

Beyond disability as an identity: the affirmation of difference based on singular ways of being

Para além da deficiência como uma identidade: a afirmação da diferença a partir dos modos singulares do ser

Carlos Henrique MACHADO
FLUP/Universidade do Porto - PT.
E-mail: petrus166@gmail.com

Abstract:

This article proposes to undo the forms of hierarchization of the different ways of existing in the world, restoring the ontological dignity of beings that move away from a majority standard that has asserted itself as a model of normality. From there, it would be necessary to undo the criteria that constitute disability as an impediment that can obstruct participation in society, since what really obstructs is taking different ways of life as a desirable standard. In this way, we intend to discuss identity claims and the danger that they are formed from the point of view of normality. By problematizing the concept of difference, we will see how it is possible to dismantle the reproductive schemes that consolidate the nuances of abnormality based on criteria that define normal and efficient. In this way, we aim to unveil new ways of experiencing reality, feeling the body, affirming difference and resisting forms of subjection, in the anti-productive fruition of desire that disrupts the organizational plan of societies and their forms of reproduction: the normal and the standard.

Keywords: disability; identity; difference; standard; abnormality.

Resumo:

O presente artigo se propõe a desfazer as formas de hierarquização dos diversos modos de existir no mundo, restituindo a dignidade ontológica de seres que se afastam de um padrão majoritário que se afirmou como modelo de normalidade. A partir daí, caberia desfazer os critérios que constituem a deficiência como um impedimento que pode obstruir a participação na sociedade, uma vez que o que realmente obstrui é tomar os diferentes modos de vida como um padrão desejável. Dessa forma, pretendemos discutir as reivindicações identitárias e o perigo de que elas se formem a partir do ponto de

vista da normalidade. Com a problematização do conceito de diferença, veremos como é possível desmontar os esquemas reprodutores que consolidaram os matizes da anormalidade com base em critérios que definem o normal e eficiente. Objetivamos, dessa maneira, desvelar novas formas de experimentar a realidade, sentir o corpo, afirmar a diferença e resistir às formas de sujeição, na fruição antiprodutiva do desejo que desarranja o plano de organização das sociedades e suas formas de reprodução: o normal e o padrão.

Palavras-chave: deficiência; identidade; diferença; padrão; anormalidade.

Introduction

A splendid cloud on a beautiful sunny afternoon has no more ontological reality than a pink mist carried by the wind. Both insist on their being to impose their way of existence. Everything that exists, exists in its own way, which is the way of existing of a being on a certain plane. Everything that exists is based on its own perfection, displaying the completeness of its being. To exist in a certain way is to exist completely, without anything missing or missing, revealing the exact measure of each being. Existence does not admit degree, everything that exists has its incomparable and complete way of being, being the effectuation of a power which is actualized in the effective possession of its presence that outlines and insists on its being. When left to themselves, things are simply the result of a tendency that makes them be one way and not another, being nothing more than what insinuates itself and what ultimately prevails. Every existence is as perfect as it can be, there is no hierarchy between all things that exist. Thus, we cannot say that one existence is more perfect than another, nor would it be appropriate here to take one type of existence as a standard and value all those that deviate from or approach this standard.

The trajectory of species in the world of living beings is marked by a selection process that constituted specific modes associated with a criterion of belonging to certain groups that are distinguished from each other. The species comprises a set of individuals who come together based on the similarity of their ways of being and who, from there, determine a pattern in relation to which existences move closer or further away. The closer to this standard, the more capable this existence is of perpetuating the species to which it belongs. Species are structured around the constitution of groupings of reciprocal structural and functional similarities. A selection process took place, throughout the reproduction of different specimens, while groups were formed based on the constitutive patterns of the elements necessary for each group to survive. Individuals with characteristics favorable to the perpetuation of each species, then, prevailed over the others in the different environments in which they found themselves placed.

The man-that-we-are ¹began to distinguish himself from other species by his common characteristics, the main one being the ability to signify the world around him. The history of beings called human beings is the history of meanings produced by a species that distinguished itself from others by its ability to organize the time of its action to signify the reality around it. By telling the world around it, the human species was able to interfere in it with the aim of making it more favorable, compensating for certain disadvantages with the use of rational activity to solve problems, thus constituting the history of its evolutionary activity. If a type of selection was responsible for making individuals with characteristics more adapted to the environment in which they prevailed thrive, rational criteria began to define what would be desirable or not in the organization of different human groups. From then on, humanity templates were established that aimed to evaluate belonging to this species, granting ontological dignity to those individuals who came close to a majority standard measured by these templates.

