

The Becoming Non-heterosexual: a view from Gilles Deleuze

GARCIA-CALDERON, Gerónimo*†

Universidad de Guadalajara

Received February 28, 2015; Accepted October 10, 2015

Abstract

In this work I analyze sexual diversity as an expression of the multiple and as an affirmation of life, to the myth of the heterosexual and deployed as axiomatic domination and subjection to other forms of sexual diversity. On the other hand, I make an exploration of how it is constituted and it expressed homosexuality within three systems proposed by Deleuze and its manifestation lines of becoming (molar, molecular and leakage). In addition, transversely I use historical ontology as a method because between unity and multiplicity, systems, lines and becoming permeate shafts knowledge, power and ethics proposed by Foucault.

Becoming, sexual Diversity, queer Politics, deleuze

Citation: GARCIA-CALDERON, Gerónimo. The Becoming Non-heterosexual: a view from Gilles Deleuze. ECORFAN Journal-Republic of Colombia 2015, 1-1: 67-73

* Correspondence to Author (email: gerogarcia25@hotmail.com)

† Researcher contributing first author.

For starters would have to say that becoming, implies two things; on the one hand, recognizing how we became over time (historical ethos Nietzsche would say). And secondly, as an expression of the uniqueness movement. For Gilles Deleuze ethos is directly related to the ontological (let the other be and move us to create something different). However, we live under the logic of rationality: the constant categorizing what is different.

The rationale is supported by the notion of "principle of reason" (or representative will call Foucault). This notion is based mainly in the Platonic thought that was both metaphysical and epistemological. For Plato the reality is a duality (apparent) and hierarchical. The idea that there is a reality "superior", "stable" and "true" and that this world is pure ever-changing appearance, not only created a new paradigm epistemological but ontological.

However, the price paid to obtain some "stability" in knowledge and reality was high. So high that the chances of being (or becoming) decreased differently. In this sense, (G. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 2012) stated: "While the difference is subject to the requirements of representation is not intended in itself and cannot be." That is, the classical metaphysical thought of the difference, but this difference is conceived under the categories of representation of the idea, namely; identity, opposition, analogy and likeness.

The world to be represented under any of these categories, the difference cannot be thought and diluted in an apparent diversity. Science, theology, aesthetics and other rational notions or ideologies are only forms of representation (ie, recognizing the original copy). Deleuze said: "The reason has become foundation, ie sufficient reason, not leaving out anything."

The diversity of the same comes in the idea of identity. The word identity means *Idem* (ditto) and *body*, ie the body of the same. Furthermore, such a representation of the same is it subordinate to the idea of simulation and (G. Deleuze, *Difference and Repetition*, 2012) said: "what is condemned in the simulation is the state of free, oceanic differences nomadic distributions, anarchy crowned".

Now, for Deleuze the drill can be represented as a body. An organism is a set of elements arranged under a purpose, a single, hierarchical truth. In this sense, the body without organs (CSO) opposes the idea of agency; a BwO is a living body or population of multiplicities whose vibrations avoids a highlight or outer end. In other words the BwO is an off-center, an unsystematic system and would provide the time / space to express what one and the many.

It is clear that for Deleuze the being is not much less duality drill. Being is immanence: pan-an-theism (All-One-God) and those different expressions of being are in the same ontological and existential level. Understanding when and immanence makes us realize that hierarchies disappear, the future allows the expression of the other: for minorities, women, gay, and transgender.

However, it was the idea of representation that has prevailed in Western thought, especially from the illustration. One form of such a representation of the simulation is found in so called *Scientia Foucault Sexualis*. (Foucault 2014) notes that since the emergence of a new regime *sexualis scientia* around human sexuality was established. Regime, full of speeches, knowledge and judgment on the exercise of sex in the population. He said that from that time:

It has not only expanded the domain of what could be said about sex and constrained men to always expand, but the speech is connected with sex by a complex and varied effects device, which cannot be limited to the only link to a law of prohibition. Censorship about sex? Rather it has built a device to produce discourses on sex, always more speeches, susceptible to operate and take effect on the economy itself.

This capture device responds to a teleological view to determine the sex and 'identity' own subjects. Hence, the heterosexual / homosexual terms appear in mid-1800 and have worked as a denial other forms, ideas or expressions of human sexuality.

Meanwhile, Monique Wittig sees this construction disursiva a "superior" system where prevails the idea of heterosexuality over other forms of sexuality. As the only true, normal and "desirable" expression of human sexuality, in other words it forms: a myth was created.

In addition, heterosexual thinking revolve around a logic based (mainly) in sexual reproduction, monogamy and masculinity as 'patriarcado principle and the "superiority" of men over women. "Heterosexuality" of the nineteenth century (and also the twentieth century) is fed by modern thought that Nietzsche called nihilism.

Nihilism is to prosecute and impoverish life. It arises because the prosecution has "tax" from one truth and that truth, refuses any other possibility in the development of being. (Nietzsche 1980) said: "(This) -not interpretation fits hesitation suffering brought with it a new, deeper, more intimate, more poisonous, more devourer of life stood all suffering in the perspective of guilt."

