



The Schizophrenic Godhead: Laboratory Dissertation Mixtape

↔ ROSE SHARON ↔



LABORATORY DISSERTATION MIXTAPE

Introduction: A Deleuzoguattarian Political Theology

Orthodox theology and secular politics are both intimately bound to each other, as has been articulated in the discourse of political theology started by Carl Schmitt. The colonial, anthropocentric, and cisheteropatriarchal world of contemporary neoliberal capitalism is built on a foundation of Abrahamic monotheism generally, and Christian trinitarianism more specifically; in other words, these forces are monotheistic and trinitarian in the way they effect their power. It is my argument that this political theology finds its social corollary in the Oedipal triangle of the nuclear family, which is three-pronged (i.e. daddy-mommy-me) and singular (i.e. *the* family). This Oedipal triangle is scalable, hierarchical, and based in a transcendent sovereign: at the top of the hierarchy is God (*the* Father) and at the bottom, the underclasses of less-than-humans and non-humans (the children). The Oedipal triangle is further reflected in the structure of the Christian God itself, as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; the Sovereign, the Citizen, and the Family. In this sense, the Oedipal triangle functions from top to bottom to generate a hierarchy in which sovereignty is transcendent, assisted by the family in keeping bodies in the formal category of subjectivation so that they may be utilized as citizens consigned to legitimizing, maintaining, and reproducing the social order.

Through a critical, constructive, and nomadic deployment of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari's *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia Vol. 1* (1972), I work to offer a critique of the Oedipal triangle as a colonial, anthropocentric, and cisheteropatriarchal master signifier around which the contemporary world is built. This critique is synchronous with, and in service to, a presumed affirmation of an anti-oedipal political theology. This anti-oedipal political theology will be explored by displacing transcendence with immanence, reimagining hierarchy as a univocal relation of active forces, and juxtaposing scalability with ontological and political nomadism. Further, these distinctions will be put into conversation with decolonial, posthuman, and transsexual thinking respectively. Rather than merely dismantling Abrahamic monotheism and Christian trinitarianism, these analyses instead hope to open these regions along a plane of immanence with a retinue of personae that can deploy (re)new(ed) concepts for thinking political theology in a world of neofascism, Anthropogenic climate change, and coloniality.

The Schizophrenic Godhead

The Godhead is schizophrenic. What does this mean? According to Deleuze and Guattari, the schizophrenic subject (and particularly in its catatonic form) is the result of the revolutionary process of schizophrenic desire being clogged up, entangled, and trapped by the Oedipus complex. *The familial triad of daddy-mommy-me*. It is my argument that the Godhead is in fact a disrupted schizophrenic process that has become a catatonic subject. *The Father, the Son, and the birthing, midwifing, and nursing Holy Spirit*. It is this familial triad, the Christian Trinity, which interrupts the revolutionary process that we have encased in the term 'God'. That the Trinity constitutes three separate persons of one substance ensures that 'God', or the Godhead, is simultaneously the producer and the product of the Oedipus complex — a perpetually self-imprisoning prisoner. As Deleuze and Guattari make clear, referencing Artaud, the Oedipal triangle traps the schizophrenic process like organs trap the body: they are the judgments of God — these organs, this Trinity — what Ramey paraphrases as "pinions and philters engineered by a jealous and vindictive divinity to inhibit movement, energy, and lines of new life." All four authors, in harmony with Artaud's lead, hope to follow the process beyond interruption

and in a sense “To Have Done With the Judgement Of God”. Is it not time for the Godhead itself to have done with such judgments against its own movements, energies, and lines of new life?

To understand God immanently, one must avoid making recourse to the usual theological methodologies — the dictates of the Church, the cardinal rules of normativity, and/or common and good sense — as these are so many paths to transcendence. Instead, one must find the conditions that compose one’s life as a body, filled with its traumas, sensuality, miscalibrations, madnesses, irritations, qualms, aches, and sufferings, along with its joys, fantasies, pride, excesses, creativity, fullness, and imperceptibility. God cannot be found outside of the world, beyond the body; God is the imperceptible aspect of each life as *a life*, the plane of immanence where transcendental sense-construction takes place. It is not enough to know God as others understand God; one has to build God out of one’s very flesh. This is the task of schizoapotheosis. In becoming-schizoapotheotic, the Godhead is met on its own terms, as Self.

