

COGITATION ON NIETZSCHE FROM DELEUZE POINT OF VIEW

Bledar Kryemadhi, PhD
University of Tirana
Faculty of Social Sciences
Departments of Philosophy
bledikryemadhi@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In this text I will present a deep analyse of the arrival of Nietzsche in Deleuze's philosophy and the interpretation he makes of Nietzsche. I can conclude that Deleuze merges with Nietzsche's philosophy. Therefore I will occasionally use Deleuze's Nietzsche as an argument, because it seems as if Nietzsche is talking about Deleuze. But only in Nietzsche Deleuze he deals in details with the thought of the German philosopher, making his philosophy in a completely original way by renewing Nietzsche and this rebirth that Deleuze makes what is known all over the world. Deleuze interprets Nietzsche without using any kind of scheme. He does not stop calling Nietzsche an atheist or a believer as other authors do, but does his analysis in a way that gives dynamism to Nietzsche's philosophy. He treats the concept of teaching Nietzsche's philosophy as strength, the will to power, the return of life, doing what is conceived in the place you will take in Nietzsche's philosophy. It gives strength a very original sense which is that of the principle of difference in strength. Use Deleuze masterfully giving a Nietzschean implication with Kant where Nietzsche complements Kant's critiques by other means, with the philosophy of meaning and evaluation. For Deleuze the will to power is a synthesis, which means that the synthesis is also a Kantian element where Deleuze takes it back and places it on Nietzsche.

Keywords: Imanenc, thought, concept, assertion, active forces.

INTRODUCTION

In this paper I will analyze the philosophy of Nietzsche from the deleu-ian point of view. The field of study is that of hypermenautics, so I will be able to make an interpretation on the interpretation of the Deleuze. What I will address in this paper is the rebirth of Nietzsche in France. That Deleuze returns to Nietzsche in the 1960s in France. How the Deleuze treats the concepts of Nietzsche as forces, the will of power, eternal return. Deleu's great persistence in moral genealogy, which has been considered by you to be one of Nietzsche's most important works. We understand that the moment Deleuze returned to Nietzsche, France dominated the philosophy of the three hs, Hegel-Hyserl-Heideger. How has it become possible to move from the new generation to that of the three masters of doubt? We will see how Deleuze uses Nietzsche and even more so he becomes Nietzsche just as much as Nietzsche becomes Deleuze. So how do we have some kind of melting, but why does that happen? How can we understand this fusion between these two philosophers? Why the Deleuze opposes Nietzsche's philosophy of Hegel's? Why Hegel was the enemy to be fought? We will also show how the Deleuze with a lot of skill passes through Nietzsche and goes beyond it, like saying one beyond having as under the sleeve Nietzsche.. We need to keep in mind something else because when you get into the philosophy of the Deleuze it is difficult to come up with fixed definitions. But who is the reason for this? Why there is such a difficulty? So what is the place of the German philosopher in the philosophy of the Deleuze. I am not going any further and I am moving further into the following treatment where I will try to give you answers to all the questions I

have raised above. I will try from my point of view provide some key points of this philosophical theory and you are the ones who will make an adequate assessment.

