

**Aristocratic Radicalism or Anarchy? An  
Examination of Nietzsche's  
Doctrine of Will to Power**

By

Martin Jenkins. BA [Hons], MA, PGCE, Cert Coun.

Dissertation submitted in support of Fellowship from  
the International  
Society for Philosophers

## Introduction

'Of all writings I love only that which is written with blood. Write with blood: and you will discover that blood is spirit'.

'He who writes in blood and aphorisms does not simply want to be read, he wants to be learned by heart.'

Of Reading and Writing. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*.

The following dissertation examines the doctrine of the 'Will to Power' as expounded in the completed and published works of Friedrich Nietzsche [1844-1900]. Will to Power ontologically constitutes everything and all that exists, being and becoming, nature and sociality. Specifically, this enquiry explores the nature of overcoming in the Will to Power. Namely, does it overcome to master, to dominate, to grow and expand or something other?

Generally, Will to Power underpins Nietzsche's writings and themes - ontology, epistemology, the constitution of the human subject, the history and development of values and valuation. It is the keystone to his whole philosophy. Without it, the *raison d'être* of his philosophy cannot be fully understood. Specifically, I have chosen this particular subject both to address misinformation and to explore what Nietzsche himself actually writes. Regarding the former, the Will to Power is wrongly associated by many lay people with an elite individual, the 'Superman' who achieves greatness by his 'Will-Power'. More informed scholars conclude that Nietzsche's philosophy underpins - intentionally or not - a politico-ethics of 'might is right'. Theoretically, the Will to Power reaches its apotheosis in 'Aristocratic Radicalism'; practically it is allegedly exemplified by the regimes of Fascist Italy and National Socialist Germany. Both regimes cited his works as philosophical justifications for their 'ideologies'.

For simplicity's sake I will use the term 'Aristocratic Radicalism' throughout the following work to encapsulate both the theoretical and practical interpretations. Although Aristocratic Radicalism is a feasible reading, I argue that the nature of Will to Power at least offers an alternative to, if not offsetting such an eventuality. Following an examination of Nietzsche's texts, I maintain Will to Power underpins an Anarchism of re-evaluation and plurality.

In pursuit of this, I will only use the works both completed and published by Nietzsche. I do not utilise the collected notes or *Nachlass* nor do I utilise the collected notes that constitute the so called book -- *The Will to Power*. This is to better acquire authorial intention of what Nietzsche wrote and meant, curtailing speculation about what he might have meant and said with reference to sources not approved by him. Accordingly, I will support the 'Splitter' thesis held by

Bernd Magnus and other Nietzsche scholars. That is, Nietzsche's works are split into the completed, published works and the incomplete, unauthorized and unpublished. The former being reliable guides to his thought. All his works - notes, letters, incomplete texts -- cannot be 'lumped' altogether and taken as reliable. Hopefully, in what follows I demonstrate that what can be found in *The Will to Power* can be found in his completed and published works

There follow four sections. I begin by exploring the entrance proper of the Will to Power in Nietzsche's writings. In the second section, whether this doctrine of overcoming entails an ontology of mastery and domination is looked at. In the third section, contrary to mastery and domination, growth and expansion as the overcoming of Will to Power is explored. Finally, the last section discusses the contention that the overcoming of Will to Power inexorably entails an elitist and hierarchical Aristocratic Radicalism. Although such a situation is possible, it is more probably undermined by the nature of Will to Power itself. Its perpetual becoming and revaluation subverts its established being for it to be more aptly described in philosophical terms as Anarchism-an Anarchism of Active Becoming which escapes from and challenges what is prior existent. The end of my dissertation points the way toward the developed and applied Nietzscheanism in the guise of Post-Modern, Post-Metaphysical, Post-Humanistic Anarchism of Michel Foucault and Gilles Deleuze.

## **1. Zarathustra and Will to Power**

I begin my examination of the Will to Power with readings from *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*.<sup>1</sup> This is for two reasons: the work carries authority as Nietzsche speaks highly of it in *Ecce Homo*. Secondly, it is the work in which Nietzsche's mature doctrine of Will to Power is first comprehensively mentioned and; subsequent works elaborate on what is written in this book. However, antecedents of the theme can be discerned in earlier works.

*Antecedents of Will to Power.*

In *Homers Contest of 1872*,<sup>3</sup> Nietzsche writes of the approbation poured on envy by the Ancient Greeks. Envy was appreciated not because it led to nihilistic struggle but because it spurred men on to activity in the form of contest. Contest and competition are the source of the Hellenic state and essential to its perpetuation and health. The presages the later theme of Will to Power as Overcoming.

In *The Greek State of 1872*, Nietzsche writes of the benefits of war.<sup>4</sup> The origin of the state as forged by nature is bloody and violent. The strong conquer the

weaker and the latter attach themselves to the former thereby internalising an acceptance and love of the state. Although expressed in loyalty to the hierarchical state, instincts grow so powerful they have to be discharged by being channeled outwards towards war with other Greek states. Nietzsche's prescriptions for problems he identified in his age such as the decline of great art, the labour question and the ideas of equality; are war and its consequences. Again, early mention of hierarchy, of powerful expansive drives and a context of aggressive expansionism presage later themes in his philosophy.

In *The Birth of Tragedy*, also of 1872, Nietzsche writes of a vehement Dionysian force in nature that synthesizes with another force - the Apollonian - to create the represented world we perceive around us and, most importantly of all, it allowed the creation of Art.<sup>5</sup> Through violent emotions such as revelry, rush [*Rausch*], excitement and intoxication, the Dionysian manifests itself in a powerful force. This force can disturb and dissolve the principium *individuationis* which allows the representation of individual things, thereby returning everything into a primal oneness [*Ur-eine*] with Nature. Hence powerful drives or energy inherent to nature is cited, again presaging later theme of Will to Power.

In *Human, All Too Human* of 1878, there are a few references to Power.<sup>6</sup> It is cited in relation to creativity, to great individuals and how future egalitarian socialism would suppress this. Power is connected with explosive energy and creativity.

In 1881's *Daybreak*, the concept of drive [*triebe*] and drives as constituting the body are introduced.<sup>7</sup> Power is maintained over oneself and others and this sometimes involves cruelty. Power is linked with mastery and domination which heralds one of the major contested characteristics of Will to Power. This will be a theme pursued late on in this work. Although mentioned in Book Five of *The Joyous Science*, this book was added in 1887.<sup>8</sup> The original 1883 publication had no mention of Will to Power. The term makes its proper entrance into Nietzsche writings in 1883 with the publication of parts One and Two of *Thus Spoke Zarathustra* [*TSZ*]. Here, in 'Of the Thousand and One Goals', tables of a peoples values are a table of its overcomings, a voice of its Will to Power.

In the section 'Of Self-Overcoming', the term is mentioned a second time. Here, for the first time, it is frequently mentioned and its characteristics and qualities expanded upon. Whilst other scholars and commentators may rely heavily on other Nietzsche works such as the dubious and posthumous *The Will to Power*, I begin with *TSZ*. This is both because of my scepticism toward the reliability of the former text - as outlined in the Introduction - and, because along with Walter Kaufman, I share the belief that that all the main themes of Nietzsche's mature philosophy are richly contained in this book.<sup>9</sup>

*Zarathustra and Will to Power*

After reading the section 'Of Self-Overcoming', I conclude that Will to Power constitutes and animates all living things as it is life. Life is characterized by Overcoming. Therefore Will to Power is life and life is overcoming. Hence:

"Only where life is, there is also will: not will to life, but - so I teach you - will to power".<sup>10</sup>

This section can be divided into three parts. Part one is found from lines one to thirty where Zarathustra talks with the wise men about values; part two is found from lines 30 to 102 where Zarathustra discourses both on the nature of living things and his teaching about Life. The third and final part from lines 102 to 118 display Zarathustra's conclusions of his discourse. Indeed, all the parts are connected to the theme of Overcoming. Life says to itself it is 'that which must overcome itself again and again' [line 75]. This is embellished when life further announces:

"Whatever I create and however much I love it - soon I have to oppose it and my love: thus will my will have it."<sup>11</sup>

Whatever life creates, it is instantiated thoroughly in it. Instantiation at time A is subject to the overcoming of Life at time B. B overcomes A and so on. The reason as to why Life must overcome itself -- at least in the human world -- is given as the pursuit of Mastery, Power, dominance and delight therein.

"And as the lesser surrenders to the greater, that it may have delight and power over the least of all; so the greatest too, surrenders and for the sake of power, stakes itself."<sup>12</sup>

This is the action of Will to Power. Life is not static; rest is not the *causa finalis* of things. Life is in flux, it overcomes itself and does this because it is Will to Power. That Will to Power or Life overcomes itself for the sake of power is further evidenced in the text.

Behind the attempts of the Wise Men to make all being conceivable, to create values of good and evil and to assess values; Zarathustra reveals the activity of Will to Power. The Wise Men exert power with their doctrines of good and evil but in so doing, a mightier power and a new overcoming grow from out of them -- Will to Power.<sup>13</sup> The servant wishes to be master but will continue to serve the existing master whilst experiencing delight in mastering those weaker to him.<sup>14</sup> The master risks his life playing dice for death. These are only the paths and footsteps of Life which is, Will to Power.<sup>1</sup>

As I've written, what is established or instantiated by Life/Will to Power is subject to further overcoming. This obviously involves overcoming something - be it established values as with the Wise Men; be it other people as with the Master and Servant; be it unequal men<sup>16</sup>; be it challenges and problems as with the greatest and most powerful; be it the existing constitution of drives in the interiority of the human being<sup>17</sup>. Life or Will to Power needs something to overcome and this is found in the previous and various instantiations of itself.

Despite this reading of the apparently coherent text of 'Of Self-Overcoming', tensions arise. Firstly, the concept of overcoming throws up both a monist and dualist understanding of Will to Power. Secondly, whilst overcoming is used frequently in *TSZ*, Nietzsche hardly mentions it in his subsequent works. Does this mean that Nietzsche rejected it? Finally, it is never *explicitly* written in the text of 'Of Self-Overcoming' that Will to Power is life and life is that which overcomes itself. To the first point.