For if desire is repressed in a society, Deleuze and Guattari state, this is hardly because “it is a desire for the mother or for the death of the father; on the contrary, desire becomes that only because it is repressed, it takes that mask on under the reign of the repression that models the mask for it and plasters it on its face. . . . The real danger is elsewhere. If desire is repressed, it is because every position of desire, no matter how small, is capable of calling into question the established order of a society: not that desire is asocial; on the contrary. But it is explosive; there is no desiring-machine capable of being assembled without demolishing entire social sectors.” (Mark Seem, “Introduction”)

Like Oedipus, God the Father is a reterritorialization of the schiz — a retroaction against the process, the decoded flows which make up both the colonially repressed primordial and the always-on-its-way, always forestalled futurity. The Father is the signifier that maintains these burial grounds, these taboos, these boundaries trapping the present in a nightmare; it is the lack holding the system together, leaving room for a consumptive, self-absorbed subjectivity; the phallic exception to the intimacy at the heart of becoming. In this sense, God the Father is also God the Cop: the guard protecting the prison system of Oedipal subjectivity and capitalist society. It is the repression of desire, the instantiation and creation of the Father, that produces the urge to kill the Father. Whether the Father of Jesus is the same God-Father of the Roman Empire, of the Founding Fathers of America, or of the Nazi Führer is still to be seen; no matter the conclusion, it is clear that Jesus has fallen into a series of Oedipal reterritorializations at the hands of these claimants...

Jesus’s sexes have been stolen! But by whom? And how? The Christ machines of the early Christian era — varied and connective — were joyous, disruptive, conflicting, productive, and multiplicitous. As Bradley H. Maclean writes,

...[in the] machinic perspective Christ machines were defined less by their interiority — by their beliefs, teachings and iterative practices — than by their machinic exteriorities. For early Christianity of the first three centuries of the Common Era was exceedingly rhizomatic, consisting of machines connected to machines, which were connected to other machines.

The historical record supports this machinic analysis of early Christianity: the coupling with Jewish, gnostic, pagan, philosophical and magical machines resulted in the formation of diverse groups including Ebionites, Marcionites, Christian gnostics and so-called ‘proto-orthodox’ groups. (*Deleuze, Guattari and the Machine in Early Christianity*, p. 12)

This ultimately changes, however, as Christian orthodoxy, backed by Roman imperial, despotic power, captures the free flowing desire of the early Christ machines in order to found ‘the’ Church. This apparatus of capture reterritorializes the n sexes of early Christ machines, collapsing the molecular desire of these machines into the molar dogma of imperial Church hierarchy. Essential to this process is the (en)framing of the body as the face — the site in which bodies are disciplined and categorized in relationship to the ultimate face of Western history: the face of the white, male, cishetero, imperial, colonizing Christ. In Deleuze and Guattari’s expression, one is forced to have a face, to be recognized in hierarchical relationship to this transcendent face of the Western God-Man. The closer one is in appearance to this face, the closer one is to perfection; the farther away, to abjection, banishment, and death. Recognition — to be made a face, a stable thing, an identifiable object — is the tool by which the State apparatus categorizes, organizes, and distributes groups across the strata of the social hierarchy.

This hierarchical structure not only functions to maintain contemporary kyriarchal relations, but also works in reverse to capture the sexes of the early Christ machines — including (and especially) the sexes of Jesus the Event. In this way, Jesus is marked as male, as heterosexual, as a king, and even as white. The life of Jesus — the transcendental Event that we encounter through coded reterritorializations, through so many forces expressing their will to power — is turned into a nihilistic, theofascistic Führer of an ancient and irrepressible death cult. So how do we reactivate the revolutionary, molecular sexes of Jesus? The question can also be framed: How do we affirm joyous Christ machines after 2,000 years of terror?

