# Discovering and Listing of Elements of Deleuze's Philosophy of Immanence as a Research Approach

Farhad Bamdad, Yahya Ghaedi*, Saeid Zarghami-Hamrah, Mehran Farajollahi

*Abstract--- Philosophy of immanence is one of the two major currents of post-structuralist philosophy in France. This philosophy in its Deleuzian approach encounters with phenomena in a way that on the basis of which one can discuss the problem of knowledge without leading oneself outside the phenomenal world or any other type of transcendence. The problem of present study is that although Deleuze like other poststructuralists has not formulated and enumerated the elements of his own philosophical approach, since this approach struggles to find an answer from inside to the problem without any transcendence and this can also be seen in the thought of Deleuze, one can make efforts towards the discovery of a research approach based on his thought. Accordingly, this essay is devoted to the study of Deleuze's philosophy and its foundations through the examination of the background and short history of the philosophy of immanence from the point of view of his definition of major philosophical disciplines (ontology and epistemology) and his work on other philosophers (Spinoza, Kant, Hume and Nietzsche). Then, having studied the nature of philosophical research, it seeks to show that we can search for such elements as research approach based on Deleuzian thought. Finally, it will be focused on the discovery and enumeration of the elements of Deleuze's research approach. The authors have found four elements through which one can conduct a research: 1. Autarky of a phenomenon, 2. Univocity of a phenomenon, 3. Cognition of a phenomenon based on radical empiricism and 4. Restricted Creativity.*

*Keywords--- Philosophy of Immanence, Gilles Deleuze, Research Approach.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Agamben divides French poststructuralist philosophy into two branches: "Philosophy of Transcendence" led by Levinas and Derrida and "Philosophy of Immanence" led by Foucault and Gilles Deleuze (Smith, 2012: 271). Among the two key figures in philosophy of immanence, Foucault is mostly reminded due to his method of archaeology and geneaology but Gilles Deleuze clearly describes himself and his method and approach to philosophy as "Immanence" (Stranford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2012). As to his philosophical project, Deleuze repeatedly noted that philosophy is possible only when it avoids all types of transcendence based on any justification and returns to immanence: "Deleuze frequently insisted that one can philosophize only when the philosophy nears itself to the immanent conditions on which it seeks to think; in other words, if philosophy wants to have a real power, it should not proceed to creat transcendent orders rather instead it must move forward through creation and be focused on the results" (Raaf, 2009). Deleuze believed that every type of transcendence would distract the thought from working and concentration on the main problem. His proposal

*Farhad Bamdad, Phd student of Philosophy of Education, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran.*
*Dr. Yahya Ghaedi, Associate professor, Department of Philosophy of Education, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran. (**Corresponding Author**),*
*Dr. Saeid Zarghami-Hamrah, Associate professor, Department of Philosophy of Education, Kharazmi University, Tehran, Iran.*
*Dr. Mehran Farajollahi, Professor in Education, Education Department, Payame-Noor University, Tehran, Iran.*

for a direct confrontation is going inside the problem/difficulty/world and staying in it. According to Deleuze, any movement towards the beyond, above, other world and symbol would turn thought impure and mislead it. Thus, pure philosophy is possible only when it becomes immanent inside the world of phenomenon. The main doctrine of philosophy of immanence is staying inside and keeping oneself away from the beyond while in most cultures, as Deleuze argues, the main and dominant approach in confrontation with the phenomena is movement towards beyond/ above/ and meaning or as Deleuze calls it, "Transcendence" (struggle for finding the answers from outside). Then, he offers an alternative before this latter approach. This alternative is "Immanence". Accordingly, despite the value, significance and validity that transcendent methods have, one can list the elements of Deleuze's philosophy of immanence as the essence of an alternative research approach to the phenomena that would add to the scope of questions, analyses and answers that move from the inside towards the outside not from the latter towards the former. The present essay is an effort for providing an overall picture of those parts of Deleuzian philosophy that would lead us to the discovering and listing the constitutive elements of an alternative research approach suggested by a poststructuralist philosopher. To this end, we begin with the context and short history of the philosophy of immanence that grounds Deleuze's thought, and then we proceed to discuss those aspects of Deleuzian philosophy of immanence and as a final stage, we discover and list its elements.

## II. METHOD:

This study is qualitative and based on descriptive-analytic method and an explorative research. Descriptive-analytic method is itself of several types. This study lies within the domain of fundamental-applied studies. That part of the study that seeks to deeply delve into Deleuze's philosophy of immanence represents the fundamental aspect of the essay while the listing of the elements of Deleuzian philosophy of Immanence as a research approach stands for its applied part. Since Deleuze as a poststructuralist philosopher has not himself list these elements, we will conduct an explorative study on his works. In this study the subject-matter will be addressed from a different angle and horizon so that through its examinations, different aspects of the subject are revealed. One of the main ways of explorative research is the search through the literature (Thornhill, Saunders, Lewis, 2005: 139-140). After explorative assessment of the literature, the approach, constituents and hidden elements of it will be discovered and listed.