Immanence Plan

We are stopping a little bit at the immanence to analyze because the immanence of saying is also the anxiety of the Deleuze and it is worth noting that he in his last work he wrote entitled "Immanence as much a life.". Even this in some way can be called beyond Nietzsche because the immanence in Nietzsche occupies an important place and although he does not mention it is present in his philosophy, as for example in the extinction of supernatural making man as the center of the world that is inside him and man himself does not process through anything outward. So man is inside. Nietzsche in his work "Thus Spoke Zarathustra " gives us an immanence as his spokesman Zarathustra, fleeing that I am leaving and dying, the soul is mortal just like the body. So we have to think of the interior as not external and the external as non-internal. The immanence plan for Deleuze should not be taken as a concept and we also cannot think of it as something about concepts, like the concept of all other concepts. If "we confuse nothing, it would hinder the concepts of being digested or turned into universal or losing their singularity, then the plan would lose its open nature.". (Deleuze. G. Guattari. F. 2009). So we are given the plan of immanence as a summary of the concepts and that then extends them, directs them. But this plan should in no way be the authority of the concepts. The immanence plan how to say it relates to concepts but does not usurp them, the plan is the one that gives life to the concept, which makes the concept move to this plan. Deleuze gives us an interesting explanation as he says; "Concepts are archipelago or skeletons, with many spine spins than skulls, while the plan is breathing in which these pieces float."(Deleuze. G. Guattari. F. 2009). So to better explain we can say that the concept is just an event, but what is the horizon of events is exactly the plan of immanence. So the concept is simply summarized in the immanence plan and remains in this interior. The plan somehow regulates the concepts, maintains or slightly metaphorically the plan we can simply call it a manager who tries to manage the concepts and then makes the concepts populate the plan. So a little simplified way we can say that the owner brings the goods but always young and the manager manages them without having the right to use the goods. But we should not think of the plan as a method because for the Deleuze the method has a kind of connection with the concepts while the plan is related to the concepts which means that the plan conditions the concept and not conditions the concepts. But also the immanence plan can be seen as the thought plan, but of the new image of thought, to the immanence plan we cannot talk about melting, we have to be careful because as we said if we talk about melting then we will have a destruction of the concept, then we only have exchanges. So we have an endless movement. "In this sense, it is said that thought and being the same and the only thing."(Deleuze. G. Guattari. F. 2009). So that is why the immanence plan has endless movements. The plan is given to us as an opinion and as an internal nature in a single one. So in that sense the immanence plan has moved from both one and the other, this movement as such is endless, what it means is that the plan of immanence is one that never lines never worked and in an even more metaphorical sense never lined up to embroider itself. For the Deleuze, if philosophy is to create concepts, it begins with the creation of concepts, then the plan of immanence must be considered paraphilosophical. But what does the paraphilosophical Deleuze understand?? The Deleuze gives us the plan of immanence as paraphilosophical not in the sense that it existed, "but something that does not exist outside of philosophy.". (Deleuze. G. Guattari. F. 2009) In other words, paraphilosophical as something that lies within the philosophy, which lies before it, as if to say that it stays at its entrance, at the door. So philosophy can be understood as the creation of the concept and the plan of immanence at the same time. Deleuze's immanence plan is just a "chaos and behaves like a

sieve" (Deleuze. G. Guattari. F. 2009). So the plan itself in this case if it is chaos it is necessarily characterized by indeterminate, by infinite speed. Chaos is chaos when there is no static, stagnant state in it.

Chaos is disintegration and what is being undone is exactly order, sustainability or consistency according to the Deleuze. But the immanence plan has its enemies. In the beginning of philosophy, the first philosophers build the plan of immanence just like cutting chaos. But the characters of religion, the priests, or expressed in terms of Nietzsche as the people of boredom, of the instinct of revenge. These priests who have transferred everything, their construction is of the transcendental order.

These priests deny everything by being imposed from the outside, by a higher god. In other words, immanence is the cut of chaos, but it is all inside, while religion is everything outside, religion gives an answer to itself from the outside. "Every time there is a religion there is a transcendence, a vertical that, an imperialist state in heaven or on earth. Whenever there is immanence there is philosophy even though the immanence serves as the agony arena and rivalry." (Deleuze. G. Guattari. F. 2009). So to say only friends raise plans of interest. Friends of your philosophy give us pure immanence. But even here there have been problems because we have still been presented with a masked philosophy. The mask that appears here is the mask of the wise. For the Deleuze Nietzsche, he asked if philosophy could be made without disguise itself in its infancy? So the first philosophers sketched a plan of immanence at infinite speed on both sides, where on the one hand it is "fysis" that complements the being and on the other hand it is "nous" that is how to behave as an image of thought. These two pages that talk about immanence give it endless speed. What worsens immanence is Christian philosophy. The authority of the church or papacy does not allow the immanence to reveal itself but gives it a truncated legitimacy. The Deleuze for this gives us the example of the fountain which although divided in many directions it originates from one point, so the papacy seeks to be the source of the immanence and as such cannot leave the immanence out of inclusion, so these are exactly, as the case of religion that has not left philosophy quiet in its world. Therefore, the Deleuze would make it very clear that "immanence is the weakest point of any philosophy as it takes with it all the dangers that must be faced with philosophy, all the punishments, efforts and denials that philosophy suffers." (Deleuze. G. Guattari. F. 2009) Already the Deleuze really gives us its own concern that for him will be permanent, even immanence as he says is a very serious problem and we can allude that the immanence has been exactly and his most anxiety great. That is why he exposes us and gives us in this way to understand other philosophers differently that the immanence for them constitutes weakness, it is weakness because it is the only place where concepts take life. Philosophy cannot do without an immanence and without concepts, it was precisely the Judeo-Christian religion that denied the Greek logos. Their word took the place of the logos.