The answer is not simple, but it can be expressed through the concept of a line of flight. A line of flight is what passes from one dominant paradigm into another, virtual one that is waiting to be actualized. The dominant paradigm is the theofascist Christ of old; the coming is the messianic. To reach this other paradigm, however, it requires accessing a line of flight within the life of Christ machines, the transcendental field of pure experience in which the n sexes traverse and connect with one another: this is what I call the trans*cendental field, as it marks the transsexuality inherent to the Christ machine network, its polymorphous perversity. To take it a step further, we must affirm the transsexuality not just of all Christ machines, but of the Jesus Event specifically in its singularity. In this way, we partake of the life of Jesus, of her transsexuality, of her messianic deoedipalization. What was once a messiah in the madhouse becomes a revolutionary in a rock opera, whose songs we cover, whose notes we riff off of, whose choreographies we produce (with a performative twist) filled with the egoless desire of co-creators in pure experience.

In her becoming-woman, we become so many Christ machines; in our becoming-Christ, she becomes so many women, minoritarian, imperceptible, inviting us into life of the Event, the messianic horizon of trans*cendental revolution — a molecular schizoapotheosis uniting the disenfranchised multitude with the anoedipal Godhead. But a ghost haunts us...

The neurotic is trapped within the residual or artificial territorialities of our society, and reduces all of them (*les rabat toutes*) to Oedipus as the ultimate territoriality—as reconstructed in the analyst’s office and projected upon the full body of the psychoanalyst (yes, my boss is my father, and so is the Chief of State, and so are you, Doctor) (p. 34)

The miraculating Holy Spirit of the psychoanalyst demands that the disjunctions of the psyche, these diverse n sexes, be reinscribed on the full body of Oedipus “as the ultimate territoriality.” The Law of God the

Father, God the Cop is not complete without this work, as there is always a deterritorializing tendency in the patient. The subject, the Messiah, is always being dismantled by the schiz, brought into relationship with “his own body without organs,” its various connections diverging into new series.

The analyst, in the role of the friend, offers help during the madness that ensues; he is not the fearsome guard of the eschatological prison, he is an ally; he is, in many senses, the good parent that the subject has come to desire in the face of overwhelming oppression. The analyst is the redemption of the spiritual Father, the promised Father that the subject has no hope but to believe in. In this way, the analyst captures even the internalized elements of the schiz, finishing the work of external prison in that the *ressentiment* it produces is transfigured into bad conscience — the subject, the prisoner, learns to love his enemy, learns to feel guilty under the Law of the Father, and learns to worship his own imprisonment as a form of justice.

In this way, the Holy Spirit of the psychoanalyst completes the task of the carceral spirituality of orthodoxy: one is guilty in advance, and thus must come to love their captor. As Foucault notes, “the soul is the prison of the body” (*Discipline and Punish*, p. 30) — the interiority of the soul that makes the body a guilty animal seeking redemption. The miraculating force that the Holy Analyst takes on of the good parent who has always held the Truth, always had good will toward the prisoner, is the fulfillment of the Father’s Law, the completion of the Oedipal Trinity. After all, the violence of the Father was always actually consubstantial with the love of the Mother...

In an attempt at escaping this Oedipalizing apparatus, I hope to lay bare an imageless messianic horizon (the concept of horizon which is alluded to heavily in “The Plane of Immanence” chapter of *What is Philosophy?*) — in other words, the imageless, virtual intensities of the messianic — that permeate the transcendental schiz after the death of God and after the death of the Subject. This messianic field emerges as the repetition of death; as the transgressions which open the *trans*/cendental* field beyond the profane Law of identity and into the sacred Real of the schiz. At the same time, the disjunctive syllogism allows for both the Law and the Real to coexist, not as originary Ground (World), but as experimental Flux. In the dissolution of the Ground, the Flux becomes all the names in history, connecting the series from degree zero to the Messianic Horizon of the Impossible. Here, where new names generate, the Messianic returns from the future nameless, the Name of all names. The Messianic is no longer the Image of God, but instead is the anti-oedipal imageless Self of the schiz. As we dissolve our names in this Messianic field, becoming-schizo, we delink from the Savior machine of the One True God, the abject Trinity of Oedipus, and Christofascist theopolitics. At the apotheotic height of the powers unfolded by the death of the Oedipal God, a boon — the schiz-Self — eternally returns as a multitude of laughing gods, a thousand tiny Jesuses, children dancing upon the immanent plane of tehomic difference...