### 2- Context of Philosophy of Immanence:

Ernest Cassirer believes that the Age of Enlightenment and its particular philosophy represents the first period of formation of the context of philosophy of immanence, because it was in this era that many efforts made for delivering the reason from all bondages and retaining its independence. In this way, knowledge lies within the territory of reason and it no longer needs any transcendent being or force (Cassirer, 2009: 9). Process of enlightenment occurs in two domains: firstly, in the domain of public life of humans, through the expansion of rationality and fight with superstitions and secondly, in the special domain of philosophy via the philosophical creation. We will discuss both domains.

### 2-1- Public Context of Age of Enlightenment for Philosophy of Immanence:

Enlightenment took action in both domains of public and philosophical life. The most important action taken towards the enlightenment of public minds was the publication of "Systematic Dictionary of the Sciences, Arts and Crafts" by Diderot and his fellows whose two important ideas can be seen in two sentences by Voltair as Horkheimer suggests: "O' Philosopher! Exact observation of physical experiences, professions and industry is the true philosophy … and superstition puts the whole universe on fire and philosophy kills the flames of this fire" (Horkheimer, 1996). These two sentences by Voltair would appear to be exaggeration, because nor philosophy can be reduced only to observation of empirical sciences

nor philosophy alone can eradicate superstition from the world. Anyway the fundamental idea of Enlightenment in the public domain lies in these two sentences: i.e. demystification of universe which is closely related to the very foundation of the immanence approach (i.e. elimination of mediators).

Man has lived most part of the history within the grips of the dominant force of nature and in front of his inability and ignorance before the diseases, natural hazards, death and war, he created stories of the myth of creation. As a result, instead of movement towards the events and search for their reasons and causes, he created different rituals for confrontation with them. This general behavior and method that expanded into different domains of public life led to an extensive transcendence that sought for the basis and origin of every phenomenon somewhere outside this world ranging from Platonic sphere of ideas in philosophy to the demons and dragons that were considered to be the source of famine (Curtis, 2014: 16). The program of Enlightenment before this method was demystification of universe and eradiction of myths and replacing them with the scientific knowledge instead of hallucination so that by its help man can deliver himself from the bondage of fear and secure the pillars of his own supremacy (Horkheimer, Adorno, 2002: 1). The natural and logical result of this program was turning from the transcendence towards the immanence, because this would return us from the outside into inside. The man who replaces the scientific knowledge with illusion and keeps himself away from mythology consciously or unconsciously enters the domain of philosophy of immanence.

As to Voltair and his fellow thinkers, Horkheimer argues that one cannot be simultaneously a follower of empiricism in epistemology and follow Leibniz in ethics as these two are in conflict (Horkheimer, 1996). As a result, Enlightenment and Modernism move from myth towards science and replacing reason with every type of imagination and transcendent inspiration and this is indeed sowing the seed of immanence in the land of human thought (scientific, political, cultural and philosophical) that will grow later (in Ninteenth and Twentieth centuries) and flourish. But the particular scene was set by Enlightenment for the philosophy of immanence in the world of philosophy to which we will turn later in this essay.

2-2- **Special Context of Age of Enlightenment for Philosophy of Immanence**:

Michel Foucault regards Kant as the creator of two philosophical questions in the Age of Enlightenment which had not been either asked so far as a whole or it was not broached as precise as Kant did. These two key questions that paved the path for the continuation of history (in the eyes of Foucault) are as follows: first, "what is true knowledge and in which conditions does it occur?), second, "what is our now (present) and where is the limit of possible experiences?" (Foucault, 1986).

First question – i.e. what is true knowledge and in which conditions does it occur? Before Kant, philosophers sought to reach the true knowledge and wrote works on the nature of truth and the way through which one can acquire knowledge of it. But Kant in a wonderful turn tried to answer the question: what is human knowledge and what is its limit and in what human knowledge is rooted?

To answer this question, Kant overthrew the early dominant philosophical presupposition in the domain of epistemology. Before Kant, it was thought that human knowledge is overlapped with the quality of objects. But he overturned this notion and argued that we know the phenomena in a form that is consistent with our epistemic capability (Naqibzadeh, 2019: 158). This proposition is a turn that leads us from outside back into inside and staying at its border which we will discuss further in upcoming sections.

