised his son that power is dangerous. It attracts the worst and corrupts the best. The father further advised his son that power is only given to those who are prepared to lower themselves, to pick it up. This is so because, when a man lowers himself to the good way of life of his society and has a genuine relationship with people around, he will understand the true meaning of his existence and give solutions to the challenges in the community.

References

- Bown, Matthew C. *Art under Stalin*. New York: Holmes and Meier Publishers, 1991.
- Buber, Martin. *Good and Evil: Two Interpretations*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith and Bullock M. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1952-1997.
- Buber, Martin. *The Knowledge of Man: Selected Essays*. Translated by Maurice Friedman and Ronald Gregor-Smith. New York: Prometheus Books, 1957.
- Buber, Martin. *Between Man and Man*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. New York, Routledge, 1957-2002.
- Buber, Martin. *I and Thou*. Translated by Ronald Gregor Smith. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1958.
- Eboh, Ben O. *Living Issues In Ethics*. Afro-Orbis Publishing Company Limited, 2005.
- Elahi, Manzoor. *Social Contract Theory of Hobbes, Locke and Rousseau*. Published on April, 2013. http://www.academia.edu/3138759/Social_Contract_Theory_by_Hobbes_Locke_and_Rousseau

- F. Copleston, *Arthur Schopenhauer: Philosopher of Pessimism*. London: Barnes and Noble, 1975-1946.
- Kierkegaard, Soren. *The Concept of Irony*. Translated by M. Lee Capel. New York: Buccaneer Books Inc, 1983.
- Kramer, Kenneth and Gawlick Mechthild. *Martin Buber's I and Thou: Practicing Living Dialogue*. New York: Paulist Press, 2003.
- Marcel, Gabriel. *Being and Having: An Existential Diary*. Translated by Peter Smith. Gloucester Press, 1976.
- Marcel, Gabriel. *The Philosophy of Existentialism*. Translated by Manya Harari. New York: Citadel Press, 1995.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Edited and Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Viking Press, 1954a.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Antichrist*. Edited and Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Viking Press, 1954b.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Will to Power*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann and R.J. Hollingdale, New York: Vintage Press, 1968.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Gay Science*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage Press, 1974.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Beyond Good and Evil*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann, New York: Vintage Press, 1996.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Birth of Tragedy*. Edited and Translated by Ronald Speirs. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary*, 8th ed., s.v. "ritual", accessed on January 16, 2025.
- Schopenhauer, Arthur. *On the Sufferings of the World, in the Meaning of Life*. Edited by Elmer D. Klemke. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- Stump, Samuel E. and Fieser James. *Philosophy: History and Problems*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies, 2008.
- Wayne, Lil. *The Purpose of Human Existence*. Published on January 18, 2018. <https://purposeofhumanexistence.wordpress.com/2015/01/26/our-broken-world/>
- Wood, Robert E. *Martin Buber's Ontology: An Analysis of I and Thou*. Northwestern University Press, 1969.
- Wood, James. *Making Things Happen: A Theory of Causal Explanation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.