But other philosophers have also occasionally attempted to change the immanence by introducing transcendence within it. But for Deleuze only one of them understood exactly what the immanence was, so she belonged to herself, was a plan described by the movements, he was the Spinoza that our philosopher would call the prince of philosophers baptizing him by the name Christ of the philosophers, because the latter makes no compromise with the transcendence. But also Nietzsche has never compromised with transcendence, so he deserves to be represented in immanence. For Deleuze, immanence is not given to consciousness, but consciousness is given to immanence. But we have another problem that is the problem of illusions, which means that immanence is also characterized by illusions and these illusions are its real threat. But that needs to be fixed for the Deleuze, "the list of these illusions would have to

be made, to be measured as Nietzsche did after Spinoz with the list of these big mistakes, but the list is endless." (Deleuze G. Guattari. F. 2009). We see here that Nietzsche widely occupies an important place in the plan of imanimity that goes to my argument. Nietzsche has great merit for the Deleu because he stopped at these illusions and demystified them. But who are the illusions?

We are given four illusions. The first illusion is that of transcendence that everyone else is back. So the trandeca within the immanence. The second is that of the universal which sends us the concepts in the plan, so the universals seek to explain the concepts but forget that they themselves must be explained. The third is the illusion of eternity. Of course, this illusion is very significant and easy to understand, which means that we are dealing with a forgetfulness, the forgetfulness of the creation of concepts.

The fourth is the illusion of discourse. This illusion does not distinguish the assertion from the concept, and in other words these illusions slander us in the destruction of immanence by making it empty and at the same time giving immanence a dualistic nature. It was Nietzsche who refused to compromise with any kind of dualism, but tried to give life what belonged to him, the dionysiac as such. We stand in front of a choice between transcendence and chaos where transcendence leads us to the outside world as the immanence puts us inside. Thought in this case cannot escape the interpretation of the immanence plan. But in this case the thought of how much he enters to think of the other, the other is beyond. Thought as the subject of the reflection of an beyond, this is where trandeca fatally comes into play. So here we have found the weakest point of the Deleu that means that this thought can come into play even with an beyond, it cannot stop it so the immanence is also the anxiety of the Deleu. But he again calls for help, Nietzsche said: "Nietzsche made it clear. Thought is creation, not the will of truth. And if there is no will of truth other than what the classical image of thought proclaimed, this is because thought is merely an opportunity of thinking but also the all-time impossibility that a thinker capable of thinking can tell me, what they have to do with the thought of being able to think. (Deleuze. G. Guattari. F. 2009). So thought must be conceived precisely as creation and only then can we think of an imanim plan. Thought only as such serves itself and in the opposite case as for example when it is the will of truth or when thought seeks to revolve around as an opinion that has lost its own opinion. So for Deleuze the thought must be characterized by this element.

Those philosophers when analyzing another philosophy and not giving us innovation in concepts do not need philosophy, so to philosophize must produce concepts, not to give us their history, philosophy is to make and not an order of systems.

A genuine interest plan that comes in to think about should be such. But it does not enter, "we can say that the plan of immanence is at the same time what needs to be thought and what cannot be thought, the plan is the thoughtless part of the thought. But that plan, which is the basis of any plan, fails to be thought of by them, it is more intimate. (Delevated. G. Guattari. F. 2009). So from this passage how to tell us the idea that the plan should think both outside and inside it. But how to think the interior not as external and external not as internal. Here we must not forget the uplift that Deleuze does to Spinoz by calling him the most accomplished of the philosophers because the latter built a pure imanim plan that, as it were, is not given to the transheder and is not transferred. Also this plan that Spinoza thought aroused less illusions, or he did not at all evoke negative or erroneous perceptions.