Second question – what is our now (present) time and where is the limit of possible experiences? As Foucault suggests, before Kant, philosophers were strange to the "now-ness" and struggled to know the end of history and preferred to move towards the eternal truth. But Kant broke this tradition (Foucault, 1986). In part of his philosophical work entitled "The Contest of Faculties" (1978), he discusses in a series of essays, the relations between the faculties that build the

university. For example, second essay of this series deals with the conflict between faculties of philosophy and law. To establish the relationship between philosophy and law, Kant proceeds to answer the question: what is progress? (Foucault, 1986). The most important answer given to this latter question till that time was the following: one cannot study the progress and development of mankind in the course of history in vacuum rather one needs first to know what is progress? After answering this question, we can return to history and having the events before one's eyes and examine them according to the notion of progress and see whether these events serve as signs of a progress or not? To this end, the signs of progress should have occurred through the past events. In present events, this sign is also occurring and they allow us to conclude that these signs of progress also occur in future.

Perhaps Kant's present method appears to be self-evident but as Foucault suggests, in those times, it would have emerged as wonderful. For Kant made the problem worldly in order to assay a worldly phenomenon (human progress) and by keeping himself away from every type of transcendent analysis and presupposition, he limited the scope of his research to this world and its border, i.e. human experience in the course of history. Regardless of his answer to the aforementioned question, he established an immanent method for assaying the questions of man in this world and he unduly laid the foundations of the immanence philosophy that culminated later in Deleuze.

### 3- **Philosophy of Deleuze**:

Mark Rolli divides the extensive works of Deleuze into two types: first, the works that were authored based on the explorations in the long history of philosophy and philosophers (Spinoza, Hume, Kant, Nietzsche and Bergson) and its branches (ontology, epistemology, aesthetics) and second, the works that aimed at the expansion and creation of philosophical notions (Rolli, 2004). In the first group of works, Deleuze studies the history of philosophy, its branches and philosophers so that by showing the distance or nearness of their ideas to his own philosophy he would proceed to formulate his own immanent approach. In other words, in his study of history of philosophy and philosophers, Deleuze is not an onlooker away from an orientation who only beholds and provides reports. Rather Deleuze journeys through history of philosophy in order to both lay a ground for his own particular approach and reveal it by showing the distance or nearness of the ideas to those of his own. On the other hand, in the second group of works, Deleuze has directly created philosophical notions, e.g. immanence approach, rhizomatic approach and control society. As a result, to have a precise and correct understanding of Deleuzian philosophy of immanence and its elements, we will need to study works from boh groups.

### 3-1- **Branches of Deleuze's Philosophy**:

At first sight, it seems that speaking of a systematic ontology and epistemology for a philosopher like Deleuze is an impossible task or needs a maximal reduction but such great Deleuze schlars as Clair Kolbrook (2008), Michael Hardt (2014) and Reedar Dave (2017), each one in part of their works on Deleuze have offered a typology of his philosophy. This has become possible due to one of the philosophical features of Deleuze that distinguishes him from his contemporaries in continental philosophy, i.e. philosophical integrity due to his many works on history of philosophy and philosophers (though his ideas and views are disperse and extensive). This makes it possible to recognize the ontology and epistemology through his thoughts.

### 3-1-1- **Deleuze's Ontology**:

Deleuze argues that philosophy for him is combined with ontology while the latter is also combined with univocity (Deleuze, 1990: 179). To have a better understanding of what Deleuze refers to as univocity and founds his own ontology

based on it, first we should shortly contemplate on other ontological visions of western philosophy. There are two dominant ontological perspectives in western thought:

First, multivocity or diversity the most important current in which is dualism. Some thinkers believe that the history of western thought has been dualistic since the past until this day. Thus, this idea not only dominates philosophy rather culture, politics and other domains of human sciences (Walker, 1990). According to this perspective, universe is made of separated roots. For example, root of being of God or creator is different from the existential foundation of the creatures (this is to say that there is no common point between the being of the creator and the creature). This perspective started with Plato and his sphere of ideas and culminated in Descartes. This perspective not only promoted the ontological diversity rather it considered the creatures in terms of dualism (e.g. dualism of body and mind in man). Natural result of this perspective is leaving the immanence behind and moving towards beyond. For one cannot speak of mutivocal and diverse being unless one speaks of diverse universes too: sensory world, intelligible world, ephemeral world, immortal world and so on and so forth.