But the prosecution on the non-heterosexual lies in the establishment of a reagent ascetic ideal (that threatens life itself). This ideal reason puts on the body. The condemnation of the immanence of becoming as it involves creating and nonconformity of a "already" system. It is a slab that has been imposed on humans to create guilt, pain, suffering.

(Halperin 2009) for his part, said: "The heterosexual / homosexual binary is a homophobic production as well as the binary male / female is a sexist production." This homophobic production implies that what is not-heterosexual "worth" less socially and individually, leaving who have a different sexual preference, in a state of inferiority and subjection.

However, sexual multiplicity expresses various (and different) likely to be multiple possibilities of being body matter present existence, artistic expression on the body; but also about other ways of thinking, perceiving the world, to interpret it.

Note that these multiplicities encompass more than the physical or ideological expression of Being, it is to affirm existence. Perceive the many possibilities of being, remind us (Deleuze and Guattari 2004) "they should be considered as germ crystals becoming, which apply only if trigger uncontrolled movements and deterritorializations average or most" (in other words, creepage).

The manifestation of the multiplicity of the one (that is, of Being) is given in the untimely. The untimely is the manifestation of forces that are to be out of time, or at all times. Where present, past and future converge constantly.

The untimely is the immanent movement of becoming. (G. Deleuze, Nietzsche and Philosophy, 2009) stated: "the untimely contains more enduring truths that gathered historical and eternal truths: the truths of the future."

The truths of the future are the forces that challenge us; we go through and determine us, always changing but eternal forces. Eternal return of what we are, we were and we can become. Thus, the sexual difference becomes becoming, in affirmation of the existence, in what is the same but always different. There is something which remains in constant change that something is happening.

However, categorizing the future is impossible; all they can do is mapping the forces as dunes, constantly changing under increasing measures, falling under measures. These forces determine the singularities through the three axes proposed by Foucault: power, knowledge and ethics. These three areas influence the non-heterosexual future, but at the same time, allow us to discover new possibilities of being.

The relationship between these forces that unfold over time, is what Foucault called "power". (G. Deleuze, Michel Foucault and Power: I travel initiatory 2014) stated: "all balances of power is power, and power is only in a relationship of forces."

Foucault there for three relationships of forces that interact more often: a) the knowledge that has been built along the "history" as a single, universal and valid and that overshadows what is considered as true or not ; b) shares held by individuals with other (called power) that is powered by a prevailing epistemological field; and finally, c) the creation of moral judgments that indicate what should or should not do, in relation to the imposition of knowledge and monitoring compliance with such knowledge through an axiology.

For example, in the case of homosexuality, power relations it involves a whole complex network of meanings both as moral judgments ranging from "naturalness" of homosexuality to the creation of homophobic speeches and empower gay and "tolerance" into society.

When a homosexual declares that only seeks to know "manly" men are interacting forces of knowledge, power and ethics: 1) to know, because it has been established that only exist two sexes (male and female) that no other future matches these models should be dismissed; 2) power, because it is forcing the other person to adjust to a "manly" behavior and if not, is already despised; and 3) ethics, since there is an implicit people "effeminate" which corresponds to the power and the idea of maleness trial.

These three axes (ie, power and ethics / morality) are what makes us over time, that is, there are a number of speeches on heterosexuality, attitudes or postures that others impose on us and the network of moral judgments crucial to our social and individual action.

On the other hand, history is made up of the balance of forces, time is marked by the forces that constantly interact with each other to form new possibilities, lines, colors, shapes, in a word it differently. Deleuze proposes three systems that explain how these forces operate: the rhizome, ipecac and arboreal.

In the system-tree forces are organized and expressed in such a way that everything depends on one root, there is no chance of being another, be different, everything has been arranged, meaning subjectivized and under a great speech, Platonic myth of knowledge. (Deleuze and Guattari 2004) stated: "The tree is already the world's image, or the root is the image of the tree-world ... we are facing the most classic and more reasonable, more outdated, most hackneyed thinking ... binary logic is the spiritual reality of the tree-root".

Here human sexuality as something "natural" thought, something specific, rigid, denial of diversity, the organization of sexuality in pairs, only the existence of "man" and "woman" is possible, it all depends on one science, one truth: scientia sexualis. Denial prevails, trial and punishment of what is different, what is expressed as diverse. Then as now, judgments about what a "man" exist only under a single explanation.

In it, raicilla system no longer remains a single root, this has been destroyed, appears multiplicity but is misunderstood, because it still needs a representation of the subject and the object to be meaningful, that is, there are multiple things but aligned, the multiple is axiomatic. (Deleuze and Guattari 2004) defined it as: "the world has turned into chaos, but the book remains a picture of the world, caosmos-raicilla, rather than root-cosmos. Strange mystification of the book, the more complete the more fragmented".

In ipecac, it multiplies the sexuality, gender bloom, but the limits of sex must still be regulated, normed and standardized. It is accepted that there can be many forms of the non-heterosexual but still rules the world of heterosexuality, heteronormativity callers.