Throughout the history of language beings, any loss or dysfunction of a psychological, physiological or anatomical structure or function that generated changes in the performance of activities within the standard considered normal was considered an obstacle to the fight for survival and the perpetuation of the species. Whether it came from an acquired condition, or referred to dysfunctions originating at birth, this was seen as a misfortune, especially in a civilization in which individuals depended exclusively on hunting and gathering, and could, in this condition, cause harm to the entire population of the group. This stance arises from the rationalization of desirable existence conditions from the perspective of the perpetuation of the species and is reproduced in practices that privilege the organic productivity of social structures. Thus, the evolution of the human species took place in the dimension of a selection that was not only based on natural factors, but also had a component linked to the practices of privileging states capable of producing useful and efficient work for the group.

Therefore, it is necessary to understand that every definition of disability in relation to a hegemonic standard ceases to be a disposition detectable and explainable as a fact, to be the manifestation of an attachment to a desirable value of an order. We would then have to find the dimension where the affirmation of unique ways of life would not be confused with the need to conform to dominant standards, but which would imply an openness to new ways of being in the world. As Peter Pál Pelbart tells us:

¹Man-who-we-are is an expression coined by Fernand Deligny to define the image formed by millennia of symbolic domestication and which defines a pattern created by culture and language. From the outset, the expression is a criticism of the way in which language and culture have shaped a subjective standard and a model of humanity that has left out a series of individuals who do not conform to it. What Deligny intends is to reinscribe the human outside the spectrum of the subject and language, taking into account the autistic individuals with whom he lived in the Cévennes, who lack language, but to whom humanity cannot be denied.

Instead of sacrificing the existential positivity of “entire populations of beings” on the altar of a Truth, it would be a case of multiplying the world in order to welcome them – hence the effort to mobilize diverse concepts to guarantee plurality and distinction between modes of existence, without making them stages of a single, universal evolutionary process. Furthermore, instead of asking “Does this exist?” and “In what way?”, it would be important to know whether there can be “a little, or a lot, passionately, not at all”, in different degrees. For example, existing as possible, potentially, or about to emerge alongside the actual, or existing stutteringly below a threshold of integrity – so many different ways of existing (Pelbart, 2014, p. 252).

Disability or difference?

According to Georges Canguilhem (1904-1995), in his book *The Normal and the Pathological*, there is an infinite number of physiological and contextual possibilities in the process of life, in which establishing a norm so that the existence of health or disease can be affirmed only transforms these concepts into a type of ideal. Every difference, therefore, tends to be normative, as it constitutes a specific way of existing. The principle of identity is at the center of the formation of a standard that becomes the perfect measure of what fits it. Whether in relation to the functioning of a gene or organ in relation to the organism, or in relation to an individual's behavior in relation to society, patterns respond to an efficient function from which the difference tends to be treated as a deviation. Far from it, affirming difference as a set of all possibilities distorts dominant constitutions, based on ways of being that escape pre-established standards, overflow normality, disorient modes of existence and established behaviors.

Difference produces modes of existence that are not to be confused with the senses and meanings adopted as universal rules. The affirmation of unique forms of life involves opening up to an environment where non-determined encounters arise. Encounters of bodies, actions, passions, affections and the most legitimate expressions of these encounters, releasing the difference of comparative schemes in the service of the efficiency of a hegemonic model. Dealing with difference means dealing with the universe at the maximum of its potential energy, with the perspective of always making unimaginable worlds emerge, new articulations of meanings, bodies, looks, movements and expressions; new encounters that make escaping standardized forms a subversive element that affirms novelty. The subversive element of difference cannot be reduced to an identity category that classifies it as a lack or deficiency based on majority structures. It must cause the disorientation of submission, normalization, control and reproduction schemes, producing new ways of moving, thinking, seeing, speaking and listening.

There is no place here for a perspective that is formed based on the point of view of normality and that invests its energies in an attempt to accept difference as a limitation accommodated within the common space. We have to dismantle the reproductive schemes that consolidated the nuances of abnormality as a defect or deficiency, based on criteria that define normal and efficient. The normalization

of the characteristics based on which differences are judged is a construction that has been consolidated throughout the history of clashes of forces in the world, an organic, social, political and economic construction, and aims to eliminate the noise that threatens to disrupt the harmony of a functional body; space arranged in an orderly, defined and productive way, the result of the manifestation of attachment to some value. It is expected, then, that physiological states unfold starting from roles already predicted in the performance of a normal set of a presupposed state.

Defining the abnormal through what is more or less is recognizing the normative character of the so-called normal state. This normal or physiological state stops being just a detectable and explainable disposition as a fact and becomes the manifestation of attachment to some value (Canguilhem, 2009, p. 20).