Second perspective is analogy versus multivocity which in the eyes of the Christian Orthodoxy suffered a fundamental problem. Multivocity allocated an independent being for something other than the Creator. As a result, in contradiction with this view, they spoke of analogic perspective defended by Acquinas. According to this perspective, there is a similarity between the being of the Creator and the creature but this similarity is not of one type (T. Angeles, 2016). To put it otherwise, there is only one authentic being and it is the Creator, but it is not so that the being of the creatures is diametrically different from this divine type. Rather this latter is an analogy of the former by consideration of which one can reach the true and authentic being. Before these two perspectives, Spinoza speaks of a third perspective which is referred to as univocity. Deleuze borrows this ontological perspective from Spinoza with one difference to which we will refer later. According to Spinoza, there is only one genuine being (God) that is for-itself and whatever else but it is from it. Based on this perspective, one can provide a univocal and integrated perspective of being and put everything into one world but this was not sufficient for the immanence pursued by Deleuze, because by speaking of the true and eternal substance, we still speak of something beyond this world that Deleuze refuses to accept it. Deleuze was after an immanent ontological perspective in which no meta-narrative element like true substance is involved (Smith, 2001). According to Deleuze, Spinoza has take a great step towards immanent ontology but he has not succeeded to leave the circle of theological ontology and by speaking of the true substance he has retained his close tie with analogical ontology while Deleuze's immanent approach is pure without any deficiency. Deleuze speaks of univocal being by eradicating the idea of true substance the result of which is the continuous difference. In other words, being for Deleuze is without cause and external effect and all types of eternal, pure and true substance. According to Deleuze, being has always existed and exists without any creator and transcendent cause. In this part, Deleuze reminds the idea of "Eternal Return of the Same" and argues: "World is a wheel with an eternal circle. Whatever is and occurs has been for several times and will continue to be" (Naqibzadeh, 2011: 147). But if this was a circle associated with continuous repetition for Nietzsche, it was continuously renewing for Deleuze. The true principle of existence is its integrity or univocity in a continuous world while on the other hand, due to the lack of any transcendent entity that brings unity to the entities in this universe, these entities are always becoming and different from each other. In other words, Deleuze endorses Nietzsche's idea of repeated circle but the frequency of which Deleuze speaks differs from the repetition to which Nietzsche refers. Neitzsche believed both in the repetition of circle and in what is repeated within it. But Deleuze takes a further step and states that the circle is repeated but what happens in every circle is renewed in a continuous way and is different from before and after of itself. For Deleuze, universe is like a sea in which every second a wave appears and disappears. This circle of appearance and disappearance of wave has always been and will continue to be. This is the repetition section in which Deleuze agrees with

Neitzsche, but as the cycle of construction of waves is repeated and the waves are so similar to each other but every wave has its own particular feature that separates it from other waves and builds a different existence for it. Continuous and integrated sea of infinite different waves is constructed. Deleuze refers to this paradoxical ontology based on simultaneous integrity and diversity that becomes possible by leaving Spinoza and Nietzsche behind as pluralism=monism (Deleuze, Guattari, 2005: 20). Accordingly, being is plural and diverse, on the one hand, due to difference and distinction, and on the other hand, due to the unity of all beings in terms of having the same root and its repeated cycle is monistic. As a result, in Deleuze's ontology, being is fully in immanent form without any further cause, reason, force, substance and transcendence. Whatever is exists in this world in a continuous and integrated form and will be and it is continuously renewing despite its difference.

3-1-2- **Deleuzian Epistemology**:

Deleuze founds his own epistemological perspective on Hume's ideas (empiricism) and Kant (role of subject in knowledge). In this regard, we have to take two points into account: Firstly, Deleuze calls himself a philosopher of immanence and although two views of Hume and Kant are very close in epistemology to the immanence approach, they do not turn into a pure immanent approach neither one by one nor in an integrated form. Secondly, Deleuze believes that philosopher's task is creation more than anything else particularly the creation of concepts. Then, in no single part of philosophy, Deleuze has not sufficed to imitation of the past masters rather he has sought to add something to their thoughts by making pure immanence via creation of something. To know the world, Deleuze was searching for a perspective that fully lies within the horizon of the world itself and frees him from the need for every transcendent idea. This was indeed exactly what was done by Hume. Although the empiricists before Hume (i.e. Locke and Berkeley) have taken effective steps towards the construction and expansion of the epistemological perspective based on experience and sense, they had not completely separated themselves from metaphysics and believed in a minimalistic metaphysics in the domain of knowledge (Copleston, 1994: 258). This division occurred in Hume. As to knowledge, Hume has a general proposition. This latter proposition is that human knowledge takes place via sense and experience. He calls the whole content of human mind "perceptions" and divides them into two general groups of "impressions" and "notions". Impressions are acquired through direct sensory experience while the notions are made by mediated sensory experience. For example, what man experiences in his encounter with a sea in the same moment via the sense of vision and the picture of which appears on the mind later is reminded in a diluted form. Accordingly, every notion is acquired based on an impression which is itself a product of a sensory experience (ibid, 1994: 263). Thus, Hume believes that the whole domain of metaphysics lies outside the possibility and capability of human knowledge, because to know every phenomenon, one should first reach an impression of a phenomenon by means of one of the senses of vision, hearing, smell, taste or touch so that in next step, its notion is made. Hume's idea set the border of human knowledge near the circle of his senses and whatever was not possible to be experienced via the Five Senses (e.g. incorporeal soul) was left outside the circle of knowledge. But this idea was distant from Deleuze's pure immanence for two reasons: first, it did not consider the role of the subject in this course, or to put it otherwise, the subject in the course of knowledge is passive and not active, secondly, in similar conditions of experience, different subjects undergo through the same course and this shows the generality of the experience. On the other hand, Kant considered the sensory experience to pave the path for knowledge but he believed that this context does not constitute the science of human knowledge: "It has always been supposed that our knowledge is correspondent to the quality of things; in other words, knowledge reflects the features of the thing that we know. Kant reverses this thesis: we know things in a way that is in line with our epistemic capabilities" (Naqibzadeh, 2015: 158). It is these capabilities of human mind and its borders (time-space) that formulate these sensory fields and constitute human