I saw fit to briefly address conceptual characters because they relate to the immanence plan. Furthermore I am referring to Deleuze as he says; “conceptual characters and the immanence plan presuppose each other. Sometimes it seems that the character precedes the plan and sometimes he seems to follow it because he appears twice, intervening twice. On the one hand it sinks into the chaos from which it draws definitions in which it forms diagrammatic treatments of an immanence plan, do you say that it extorts a handful of chaos-rassiness to throw on the table. On the other hand, every envelope that falls connects the intensive treatments of a concept that occupies this or that region of the table, do you say that the latter was taken according to figures.

With these personal treatments, the conceptual character intervenes in the chaos and diagrammatic treatments of the immanence plan, but also between the plan and the intensive treatments of the concepts that come to populate it. (Deleuze. G. Guattari. F. 2009). So conceptual characters interfere with the plan of immanence, perform movements that describe it, and most importantly interfere with the creation of its concepts. So these conceptual characters whom Deleuze shares in sympathy antipathetic goats, sympathetic characters represent the author and antipathetic characters represent other philosophers to whom the author is critical. Characters matter to the philosopher because they give him the opportunity to build his own philosophy. For example, we have the Socrates of Plato, Dionisin, Zarathustra, the antiquity of Nietzsche, the idiot of the Qur'an. For the Deleuze people thought that Nietzsche gave up concepts but he created strong and intense concepts. As are "forces", "doing", "life" and "value" and of course antipathetic concepts, disgusting such as "killing of conscience", "Christ of revenge", "worthy", etc. It is to this extent that Nietzsche undertakes to build the plan of immanence with his endless movements of willpower and eternal return that in some way he shakes the image of thought. But for Deleuze it is difficult to understand the characters in him because they are complicated. I will try to quote Deleuze to more clearly understand the world of conceptual character implication in Nietzsche. "It is true that their manifestation in itself evokes two meanings, which makes many readers consider Nietzsche as a poet, miraculous or mythical creator. But conceptual characters in Nietzsche and elsewhere are not mythical personifications, nor historical persons, much less literary or Roman heroes. Nietzsche's vision is as much a myth as Plato's Socrates is of history. To become is not to be and Dionysus becomes a philosopher at the same time that Nietzsche becomes Dionis. (Deleuze. G. Guattari. F. 2009).

So from this passage we read we see that we are dealing with a fusion of the conceptual character with the philosopher, how to say philosophy not only melts but also becomes the character himself, which means that he becomes the conceptual character to understand what he has created. . In Nietzsche, for example, the latter becomes Dionis to understand Dionis and at the same time Dionysus becomes a philosopher to understand philosophy. But here he must understand another very important idea of the Deleuze that is that of the difference between conceptual characters and aesthetic figures. So for Deleuze the conceptual characters are the power of the concept, while the aesthetic figures as it were to say they also have the power but power of affects and perceptions. "The former act on an immanence plan that is an image of thought-provinces (noumen), the second on the composition plan as an image of the university (phenomena)". (Deleuze. G. Guattari. F. 2009). These two comparisons bring us art and philosophy where art in a way or a titer thinks and is not that it thinks less than philosophy but that it thinks through affect and perceptions, while philosophy thinks through the plan of immanence and cones. But for Deleuze these two plans, that of composition in art and that of immanence in philosophy, slip into each other. How to understand this?

A plan can be conquered by the elements of another in such a way that the thinker can create a new image of thought, create an imanim plan and not populate it with concepts but with other entities such as novel, poetic, music, etc. The opposite can also happen that a composition plan is populated with conceptual characters, with concepts. These thinkers for Deleuze are called half philosophers but at the same time are more than philosophers. For example, like Helderlin, Klajst, Mallarmé, Kafka, etc. (Nietzsche. F. 1984)

So these two plans can exchange their entities and in this case what is produced is more than philosophy. A synthesis of art and philosophy gives us one more than philosophy. therefore it takes a crossroads of art with philosophy and for the Deleuze those who do not make this intersection are geniuses that behave and settle in eternal tricks. (Stumpf. S. E 2010).