Being different is not being different from an opposite. To be different is to differ in relation to yourself, in a gap that never stops opening up to all possibilities. To differ is to be able to say yes to the singularity that defines dissimilarity. Without negation, difference does not go towards opposition or contradiction, as it is not subordinated to the identical. It deprives the very identity of the thing, releasing a power of selection of the new in its encounters with inexhaustible transformations of a being that is always recreated. To capture such power, we need to leave the order of laws that determines the similarity of the individuals that are determined by it and their equivalence to the terms that it determines. Leaving the point of view of normality from which a certain difference is seen as a deficiency leads us to think of difference as a principle of production of the new, without situating it as marginal in relation to a center, but as a fold that is in the bond, on the border and in the interstice. The difference is always differing, jumping from one side to another without being able to fix its place.

(...) it is necessary that difference becomes the element, the ultimate unity, that it refers, therefore, to other differences that never identify it, but differentiate it. It is necessary that each term of a series, being already a difference, is placed in a variable relationship with other terms and thus constitutes other series devoid of center and convergence. It is necessary to affirm the divergence and decentering in the series itself. Each thing, each being must be its own identity absorbed in difference, each being just a difference between differences. It is necessary to show the difference by differing (Deleuze, 1988, p. 107).

If the limits of identity establish a standard average for the functioning of the normal, the difference is the excessiveness of being. It is, then, about undoing the meaning of normality based on categories that subvert the dominant constitutions whose forms of expression relegate difference to the negative, lack, absence, normality and deficiency. It would not be appropriate, then, to hierarchize identities and differences based on the normalization of ways of being considered as a standard to be observed, with a specific identity as a parameter in relation to which everything that differs from that

identity will be evaluated. The strata that constitute the majority patterns of existing must be disarticulated based on singular existences that bear the mark of difference in their ways of existing. Difference composes a minority and deviant becoming, based on switches that allow themselves to escape control. The escape from control is linked to the conjuration of identity appropriations and their ways of fixing it as a standard, making room for its own times, specific skills and singular rhythms.

When we are faced with the impossibility of an ear capturing sound waves, a mouth producing words, eyes reflecting images at the bottom of the retina, a neuron producing certain synapses, a body walking on its feathers or its limbs moving for each specific command of the brain, this does not mean its deficiency, but it must allow a new way of articulation between the forms of content within the machinic arrangements of bodies ². Expressing the world through these new forms is more than using the expressions coded from a dominant pattern, as it is first and foremost letting people hear, see, speak and move based on the singularity of each body, letting them carry out their actions. operations that are specific to them and that can secrete new meanings for life. These singular expressions contrast with the forms of enunciation of a hegemonic pattern of existing, which is precisely from which discourses about normality and disability are produced, not dealing with biological facts, but forms of enunciation that they act on bodies, producing their discursive codes in them. It would then be a question of subverting these codes, releasing new expressions that are the result of the rearrangement of dissident bodies and their enunciation, in which difference exists as a vector for the production of new agencies. Well, as Carlos Skliar said:

The presumption that disability is simply a biological fact and that it presents universal characteristics should be, once again, problematized epistemologically: understanding the disability discourse, and then revealing that the object of this discourse is not the person who is in a wheelchair or one who uses a hearing aid, or one who does not learn according to the rhythm and way that the norm expects, but rather the historical, cultural, social and economic processes that regulate and control the way in which they are thought and invented the bodies, minds, language, sexuality of others. To express it even more bluntly: disability is not a biological issue, but a cultural rhetoric. Disability is not a problem for disabled people and/or their families and/or specialists. Disability is related to the very idea of normality and its historicity. (Skliar, 2003, p.158).

² The forms of content and the forms of expression, according to Deleuze and Guattari, would be the respective productions of the machinic assemblages of bodies and the collective assemblages of enunciation. While the machinic assemblages of bodies comprise the mixture of bodies reacting on each other, on the other hand, the collective assemblages of enunciation would be the set of acts and statements, incorporeal transformations attributed to bodies. The assemblages interrelate based on a reciprocal intervention as they produce individuated forms. Its lines articulate bodies and produce territories that circumscribe spaces of meaning where the individual's ways of being in the world are constituted. Assemblages are events that affect both the dimension of bodily modifications and the incorporeal transformations of collective regimes of enunciation, thus affecting the limits of what can be felt, moved, said or thought.

Here, it would be appropriate to question the absolute truth of normal reference as that which silences the disorder caused by the presence of the multiplicity of difference. Normal is not a fact, but rather a value construction that groups based on a standard measure and excludes, by that same measure, everything that escapes and does not conform to its extension. The otherness of difference is confronted with practices that transform it into a defect, limitation or deficiency, and is then treated by devices for regulating and controlling normality in the construction of identities that can be named in a way that enables their representation in the strata of the organizational plan. Such a plan works through the selection and ordering of the forces that act within it, based on stratified formations in which devices of a diagram act that stabilize and fix them. The stabilization of forces and their original disparities in a determined plan of organization structures the codes that guarantee their functioning through standardization aimed at useful work for the preservation of the species.