A Philosophical Trinity

But is this plane not only anti-oedipal, but also anti-trinitarian? In *What is Philosophy?*, Deleuze and Guattari write that,

Philosophy presents three elements, each of which fits with the other two but must be considered for itself: *the prephilosophical plane it must layout (immanence), the persona or personae it must invent and bring to life (insistence), and the philosophical concepts it must create (consistency)*. Laying out, inventing, and creating constitute the philosophical trinity—diagrammatic, personalistic, and intensive features. Concepts are

grouped according to whether they resonate or throw out mobile bridges, covering the same plane of immanence that connects them to one another. There are families of planes according to whether the infinite movements of thought fold within one another and compose variations of curvature or, on the contrary, select noncomposable varieties. There are types of persona according to the possibilities of even their hostile encounters on the same plane and in a group. But it is often difficult to determine if it is the same group, the same type, or the same family. A whole “taste” is needed here.

Here they describe a philosophical trinity for themselves: the concept, the plane, and the conceptual personae. As stated earlier, we are not merely attempting to critique and abandon the trinitarian structure, but instead to deoedipalize it and draw from it a schizophrenic Godhead liberated from the shackles of the colonial, anthropocentric, and cisheteropatriarchal master signifier of Oedipus. It is through Deleuze and Guattari’s philosophical trinity that I offer my own philosophical (and atheological) trinity: the concept of modernity/coloniality/rationality/secularity, the plane of the death of God, and the conceptual personae of the atheological eunuch.

The consistency of the concepts of modernity, coloniality, rationality, and secularity lies in the fact that each concept contains the others, and each of these components, although separate, thus form a singular concept: modernity/coloniality/rationality/secularity. They are bound by exoconsistency to concepts of race, power, nation, religion, language, gender, sexuality, economics, ecology, and politics. It is in relation to this consistency and exoconsistency that we find all worlds as worlds engulfed in desire: the desiring-machines of these heterarchies sustain a global world-order dominated by a coloniality of knowledge, which maintains colonial superiority by reducing the Other to an object to be interpreted, to be understood and controlled. At the same time, it is in the form of fertile desiring-machines — as connective synthesis in particular — that the self-understanding of the colonized persists. This is not yet delinking, but rather the groundless *Ground* (*tehom*) which makes it possible: the ever-repressed, ever-living desire of colonized subjects. By seizing the connectivity of desire that turns in the abyss of *tehom* — in the wound of trauma and the womb of resistance — (re)new(ed) worlds are born on the Earth.

The creation of the concept of modernity/coloniality/rationality/secularity must happen on a particular plane — what has been called the death of God — by particular conceptual personae: the ever-diluted minorities that spawn from this plane of the dying God. In other words, the death of God is the soil through which these concepts rise; it is the prefiguration of modernity/coloniality/rationality/secularity, its very presupposition. The death of God, as plane, is quite literally the plane of immanence: the point at which transcendence is both overcome and relegated to secondary status. With the death of God, the plan(e) of transcendence becomes obsolete; the Subject which once dominated the heterarchies of the World, ‘Man’, is limited to an effect of immanence, a product of the conjunctive synthesis that, as product, must itself pass away. In this sense, a new kind of Reason emerges that disrupts the colonial rationality and secularity: a deanthropomorphized, posthuman Reason that traces the conjunctive synthesis from point zero to the highest intensity, an animism of the multiplicity that functions as an apocalypse in which all names coexist along the plane.