For the Deleuze, conceptual characters in collaboration with the immanence plan create thought events or his treatments. We have some treatments. The first is that of the relationship where the friend who connects relationships with other friends enters. The second is that of dynamics which means climbing and going down. This gives flexible traces to conceptual characters. Such dynamics cannot be reduced in each other. We also have the legal form which means that the opinion never ends up looking for what belongs to him. It demands its own right. But Deleuze also gives us an existential betrayal. The most important in this trauma is Nietzsche, as according to him philosophy invents ways of existence or life opportunities. These treatments characterize the conceptual perfections that in collaboration with immanence give life to their purpose. The Deleuze concludes how to summarize the role of philosophy. He states that; "The philosophy presents three elements, where and why each responds to the other two should be considered in itself: the philosophical plan she should sketch (imanim) the character or pro-philosophical characters she has to invent and make live (insistence) philosophical concepts that it must create (consistency) sketch, inventor, create, this is philosophical trinity. (Deleuze G. Guattari. F. 2009). So the Deleuze ultimately gives us the role of philosophy, it is these tasks that philosophy must exercise. Philosophy should not go and look for things that do not belong to you and deal with things that do not give pleasure.

Concepts are created and what gives them power is taste. Therefore for Deleuze, the one who felt the creation of concepts with pure philosophical taste was exactly Nietzsche.

How to say the creation of the concept requires no reason, but it is instinctive, its creation occurs from a taste, from an apology. Therefore Nietzsche through this sensory instinct managed to leave traces in his works. So Nietzsche created the concepts and faced them with problems, then these concepts directed the problems towards solutions. It is clear that the Deleuze attaches importance to the creation of concepts that come as a result of taste because they are like saying a priori and give a nice correlation of philosophy. Those concepts that do not face the problem, that do not want to solve the problem or do not participate in the solution of a problem should be removed from circulation, because these empty concepts together with the conceptual characters are left simply in the treatment of opinions. This is the low philosophical taste. The Deleuze explains quite well the decline in concepts in opinions, as he says: "but we are with the highest dialectical ambitions, be in the presence of the gene of the greatest dialectics, we fall anyway in the most miserable conditions, what Nietzsche diagnoses as the art of plebula or bad taste. In philosophy the reduction of the concept in assertion that are merely opinions, absorbing the plan of immanence in false meetings and in bad feelings (the illusions of transcendence or universal) the model of a knowledge that claims to be only superior opinion, urdoxa, replacing conceptual characters with professors and school bosses. Dialectics claims to find a pure philosophical discourse but cannot do anything but establish

one after the other opinions. (Deleuze G. Guattari. F. 2009). So to say dialectic no longer solves problems, it remains simply in the realm of opinion, as we have said that the Deleuze is always attacked against dialectics does so by having one not even under the sleeve, Nietzsche, and here we see it seems as if Nietzsche tells us that dialectics is the art of plebe, of low feelings.

Image of thought

I found it reasonable to give a little more image of thought. So I am dedicating a few pages to this paper as the image of thought is like saying through and beyond Nietzsche. In his masterpiece "Dance and Repetition" he gives us the image of thought by dedicating it to the trecherek of pages. Of course the image of the thought in Deleuze is very broad and I want to say that its treatment is a separate topic. But I will briefly stop the Deleuze, initially announcing this image of thought precisely in the works on Nietzsche. For Deleuze the one who gives us a new image of thought was Nietzsche. (Deleuze. G. 2002).

I am now dwelling on a quote from him to understand what was the dogmatic image of thought that defined and determined the world of imagination. Deleuze says; "The world of imagination is this, as it was said, the imagination is defined by several elements. Identity in concept, opposition to defining the concept, analogy to judgment, similarity in object. (Deleuze. G. 1997). So the four roots of the world as imagination, each of these is specific, each of them reflects the other. The identity of the concept conditions the form of the same in the re-recognition. Defining the concept implies comparing sermons based on opposite sermons. So in a double sense of regression-progressive described on one side by memory and on the other by an imagination that how to say it only aims to recreate it. The analogy is clearly established on the highest concepts of definition either on the reports of unspecified concepts in relation to respective objects. So this analogy sends us to the resemblance as the continuum of perception. I think it is the most general principle of any imagination. Everything I know, I perceive must be in one way or another determined by the same consciousness.

Also Deleuze in his work on Kantin gives us an explanation about the importance of imagination and how we can define it. "What is important in the imagination is the prefixion for-fiction implies the active recovery of what is presented, ie the activity and the unit that are distinguished by passivity and sensitivity related to the sensitivity in the veneers. From this point of view we do not need to define recognition as the synthesis of implications.