According to Deleuze and Guattari, assemblages are stratified in the organizational plan that stabilizes them. However, at the same time, they would have peaks of deterritorialization that drive them, openings that allow new, still unknown relationships to be created and recreated in their structures, “inventing a specific, autonomous and unforeseen becoming” (Deleuze; Guattari, 1995, p. 45). It is through strata that agencies are stabilized at the organizational level, through devices that stratify lines into dominant models in relation to others. The models will stratify the bodies, selecting the patterns of their functioning. The bodies, in turn, inscribe an economically satisfactory result in their relationship with the model, distributing it through an organism. “The organism is not the body, but a stratum, that is to say a phenomenon of accumulation, coagulation, sedimentation that imposes on it forms, functions, connections, dominant and hierarchical organizations, transcendences organized to extract useful work” (deleuze; guattari , 1996, p.20). At the organizational level, bodies are disciplined, bodies are established with specific production functions in relation to determined purposes.

There, to once again erase the instability, the fractures of identity, the same-look invents its normality by translating these untranslatable-human-environments into abnormal-other, into deficient-other, making them, in some way, classifiable and, therefore, more digestible to the hunger of the norm, closer to order (Wiacek,2004, p. 94).

We are interested here in these “untranslatable-human-means”, insofar as, based on their expressions, control can escape. If we take the means as spaces that welcome the tendencies of each of the things mixed in them, what we have is the way in which each thing expresses its tendency that will make it constitute itself in this or that way, asserting itself independent of any purpose. If we take any body as an organism where the organs are presented as means directed towards a specific purpose, such as the lung, which captures air, or the heart, which pumps blood according to a purpose translated into

breathing or circulation , we see that the means themselves are already determined by the ends of the organism. Differently, if we take bodies as means that accept tendencies, the lungs and the heart would no longer be constituted as means determined by breathing or circulation , but as means where the multiplicity of small structures, that of the alveoli, insinuate themselves in the face of the network of small blood capillaries, with the tendency of both to diffuse oxygen and carbon dioxide molecules that allow the exchange of different gases. The emphasis is thus transferred from the purposes to the milieu where the tendencies of the alveoli, blood capillaries and gases take place. The consequence is, therefore, the understanding that the means differ not for any external cause or purpose, but for the multiplicity of what is insinuated in them.

If in the body the organs free themselves from the functions of the organism and assume singular determinations as an expression of their powers that maintain an original incompatibility, this body will always be an experiment, since in it the organs no longer perform functions, but enable unusual encounters. We would then arrive at what Deleuze and Guattari called a body without organs, not due to the absence of organs, but due to the lack of submission to the order of the organism based on its determined functions. What we would have as a result would be a body open to connections, circuits, conjunctions, superpositions and thresholds that detach themselves from a dominant and majority reality controlled by the organism. In addition to the dominant and hierarchical organizations that formulate the notion of disability, we have a field in which a body without organs is constituted based on differences that do not fit into a standard and majority model. Shattered, disproportionate bodies made up of resolutions on which no form is placed that sediments, organizes and imposes functions. “Is it so sad to bear the eyes to see, the lungs to breathe, the mouth to swallow, the tongue to speak, the brain to think, the anus and larynx, the head and legs? Why not walk with your head, sing with your sinuses, see with your skin, breathe with your belly” (Deleuze; Guattari, 1996, p.11).

Identity and difference

For Americans, white is white, black is black
 (And the mulatta is not the one)
 A fagot is a queer, a macho is a macho,
 A woman is a woman and money is money
 And so they win, they bargain, they lose

Rights are granted, rights are gained
 While down here, uncertainty is the regime
 And we dance with a grace whose secret
 I don't even know
 Between delight and misfortune
 Between the monstrous and the sublime
 Americans are not Americans
 They are old human men
 Arriving, passing, crossing.
 (Caetano Veloso)

What is placed outside the norm has reactions that range from explicit exclusion, through assistance actions and pious conceptions or even struggles that aim to create a subject of rights who can assert their identity. When it comes, however, to guaranteeing access for individuals who do not conform to a majority standard of existence to fundamental aspects of life, such as work, education, housing and leisure, the term “person with disability” takes on a dimension of struggle. policy that aims to include difference in the daily game of life. It is understood, then, the formatting of a certain identity that appears in terms of legislation, in terms of governmental and civil mobilization and in terms of an affirmative discourse of diverse demands. When one intends to give visibility to a group that was excluded from the process of building human societies, identity groups around its expressions an aura of representation that serves specific purposes.