As Walter Kaufman and other commentators have pointed out, the action of Will to Power in overcoming, creates a dualism contradicting an ostensibly monist understanding of it.<sup>18</sup> Will to Power is, at Time 2 overcoming Will to Power previously instantiated at Time 1. There thus emerge two Will to Power[s]: the one overcoming and the one overcome. This creates dual Will to Powers and such dualism is in conflict with the claim for monism made most explicitly in *Beyond Good and Evil* #36. Here Nietzsche writes that the world 'described from its 'intelligible character' - would be just this 'will to power and nothing else.'-"  
If dualism is preferred, then whilst overcoming is accounted for, there will be at least two instances in every act of overcoming. That there will be many acts of overcoming means dualism multiplies. Overcoming will become nebulous and monism refuted. So either there is monism -- which cannot account for overcoming; or there is dualism which now only partially accounts for overcoming.

This dilemma is the result of faulty thinking. Contrary to thinking of Will to Power as a singular, unitary entity -- whether *der Wille* of Schopenhauer or an underlying metaphysical essence or ground -- Will to Power is to be thought as a plurality, as a myriad of instantiations and overcomings. Hence:

"That I have to be struggle and becoming and goal and conflict of goals: ah, he who divines my will surely divines too what crooked paths it has to go to."<sup>19</sup>

Life as Will to Power is 'conflict of *goals*' and instantiates itself in '*crooked paths*'. note the use of the plural in both goals and paths. Plurality entails many instantiations of Will to Power and consequently, many overcomings. This is further evidenced elsewhere in *TSZ* where opposition between men is cited as

natural to Life/Will to Power:

"They should press on to the future across a thousand bridges and gangways, and there should be more and more war and inequality among them: thus my great love makes me speak!"  
[My emphasis].<sup>20</sup>

Life needs height and conflict between the steps or overcomings it creates:

"And because it needs height, it needs steps and conflict between steps and those who climb them! Life wants to climb and in climbing, overcome itself." <sup>21</sup>

Bridges, gangways, steps -- all in the plural -- mark the crooked paths of life/Will to Power in its overcomings.

With the textual emphasis being on the plurality and indeed, the multiplicity of overcomings, to invoke either monism or dualism is misplaced. How though, is plurality and multiplicity reconcilable with mastery and domination? Domination implies the homogeneity of Mastered with the Master but plurality is antithetical to homogeneity. There appears to be a tension between the two. Whilst the issue is germane to an examination of Will to Power, it will not be addressed here. Instead it will be addressed further on in this enquiry, especially in the fourth section.

The second issue to consider is the status of overcoming in Nietzsche's writings on Will to Power. If overcoming is a significant element in the doctrine, then this status is not commensurate with the disappearance of the term in texts subsequent to *TSZ*. For overcoming is significant in the latter work alone but not in the works after it. In fact, it is hardly mentioned. If it is such an important characteristic of Will to Power, it would be expected -- to myself at least -- that its importance merits frequent reference. As this is not the case, it cannot be of any importance. Furthermore, this absence reinforces the conclusion held by James Winchester that the doctrine is neither coherent nor consistent.<sup>22</sup>

Despite being dropped from usage, I don't think this is damaging for the doctrine of Will to Power. In *TSZ*, overcoming is, as I have previously pointed out, mentioned in intimate connection with Will to Power which seeks mastery and domination. Although the term overcoming is dropped from usage after *TSZ*, the import of overcoming remains imprinted and discernible in the activity of Will to Power. So it is quite feasible to conclude a continuity between the activity of overcoming even though the term is *in absentia* and; the activity of Will to Power.

For example, in *Beyond Good and Evil [BGE]* - the book published immediately after *TSZ*, overcoming is not mentioned. Yet the similarities between the previously mentioned overcoming and the activity of Will to Power are too

similar to be insignificant. Nietzsche writes how physiological drives seek to master other drives; how Ascetics are the consequence of self-overcoming; how stronger drives are tyrants against weaker ones; how the spirit [*geist*] seeks to digest everything other to and alien to it and, how equals in power will have to look outwards to grow, spread, seize and become dominant.<sup>23</sup> These examples can be interpreted as instances of overcoming as described in *TSZ*. The theme of overcoming is continued by other means. As such, the objection that Will to Power is incoherent can be challenged.

The third point concerns the text 'Of Self-Overcoming'. It would strike the diligent reader that not once in the text, is it explicitly written that Will to Power is Life and Life overcomes itself. The prime thesis that Will to Power is Life and life overcomes itself because it is Will to Power is, therefore, without explicit textual support. As such, the thesis is questionable. An immediate response to this point is that Nietzsche is not a systematic writer. The themes in his writings are fragmented throughout his works. For example, the doctrine of Will to Power is not introduced in a substantive, self-contained way; references to it are scattered throughout the works. So relating to the point that Nietzsche never links Will to Power with Life etc, the reply is that he does. Although, as a non-systematic writer, he does not do so explicitly.

For example, in 'Of Self-Overcoming' Life tells Zarathustra 'Where I found a living thing, there I found Will to Power.'<sup>24</sup> In all living things therefore, Will to Power is present. As living things *qua* living things are instances of Life, it is sound to conclude that Will to Power can be found in life indeed, is Life itself. This is further evidenced in the text when Life again tells Zarathustra 'Only where life is, there is also will: not will to life, but -- so I teach you -- Will to Power.'<sup>25</sup> Again, it is safe to conclude that Life is Will to Power and Will to Power is Life.

Life tells Zarathustra 'I am that which must overcome itself again and again'.<sup>26</sup>

Having established that Life is Will to Power and Will to Power is Life, I deduce that Will to Power is overcoming. It is by the method of deduction from what is fragmentarily written in 'Of Self-Overcoming' that I safely conclude that Life is Will to Power, Will to Power is Life and Life overcomes itself because it is Will to Power.

The final criticism is that Will to Power as instantiated in Life and overcoming, is an aggressive philosophy. It appears to be about expansion, conflict, about having power, mastery and domination over what presumably, must be weaker people and things. This is unavoidable as it is naturalistic -- it naturally and inexorably follows from out of the nature of Life itself. A person is perpetually going to be subject to the overcomings of others and will be subject to overcoming others.

This objection highlights a problem with the ontology of Will to Power. Namely, it fails to recognise the distinction between *de Jure* and *de Facto*: that something is the case does not entail that it ought to be the case. As with Thrasymachus, there is a failure to recognise that Might is not Right.<sup>27</sup>

This objection is not to reject Nietzsche and his doctrine of Will to Power, it is to recognise the questions he is asking and to think with him. The emphasis on 'Right' employed by the objection seek a sanction, a higher sanction. But where is this Higher Sanction, this higher and objective truth? Is it found in Reason, God, the Forms - in short, in a Transcendental Other World? The onus is on the advocates of Reason etc to justify the objective, absoluteness of Moral 'Right'. Assuming they cannot [for Nietzsche claims that all transcendent metaphysics collapses with the death of God] Nietzsche offers an alternative explanation for the immanent and not transcendent construction and following of values based on Will to Power. Life or Will to Power expresses itself in the values of those values which emanate from out of itself. Analysing the nature of values past and present is precisely Nietzsche's project. Indeed, it is Nietzsche himself who makes the famous call for the re-valuation of all values following the death of God. The Will to Power is central to this re-valuation.

Furthermore, the ontology of Will to Power does not necessarily entail a brutish, aggressive philosophy where 'might is right' -- as proposed above. In his writings, Nietzsche develops and qualifies its activities demonstrating that it is not a simple, crude matter of 'might is right'. Whilst Nietzsche frequently concentrates on the struggles between Will to Power at the lower level of drives or affects in the organic body, he demonstrates how it is subject to sublimation and social development. Thus Nietzsche describes how the primitive drives are not given free play but are repressed by society to create 'Conscience' and 'Bad Conscience'; he writes of how Laws are made by the stronger to protect themselves and other, from the rancour of the weaker;<sup>28</sup> he writes of how drives become sublimated so that the primitive passions of the barbarian become the sophisticated 'Love of Truth' of the philosopher.<sup>29</sup>

Despite these qualifications, one retort is that in whatever guise, Will to Power remains an aggressive ontology.

Accordingly, in the ensuing pages, I will explore this issue of whether Will to Power is an ontology that:

- Seeks to dominate by overcoming other instantiations of Will to Power.
- Seeks not to dominate but to grow and expand.
- Results in Aristocratic Radicalism or Anarchy.

## 2. Will to Power Overcomes to Master

Following the previous introduction of Will to Power by Nietzsche in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, we have seen here that Will to Power is characterised by overcoming for the ‘power and delight’ of mastery. In the post-Zarathustra works, Nietzsche elaborates upon this and this will have a further bearing on its nature. So, can the doctrine of Will to Power -- in whatever manifestation -- be understood as an aggressive philosophy advocating expansive domination and mastery with its natural result in social terms being the Aristocratic Radicalism of an elite few mastering the many?<sup>30</sup>

In answering this question, I will now cite post-Zarathustra textual evidence to elucidate further, the nature of the Will to Power and, the evidence for the contention that it overcomes to master and dominate or; whether it overcomes to grow or; whether both are moments of the same process or finally, whether it is something other than these. This analyses will involve heavy reliance on the text of Nietzsche’s published and completed works and, at the same time a demonstration of the superfluity of *The Will to Power* book.<sup>31</sup>

### *Omnipresent Will to Power*

In *Beyond Good and Evil* [BGE] #36, Nietzsche asks the reader to consider the proposition that the reality of our drives, affects and passions could provide a sufficient explanation for the reality of the material world as a whole, albeit at a more rudimentary level. So that:

‘The world seen from the inside, the world determined and described with respect to its ‘intelligible character’ - would be just this ‘will to power’ and nothing else. -‘

So Will to Power is present in human drives, emotions, affects and, at a more primitive level, it is present in the natural world. Repeating what was said in *Zarathustra*, life is Will to Power and Will to Power is Life: it is ontological and therefore omnipresent. Writing of nature, important characteristics of the Will to Power are disclosed. For against the modern interpretation of Laws obtaining in nature, another interpretation of the text of nature would observe:

‘...the tyrannically inconsiderate and relentless enforcement of claims of power...an interpreter who would picture the unexceptional and unconditional aspects of all ‘will to power’ so vividly that almost every word, even the word ‘tyranny’ itself would eventually seem unsuitable or a weakening and attenuating metaphor – being too human –but he might, nevertheless end by asserting the same thing about this world as you do, namely that it has a ‘necessary’ and ‘calculable’ course, not because laws obtain

*in it, but because they are absolutely lacking and every power draws its ultimate consequences at every moment.’<sup>32</sup>*

The important insight in this passage is the elucidation of the nature of Will to Power. It is described as ‘the tyrannically inconsiderate and relentless enforcement of claims of power’. Tyrannically as opposed to democratic, or law-abiding -- the uncompromising, absolute, unyielding enforcement of power, claims of power. This description is reinforced later in the passage where it is written that it has a necessary and calculable course because ‘every power draws its ultimate consequences at every moment’. Will to Power is Power [*macht*] which, from out of itself, necessarily is what it is at every moment. Power *qua* power is necessarily compelled to be its ultimate state, its absolute superlativity at every and any moment. It is a *sui generis immanence* of dynamic power instantiating itself fully out of necessity. Will to Power is the necessary manifestation of power *qua* Power.