general-required knowledge. In other words, sensory experience provides the ground for the knowledge of phenomenon but what constitutes human knowledge of phenomenon is the passage of sensory experience through the filter of human mind, its capabilities and borders, i.e. action of the subject, that leads to the appearance of a phenomenon in mind (not like the English empiricists who insist on the passive reflection of phenomenon).

Accordingly, to construct pure epistemology based on the two aforementioned points (making up the deficiency of the views of Hume and Kant based on the ideas of immanence and creation), Deleuze pioneers a conceptual creation according to which he explains his own epistemological perspective: "When we are able to speak of the process of immanence, immanence is no longer immanent in anything but the immanence itself. This process would be the fundamental empiricism" (Deleuze, Guatteri, 1994: 47). Now we need to see what Deleuze means by fundamental empiricism (or as he sometimes calls it, superior empiricism). Deleuze in his confrontation with these two perspectives was partly sympathetic and seeks to make this an integrated part of the immanence approach while he leaves the universalist part aside.

The universality or generality of experience requires the transcendent force that before the occurrence of experience has unified it in all expiencers. Aside from discussing the origin of this force (e.g. Kant) or due to its lying outside the circle of sensory experience passing it in silence (e.g. Hume), no one of these ideas is convicing for Deleuze due to their transcendence. Deleuze clearly defines his stance as to every type of universal affair and issue (e.g. creator, Cause of causes, assimilating transcendence) and argues that in his eyes, no universal idea and thought is possible unless the constitutive content of it is already manipulated (Deleuze, 1991: 77). Thus, he chooses that part of the epistemological ideas of Hume and Kant that does not lead to any universal idea and by combining them he makes his own epistemological perspective. In his confrontation with Hume who believed that human knowledge is a reflection of the sensory experience and thus is passive, Deleuze accepts the beginning of knowledge from experience but he refutes the the passivity of experience and its universality. On the other hand, in his encounter with Kant who considered sensory experience as something that lays the ground for knowledge and not its constitutive, he insists on human min and its capabilities as the source of epistemic forms. He chooses the part that underlines the activity and role of mind as the knowing subject and leaves the universal part of knowledge aside. He was struggling after pure immanence, i.e. a refined perspective in which there is no droplet of any transcendent view, an proposes his fundamental empiricism which is a unique and concrete perspective before universal empiricism (Hume) and abstract knowledge of the subject (Kant) (Mullarkey, 2006, p. 14). Accordingly, one can divide Deleuze's epistemology into three parts: first part as borrowed from Hume (beginning every knowledge from sensory experience), second part is borrowed from Kant (formation of sensory experience by mediation of mind and not merely its reflection) and the third part is what he has himself created (insistence on unity and uniqueness of knowledge for every subject and not its universality and abstractness). Earlier in this essay we spoke of the first and second part, now we proceed to deal with the third part.

Deleuze believed that every perception although beginning from a sensory experience and is formulated by the mediation of the mind of subject, it is not still so that the sense and mind to act in an all passive way. In other words, it is not so that sense and knowing mind act without any affection from the object and his conditions rather the act of knowing is a combination of sensory experience (Hume), formulation of mind (Kant) and conditions of the knower (subject) (his creation). According to Deleuze, knowledge and experience are not aimed at finding universals and eternal truths (Deleuze, Parnet, 2007, p. vii). Rather it consists of finding the qualities that occur in the phenomena and the new knowledge and this is what Deleuze refers to as the pure and fundamental empiricism, i.e. a pure experience inside the subject.

### 3-2- **Definition of Philosophy from a Deleuzian Perspective**:

To offer his own pure definition of philosophy, Deleuze first reveals its negative aspect: philosophy is not becoming deeper, reflection and relation (Deleuze, Guattari, 1994: 6). These three perspectives of philosophy are impurities according to Deleuze. Philosophy is not a deep thinking, because with this perspective, philosopher turns into a beholder who is only engaged with beholding what is around him or inside him and he draws conclusions from his deep contemplations and reports them instead of creating them. On the other hand, everyone is thinking and it is not so that only philosophers are thinking. Then, what is done by an artist or a scientist? Thus, philosophy is not thinking and reflection of it. Finally, it should be stated that philosophy is not working on relations. In Twenty first century, many have considered philosophy to be equal to working on relations (with its special human and philosophical sense). This group sought to know the features and conditions in which human relations are developed or how humans can reach a common experience or sense by mediation of experience? (Catholic University of America, 2003). These efforts (despite their value and philosophical implications) are finally the reduction of philosophy into a current like sociology through which they seek after a common understanding and nearness of humans. The impurity of these persepctives has its origin in the fact that they all do not pay attention to creation of concept. In deep contemplation the subject is dealing with reporting while in thinking it is engaged with reflection and in the domain of relations it is concerned with search.