The question, however, is to think about how the demarcation of this identity space ends up reinforcing the discourse of normality that attracts everything to a center from which the measures that conform difference to the normal rhetoric, the rhetoric of sameness and the hegemonic rhetoric of “an unpleasant name that makes you think of the same thing, where there is nothing but difference” (Scherer, 1999, p. 136). What happens, then, is an appropriation that removes the subversive potential, since they accommodate disparate forces within the structures of normality at the maximum of their potential energy, confining them in a space of control in which sameness plays its stabilizing role. If questions of identity, especially those linked to gender, race, ethnicity and those of people with disabilities, demarcate a space for legitimate claims and group around them minorities who are brought together by the way in which they have been excluded from civilizing processes, it must be careful that the principles that govern identity do not appropriate the subversive forces that govern difference. If the difference is responsible for the constitution of the maximum potential energy, the inscription of identity is the result

of the stabilization of the field of disparate powers. The strata control devices that stabilize the forces in becoming inscribe identity on the organizational plane in order to get rid of the discomfort of difference and the instability that threatens its preservation.

The care that must be taken when dealing with identity claims involves the need to avoid capturing differences in a plan that belongs to the same place. The difference must remain beyond the limits, as something “which is nothing more than its reticence in relation to the conventions of current communication, on which the social order is based” (Scherer, 1999, p. 138). Only then is it powerful in operating the transformations of new states of being. It operates in a metastable equilibrium³, where forces act at the maximum of their potential energy and where the being maintains the original incompatibility of its lag. Only in this way will it be possible to process all the “attractions, repulsions, sympathies and antipathies, changes, alliances, penetrations and expansions that affect bodies of all types, one in relation to the other” (Deleuze; Guattari, 1995, p. 27). It is an unlimited production of differences that are uncontrollable becomings. Identity, on the other hand, acts by limiting variations, allowing each of them to be marked with a sign that allows them to be identified. Because of this, identity acts from centers endowed with stability that align divergent lines and establish a pattern. It encloses the disparate powers in a closed space where it presides over the selection of what is actualized as a stable determination.

(...) the point is that, for all the otherness that cannot be translated into the Same of reason, the Same of the body that hears, the Same of the body that sees, the Same of the white, the Same of the West, the Same of the heterosexual, even of the adult, etc., it is only possible to exist in this scenario of interiority or exteriority. Either you are within this scenario — this spatiality in which the Same is the center and from which, from it, panoptically, everything is looked at and determined — or you are outside, on its margin, on its periphery. This single scenario that leads to thinking only in terms of inclusion/exclusion produces a location that is, to say the least, arrogant, not to say perverse: in this opposition inside/outside, as Derrida points out, positivity is in the “inside” which, in turn, is the (natural) place of sameness. Therefore, if, on the one hand, and in opposition, being “outside”/excluded means negativity, at the same time, the inclusion of the other implies their capture to the place that is inherently of the Same, of its order, of its way of existing (Wiacek, 2004, p. 55 and 56).

Difference cannot allow itself to be taken over by the norm of the same. It must open a field of possibilities in which new ways of life can be created. In them, the disparate powers that coexist in a state of tension form a problematic complex whose resolution does not follow any model. While identity is constituted under determinations reflected on the organizational plan, forming a unit around several

³ Stable equilibrium corresponds to the lowest possible energy level, when all possible transformations have already been carried out and the potentials have already been updated, distributing the potentials into certain limits. Metastable equilibrium is characterized by maximum potential energy where free and unrelated forces coexist as a set of possibilities for different combinations, in a game that constitutes complete unpredictability.

elements that are linked to form an organism in its regime of totalization, difference disarticulates the organism based on the manifestation of bodies freed from their limits and diverted from their ends, based on the explosive force that life brings within itself. Identity should not preside over the relationship of forces in bodies that express their difference, representing the limits of recognition of common elements gathered around a center of fundamental competences. It is necessary for each competence to be placed in a variable relationship with the others, thus constituting other series devoid of center and convergence, undoing the stability of the identical, the standard and the dominant that sets the measures of what remains the same.

To do so, otherness must envy sameness, be reluctant every time its other-existence insists on being unclassifiable or insists on remaining on the border (where sameness cannot distinguish whether the other is inside or outside). Above all, it is necessary to reinvent regimes of knowledge/power that endorse the unanimous possibility of normality (Wiacek, 2004, p. 56).

The search for identity as a form of struggle arises from the weakening of the collective political commitment that takes place in a society that seeks to reproduce its standard and leaves behind everything that does not fit with it. Individuals excluded from the game of life express their affections with the aim of demarcating identity and a cry for recognition. Therefore, care must be taken when questioning identity bases, given the circumstances that produce them and the effects they generate. However, one cannot lose the perspective of questioning the reduction of difference to identity in the face of the consequences of this act, which takes on the aspect of a normalizing regression. The issue relates to the ontological claim of difference based on provisional states of being. Being as becoming and not as identity arises from a gap that is characterized by the provisionality of the states of this being that never stops moving away from itself. Achieving this provisional dimension is necessary if we want to escape any type of identity designation without running the risk of dimming the shine of a legitimate emancipatory claim. A provisional being carries all the possibilities of a process that opens up to a continuous movement of updating, without having the principle of a stationary state and identical to itself, because, as Judith Butler and Paul Preciado observed:

Life is not identity! Life resists the idea of identity, it is necessary to admit ambiguity. Identity can often be vital to facing a situation of oppression, but it would be a mistake to use it to avoid facing complexity. You cannot saturate life with identity (Butler; Preciado, 2018, p. 4)

Deleuze tells us about the aspects that subject difference to the illusions of representation, stating the need to undo this submission in order to be able to think about difference in itself. Such subordination is done due to the need for representation to conquer the obscure, to understand fading, to capture the power of stunning and intoxication of difference. Representation needs a convergent and monocentric

world, as it cannot handle affirming divergence and decentering. Reason as the foundation of representation is a means of leading the identical to reign over the infinite itself and of causing the infinite to be penetrated by the continuity of similarity, the relationship of analogy and the opposition of predicates. Its demand, according Deleuze:

(...) consists in fixing, for difference, a happy moment, neither too big nor too small, between excess and deficiency, but the apparently opposite demand of infinite representation, which aims to integrate the infinitely large and the infinitely small of difference. Excess itself and deficiency itself. (Deleuze, 1988, p. 418).

The alternatives of representation only express their marks in relation to an identity that is always dominant, accounting for the oscillations of the identical in relation to an always rebellious matter whose excess or lack it sometimes rejects and sometimes integrates. Representation finds the same from which difference is enclosed in the limits that circumscribe oppositions and similarities. Identifying is keeping difference within the limits where it is not capable of undoing the traces of belonging that fix an identity. Subordinating difference to identity means keeping together everything that is affirmed as the same thing that will represent this defined set in all its variations and, from there, being able to accommodate them within a determined representation. Regardless of what is represented, the difference in representation is limited to the degree of variation in identity forms. This limitation of representation, expressed in minority struggles based on identity keys, traps protest movements in limits where difference ceases to act in the sense of promoting the disarticulation of hegemonic standards. Here it would be a question of promoting an undoing of representative structures based on a cry that resists based on expressions of difference, releasing minority becomings capable of dissolving any and all hierarchy. Thus, given the implications of bringing difference to the scene of protest movements, it is necessary to question the primacy of identity as a fundamental paradigm for political struggle. As Deleuze stated, one would have to “find the zone of neighborhood, of indiscernibility or of indifferenciation such that it is no longer possible to distinguish oneself from a woman, an animal or a molecule” (Deleuze, 1997, p. 11). Therefore, the verticality in which the master signifier of identity is erected would be undone here, to find the horizontality of the region of non-signifying signs of difference.

Imagine the following taxonomy:

Animals are divided into: a) belonging to the emperor, b) embalmed, c) domesticated, d) piglets, e) mermaids, f) fabulous, g) dogs in freedom, h) included in the present classification, i) that move like crazy, j) innumerable, k) we draw with a very fine camel hair brush, l) etcetera, m) that have just broken the bubble, n) that from afar look like flies (Borges, 2007, p.76).

In an unusual taxonomy, Borges breaks with the traditional idea of classification in which similarity is considered a fundamental principle of ordering. Borges' taxonomy works as a provocation to the ways of establishing a precise meaning and the determinable content of similarity. What makes it absurd is not the extravagance of unusual encounters, but the impossibility of distributing enumerated things, undoing the possibility of classificatory groupings and the meaning of the identities that support them. This removes the foundation on which beings can be juxtaposed, making it impossible to establish parameters for any type of classification. The borders of similarity are diluted and its limits resized to the point where it is no longer possible to insert elements into any type of class or category. As Deleuze and Guattari told us: "We know that between a man and a woman many beings pass, who come from another world, brought by the wind, who form rhizomes around the roots, and do not allow themselves to be understood in terms of production, but only of becoming." (Deleuze; Guattari, 1997a, p.19). It is a wild exteriority that cannot be captured by any measure that makes them intelligible, familiar, accessible or controllable, without being able to internalize them in one and the same identifiable framework of references.

The resistance to identifying oneself, based on a set of references, far from representing a threat, opens up a perspective of irreducibility of a power that manifests itself without any objective or origin, being a case of experimentation instead of being a universe subject to any interpretation. Beyond the limits of an identity, one escapes a model and its location in a type of relationship that encloses a determined set to attribute a status to the unclassifiable whole that moves under an a priori demarcated ground. This unclassifiable is constituted by all types of possible, transversal and reversible relationships, not excluding any variation that arises from the relationship of mobile forces that coexist in a metastable equilibrium. In the preface to Guy Hocquenghem's book, *L'Après-Mai des Faunnes* (1974), Deleuze criticizes the issue of identity based on homosexual becoming. In this book, Hocquenghem shifts the question of recognition through identity, stating that homosexuality should not be taken as a name that identifies anything and that, instead of homosexual subjects, homosexual productions of desire should be taken into account. Instead of closing in on the same thing, homosexuality should open up to a range of possibilities, thus refusing any and all closure of identity. Deleuze proposes that homosexuality be made a line of flight that is always establishing drifts that are incapable of being captured by an identity.