As stated in ‘Of Self-Overcoming’ in *Zarathustra* and in BGE #36, Will to Power is ontological, as it constitutes Life and the reality of the World respectively. Now, BGE #36 stipulates different degrees of manifestation – from the human interiority of drives, affects to the material yet more primitive affects of the natural material world - as demonstrated in BGE #22. The same phenomena discerned in nature are found in human affects and drives. Thus:

“A quantum of power is just a quantum of drive, will, affect, more precisely, it is nothing other than this willing, affecting.”<sup>33</sup>

The *sui generis immanence* or necessity of the Will to Power, as a quantum of power, to be its ultimate consequences at every moment is present in human drives, Willing and affects. That the Will to Power is an immanent dynamic of power drawing its ultimate consequences at every moment leads only, on the accounts provided so far, to an immanent stasis. There is though, a further qualification hinted at in BGE #22. This is that there is a plurality of ‘claims of power;’ not claim in the singular, but ‘claims’ in the plural.

Two observations are consequently deduced from BGE #22. Firstly, there are many instantiations of Will to Power and not a singular, unitary entity called ‘The’ Will to Power. Secondly, each instantiation is not static but active. It is active because it has ‘claims’. As a transient verb, ‘claim’ has the dictionary definition of to ‘demand something, to assert one’s ownership, desert or interest’. This second point is interesting because it links in with a frequent description made by Nietzsche of Will to Power in *Zarathustra* and after, namely that it overcomes so as to dominate and master other instantiations. To this description we now move.

## *Overcoming to Master and Dominate*

If claims of Power could mean that an instantiation of Will to Power has claims, demands, and assertions of ownership against other instantiations, I don't think that this is irreconcilable with the description of it overcoming to dominate and master. To support this contention, I will cite the textual evidence. In BGE #6, writing of drives within the interiority of the human, Nietzsche states:

‘..that each one of them would like only too well to represent itself as the ultimate aim of existence and as the legitimate master of all other drives. For every drive is tyrannical; and as such seek to philosophise.’ [my emphasis]

In #19 of BGE, Nietzsche undermines the metaphysical conception of human interiority with its singular volitional agent. Instead, the feeling of volition or command is the feeling of success following on from a prior act already undertaken by a commanding drive [or souls as Nietzsche here terms them] in the hierarchical organisation of the body. The body is thus described as a ‘social structure composed of many souls’; the point being that the commanding drive masters others in the hierarchy. Incorporation, which will be introduced later, is hinted at.<sup>34</sup>

In # 198, also in BGE, Nietzsche writes how moral prescriptions are directed at the person as cures for:

“...his passions, his good and bad tendencies to the extent that they have will to power and want to play master.”

Yet again in BGE #259, we can read that:

“...life is *essentially* a process of appropriating, injuring, overpowering the alien and weaker, oppressing, being harsh, imposing your own form, incorporating and at least, the very least, exploiting-“

In the passages above, the aims of mastery and domination are very explicit. Why does this happen? In the above passage, a group of equals is denied expressing such behaviour with each other. So instead, they turn outwards:

“It will have to be the embodiment of the Will to Power, it will want to grow, spread, grab, win dominance – not out of any morality or immorality, but because it is *alive* and because life precisely *is* will to power.”

Winning dominance occurs because this is overcoming by life and life, is Will to Power.

Finally, in sections #17 and #18 of the second essay in *On the Genealogy of*

*Morality* [GM], a vision of how society began is relayed by Nietzsche. It began not by any mythical 'social contract'.<sup>35</sup> It began by the terrible and creative 'artists violence' perpetrated by 'some blond beasts of prey, a race of conquerors and lords' that mastered a formless population. They kneaded, moulded and organised material to create human beings. In this their instinct for freedom or Will to Power was at work.

In all the examples cited above, Will to Power can explicitly be seen as overcoming for mastery and domination.

I mentioned earlier about the Will to Power characterised in BGE #22 as drawing its ultimate consequences at every moment. With this in mind, it is feasible to conclude that in so drawing its ultimate consequences; an instance of Will to Power overcomes other instances to master and dominate them. As such, the original instance becomes cumulatively stronger and this further increases both its immanent capacity of drawing even greater ultimate consequences of Power [*macht*] at every moment and for further mastery.

*How does it Master and Dominate*

Precisely how does this occur? The overcome instances of Will to Power must *prima facie*, be weaker. That there are instances of different degrees of power is evident when Nietzsche writes:

"To demand of strength that it not express itself as strength, that it not be a desire to overwhelm, a desire to cast down, a desire to become lord, a thirst for enemies and resistances and triumphs, is just as nonsensical as to demand of weakness that it express itself as strength. A quantum of power is just a quantum of drive, will, affect, more precisely, it is nothing other than this willing, affecting" <sup>36</sup>

This passage reiterates the point that Power necessarily expresses what it is by drawing its ultimate conclusions at every moment. It also establishes that there is a difference in strength between such quanta of power or instantiations of Will to Power. Nietzsche further verifies this in a passage from BGE #21 when he writes that action is a matter of strong and weak wills. Is it obvious though that the stronger always overcomes the weaker? How precisely does the stronger overcome the weaker to master and dominate it?

To the first question. As strength necessarily expresses itself as strength so the stronger instance of Will to Power will necessarily master the weaker. Contradicting this is the theme central to Nietzsche's work that Judeo - Christian

valuations proffered by the weaker and unhealthy *triumphed over the stronger* Noble Aristocrats, thereby mastering and dominating Europe for nearly two millennia. So the stronger does not overcome the weaker. The contradiction can be avoided by admitting that the 'weaker' had become stronger than the Noble Aristocrats. Indeed, Nietzsche writes that the numerically weaker were stronger in mind as opposed to the overflowing superior physicality of the numerically fewer Nobles and this permitted the 'slave revolt' in morality. This abides with the aphorism that 'the will to overcome an emotion is ultimately the will of another affect or *several others*'. It also demonstrates that Will to Power is not identical with physical strength alone but with the intellectual qualities amongst others.<sup>37</sup>

The second question raised above asked how precisely one or several instantiations overcome, to master and dominate others. In the textual examples cited above, playing master, wanting to play the tyrant is predicated of the stronger instances of Will to Power instantiated in nature as power claims, in human drives and in the 'artists violence'. By analytical definition, the master 'masters' and controls. But how?

In *Daybreak*, #109 Nietzsche describes how to deal with a 'vehement drive'. There are six ways cited: avoiding opportunities for its gratification, implanting regularity into the drive, engendering satiety and disgust, associating it with a painful idea, the dislocation of forces and finally, a general weakening and exhaustion of the drive. These methods are not the actions of a dispassionate intellect - this being merely the blind instrument of 'another drive which is the rival' of the vehement drive. Vehemence can be linked to being strong and, a strong drive is a greater quantum of Will to Power in relation to another. So we are talking of competing drives in which the greater the vehemence of a drive, the greater the quanta of Will to Power. Accordingly in this example provided by Nietzsche, as the successful drive is the stronger one, it must have a greater level of Will to Power. It can therefore manipulate and overcome its rival drive in any of the six ways listed. So in this scenario described by Nietzsche, we get a glimpse of how one drive can master and dominate others.

Wolfgang Muller-Lauter writes of 'schemas of mastery'.<sup>38</sup> Their striving for power unites a shifting plurality of 'power quanta' or instantiations of Will to Power. John Richardson provides a more explicit explanation of unity. He writes that:

"drive A rules drive B insofar as it has turned B toward A's own end, so that B now participates in A's distinctive activity. Mastery is bringing another will into a subordinate role within one's own effort thereby 'incorporating' the other as a sort of organ or tool."<sup>39</sup>

The use of 'incorporation' is fruitful. Weaker drives are incorporated

[*Einverleibung*] by the more powerful drives[s] in pursuit of their aims. Whilst Richardson quotes from *The Will to Power*, references to incorporation can readily be found in Nietzsche's published and completed works.<sup>40</sup> As we've seen, drives can be tyrants wishing to rule and master other drives. Hence in the already quoted passage from BGE #259 we find that life, which is Will to Power:

“...is essentially a process of appropriating, injuring, overpowering the alien and weaker, oppressing, being harsh, imposing your own form, incorporating and at least, at the very least, exploiting.”  
[Boldface emphasis mine].

Note that incorporation is mentioned in the same passage as exploiting. Reference to a dictionary yields the following:

“Exploit: v.t. To develop, utilise profitably, use someone's services in order to further one's own ends.”<sup>41</sup>

This definition is complimentary if not identical with the description of Incorporation as provided by John Richardson. Overall then, a stronger drive, possessed of a greater degree of Will to Power, can incorporate and thereby exploit a weaker drive to its 'needs' and 'aims'. This is overcoming. Instantiations of Will to Power -- from primitive Nature to the drives in organic life to organisations in social life -- overcome other instantiations, incorporating and exploiting to master and dominate them.<sup>42</sup>

In another supporting example, Nietzsche writes of the 'fundamental will of the spirit' [*Geist*]. Apparently irreconcilable with Nietzsche the anti-metaphysician, the term *Geist* actually relates to the 'intellect' or 'Mind' of what must be the social human being [and not anything metaphysical] in its acquisition of knowledge.<sup>43</sup> This commanding element which the common people call 'spirit' [*Geist*] wants to dominate itself, its surroundings and to feel mastery:

“That imperious something that the common people call 'spirit' wants to be the master in itself and around itself, and to feel its mastery. It has the will to go from multiplicity to simplicity, a will that binds together, subdues, a tyrannical and truly masterful will. Its needs and abilities are the same as physiologists have established for everything that lives, grows, propagates. The power of spirit to appropriate foreign elements manifests itself in a strong tendency to assimilate the new to the old, to simplify the manifold, to disregard or push aside their inconsistencies just as it will arbitrarily select or outline aspects of the foreign, of any piece of the external world for stronger stress, emphasis or falsification in its own interests. *Its intention here is to incorporate new 'experiences', to classify new things into old classes which is to say: it aims at growth or more particularly, the feeling of growth, the feeling of increasing strength.* The same will is served by an apparently opposite instinct of the spirit: a sudden decision for ignorance... ..all this activity is necessary according to

the degree of the spirits appropriating energy, its digestive energy, to keep the same metaphor – and indeed the ‘spirit’ really resembles nothing so much as a stomach”. 44 [My emphasis].