For the concepts to grow along the plane requires the labor of conceptual personae — referring in this work specifically to what I call atheological eunuchs. These personae emerge in relation to the plane, as its particular characters, as its claimants. Those who can claim to be children of the death of God are the at once atheological, in that they have seen the death of the sacred, and castrated, in the sense that this death leads to

(the confrontation of) nihilism, ennui, and anomie. The eunuchs exist in this atheological, castrated state through the disjunctive synthesis, which forces them to be all things at once (and no thing at all), a posthuman apocalypse that is simultaneously a transsexual intercarnation. They are without God and yet must choose who and what their God is: in other words, who and what they are, their right to claim over the meaning of the death of God, and its principle concept, modernity/coloniality/rationality/secularity. The atheological eunuchs are a continuing process of becoming-minoritarian: as they ride the posthuman death of God, creating and embodying the concept of modernity/coloniality/rationality/secularity, they arrive and depart as so many ships on an ever-receding shore. In this sense, there are three particular claimants that we must examine: the Apostle-Priest, the Colonist-King, and the Vanishing-Nomad. Each of these personae — variations of the atheological eunuch — based on their diverse relations claim the death of God and modernity/coloniality/rationality/secularity differently; their difference being the key to comprehending the contemporary world-order.

Gathered together, the concept of modernity/coloniality/rationality/secularity, the plane of the death of God, and the conceptual personae of the atheological eunuch are products of my distinct *taste*: I have imagined the eunuch as the transsexual reader — composed of a multiplicity of sexes (i.e. perspectives) — of that great Event, the death of God, the opening of the posthuman, that in itself gives birth to different understandings of modernity/coloniality/rationality/secularity. In this sense, the concept, the plane, and the conceptual personae are a philosophical/atheological trinity.

Jesus: Desiring-Revolution and the Kin-dom of Heaven

Jesus Christ of Nazareth started a revolution in the history of desire, a revolution that transformed the love of God from a transcendent piety into an immanent criteria for establishing the highest powers of the earth in and as the kin-dom of heaven.

To affirm these powers is not only the negation of personal death, but is the affirmation of life beyond the egoic bounds that constitute the parameters and possibility of personal death; in other words, where One dies, other Ones begin along the horizon as the infinite folds of the unfolding Messiah. I follow Deleuze and Guattari in quoting Rimbaud: “Let him die in his leaping through unheard-of and unnamable things: other horrible workers will come; they will begin on the horizons where the other collapsed!” Where there is an infinitude of desiring-machines, the Christ contracts these desiring-machines into his folds, unfolding them as Ones. “*The many become one, and are increased by one.*” Each and every subject a repetition, a simulacrum of the Christ; each and every I refuted through affirmation, a pulsation of desiring-machines as the crowned anarchies of the messianic horizon, traced upon the earth as the kin-dom of heaven.

To be one’s Self in this sense is not to be isolated, catatonic, or solipsistic; it is to be the earth in desiring-revolution — the schizophrenification of death, the transsexualization of life, the posthumanification of the spirit. Jesus Christ of Nazareth did not merely live in his head, in his flesh, or in his death; he lived *a life* in God, as God, and for God.

Epitaph

‘My’ soul: an empty fullness aching to be built in the image of flashing eternity. Yearning for *a life*, it constructs its flesh from dancing particles; that little ‘me’ that was and is and will become is but a product of

its morphogenetic field. 'I' am a relic of cosmic delight. 'I' am a wave splashed on the shore of joyous abundance. 'I' am a miracle wrought from pure difference dining on itself. Feed 'me', eat 'me', shit 'me' out and turn 'me' to tumultuous dust. FOR EVERY LONG HOUR... there is but a short collection of eons. 'You' are the taste of every moment, clinging in quiet stillness to palpability, choosing to see itself unfold. Let the 'I' fumble softly into an imaginary wholeness, a mad singularity, a meaningful, nonsensical, ever-birthing Godheadification of the schiz. In freeing the Earth of the tyranny of the I, the cosmic forces of the eternal return bring forth a (re)new(ed) Self, the Shamanic Self, the transsexual mechanic of desire; in Her, the way to the future is spelled along a nomadic path, through the gate of the Moment in each and every moment, movements threaded through the eye of the needle, the narrow path that brings down the lightning that lights the way beyond Man, toward post/humanity, toward decolonization, beyond the fascist circle of Zarathustra's dwarf...