It is no longer a question of being a man or a woman, but of inventing sexes (...) Far from closing in on the identity of one sex, this homosexuality opens up to a loss of identity, to the 'system in action of non-exclusive ramifications of desire multivocal'. (...) it is no longer absolutely a question for the homosexual of being recognized and of placing himself as a subject with rights (...) It is a question, for the new homosexual, of demanding to be like that, to finally say: no one oh, it doesn't exist. You call us homosexuals, okay, but we are already somewhere else. There is no longer a homosexual subject, but homosexual productions of desire and homosexual agencies

that produce statements that swarm everywhere, SM and transvestites, in love relationships as well as in political struggles. (...) homosexual desire is specific, there are homosexual statements, but homosexuality is nothing, it is just a word, and yet, let us take the word seriously, let us necessarily go through it so that it restores everything it contains alterity and which is not the unconscious of psychoanalysis, but the progression of a sexual becoming to come (Deleuze, 2006, p. 360-362).

Conclusion

The identity claims of people with disabilities emerge as attempts to make them part of political, social, cultural and educational agendas, giving visibility to other ways of inserting themselves in the world that do not conform to hegemonic standards of existence. Thus, we fight against exclusion and, because of this, we seek a place for the full expression of unique ways of life based on an identity that gives visibility and carries the representation of groups in conditions of vulnerability that seek to fit in. in the game of existence. The perspective of emancipatory identities functioning as a type of resistance to exclusion, however, poses a problem that deserves to be analyzed. In its Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the United Nations (UN) identifies people with disabilities as “those who have impairments of a physical, intellectual or sensory nature, which, in interaction with various barriers, may obstruct their full and effective participation in society with other people” (United Nations [UN], 2006, art. 1). Identifying disability as an impediment that can obstruct participation in society deprives difference of its main power, which is the set of possibilities that releases lines of flight which are launched in all directions. The impediment, therefore, is taken from the consideration of a hegemonic standard in relation to which the normal body is constituted, outside of which everything else is considered. as an abnormality or deficiency, when what is questionable should be the way in which societies are structured around a model of efficiency. As Canguilhem observes: “Remove the impediment and you will obtain the norm” (Canguilhem, 2012, p. 198).

The normal body is the body of useful work, the body that adapts to standard measures of efficiency, the body that produces for the good functioning of the organization plan. In this context, bodies are considered based on a principle of organicity, in which social strata impose dominant and hierarchical forms, functions, organizations to extract useful and efficient work from them. According to the principles that privileged the productivity of the body and the order of the organism, dysfunctions are conjured to the extent that they represent a disruption in a functioning pattern. In a desirable conformation, the organs are expected to perform their role satisfactorily so that the normal body can function satisfactorily, so that any interruption in this order of functioning must be treated, reinscribing the diseased organ into a healthy and efficient set. The meeting of bodies is then crossed by a set of statements that elaborate the principles of normality based on the standardization of what is healthy and

desirable and the indication of everything that disturbs the order of the organism, which comes to be described as a disease. to be combatted, so that the body can thus resume its normal functions. Considering as an impediment any deviation that compromises the body's action within what is expected of it in relation to the hegemonic standards that regulate its normal functioning reinforces the measures of normality that disregard difference as a disruptive factor that brings on the body the marks of diversity, of unpredictable and indeterminate. In addition to the normal body, what we have is the full body, which remains open to drifts that divert it from predictable and useful production.

The full body is full of gaps through which uncontrollable, unknown and unsubmitive powers leak that disarticulate the organizational plan into its different strata. It is marked by a difference that will always be a deviation from the paths of identity from the set of unpredictable powers of dispersion and wandering. By differing, the body opens up to a provisional dimension that never stops transforming, always returning from zero, from the point of emergencies, because nothing is ready in it. In the full body, the power of the disparate forces of a virtual acts as a knot of tendencies that never stops spilling out as an endless number of possibilities or a set of differential relationships. Because of this, he breaks with the reference model of a majority standard, affirming singular ways that open up to an environment in which unusual encounters of actions, passions and affections occur, releasing expressions that distort the schemes in the service of hegemonic models, as they make appear the unclassifiable and the inapprehensible to the categories of the representation of the same that presides over the status of the normal, an order other than the other and more likely order and which because of this scares and frightens. As Canguilhem well observes, the difficulty in accepting the deviations that cause a measurement, shape or model to oscillate from one side to the other comes from the fear of equivocation.