So as to be master and to feel it, the spirit appropriates and incorporates new experiences into existing classes of experience; it selects and outlines aspects of the foreign to redesign them in its own interests. The spirit combines, subdues, digests, phenomena of ‘knowledge’ and in so doing, confirms those needs and abilities, which physiologists have identified, exist for all life that grows and propagates i.e., incorporating the external to the internal like a stomach digests, assimilates food.

In sum, it seems explicitly clear that Will to Power overcomes or incorporates to Master and Dominate; and as Will to Power is life, this is the characteristic of all life. If the stronger instantiation incorporates the weaker to master and dominate them in the furtherance of its interests, this easily lends itself to the social thesis of Aristocratic Radicalism and the realisation of the fears of J.P. Stern and others. That is, an elite powerful few possessed by Will to Power, will incorporate and exploit the many in a hierarchical structure. Nietzsche apparently confirms this:

“The crucial thing about a good and healthy aristocracy, however, is that it does *not* feel that it is a function [whether of monarchy or community] but rather its *essence* and highest justification – and that therefore it has no misgivings in condoning the sacrifice of a vast number of people who must *for its sake* be oppressed and diminished into incomplete people slaves, tools. Its fundamental belief must simply be that society can *not* exist for its own sake, but rather only as a foundation and scaffolding to enable a select kind of creature to ascend to its higher task and in general to its higher existence – much like those sun-loving climbing plants on Java [called *Sipo matador*] whose tendrils encircle an oak tree so long and so repeatedly that finally, high above it but still supported by it, they are able to unfold their coronas in the free air and make a show of their happiness.” 45.

However, a close reading of BGE #230 quoted above demonstrates that the conclusion that Will to Power overcomes to master and dominate has been drawn too hastily. For in the quote a tension between mastering and growth is observed. It is written that the spirit aims: ‘to be master in itself, around itself and to feel its mastery’ and it is also written that ‘it aims at growth...the feeling of growth’. This tension can also be found in BGE #259. It is to an exploration of this tension and its consequences we now go and, to explore the alternative possibility that Will to Power overcomes to grow, for growth and not to master.

### 3. Will to Power Overcomes to Grow

As noted in the previous Chapter, there arose a tension between the view that Will to Power overcomes to dominate and master and the view that it overcomes to grow. In pursuance of the latter, I will now cite the supporting evidence gleaned from Nietzsche's writings and examine its veracity.

In *The Anti-Christ*, #2 we find Nietzsche writing:

“What is good? – All that heightens the feeling of power, the Will to Power, power itself in man.  
What is bad? – All that proceeds from weakness.  
What is happiness? – The feeling that power *increases* – That a resistance is overcome.”

A more ontological description is found further on in the same text in #6:

“I consider life itself instinct for growth, for continuance, for accumulation of forces, for *power*: where the will to power is lacking there is decline.”

Again, in the same text #17 Nietzsche writes about ascending life in contrast to declining life. Echoing AC #6 above, the latter occurs when Will to Power declines meriting an accompanying physiological decadence. Finally in GM #2, the true will of life is described as ‘creating *greater* units of power’.

In contrast to the textual evidence in support of the thesis that Will to Power overcomes to master and dominate, textual support for the growth thesis is markedly thinner.<sup>47</sup> This could imply that Nietzsche did not seriously favour the thesis. Whilst this may be possible, I don't think it detracts from the growth thesis. Firstly, this thesis overcomes internal tensions evident in the mastery thesis. Secondly, it is supported indirectly by an argument from analogy. To the first point.

#### *Growth Avoids Internal Tensions*

Perhaps the positing of two distinct thesis of Will to Power -- mastery and growth -- is false. For both are part of the same process of overcoming. Growth is the means to the end of Mastery. Once mastery has been established, Will to Power seeks to grow to master something more and so on cumulatively. Indeed, as we've read from BGE #230, the dominant part of the spirit seeks *domination* and its needs are the same as that which lives, *grows* and propagates. It incorporates new experiences which is to say ‘it aims at growth, the feeling of growth’. Equally, in the passage from BGE #259, this is reiterated when it is written that life both wants to *grow*, and *win dominance*.

In so including growth as a means to Mastery, Mastery and domination remain the primary motives in overcoming. Without Mastery and further Mastery, there would be no need for growth. Equally, without growth, no Mastery and further Mastery could occur. So growth is as requisite to Mastery as Mastery is to growth -- both play an equally essential part in overcoming and none is more primary than the other.

Strictly speaking, Mastery seeks to master. Once something has been mastered *qua* mastered, that is the end of the matter. Mastery and a stasis consequently prevail. As the overcoming of Will to Power is not a stasis but a becoming, a dynamic; Mastery cannot be the end of overcoming; so it must be growth.

But it goes on to master something else using growth as a means? In the first instance, this misses the definition of Mastery as given in the preceding passage: Mastery is a stasis. In the second instance, if anything other than mastery enters the equation of overcoming then *ipso facto*, we go beyond the limits of mastery and its stasis. As overcoming is not a stasis and mastery is, mastery cannot be the primary characteristic in overcoming; therefore Growth must be.

In sum, the thesis that Will to Power essentially overcomes other instantiations in order to grow, avoids tensions -- noted above -- inherent to the Mastery thesis. As such, it is the preferable and superior understanding of Will to Power.

Now to examine the second point of the argument by analogy in support of the growth thesis.

#### *Analogy with Spinoza*

In support of the growth thesis, I will employ an argument by analogy. In BGE #13, Nietzsche writes that:

“Above all a living thing wants to discharge its power – life itself is will to power -: self preservation is only one of the indirect and most frequent *consequences* of this. – In short here as elsewhere watch out for superfluous *teleological* principles! – such as the drive for self preservation (which we owe to Spinoza’s inconsistency).”

For self-preservation read mastery and domination. Spinoza advocated a dynamic power ontology -- *Natura Naturans* -- yet was inconsistent by claiming that the end of this ontology in living things was self-preservation [*conatus*].<sup>47</sup> As this inconsistency is to be avoided; Spinoza’s *Natura Naturans* cannot properly entail self-preservation. By implication, Will to Power cannot primarily entail a stasis of self-preservation, mastery or domination. These are only its indirect

consequences. Will to Power seeks to grow, to discharge its power by drawing its ultimate consequences at every moment.

In addition to the analogy, in AC #6 we read that life is 'instinct for growth, for continuance, for accumulation of forces, for power.. .' In combination with the BGE #13 quote above, I deduce that *Will to Power seeks to discharge itself by overcoming in order to grow. Will to Power does not seek states of equilibrium [such as mastery and domination or indeed self preservation] which are at best, secondary consequences. Primacy lies with Will to Power discharging its ultimate consequences at every moment as overcoming to grow.*

A flaw which prevents this line of reasoning from being conclusive arises. In BGE #13, Nietzsche does not write that life discharges power 'for the sake of growth'. If he did, this would explicitly verify the above argument by analogy. That he doesn't means that the rectification of 'Spinoza's inconsistency' cannot be analogously used in support of the growth thesis.

Although no explicit mention is made, I maintain that the argument holds deductively. When it is written in BGE #13 that 'above all a living thing wants to discharge its power -- life itself is will to power', this reiterates the import of passages already quoted such as BGE #22 and GM1 #13. Here, power is mentioned respectively as 'claims of power' 'drawing its ultimate consequences at every moment' and 'a quantum of power is just such a quantum of drive, will, affect...'. Power is discharged as power claims overcoming each other in drives, will, affects. Thus in living things life discharges power. BGE #13 can be used therefore in combination with other evidence to deductively conclude that Will to Power is life and life overcomes itself so as to grow.

#### *Growth, Resistance, Modern Ideas and Decline*

Further evidence for the growth thesis may be found in Nietzsche's opposition to Christianity and its secular derivatives of 'Modern Ideas'. Will to Power seeks to grow whereas 'Modern Ideas' [with its values such as equality and pity] perpetuate decline and degeneration.

In 'Expeditions', # 38 *Twilight of the Idols*, Nietzsche castigates the modern idea of Liberalism for undermining Will to Power. It does this by removing conditions and possibilities for it to grow replacing it with equality which renders everything similar. By implication, inequality is valued as it will not undermine Will to Power. This is supported in the previous section # 37 where we find:

"Our virtues are conditioned, are demanded by our weakness...  
... 'Equality', a certain actual rendering similar of which the theory  
of 'equal rights' is only the expression, belongs essentially to decline:

the chasm between man and man, class and class, the multiplicity of types, the will to be oneself, to be standing out – that which I call *pathos of distance* – characterises every strong age. The tension, the range between the extremes is today growing less and less – the extremes are themselves finally obliterated to the point of similarity.”<sup>48</sup>

Equality, rendering similar, must reduce the scope for difference, variety and the multiplicity of types engendering the indifference of identity or Identitarianism. By Identitarianism I mean the ontological and epistemological situation where conceptually and actually, ‘reality’ is reduced to one, totalising, reflexive schema which is closed to transcendence, difference or any other, outside it.<sup>49</sup> This is evidenced in Nietzsche’s critique of ‘Modern Ideas’ where such a reduction to the identically same is viewed as symptoms of decline. The opposite of identitarianism -- ‘Pathos of Distance’ -- must afford opportunities for Will to Power. These opportunities are cited as Freedom. Freedom means ‘that the manly instincts which delight in war and victory have gained mastery over the other instincts – for example, the instinct for ‘happiness’”.

Further in the same section #38 cited, Nietzsche writes that the struggle or war for Liberal institutions produces this ‘Freedom’ . How is this measured in both the individual and in nations?:

“By the resistance which has to be overcome, by the effort it costs to stay aloft”.