On the other hand, these three perspectives have their own particular impurities that deviate them from the path of philosophy: in deep contemplation, the efforts are focused on building the general which is indeed a prerequisite of every universal and transcendent affair by which one can neglect all otherness and reach the eternity and identity of a universal affair. In contemplative thinking, the border of philosophy is expanded to the point that one can call every thinking philosophy and as some scholars say, one can speak of philosopher artists, philosopher writers and philosopher psychologists while philosophy in its exact sense is separated from every other domain (based on the prerequisites of Deleuzian perspective). The impurity of the third perspective (in contradiction with the second perspective) is that by focusing on relation, it reduces philosophy to something and this leaves many fundamental notions aside.

In one of his final writings, i.e. "What Is Philosophy?", Deleuze offers a definition of pure philosophy: "Philosophical notions are not parts of a jigsaw puzzle rather they are born out of dicing. Anyway they are singing their songs and the philosophy that creates them always introduces a capable universal that despite remaining open is not fragmented" (Deleuze, Guatteri, 1994: 35). Deleuze clearly states that philosophy for him is neither interpretation (returning to the first meaning) nor analysis (search for relationship with reality) or interpretation (establishing a relationship with reality). To put it otherwise, it has nothing to do with any type of transcendence. For Deleuze, philosophy is creation. In other words, philosophy and its notions needless of all external and internal affairs are created.

### 4- **Elements of Philosophy of Immanence as a Research Approach**:

To list the elements of philosophy as a research approach, one should first deal with the nature of philosophical research so that he can discover its elements by understanding the nature of the notion of philosophical research. Accordingly, given two definitions of paradigm and tradition, we first need to ask whether we can reach a comprehensive definition of philosophical research that would cover all its nature. Paradigm: "By paradigm I refer to the publicly accepted scientific achievements that provide patterns of problems and solutions for a society of practitioners for a determinate period of time" (Cohen, 2008: 76). Tradition: "A consistent universality that includes internal notions of nature, man and society and has a focus and methodology" (Atkinson, Delamont, Hammersley, 1988).

The important point in these two definitions as regards the nature of philosophical research in the publicly accepted paradigm an in tradition is having similar internal notions concerning nature, man and society. Accordingly, prerequisite

of speaking of philosophical research as a paradigm or a research tradition is having similar unique principles and founations accepte by thinkers in this domain according to which one can reach a paradigm or tradition. But philosophers from Plato, Kant and Nietzsche to Russell and Jaspers (Naqibzadeh, 2014: 9) have different views. For example, Nietzsche has described philosophy as creation of values while Russel believes that philosophy consists of clarification of concepts through analysis (ibid: 9). Accordingly, Nietzsche's approach moves from nothing towards being, i.e. from a value that does not exist, he moves towards creation of it while Russell prefers to work on what exists and cast light on its different aspects. These two diametrically different approaches lead to the creation of different methods of philosophization. As a result, researching based on different philosophical approaches are basically different from each other. One can state that there is nothing called philosophical paradigm or tradition that would have the capacity to cover all philosophical approaches rather every philosophical approach in its encounter with the world builds its method based on its own constitutive elements. Every philosophical perspective has its own approach to the world and proceeds to know and understand it based on its own epistemology. As a result, every philosophical approach investigates phenomena from the point of view of its particular perspective and makes clear its own particular dimensions as compared to other perspectives. What distinguishes this particular perspective is the method according to which an approach proceeds to have an encounter with the phenomena. The immanence as an alternative philosophical perspective follows this foundation. Immanence like other parts of the domain of postmodern thinking despite its avoidance from the idea of method in its general sense (clear, eternal and identical) finally takes advantage of its very minimal form (organized thinking) and makes use of it. Here we will continue to clarify the elements of this intellectual approach and its related research approach. The most important constitutive elements of the immanence based approach as an organized intellectual approach based on the aforementioned principles can be listed as follows:

1- Autarky of phenomena (based on the backgrouns of philosophy of immanence and Deleuze's approach to those backgrounds); accordingly, first step for an immanent research on phenomena is making them self-sufficient. To this end, one should stay wholly inside the world of phenomena and stay away from every transcendent principle or factor. In other words, when one encounters a phenomenon, he needs to leave all a priori thoughts. For example, this Marxist left principle that class conflicts exist in a clear or hidden way in every phenomenon needs to be set aside in order to have a direct encounter with the phenomenon. The next step in Autarky of a Phenomenon after staying away from the transcendent factor is keeping oneself away from the extra-textual mediators in one's encounter with it. To state the matter differently, phenomenon itself either says what it is supposed to say or fails to do so. In both cases, we should avoid all types of mediators of understanding. For example, a group of researchers in their encounter with a text, assay it by mediation of psychology and in doing so, they proceed to read the white between the lines (psychology of phenomenon). According to the immanence approach, this approach lies outside the circle of examination of a text and making it self-sufficient. Finally, first element of research approach based on the immanence is autarky of text through avoidance from every extra-textual factor and mediator.