This questioning is immediate, however long our previous trust may have been, however solid our habit may have been of seeing the wild rose bloom in the rose garden, the tadpoles turn into frogs, the mares suckle their foals and, in general, see the same engender the same. All it takes is a disappointment in this trust, a morphological deviation, an appearance of specific equivocation, for a radical fear to take hold of us (Canguilhem, 2012, p. 187).

It would be about seeking to create new ways of experiencing reality, feeling the body, affirming difference and resisting forms of subjection, in the anti-productive enjoyment of desire that disrupts the organizational plan. Provoking the meeting of bodies that can produce something beyond the homogenization that demands the reproduction of the same, the normal and the standard. Open spaces where the power of forces that flee in all directions can be asserted and that form a network of insubordination, contagion and proliferation of difference. From the dissolved identity, the body opens up to the difference in itself that penetrates all others and becomes powerful in affirming that which

scares, worries and rejects as disturbing. We should not seek to adapt it to the norms of a larger world, but rather let it subvert all order through the subtlety of its smaller presence that claims another world. If this world is slow to come, let us hurry to create holes in the walls that retain the excluded and segregated deviant bodies in spaces where they remain docile in the face of the tolerance of men of good will. If bodies don't fit in the world, change the world and make it a common place for nomadic singularities that produce disparate meanings. Spread within it the germ of difference and fertilize within it seeds of a transversal and clandestine plenitude that pushes its limits. Only in this way can the titles of second-class citizens be abolished in the face of the homogeneous face of the man-that-we-are, so that citizenship can be experienced that produces possible, fortuitous encounters that are not aligned with identities of any kind. In fact, as Deleuze already stated:

The problem was never in the nature of this or that exclusive group, but in the transversal relationships in which the effects produced by this or that thing (homosexuality, drugs, etc.) can always be produced by other means. Against those who think "I am this, I am that", and who think this way in a psychoanalytic way (reference to their childhood or destiny), it is necessary to think in uncertain, improbable terms: I don't know what I am, so many searches or necessary, non-narcissistic, non-Oedipal attempts – no queer can ever say with certainty "I am a queer." The problem is not being this or that in man, but rather that of an inhuman becoming, of a universal animal becoming: not taking oneself for an animal, but undoing the human organization of the body, crossing this or that zone of intensity of the body, each one discovering their own zones, and the groups, populations, species that inhabit them (Deleuze, 1992, p. 21).

Bibliographic references

BORGES, Jorge Luiz. *Other inquisitions*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2007.

BUTLER, Judith; PRECIADO, Paul. Life is not identity! Life resists the idea of identity. Interview carried out by Ursula Del Aguila in November 2008 for the French magazine *Têtu* (n. 138). Translation: Luiz Morando. Available at: <https://resistadotblog.wordpress.com/2018/05/08/a-vida-nao-ea-identidade-a-vida-resiste-a-ideia-da-identidade/> (Accessed on 26.05.2024).

CANGUILHEM, Georges. *The normal and the pathological*. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2009.

CANGUILHEM, G. *The knowledge of life*. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2012.

DELEUZE, Gilles. *Difference and repetition*. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1988.

DELEUZE, G. *Conversations*. São Paulo: Ed 34, 1992.

DELEUZE, G. *Critical and clinical*. São Paulo: Ed 34, 1997.

DELEUZE, G. *The desert island*. São Paulo: Iluminuras, 2006.

DELEUZE, Gilles; GUATTARI, Felix. *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. Vol.2. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 1995.

DELEUZE, G; GUATTARI, F. *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. Vol.3. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 1996.

DELEUZE, G; GUATTARI, F.. *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia*. Vol.4. São Paulo: Ed. 34, 1997.

United Nations Organization. (2006, December 13.). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Doc. A/61/611, New York

PELBART, Peter Pál. *For an art of establishing modes of existence that “do not exist?”*. Catalog of the 31st São Paulo Biennial 2014. p. 250-265.

SCHÉRER, Renê. Deleuze and the homosexual issue – a Platonic path to truth. *Lugar Comum*, 7, 1999, p. 135-163.

SKLIAR, Carlos. *(Unlikely) pedagogy of difference – what if the other wasn't there?* Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2003.

WIACEK, Juslaine. *The out of the air, the becoming-other. And, in the media, (dis)efficiency is on the scene in yet another program to normalize difference*. 2004. 114 f. Dissertation (Masters in Literature) - Postgraduate Program in Literature at the State University of Maringá, Paraná, 2004.



MACHADO, Carlos Henrique. Beyond disability as an identity: the affirmation of difference based on singular ways of being. *Kalagatos*, Fortaleza, vol.21, n.3, 2024, eK24065, p. 01-17.

Received: 08/2024

Approved: 09/2024