In sum, Will to Power overcomes resistances to grow.

By implication, *without resistances, Will to Power cannot grow.*<sup>50</sup>

This is in direct contradiction with the thesis of Will to Power developed so far, as an *unconditional sui generis* immanence, as that which draws its furthest consequences at every moment. In other words, it needs an external resistance to react to, as a pre-requisite to overcome and grow. Perhaps the absence of this heralds the decline Nietzsche observes in ‘Modern Ideas’. [cf: AC #6, 17 *passim*]<sup>51</sup>

Addressing the contradiction, one response to this is to realise that resistance arises from an instantiation of Will to Power resisting against, *another instantiation that is trying to incorporate it*. So growth is occurring without the stimulus of resistance. Resistance is a response of one instance of Will to Power to the expansionist provocation of another. Accordingly, this remains within the hypothesis of growth as incorporation and as Will to Power as a *sui generis* immanence. A linked response is that resistance is reactive - reacting to a prior existing and pro-active attempt at growth. Resistance is thereby secondary and not the prerequisite stimulus to Will to Power as contended above i.e. ‘without resistances the Will to Power cannot grow’. On both accounts, the contradiction is undermined and Will to Power remains understood as a *sui generis immanence*

not requiring resistance as the pre-requisite to overcoming.

Additionally, the issue is not that resistances or their potential cease to exist; rather it is that Modern Ideas prescribe against Will to Power overcoming to grow. The identitarian categories of Modern Ideas prescribe against growth or change [which subsequently encounters resistances] with a repetition of the existing same e.g. universal equality, similarity, pity for the creature]. Growth threatens the overcoming of existing values, categories and demarcations of becoming. It threatens the end and final states of crypto Christian -- Metaphysical categories of teleology and eschatology.

So whilst growth as the actualisation of Will to Power can be attempted, it will meet however, with condemnation and repression in the name of the one true God, the one true democratic herd instinct, the one Truth. Hence Nietzsche's objections to Modern Ideas and his preference for growth.

### *Paradox of the Growth Thesis*

The more Will to Power grows, the more subsequent resistances are overcome and incorporated into the victor. The more it cumulatively grows and expands, the lesser the alternative, assemblages of Will to Power outside the victor itself. Having incorporated subordinate instances, oligopolies and ultimately an identitarian monopoly of a victorious Will to Power will follow on from the trajectory of the growth thesis. This is the situation I have called Aristocratic Radicalism [in which an elite minority rule over the majority]. As Bruce Detwiler writes, Will to Power displays a:

“... generalised inclination to grow, to increase, to overcome resistances and to become more through the appropriation of, or the participation of what is alien.....[.] Once the struggle among the drives has forged a unity in diversity that we call the self into a cohesive centre of power unto itself, the interaction among selves within society might well resemble the interaction of drives within the body .....and if the above interpretation is correct, his discussion of the political ramifications of life as will to power do indeed flow from the same ontology as his thoughts on self-constitution.”<sup>52</sup>

The success of growth epitomised in Aristocratic Radicalism will create the supremacy of a minority elite [whether of drives in a self or individuals in a socio-political group] that will suppress any growth which could challenge its supremacy. The latter is the identitarianism identified by Nietzsche in 'Modern Ideas'. Paradoxically, the success of Aristocratic Radicalism brings about the same situation found in the stagnation of Modern Ideas. Nietzsche's prescriptions and ontology result in what he opposes. Nietzsche opposed

'modern ideas'. By implication, he must therefore oppose Aristocratic Radicalism. Yet the latter is a corollary of his ontology of Will to Power understood as overcoming to grow. Growth leads to identity, sameness and closure against anything different i.e., growth ceases to grow and opposes instances of growth within and without itself.

Of course, Aristocratic Radicalism would permit growth on its own terms if it enhanced the ruling individuals themselves. Nietzsche's analogy of the 'Sipo Matador' gives support to this.<sup>53</sup>

Yet even this version of Aristocratic Radicalism does not escape from the charges of identitarianism etc. The elite minority may grow yet retain the incorporated majority in a condition of slavery in one guise or another, for its interests. Aristocratic Radicalism still exists within a contradiction: Nietzsche both supports it and on the ground that the identitarianism of Modern Ideas is present in it, he opposes it. Furthermore, the criticisms of JP Stern and others are seemingly correct -- Nietzsche does advocate oppression and tyranny. Aristocratic Radicalism is not dissimilar to Fascism.<sup>54</sup> If this is opposed then Will to Power overcoming to grow must also be opposed.

Here, it is possible to conclude that the doctrine of Will to Power is problematic and, to agree with certain scholars, that it ought to be rejected. However, I aim to demonstrate both that it is a coherent doctrine and does not necessarily entail Aristocratic Radicalism as maintained in certain scholarly and popular consciousness'. This will be done in the following and final section.

#### **4. Will to Power as Aristocratic Radicalism or Anarchy**

In the preceding chapter, it was concluded that Will to Power understood as overcoming to grow, would inexorably result -- in both the human subject and the political polity -- in Aristocratic Radicalism. That is, a minority of the most powerful, instantiated as either drives or persons, rule over the weaker majority. As pointed out throughout this paper, critics of Nietzsche argue that his philosophy furnishes Fascistic socio-political structures [JP Stern] or elitist authoritarianism [Bruce Detwiler]. According to Marxists such as Stefan Steinberg, Nietzsche's philosophy of Will to Power is to be opposed as it proffers:

"Opposition to any form of democratic society [in particular, socialist or workers democracy] in favour of an elite society based on strict definition of rank."<sup>55</sup>

Although it is plausible, coherent and the most common [mis?] understanding of Nietzsche's philosophy, I contest the conclusiveness of this reading. The nature of Will to Power prevents such an outcome and the French philosopher Gilles

Deleuze articulates this. Accordingly, I will now examine Deleuze's interpretation of Nietzsche's doctrine of Will to Power. This will propose that whilst the nature of Will to Power as overcoming to grow can entail Aristocratic Radicalism; its nature can also entail the deconstruction of what exists and its subsequent plural reconfiguration. As it so deconstructs, reconfigures and re-establishes power structures, I will term this *Anarchy*. Combined with the insights of Deleuze, Anarchy is not to be understood in the traditional reactive sense where the humanist subject is struggling to smash the State yielding a static state of universal Freedom. It is to be understood as an active and permanent deconstruction and reconstruction inherent to what ontologically exists: Anarchy contra Aristocratic Radicalism. Now to Deleuze.

### *Deleuze's Nietzsche*

In *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, Deleuze develops an interpretation of Will to Power which challenges previous Metaphysical Philosophy as practiced in Europe since Plato.<sup>56</sup> This practice sought a single absolute truth -- 'the Truth' -- which definitively accounted for and explained all phenomena. Against this, Will to Power on Deleuze's reading is both active and reactive thereby fermenting a plurality of values and perspectives.<sup>57</sup>

Deleuze maintains that at its basic level, 'reality' is constituted by a chaos of forces. These are, following Heraclitus, in a state of becoming. They become into being by means of the Eternal Recurrence or Eternal Return as Deleuze terms it. Here, under the horizon of temporality, the chaos of reality returns to itself to be established in 'reality' as a definite organisation of forces. In this return, the activity of Will to Power determines two different types of forces - -*Active* and *Reactive*.

Active and Reactive are tied into Nietzsche's concepts of value creation; namely Noble and Slavish respectively. Deleuze thus writes:

"Return is the becoming of that which becomes. Return is the being of of the Becoming itself, the Being which is affirmed in Becoming."<sup>58</sup>

In other words, the becoming of the chaos becomes instantiated as either active or reactive being/forces. Will to Power decides which forces are so instantiated.

How does Will to Power accomplish this? It is the genesis of the quantitative difference between forces [i.e. whether they are dominant or subordinate]. It is differential as it generates the qualitative difference between forces [i.e. whether they are active or reactive, noble or slavish respectively]. Hence Deleuze terms this role the 'genetic and differential' element of Will to Power.

This element is contrary to the reflexive, foundational premises of Metaphysical Philosophy such as Plato's *eidos*, Aristotle's *ousia* or Hegel's *Geist*; upon which there follow definite conclusions. Contrary as Will to Power is not reducible to the forces it continually configures, destroys and reconfigures in what comes to existence. In this sense it is non-foundational and hence anti-metaphysical.

In the Eternal Return, the activity of Will to Power establishes the types of forces which come to exist, which become established as Being -- namely active or reactive. As Deleuze writes:

“In this synthesis [Eternal Return MJ] forces pass through the same differences again or diversity is reproduced. The synthesis is one of the forces, of their difference and their reproduction: the Eternal Return is the synthesis which has as its principle, the Will to Power.”<sup>59</sup>

Consequent to the activity of Will to Power, if reactive forces are produced, what is already in existence is reproduced, is reinforced. For instance, in *On the Genealogy of Morality*, fuelled by resentment and the ascetic ideal, Slave morality says 'No' to what is different, what is new and prescribes against it.<sup>60</sup> It thereby preserves its dominance by incorporating what is different, new - what is Other - within its architecture of existing values and judgements.

If, due to the activity of Will to Power, active forces are produced, the diversity [or difference] inherent to the original chaos of forces is unleashed. The becoming of multiplicity, diversity and chance thereby becomes Being. This ties in with, for instance, Nietzsche's descriptions of the Noble Masters, of Master Morality, the *Übermensch*, Free Spirits and New Philosophers. These actively affirm themselves and life. In doing so they create new values and perspectives naturalistically. By means of such active forces, 'the new' is created outside of existing reactive values, perspectives, structures and instantiations. As such, the confines of metaphysical philosophy which demanded an holistic, monolithic philosophy to account for and include everything [i.e. Identitarianism] are exploded; exploded by the active forces of Will to Power.

#### *Deleuze's Reading of Eternal Return*

Deleuze's interpretation of the Eternal Return is deemed controversial. If not a convincing interpretation, it will undermine his interpretation of Will to Power. Nietzsche's doctrine of the Eternal Return appears to advocate a repetition of the same events to eternity. What exists now is an exact repetition of a previous state of affairs and what now exists will be return to exist identically *ad infinitum*. Some Nietzsche scholars dispute this cosmological reading of the Eternal Return. Others write how the doctrine is irreconcilable with the Will to Power; of how Nietzsche's opposition to Christian-Metaphysical values will be nullified by a

fatalistic determinism borne of the Eternal Return of the Same *ad infinitum*. The alternative view is that the doctrine is existential. That is, it is a variant of Kant's Categorical Imperative whereby, one is to live one's life as if one were to live it over and over again to eternity.