It is self-imaging that is defined as recognition, that is, as the synthesis of what is presented. (Deleuze. G. 2009). So to say in this philosophy which is called the philosophy of imagination implies a sedentary division where thought is subject to the authority of the principle of identity. But we find the note in this statement in the prefix for the word imagination. So every single current face like saying we have to convey that this face is re-conditioned through a re-recognition as the same. So in this philosophy we have nothing but a reincarnation of learning, a recollection. How to run away and come back is to come back.

But who escapes this rationalism.?, the one that saves them is exactly the difference. So we need to think of a difference outside the framework of the four elements of the world of imagination. A distinction within the concept and a distinction between concepts, because only in this way does identity be destroyed, it is destroyed because the difference is repeated. I am trying to give an example of how difference changes or how to understand this difference. For example if we put something on a scale it will show us the mass and so whenever we put something in it it changes the mass constantly. So the difference changes, it repeats, which means we don't have the same, we don't have an identity.

CONCLUSIONS

What is most difficult in this paper is to give conclusions or to conclude it. However, I am trying to give an overall opinion based on my studies. I will also give any possible criticism of the Deleuze regarding Nietzsche. But of course it is a modest, more benevolent critique.

As it was said, the volcano is what it wants and strength is what it can. So how to say the will finds in strength the opportunity and the strength finds in the will what it needs. Also Deleuze goes to a transcendental empiricism and that is the conception of that you fall with thought. To the will to power enables eternal return and to eternal return he gives us a clear interpretation saying that eternal return should not be understood as the return of the identical, of the same, because that would be wrong. So eternal return is heterogeneous, not homogeneous, and cannot be understood as the return of the same. For the Deleuze, eternal return is a centrifugal force rotating in a spiral shape, those that resist this force and come out will constitute eternal return, those that will come out will be strong forces, active forces. So eternal return enables us superhuman, the latter has nothing human. Also the force is not physical in Nietzsche, but is ontological, so the force is invisible to the visible. In another conclusion we draw from this treatment is the opposition to Hegel's philosophy. Deleuze thinks that Nietzsche has known Hegel, and in all the affirmative philosophy that characterizes Nietzsche, you can directly oppose that Hegelian who is denying it. For Deleuze Nietzsche he criticized German philosophy as it was a dialectical philosophy and in this sense Deleuze finds in Nietzsche what he needed to overthrow Hegel. He goes to the slave and the lord. Slave begins with his denial saying; you are bad and I am good. As the gentleman says; I am good and you are bad. Here Deleuze thinks that dialectic no longer drinks water as the gentleman does not oppose the slave but simply asserts himself, so how to say we have the assertion of the assertion that does not imply any kind of denial. The master differs from the slave. He is not interested in the slave and does not deal with him at all, he simply proclaims his nature. From my point of view, I can criticize the Deleuze after using the works after Nietzsche's death to interpret it, and this complicates the matter as we know that the works after death have also had forgeries. But I also disagree with Deleuze that you want to give Nietzsche an ontology, so include a metaphysics on Nietzsche. At this point Nietzsche has made it very clear that it was for overcoming any metaphysics and has never used the word being but only man. These are the conclusions I have drawn and of course I have simply analyzed while these conclusions have come as a result of my analysis. But we have to be careful because that doesn't assume these are true but a personal thought based on my individual studies.

REFERENCES

- Deleuze. G. Guattari. F. "What is philosophy?" Publications. Zenith. Tirana 2009
Deleuze. G. "Kant's Critical Philosophy (Faculty Doctrine)". Publications. Zenith. Tirana 2009
Deleuze. G. "Nietzsche and philosophy". Publications. Einaudi. Turin 2002
Deleuze. G. "Differenza e ripetizione". Publications. Raffaello Cortina. Milan 1997
Nietzsche. F. "Genealogia della morale". Publications. Adelphi. Milan 1984
Nietzsche. F. "Thus spake Zarathustra." Phoenix Publications. Tirana 2001
Stumpf. S. E. "Philosophy, history and problems". Publications. Toena. Tirana 2010
Santagata. M. "Storia della filosofia". Publications. Cirena and Ferrara. Milan 2000