2- Univocity of a Phenomenon (based on Deleuze's work on the views of Spinoza and Deleuzian ontological ideas): univocal encounter with a phenomenon is of two negative and positive parts. The first part is negative and based on avoiding all types of dualism in one's encounter with the studied phenomenon. Many views are grounded in dualistic foundations and in their studies separate them from the dualistic perspectives. For example, in their encounter with man as a phenomenon, they separate the body (in its physical sense) and psche (in psychological sense) from each other. According to immanence approach, these dualisms are unacceptable and one should keep oneself away from them. In the second positive part. This element of the immanence approach must consider the text as an integrated phenomenon). In the study of every other phenomenon (e.g. man or society) this immanent rule prevails. The second element of research based

on the immanence approach is univocity of text that is of negative (avoidance of dualism of phenomenon) and positive (having an integrated notion of phenomenon) aspects.

3- Cognition of a phenomenon based on radical empiricism (based on Deleuze's work on the views of Hume and Kant and epistemology): after the aforementioned two elements of autarky and univocity, it is now time for knowing the phenomenon. Knowing the phenomenon based on the immanence approach is in the form that after leaving all a priori (sensory) notions aside, one should turn to know the phenomenon based on the direct encounter with it. this empiricial knowledge based on the immanent approach has several features that distinguish it from other type of empirical knowledge. Deleuze calls this type of knowledge, fundamental or noble empiricism. Its features consist of A- this experience and knowledge has its own origin in the capacities of man and should avoid all type of possibility and super-human force whether in the stage of experience or in the stage of analysis of the experience; B- this experience and its consequent knowledge is limited and occurs within the framework of time-space. In other words, this type of experience does not lead to universal affairs and stays partial; C- this experience is an experience dependent upon the subject. In other words, since based on the immanence approach, everything transcendent lies outside human knowledge, experience in its sheer sense is the unique and integrated source of the knowledge of subject. One can also state that noble empiricism is finite, partial, unique and integrated. Thus, the knowledge acquired through it in research on the phenomenon should have the aforementioned features so that not to be left outside the circle of immanence.

4- Restricted Creativity (based on the work of Deleuze on the ideas of Nietzsche and definition of philosophy from the point of view of Deleuze): this is the last step of the research based on the immanence approach. Deleuze believes that philosopher's task in his encounter with being and phenomena is neither deep contemplation nor reflection or reporting. Rather according to Deleuze, the only task of philosopher is creation but not every creation rather an immanent or Restricted Creativity. It is this latter step that complements the early three steps and leads the philosophical research to its end. This element drived from Deleuze's immanent approach in his encounter with phenomena and research is also of two aspects: negative aspect (what should not be done) and positive aspect (what should be done). As to the negative aspect of this element, one can state based on what separates Deleuze's philosophical work from the nonphilosophical ones that the researcher should not merely reflect or report the text after making the text self-sufficient, having a univocal notion of it and knowing it based on the fundamental empiricism. According to the negative aspect, this element of research based on the immanence approach, creation is limited and finite and this distinguishes immanent philosophical research from other types of philosophical studies, because for example, in a research based on analytical approach, one can make use of the three aforementioned elements: analytic philosophy suggests that analysis is the main task of philosophy. It seeks to answer the philosophical questions via analysis of use of language. Therefore, it is through clarification of the use of words that problems can be relatively resolved (Popkin, 2014: 533). As a result, using immanence approach, one can encounter with the self-sufficiency of the text, its univocity and even the knwoeldge without any mediator. The creation as final element is limited in this context. It is limited to the conditions and features of human understanding and the way that we acquire a common experience of a text. Then, the final element of this research approach is Restricted Creativity.

## III. CONCLUSION:

Although Deleuze is considered to be a poststructuralist philosopher and naturally he should avoid structuration and formulation of thoughts, our deep contemplation of Deleuze's intellectual work reveals two features of his philosophy to us: possibility of discovering and listing the elements of his philosophy that provide a research approach: first, Deleuze has grounded his philosophy based on an approach that is of long historical background dating back to Enlightenment (i.e.

philosophy of immanence). On the other hand, contrary to other poststructuralists, he discusses the subdivisions of the classic philosophy (i.e. ontology and epistemology). As a result, these two features can help us to conduct an explorative study that would reveal the hidden factors and elements and list them as the foundation of a distinct research approach: 1- Autarky of a Phenomenon , 2-Univocity of a Phenomenon, 3- Cognition of a Phenomenon based on a Radical Empiricism, and 4- Restricted Creativity.