Moving away from this issue in Nietzschean scholarship, what of Deleuze's reading? James Winchester disputes the reading as a violation of what Nietzsche actually wrote.<sup>61</sup> Winchester maintains that Nietzsche's exposition of the Eternal Return is a cosmological Eternal Return of the Same *ad infinitum*.

Deleuze's Eternal Return is consistent with Nietzsche's anti-metaphysics, a critique of those teleological [Aristotelian, Metaphysico-Christian] theories and categories of thought in which a terminal, end state is designated.<sup>62</sup> The reading of the Eternal Return as the *cyclical* Eternal Return of the Same *ad infinitum* presupposes the stages of Beginning and End, or First and Final states. The present moment is both a beginning and an end state to be repeated identically *ad infinitum*. However, Deleuze poses the question that if the universe had a final state, it would have been obtained and becoming would have morphed into Being. The passing of the present moment means that no such state has been achieved. There is instead, an infinity of past time. Crypto-theological problems are encountered in relation to the cosmological reading of the Eternal Return as the return of the Same *ad infinitum*. Infinity means that becoming cannot arise with a First cause so it could not have began still less, have become its final state. Further, if becoming is a becoming something, why asks Deleuze, hasn't it reached its goal? Moreover, how can becoming become Being? To overcome such intractable problems Deleuze proffers the only feasible solution -- being is not distinct from becoming, returning is the being of that which becomes. There is a circularity but one which returns in difference and multiplicity, not as the Same. Returning is the being of becoming, the returning of forces in their multiplicity, diversity and chance as determined by Will to Power.

Secondly, to reinforce his hypothesis of becoming as returning, Deleuze examines how the present moment passes. The present moment would not pass unless it were not also past and yet to come, at the same time as being present. That is, it is becoming. For if the present had to wait for a new present to succeed it so it could become past, it would never pass and be forever, present. So the present is not a singular bracketing of an eternal present [being] but a synthesis of the simultaneously present and past, present and yet to come. Not only is pure becoming active but the synthetic relation of past, present, of the yet to come, is explicable in and by the Eternal Return. That is, Deleuze's interpretation of the Eternal Return.

Thirdly, the Eternal Return of the Same would invite mechanistic thinking with its use of cause and effect. The first cause initiates the cyclical process and the

final state concludes the initial cause *ad infinitum*. Nietzsche, as we have already seen, is dismissive of mechanistic thinking with its causal laws of nature.<sup>63</sup> For it is not 'laws' which determine the becoming of being and the returning or being of becoming -- it is Will to Power and nothing else.

Fourthly, faithfully following Nietzsche's descriptions, Deleuze proposes that Will to Power is a dynamic ontology. This ontology is a flux of plural instantiations in multiplicity, diversity and chance, each of which is compelled to grow and expand -- as was established in the previous section. Physiological drives for instance, seek to grow and expand. Whether this leads to reincorporation under existing structures in dominance or, whether it leads to the instantiation of something new; does not detract from the basic fact that Will to Power is a dynamic of plural instantiations. In other words, under present, fixed appearances there lies the animated flux of Will to Power. As the latter can reconfigure the former, the horizon of the future is unwritten. For the becoming of Will to Power can either rewrite, reinterpret or reinforce what is in existence. This is because its plural nature of drives is in flux and this flux can challenge what is presently established. So the unconditional return of the identically same *ad infinitum* is offset by Nietzsche's own description of Will to Power. The Eternal Return, as according to Deleuze, 'decides' whether new active forces are unleashed or whether the existing reactive structures reincorporate them and remain dominant. That is to say, whether the present structure of things remains in dominance or; whether it is changed in varying degrees, by active forces. With the latter, the present cannot unconditionally reach out to infinity; it can at most be a contingent domination. This, precludes any return of the same *ad infinitum*.

The four points noted above lead Deleuze to conclude that Eternal Return is therefore not the return of the Same *ad infinitum*. Eternal Return is either consistent with the doctrine of Will to Power -- as Deleuze demonstrates -- or; perhaps it is just an existential imperative, Nietzsche's personal practical reevaluation of values. If not even this, it is incongruous to the rest of Nietzsche's corpus. Nevertheless, I now continue with the my exposition of active and reactive forces of Will to Power.

#### *Ressentiment and Aristocratic Radicalism*

Returning now to the main thread of Active and Reactive Forces, I expound the nature of Reactive forces and their relation to resentment and Aristocratic Radicalism. Reactive forces incorporate active ones by absorbing their power thereby preventing their own active, independent instantiation. This is the tendency of resentment and the ascetic ideal as promulgated by Nietzsche. With Aristocratic Radicalism, an identical tendency can be observed. In order to preserve the order of rank of the pyramided structure, what is new or attempts to

be new -active forces - will have to be incorporated into those very structures and thereby disarmed. This ensures that its monopoly on reality is upheld. So just as reactive morality must say 'No' to what is different etc, so must Aristocratic Radicalism. Otherwise the whole Aristocratic structure would be compromised and its play of power disabled. So, if Nietzsche advocates Aristocratic Radicalism, not only is he advocating ressentiment and the supremacy of reactive being/values; he is also upholding the monolithic nature of metaphysics. All of which, he ostensibly opposes. Moreover, if, as argued in the previous chapter, Will to Power overcomes to grow entailing Aristocratic Radicalism, then the dynamic of growth must be fuelled by ressentiment etc. We appear to be entering muddy waters. The way to clear the waters necessitates a radical re-interpretation of Will to Power.

#### *Active Anarchy, Reactive Aristocracy*

To reiterate, Deleuze notes two different aspects of Will to Power: Active and Reactive. The reactive constitutes everything instantiated and established. It is reinforced by the domination of such forces in the Eternal Return. Western Philosophy, Science, Consciousness and Humanity are thus reactive. I equate this with the thesis so far held in this enquiry; namely that Will to Power overcomes to grow reaching its apotheosis in Aristocratic Radicalism.

The active aspect of Will to Power is also present in the Eternal Return. Depending upon the activity of Will to Power, the multiplicity, diversity and chance of forces can be affirmed to return. They can either then be incorporated by existing reactive forces or, they fail to be incorporated and instantiate themselves outside of those reactive forces and their structures.

Here, the affirmation of diverse, multiple and chance active forces are instantiated in the guise of 'the new'; expressed in invention, creativity and importantly, re-evaluation. I equate this process as Anarchy as it re-evaluates, challenges and undermines established reactive forces at all levels and instances - micro and macro.<sup>64</sup>

In whatever guise, reactive Will to Power overcomes to grow and this tends toward Aristocratic Radicalism with its elitist, hierarchical order of rank. Weaker forces are incorporated by stronger ones to further their own interests. This is the nature of reactive forces or drives, affects, willing. As such, the critics of Nietzsche who maintain that Will to Power inexorably leads to Aristocratic Radicalism or crypto-Fascism, are only partially correct.

Although this is a tendency, it is offset by the actions of active forces. Moreover, the greater the occurrences of active forces, the greater the number of sites of

active secession from and active re-evaluation of, what was in existence. The more sites that come to exist, the greater the plurality.<sup>65</sup> Active forces of Anarchy and their plural occurrences of secession thereby can deter monolithic Aristocratic Radicalism. The Anarchy of Pluralism challenges the singularity of Aristocratic Radicalism. However, this outcome is qualified being a matter of the balance of active and reactive forces. Following the death of God, there can be no absolute right or wrong. There is only the battle between respective forces.

### *Problems*

Firstly, active forces will become reactive. Presumably, active *qua* active forces must be stronger than reactive ones so as to break free of their incorporation to the latter. If they were not stronger, they would not have the superiority to break away. Yet they do break away. However, if this process continued unabated, active forces would break away from themselves *ad infinitum* and dissolve themselves. They would consequently, cease to exist. So at some point, in order to remain in existence the break away active forces must become reactive. Becoming reactive enables what active forces have established to remain in existence. It also enables them to consolidate and build themselves as an alternative to what previously exists and to that from which they seceded. As reactive, Will to Power will overcome other forces by incorporating them furthering growth and expansion. Analogously, a revolution is an explosion of many different active forces -- a festival of all the oppressed -- before it becomes reactively consolidated leading some forces to become counter-revolutionary, others to denounce it as being betrayed.

Whilst this means that reality is predominantly reactive, there is nevertheless the possibility of active forces exploding and challenging existing reactive forces. Albeit, this is dependent on the differential and genetic element of Will to Power.

Secondly, the conclusions reached above concerning active forces will follow only if Deleuze's reading of Nietzsche, particularly the Eternal Return, is accepted as convincing. As I've written above, many scholar's are sceptical of Deleuze's reading. Nevertheless, I believe that the points he raises do find support elsewhere in the completed and published works of Nietzsche. That is, unlike Deleuze, recourse does not have to be made to *The Will to Power*.<sup>66</sup>

In *The Birth of Tragedy*, we encounter the Dionysian and the Apollonian.<sup>67</sup> The latter accords with reactive forces as it seeks stability. The former is active in that it is a rush of *macht*, disturbing stability but which ultimately cannot sustain itself. Instead, it yields to the return of the Apollonian world of stable appearance.

In *Beyond Good and Evil*, Master and Slave Moralities are introduced.<sup>68</sup>

Whilst these can exist as two separate entities, they are more frequently found juxtaposed in one community, in one body. The master morality marks the autobiographical bestowal of values; bestowed by the self-glorifying actions borne from a feeling of fullness, of overflowing power. Or in other words, by active forces, power, drives, affects or behaviour. Slave morality is on the contrary, reactive. It acts only as reaction to the active behaviour of the Noble Masters. In so reacting it re-values the Masters as 'Evil'. The values of the *bonhomme*, of the harmless, inactive and non-threatening person [i.e. not the active] are designated as 'Good'.

In the second treatise of *On the Genealogy of Morality* entitled 'Guilt, Bad Conscience and Related Matters', Nietzsche describes the development of social identities and their subsequent, reactive suppression of active alternatives.<sup>69</sup> The practice of mnemonics literally burns memory into human material. The ability to remember and, to remember possible punishments furnishes the ability to make promises and honour them. Wayward active drives such as instant gratification, are suppressed and incorporated into the structure of the stable, continent moral subject. This is the action of Conscience.