Yet how different it is not so, freedom is still aligned under a single idea of sexuality although it has accepted that there may be other ways, but subject to a single image in the world.

Finally, the system-rhizome multiplicity is meant, here the manifold is not dependent on the one, but the one is constituted by the multiplicity ratio always moving, new possibilities appear, others stop and die: life, death and Becoming is part of an unsystematic system. Universality disappears, everything is connected and is heterogeneous, because there is no center, a single source. There is no denial; positive and negative converge and behold, his wealth, his constant change. (Deleuze and Guattari 2004) clarified: "In itself, the rhizome has many forms, from the branched surface area in every way to its concretions in bulbs and tubers".

In the rhizome, sexual diversity is becoming, not only multiplicity, the limits of freedom are expanded, the singularities are expressed, life is renewed, it is left to prosecute, it has gone the benchmark from which he condemns. The different states while different. Memory and material combine to create something new: sexuality is expressed in different ways, art, politics, ethics, cosmetics, self-care, and so on. Here the term homosexual or queer becomes illusion, a category that goes beyond sexual practice.

However, how these multiple forces interact in the future? Deleuze explains through three types of lines, which are: the molar line, molecular and creepage distances.

These lines are determined by exogenous and endogenous processes for expressing a timeless or untimely movement (as relentless strength of the movement) the future itself.

The molar line are institutionalized forces, state power. (Deleuze and Guattari 2004) defined it as: "responsible for creating compact and functional stable structures (forms)". The molar line are the forces that have been "molded on" and "adjusted" to create an idea, juicio where "truth" is also set. Territorial thinking. For example, marriage (essentially monogamous) serves the purpose of ensuring some security in personal relationships, even in the "free unions" the trend has been that although there is no contract signed in between, has almost the same scope and responsibility that if he had done. The State therefore plays a key role in the standardization and standardization of individual relationships, but for this to work a system of knowledge-power (as Foucault reminds us) should be established.

Molecular lines, meanwhile, come from what has been built or socially accepted as desirable. (Deleuze and Guattari 2004) said in molecular lines occur: "the phenomena centering, unification, totalization, integration, hierarchization, end forming a overcoding".

This overcoding is the unification of discursive constructions and significant that a company implements. In this sense, I think that gay marriage can become more of a model to aim for than a right, where many would take to "take part" in a society that exalts the value of marriage as desirable. How many homosexuals (men and women) have not been questioned whether they will remain single all their life and are getting married?

Creepage meanwhile, are the creative forces of new possibilities of being. "Conquests are both creations" (Deleuze and Guattari 2004). Leakage lines allow us to affirm the existence, since the chances of the difference of being expressed.

For example, the so-called "polyamory" is a new way of creating relationships in sexaffectives break the molar and molecular lines. It would be a demonstration of the crystals of becoming.

These crystals of becoming that are embedded in space-time, enable new lines drawn us and allow expression of the forces of being. And these forces are what constitute us over time, unexpectedly, openings in the forces that have been immobilized, stratified.

There is something that has made us, but that constitution not only remains in the past, but this is updated. That is something that I entered a relationship between past and present and aware that we perceive to be happening is a crystal of becoming. That "shines" glass allows us to perceive the chiaroscuro of being, it is a brief flash that sets us free and happy but that both saddens us, makes us aware of who we are, we were and what we could be. It is the constant evolution ever changing, always new, of our being.

Michel Foucault said: "We must commit ourselves to becoming and not obstinarnos homosexuals to recognize what we are." That is, for Foucault not define what different matter but, in becoming. This evolution is linked to both the theory and praxis, recognized as different as the other and avoid creating a "homosexual myth", since passing that, what would be different and laminating convertiría in a reactive force.

The future would be this: first, to affirm the diversity of existence, we become other. The non-heterosexual diversity needs to be said, not negatively, but to understand that there are other possibilities, other worlds. On the other hand, the evolution allows us to create something new: new forms of socialization, artistic expressions, performativity.

Create involves constant movement, endless review of what we are, we were and could be. Will to power, of love, of being.

References

Deleuze, Gilles. *Diferencia y Repetición*. Buenos Aires: Amorrortu, 2012.

—. *Michel Foucault y el Poder: viajes iniciáticos I*. Madrid: Errata Naturae, 2014.

—. *Nietzsche y la Filosofía*. Barcelona: Anagrama, 2009.

Deleuze, Guilles, y Félix Guattari. *Mil Mesetas, capitalismo y esquizofrenia*. Valencia: Pre-Textos, 2004.

Foucault, Michel. *Historia de la sexualidad I: la voluntad de saber*. Distrito Federal: Siglo XXI, 2014.

Halperin, David. *San Foucault*. Cordoba: Ediciones Literales, 2009.

Laurri-Max, Maite. *La Sexualidad Según Michel Foucault*. Valencia: Tándem Edicions, 2000.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *La Genealogía de la Moral*. Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 1980.

Platón. *Diálogos II*. Madrid: Gredos, 1987.

Witting, Monique. *El Pensamiento Heterosexual y Otros Ensayos*. Barcelona: Egales, 2006.