## REFERENCES

[1]    Atkinson, Paul, Delamont, Sara. Hammersley, Martyn,"Qualitative Research Traditions: A British Response to Jacob" Review of Educational Research Vol. 58, No. 2, (p: 231-250) 1988.
[2]    Cassirer, Ernst, The Philosophy of the Enlightenment Translated by Fritz C.A. Koelin, Princeton University Press 2009.
[3]    Catholic University of America, New Catholic encyclopedia, USA: Thomson/Gale 2003.
[4]    Cohn, Thomas S., Structure of Scientific Revolutions, trans. Abbas Taheri, Tehran: Qesseh, 2008.
[5]    Copleston, Frederick, A HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY VOLUME V, New York: DOUBLEDAY 1994.
[6]    Curtis, Vesta S., Iranian Myths, trans. Abbas Mokhber, Tehran: Markaz, 2014.
[7]    Dave, Reedar, Deleuze, trans. Fariborz Majeedi, Tehran: Elmi va Farhangi, 2017.
[8]    Deleuze, Gilles, The Logic of Sense Translated by Mark Lester with Charles Stivale , London;The Athlone Press 1990.
[9]    Deleuze, Gilles, Empiricism and Subjectivity Translated by  Constantin V. Boundas. Columbia University Press  1991.
[10]   Deleuze, Gilles. Parnet, Claire, Dialogues Translated by Barbara Habberjam, Hugh Tomlinson, Columbia University Press 2007.
[11]   . Deleuze, Gilles.Guattari, Felix,What is Philosophy? Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell.New York :Columbia University Press 1994.
[12]   . Deleutze, Gilles.Guattari, Felix ,A THOUSAND PLATEAUS Capitalism and Schizophrenia Translation by Brian Massumi. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press 2005.
[13]   Foucault, M, "What is Enlightenment? ", The Foucault Reader  (trans. C Porter). In P. Rabinow (Ed) 1984.
[14]   Hardt, Michael, Gilles Deleuze: An Apprecentiship in Philosophy, trans. Reza Najafzadeh, Tehran: Nashre Ney, 2014.
[15]   Horkheime , Max ,"Reason Against Itself: Some Remarks on Enlightenment", What Is Enlightenment? EDITED BY James Schmidt, UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PRESS 1996.
[16]   Horkheime, Max. Adorno, Theodor W,DIALECTIC OF ENLIGHTENMENT Translated by Edmund Jephcott. Stanford University Press 2002.
[17]   Kolbrook, Clair, Gilles Deleuze, trans. Reza Sirvan, Tehran, Markaz, 2016.
[18]   Mullarkey, John, Post-Continental Philosophy: An Outline, Continuum International Publishing Group 2006. Rölli, Marc, "Immanence and Transcendence"Bulletin de la Sociite Amincaine de Philosophie de Langue volume 14, Number 2, Fall(p:50-74) 2004.
[19]   Naqibzadeh, Mir Abd Al Hossein, An Introduction to Philosophical Perspectives of Twentieth Century, Tehran: Tahuri Library, 2011.
[20]   Naqibzadeh, Mir Abd Al Hossein, An Introduction to Philosophy of Education, Tehran: Tahuri Library, 2014.
[21]   Naqibzadeh, Mir Abd Al Hossein, Philosophy of Kant, Tehran: Agah Press, 2015.
[22]   Popkin, Richard and Avrum Stroll, Philosophy Made Simple, trans. Seyed Jalal Al Din Mojtabavi, Tehran: Hekmat Press, 2014.
[23]   Raaf, John, Gilles Deleuze: Ideas and Works, trans. Mostafa Amiri, Monthly Book of Philosophy, 2,2009, pp.3-31.
[24]   Smith, Daniel W, Deleuze and Religion  ed by Mary Bryden London: Routledge 2001.
[25]   Smith, Daniel W,,Essays on Deleuze. Edinburgh University Press 2012..
[26]   Stanford Encyclopedia  of Philosophy,Gilles Deleuze, Stanford University Press 2012.
[27]   T. Angeles, Moses Aaron, "The Language of Analogy in the Five Ways of St. Thomas Aquinas", Scientia VOL.5.2 (P:107-117) 2016.
[28]   Thornhill, Adrian. Saunders, Mark N.K. Lewis, Philip.(2005). Research Methods for Business Students. Prentice Hall 2005.
[29]   Walker, R.G.B, The Concept of Culture in the Theory of International Relations, Culture and International Relations ed John Chay,New York:Praeger 1990.