Nietzsche also writes of 'Bad Conscience'. Here, active drives or forces that would otherwise have been manifested by the wild, pre-social individual are turned inwards. Internalisation grows in proportion as outward expression is obstructed by punishments; punishments issued by the 'artists of violence' who command the bulwarks of the primitive state. As Nietzsche writes:

"This instinct for freedom forcibly made latent [the instincts of the pre-social individual MJ]...the instinct for freedom, driven back, suppressed, imprisoned within and finally discharging and venting itself only on itself; this is the bad conscience in its beginning."<sup>70</sup>

In Deleuzian terms, the active instincts for freedom are suppressed or incorporated by the reactive Conscience to create a Bad Conscience.

Further in support of Deleuze is the following passage:

"Beneath every oligarchy -- all of history teaches this -- *tyrannical* craving lies hidden; every oligarchy trembles constantly from the tension that every individual in it needs in order to remain lord over this craving. [Thus it was for example with the *Greeks*: Plato attests it in a hundred passages, Plato who knew his own kind -- *and himself*...]71

The tyrannical craving is kept in check by a tension which every oligarchy needs. This craving can be understood as the active forces which want to break the reactive structures presently lording over the craving.

Similarly, in 'What I Owe to the Ancients' from *Twilight of the Idols*, we can read Nietzsche the psychologist observing the strongest instinct of the Greeks: the Will to Power.<sup>72</sup> All their institutions evolve out protective measures designed for mutual security against the explosive material within them. This internal tension discharges itself in fearful and ruthless external hostility. Thus, institutions are reactive, attempting to incorporate the explosive material or active forces within. Unfortunately, such active forces cannot always be contained and are instantiated externally, outside of the reactive institutions.

In the same chapter, Nietzsche returns to themes discussed in *The Birth of Tragedy* reiterating an emphasis on active forces and thereby creating a consistency from his earliest to his last works. The named phenomenon of Dionysus explains the old Hellenic instinct. This is an instinct:

“still exuberant and even overflowing: it is explicable only as an excess of energy.”<sup>73</sup>

Socratic rationalism is decadence. It is a reaction to the healthy active instincts of the Hellenes. It becomes established as an otherworldly metaphysics in Platonic Philosophy which in turn, develops into Christianity.<sup>74</sup> Thus, reinforcing Deleuze's point, reactivity has dominated the Western Occidental world as Philosophical, Religious and Cultural values. Nietzsche calls for active re-evaluation of these values as 'Dionysus Against the Crucified'.<sup>75</sup>

Dionysus not being a mere man but 'Dynamite'.<sup>76</sup> The themes highlighted by Deleuze of active and reactive forces, drives, instincts and values, are plain to see.

In conclusion to this chapter, the insights of Deleuze, which are shared by other Nietzsche scholars, declare there to be two aspects of Will to Power: Active and Reactive. <sup>77</sup> Active forces contest the linear, cumulative growth which would otherwise result in Aristocratic Radicalism. From the examples cited above, I think this is quite feasible. Instead, active forces escape from and revalue existing ontological structures and values at every level. In this sense they are Anarchistic and depart from existing thematics and structures. The more instances of such departures, the more plural instantiations of active Will to Power. Aristocratic Radicalism is not inexorable as Anarchist pluralism can offset it. However, this ultimately depends on the balance of forces as determined by Will to Power.

## **Conclusion**

Having used the completed and published works of Nietzsche alone, I have hopefully demonstrated that recourse to *The Will to Power* and other such sources are as unnecessary as they are unreliable. Utilizing the published and completed works, I've endeavoured to show that Nietzsche's doctrine of Will to Power can

support a derivation of Anarchy, albeit of the Post-Modern, Post-Humanist type, as much as the more frequent one of Aristocratic Radicalism.

In the first section, I pinpointed the emergence of the term 'Will to Power' proper in *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. It was characterized as an omnipresent ontology which overcomes existing instantiations of itself at multifarious points and sites. It was initially proposed that stronger manifestations of Will to Power do this enabling them to achieve domination and mastery over weaker instantiations, thereby incorporating and exploiting them to their own ends. Although it appears to be the most widespread understanding of Will to Power, the Mastery thesis failed to convince.

Mastery is by definition and action, a stasis. As a stasis, it is not a becoming or Overcoming. A more appropriate candidate for the overcoming nature of Will to Power is Growth as identified in third section. Life is Will to Power and Life immanently overcomes itself to grow. A corollary of this is life organizing itself in pyramidal structures. Here the strongest instantiation of Will to Power overcomes lesser ones and exploits them for its own interests by incorporating them. In this manner and trajectory, the strongest continues to grow. Politically and socially, this entails Aristocratic Radicalism. Again a pyramidal social structure apparently based on 'might is right' will follow contrary to the egalitarianism of 'Modern Ideas' which coincidentally or not, Nietzsche vehemently opposed. Furthermore, this lends itself to Fascistic and authoritarian interpretations of Nietzschean Philosophy; interpretations which had been argued against for by scholars intending to rehabilitate Nietzsche after the end of the Second World War.

However, the Aristocratic Radicalist position is somewhat undermined by remaining faithful to the description of Will to Power as espoused by Nietzsche himself and examined in the final section. This description holds that it is constituted by overcoming. As such, a stasis -- whether in the Metaphysical-Christian *weltanschauung* or in fixed, hierarchical social structures of Aristocratic Radicalism -- will be at most unlikely or at least, subject to permanent challenges. For it must be remembered that Will to Power is overcoming and therefore overcomes its previous instantiations.

This 'becoming' can justify situations antithetical to Aristocratic Radicalism. For William Connolly, it can underpin agonistic liberalism where various instantiations of Will to Power contest others for democratic hegemony and where the existing political-social structures and values are overcome at various levels, by the creativity of growing life. It can also underpin a post-humanist Anarchism. Basing itself on the insights of Gilles Deleuze, this philosophy maintains that social structures, identities, values, themselves instantiations of a now reactive Will to Power, can be contested by alternative ones inspired by active instantiations of Will to Power. This is, what Max Stirner would term a

permanent process of insurrection against 'What is' and not the singular event of 'the Revolution'. Its success is not guaranteed by teleology and it is mostly specific. It occurs at what Deleuze and Michel Foucault would call 'the micro-level'. These specific instances can connect with others to create larger macro alliances, but these are contingent and not necessitated by historicism. This is precisely the philosophy of Post-Humanistic Anarchism. This continually and immanently challenges existing social structures, practices, identities and values with alternatives. This is not to dismiss the possibilities of Aristocratic Radicalism. History and events demonstrate that it does and can occur. It is however, within the possibilities of Life, as Will to Power, to overcome and contest it.

## References

1. Friedrich Nietzsche. *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Penguin Books. 1969.
2. Friedrich Nietzsche. *Ecce Homo*. Penguin Books. 1992.
3. Friedrich Nietzsche. *Homer's Contest*. [www.geocities.com/thenietzschechannel/tgs.htm](http://www.geocities.com/thenietzschechannel/tgs.htm)
4. Friedrich Nietzsche. *The Greek State*. [www.geocities.com/thenietzschechannel/hc.htm](http://www.geocities.com/thenietzschechannel/hc.htm)
5. Friedrich Nietzsche. *The Birth of Tragedy*. Penguin Books. 2003.
6. Friedrich Nietzsche. *Human, All Too Human*. Cambridge University Press. 1996.
7. Friedrich Nietzsche. *Daybreak*. Cambridge University Press. 1997.
8. Friedrich Nietzsche. *The Gay Science*. Cambridge University Press. 2001.
9. P. 65. "To explain Zarathustra, which contains most of Nietzsche's ideas in veiled and symbolical form and is hence a good summary for those who know Nietzsche thoroughly, but hard to understand for those who do not, Nietzsche added first *Beyond Good and Evil* and then *On the Genealogy of Morality*."  
  
Walter Kaufman. *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Anti-Christ*. University of Princeton. 1974.
10. Of Self-Overcoming. *Zarathustra op cite*.
11. *ibid*.
12. *ibid*.
13. *ibid*. Lines 105 – 110.
14. *ibid*. Lines 63 – 65.
15. *ibid*. Lines 89 – 91.
16. Of the Tarantulas. *Zarathustra. op cite*.

17. Of the Despisers of the Body. *Zarathustra* op cite.
18. P. 215. Kaufman op cite.
19. Of Self-Overcoming. *Zarathustra* op cite.
20. Of the Tarantulas. *Zarathustra*. op cite.
21. *ibid.*
22. James Winchester. *Nietzsche's Aesthetic Turn*.  
State University of New York Press. 1991.

In Chapter 2 *A System of Will to Power* Winchester is critical of a compelling and systematic doctrine of the Will to Power. Thus on Page 68 he writes:

“The Will to Power is revealed with a more systematic and unified voice than the eternal return but it is not entirely consistent. Although it is arguably the single most important doctrine in Nietzsche’s works, I do not believe it forms the backbone of a system.”

23. #6, # 51, #158 & #198, #259.  
Friedrich Nietzsche. *Beyond Good and Evil*.  
Penguin. 1992.
24. Of Self Overcoming *Zarathustra* op cite.
25. *ibid.*
26. *ibid.*
27. 336b – 354.  
Plato. *The Republic*. 336b – 354.  
Oxford University Press. 1994.
28. See Second Treatise. Guilt, Bad Conscience and Related Matters. #11 et alibi  
Friedrich Nietzsche. *On The Genealogy of Morality*.  
Hackett Publishing. 1998.
29. P. 220 Kaufman op cite.  
Citing references in Nietzsche’s texts, Kaufman writes here about how drives can be sublimated and spiritualised to create and be created by Morality. Although I’m not in agreement with his contention that these processes underpin and manifest in Reason and the Rational Individual - more befitting to Humanism - Kaufman is correct to point out the extremely important fact that Will to Power is sublimated and spiritualised.
30. George Brandes coined the term ‘Aristocratic Radicalism’. See his *Essay On Aristocratic Radicalism*. William Keinman. London. 1914.  
By this term I mean an elite ruling over the many. Nietzsche writes about this throughout his works. See reference #45 below.

JP Stern argued that Nietzsche’s writings could be used as a philosophical

justification for National Socialism. Hitler, was for instance, the embodiment of Nietzsche doctrine of the Will to Power. Abir Taha is in no doubt that Nietzsche's writings provided philosophical justification for an esoteric National Socialism. Walter Kaufman wrote against Nazi interpretations of Nietzsche to demonstrate that in actuality, the Nazis were opposed to Nietzsche the Anti-Semite, anti-militarist, anti-nationalist, Good European. After the recent re-introduction of Nietzsche into contemporary 'Postmodernist' Philosophical discourse by Derrida, Foucault and Deleuze, critics such as Luc Ferry have again responded. See:

J.P. Stern. *A Study of Nietzsche*. Cambridge University Press. 1979.

Walter Kaufman. *Nietzsche: Philosopher, Psychologist, Anti-Christ*. Princeton University Press. 1974.

Luc Ferry & Alan Renault [eds] *Why We are not Nietzscheans*. University of Chicago. 1997.

Abir Taha. *Nietzsche, Prophet of Nazism: The Cult of the Superman*. Author House. 2005.

Jacob Golomb & Robert S. Wistrich [eds] *Nietzsche, Godfather of Fascism?* Princeton University Press. 2002.

31. Friedrich Nietzsche. *The Will to Power*. Vintage. 1968.

As I've written elsewhere, this non-work by Nietzsche is unreliable as evidence of Nietzsche's authorial intention. What is contained in Nietzsche's completed and published works and *The Will to Power* is valid. What is found in the latter only is not. I demonstrate the superfluity of *The Will to Power* by means of footnotes.

32. Friedrich Nietzsche. #22. *Beyond Good and Evil*. Penguin. 2002.

Cf WP # 619 "The victorious concept 'force' by means of which our physicists have created God and the world still needs to be completed: an inner will must be ascribed to it, which I designate as 'will to power', i.e., as an insatiable desire to manifest power; or as the employment and exercise of power, as a creative drive etc...one is obliged to understand all motion, all 'appearances', all 'laws' only as symptoms of an inner event...."

Although intelligible, the WP quote is superfluous. Material concerning the Will to Power is already contained in BGE #22. The 'inner will' or 'insatiable desire to manifest power' is already stated in BGE #22 where it is written that nature does not operate by adherence to Laws but can be read as 'the tyrannically ruthless and pitiless execution of power claims' of Will to Power where 'every power draws its ultimate consequences at every moment'.

33. Friedrich Nietzsche. #13. 'Good and Evil, Good and Bad'. Hackett 1998.  
*On the Genealogy of Morality*.

34. This is an epi-phenomenalist view of the Mind whereby conscious awareness occurs after the event. The implications are wide ranging but cannot be gone into here. In addition, an Anti-Humanism is announced whereby Will to Power manifested as

drives, uses the Subject, the Subject does not instrumentally use Power. This negates any humanist view where the subject uses Power; on the contrary immanent movements of Power create and manifest Subjects. Again, issues such as determinism arise to be explored elsewhere.

35. By 'Social Contract' is meant a contract made by consenting parties to found a Political Society from out of a state of Nature. See further:

Johnathon Wolf. *An Introduction to Political Philosophy*. Oxford 1996.

That the stronger instances of Will to Power become master of the weaker is stated quite clearly in the completed and published works of Nietzsche. The Will to Power is thereby superfluous. For instance, Cf GM1 #13 and BGE # 21 with Will to Power #630.

37. See for example the role of the Ascetic Priest and his flock: GM I #8, 9, 10. GM 2 #14, 15; *Twilight of the Idols*, Improver s#2.

Conversely, the 'Aristocratic' man can marshal and give order to their internal chaos or myriad drives. Analogously, the stronger person with greater internal breadth [a collection of powerful drives hence, more values and perceptions] can apply this to empathise with, to understand and thereby incorporate other, human beings who are possessed of lesser degrees of will to power.

See BGE # 211. TI. Expeditions #49 et alibi.

- 38 Wolfgang Muller – Lauter. *Nietzsche's Teaching of the Will to Power*.  
Journal of Nietzsche Studies # ? 1994

39. John Richardson. *Nietzsche's Power Ontology*.  
*Nietzsche*. John Richardson & Brian Leiter [eds]  
Oxford University Press. 2001.

40. See WP # 656. Again, appropriation, assimilation and incorporation are found in the completed and published work of BGE # 230 & 259. The WP is superfluous.

41. *Maxwells Illustrated Colour Dictionary*.  
International Learning Systems Corporation. 1969.

42. As a guide, Will to Power is present in different contexts – by no means exhaustive:

Primitive Nature – BGE # 9, 22, 36.

Human interiority – BGE # 6, 19, 117, 198, 211, 230. GM1 # 13. GM2.

Social organisation. BGE # 76, 259, GM2 # 11, 12, 18 et alibi. GM3.

TI. Expeditions # 36, 37. Ancients #3.

This tendency of Power [*macht*] to overcome could also be the 'Will' of Power, i.e the Will to Power of Power. It has nothing to do with anthropomorphic misreading such as 'Will-power' or 'triumph of the will'. This is deductively gleaned from the published and completed works. CF WP # 619 with its 'inner will'.

43. R.J. Holingdale. Notes #8. *Zarathustra*. Op cite above.

44. BGE # 230.

45. BGE # 258. See also BGE #258. GM2 #12, AC #2. This theme of an aristocratic elite for whom the rest of society exist is a perennial theme running from *The Greek State* through to *Ecce Homo*.

46. WP mentioned in explicit connection with growth:

AC #2, 6,

BGE #230, 259.

GM II #12.

47. Benedict Spinoza. *Ethics*. Everyman 1993.

Spinoza makes a distinction between *Natura Naturata* – God / Nature as manifest and *Natura Naturans* - the becoming of God / Nature. The *Conatus* is the striving of each mode of God / Nature in eminent accordance with its essence i.e. fully active in producing as opposed to being in passive receipt of affects. Nietzsche obviously finds an inconsistency between becoming and self-preservation.

48. #37. Expeditions of an Untimely Man. *Twilight of the Idols*. Penguin 1990.

49. The term 'Identitarianism' is of Post-Modernist origin. It denotes the identity of a conceptual schema with its foundation. This exudes closure to anything different or other to the that schema or theory. Nietzsche feared 'modern ideas', with such concepts as 'equality' or as he interpreted it – as making similar - would be so totalising and therefore exclude anything that was different or challenging to its hegemony. This would entail stagnation and the diminution of humanity away from what it otherwise could become.

50. There is also evidence for the proposition that Will to Power requires resistances as a condition of its being active in #656, 696, 702, 704 of *The Will to Power* op cite. As demonstrated in my text, the theme is already found in the completed and published texts. This reinforces my contention the *The Will to Power* is at best secondary and at least, superfluous.

51. Reactive and Ressentiment is redirection and repression of Will to Power not its eradication.

52. P. 160/1 Bruce Detwiler. *Nietzsche and the Politics of Aristocratic Radicalism*. Chicago 1990.

For a critique of Detwiler's view see:

Bela Egyed. Nietzsche's Anti-Democratic Liberalism. *Eurozine*.

[www.eurozine.com/articles/2088-04-08egyed-en.html](http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2088-04-08egyed-en.html)

53. #258 *Beyond Good and Evil*. Op cite above.

The analogy of the Javanese Sipo Matador is made to show the relation of Aristocracy to the rest of society. The aristocracy is the justification and essence of a society. In the previous section, Nietzsche writes how every advance of humanity has been and will be the work of an aristocratic society: a society that believes in hierarchy and needs slavery

in one sense or another.

55. Stefan Steinburg. *One Hundred Years Since the Death of Friedrich Nietzsche: A Review of his Ideas and Influence.*  
[www.wsws.org](http://www.wsws.org). Socialist Equality Party. 2000.
56. Gilles Deleuze. *Nietzsche and Philosophy.*
57. In the terminology of Post-Modern Philosophy, it heralds *difference*. Namely a non-dialectical, non thematic, event of the 'Other', of 'Alterity', of Difference to what already exists. It is non-dialectical because non-teleological and therefore not a product of cumulative sublimation of the Negation into a higher unity. Difference prevents the closure of a Holistic structure - epistemic or ontological.
58. Ibid. P 24.
59. Ibid. P 45.
60. #10 et passim. 'Good and Bad, Good and Evil'. *On the Genealogy of Morality.*  
Op cite above.
61. James Winchester. *Nietzsche's Aesthetic Turn.*  
State University New York. 1994.
62. CH 2 Active and Reactive #5 *Nietzsche & Philosophy* op cite above.
63. See for example, #22 BGE op cite above.  
#13; 1st Essay. *Genealogy of Morality* op cite above.
64. On the apparently unlikely relation between Nietzsche and Anarchism see:  
  
Lewis Call. *Toward An Anarchy of Becoming: Post-Modern Anarchism in Nietzschean Philosophy.*  
Journal of Nietzsche Studies #21, 2001.  
  
John Moore [ed]. *I am not a Man, I am Dynamite: Friedrich Nietzsche and the Anarchist Tradition.*  
Automedia. 2004.
65. A similar theme concerning the relation between Nietzsche and Pluralism in the guise of Agonal Liberalism is articulated by William E. Connolly. See: *Agonised Liberalism: The Liberal Theory of William E. Connolly.*  
Radical Philosophy #127. 2005.
66. This further reinforces my contention announced in the *Introduction* that *The Will to Power* is superfluous. All themes in Nietzsche's philosophy are contained in his completed, published and authorised works.
67. Friedrich Nietzsche. *The Birth Of Tragedy.*  
Penguin. 1993.
68. #260. *Beyond Good And Evil.* Op cite above.
69. *On the Genealogy of Morality.* Op cite above.
70. Ibid.

71. Ibid. *What is the Meaning of Ascetic Ideals?*
72. Ibid # 18. Cf: What I Owe the Ancients # 3. *Twilight Of the Idols* op cite above.
73. Ibid #4.
74. Ibid. *The Problem of Socrates*.
75. #9. Why I am A Destiny. *Ecce Homo*.  
Penguin 1992.
76. Ibid. #1.
77. See for example Chapter 2 of:
- Linda Williams. *Nietzsche's Mirror: The World as Will to Power*.  
Rowan & Littlefield. 2001.
- Jill Marsden. *Nietzsche and Deleuze*.  
Journal of Nietzsche Studies, #16, 1998