

K

Anti-blackness K's refusal to historicize itself along lines of class replicates material and cultural oppression—that makes analyzing the aff through a Marxist lens necessary. The perm fails because K must come first.

Annie **Olaloku-Teriba**, contributor to "historicalmaterialism.org," 2018. [Afro-Pessimism and the [un]logic of anti-blackness, Accessed at: <http://www.historicalmaterialism.org/articles/afro-pessimism-and-unlogic-anti-blackness>] MD

The notion, advanced by Afro-pessimists, that to be 'ethnically' black is paradigmatically different from any other racial group rests primarily on the presumption that the master–slave dynamic is essentially racialised. A tension emerges as Sexton and Wilderson go further. For them it is neither race, nor racism, which structures white supremacy; rather, White Supremacy is just one iteration of a global anti-black solidarity. Black is not a race, since blacks are the antagonist of the very category of human, and yet it is. Indeed, the category of ontological non-being, which Sexton and Wilderson identify, relies heavily on the assumptive logic of 'Race' – following from Patrick Wolfe's paradox, this is in itself a powerful sign of the extent to which racial ideology has embedded itself in our capacity to conceptualise difference.[31] Thus, the purportedly distinctive dynamic between 'the Human and the Black' is widely articulated through 'anti-blackness' and its contemporary accoutrements. Today, the concept of 'anti-blackness' has come to signify, not only the particularity of racism against those deemed black, but also the centrality of such racism to all paradigms of racial domination. In this sense, Afro-pessimism emerges from a tradition of ethnocentric analyses, which focuses on the particular intensity of systemic white domination of black people. However, Afro-pessimism marks a departure from this tradition through a theorisation of anti-blackness that takes aim at other racially dominated groups as fundamentally and irredeemably implicated in the domination of black people. Afro-pessimists want us to think through these relationships as existing on different planes. Between the poor white and the white master, and between the 'non-black person of colour' and the white, there is a sort of reasoned violence. For the black, on the other hand, there is primarily gratuitous violence – existing in a state of incomprehensible 'external superviolence' and internalised self-hatred.[32] Wilderson renders this logic explicit when he asserts, 'every other group lives in a context of violence which has what I would call a sort of psychological grounding wire, which means that they can write a sentence about why they are experiencing that violence. ... For a Black person to try and emulate that kind of interpretive lens, the problem becomes a lot bigger. For us this is the ongoing tactic of a strategy for human renewal.'[33] This emerges from a reading of Fanon that begins from the points where he seems 'at a loss' to explain what he is confronted with.[34] Contrasting Fanon to Marx, Wilderson comments that '[the] slave relation ... relegates the capital relation ... to a conflict, and not the antagonism that Marx ... thought it to be'.[35] Crucial to his argument is the idea that Fanon's critique of Hegel's master–slave dialectic sets out to show some essential difference between the worker/capitalist relation and the Negro/White master relation. Wilderson goes on to assert that 'were [the worker/capitalist relation] to be "solved" (were it to cease to exist as a relation, after the victory of the proletariat), the world would still be subsumed by the slave relation: an antagonism not between the position of the worker and that of the boss, but between the Human and the Black'.[36] This reading treats Fanon's Black Skin, White Masks as a series of independent moments, disregarding his emphasis on temporality in the introduction.[37] In a lecture, titled after one of his articles, Sexton argues that these moments are in tension, constituting 'a slippage between the universal denunciation of all exploitation, and the conceptual conflation of all such suffering under the broadest heading'.[38] It therefore effaces the relationship between these moments of complete despair and his moments of clarity – where these mystifications of 'race', the burden of incomprehensibility that they impose, and the nihilism which they invite, are turned on their head within the same text through the illuminating capacity of struggle. Turning, for example, to Fanon's essay on 'The Negro and Recognition', embedded in his critique of Hegel's master–slave dialectic is a striking demystification. Clarifying his motivations, Fanon writes: I hope I have shown that here the master differs basically from the master described by Hegel. For Hegel there is reciprocity; here the master laughs at the consciousness of the slave. What he wants from the slave is not recognition but work. In the same way, the slave here is in no way identifiable with the slave who loses himself in the object and finds in his work the source of his liberation. The Negro wants to be like the master. Therefore, he is less independent than the Hegelian slave. In Hegel the slave turns away from the master and turns toward the object. Here the slave turns toward the master and abandons the object.[39] What does Fanon mean when he says that what the master 'wants from the slave is not recognition but work'? Against Hegel's 'absolute reciprocity', Fanon advances a conception of the negro slave as the alienated epitome of exploitation; which is to say that the master and the slave in Fanon's account are not produced by a relation of anti-blackness (in the new life that this term has taken on) but by exploitation. This harkens back to Wilderson's earlier misunderstanding of the base in Marxist theory. Fanon, in

contrast to Wilderson, gives ontological priority to the exploitative relation of production between master and slave. This priority is reiterated elsewhere, when Fanon takes aim at attempts to assert a global blackness: “Negroes” are in the process of disappearing, since those who created them are witnessing the demise of their economic and cultural supremacy.[40] Fanon is less concerned with the slave as an opposing pole from which ‘Man’ has built community – he has no such illusions about the material existence of white fraternity.[41] Culture, he argues, is first and foremost national in nature.[42] Instead, Fanon is concerned with how the profits from her labour finance society. We might then think of the position of the slave as the capitalist aspiration for all workers – stripped of all that which renders her recognisable, the worker as ‘a mere mechanism’, but possible only through the mystification of race. [43] In contrast to Wilderson’s assertion that ‘an ensemble of ontological questions that has as its foundation accumulation and fungibility as a grammar of suffering’ exclusively marking the black as outside of ‘[a humanist] discourse that has as its foundation alienation and exploitation as a grammar of suffering’, the master–slave relation which Fanon proposes upsets this binary.[44] Fanon’s elucidation exposes the slave as contingently black, not ‘paradigmatically black’. What is the difference? The Afro-pessimist sees the world as structured by a non-black solidarity in preventing the ontological possibility of black life. Were ‘black’ meant as a metaphor for the condition of total alienation from self, this might make sense.[45] However, because the Afro-pessimist imaginary ties itself to a morphological account of blackness, this leads us to a theoretical dead end. In this world-view, it therefore becomes necessary to begin by treating ‘race’ as a problem fundamentally rooted in the formation of sociality – in which the Black precedes the historical order and the processes, both violent and mundane, which create her. By contrast, to think through the implications of contingency is to confront the reality that these racial categories – categories that Wilderson and Sexton treat as absolute – are actually unstable as evidence that something else is afoot. It is to see ‘race’ not as an anchor, but as a mystification conjured to weather crises of legitimacy. For example, we can examine how Sexton links the condition of the Afro-American slave, the free black and the African thus: ‘because blackness serves as the basis of enslavement in the logic of a transnational political and legal culture, it permanently destabilises the position of any nominally free black population’.[46] The presumption of a shared (presumably global) legal and political culture within which the assertion that blackness was a basis of enslavement might be made is quite mistaken. Even in the US, the centralisation of the legal and political status of blacks only emerged at the moment of formal abolition following the American Civil War. Prior to this, the internal border system of the US produced divergent rationales and attendant juridical technology for enslavement. The South might be considered to fit the relationship that Sexton suggests. For example, Supreme Court judges in Georgia argued that the free black was ‘associated still with the slave in this State’.[47] However, the North tells a different story, wherein free blacks were likened to ‘white women and children ... denied many political rights but did not therefore forfeit their basic status as citizens’.[48] In any case, the debates within slave states in the late antebellum period included the proposition of ‘forcing their free black populations to elect between re-enslavement and leaving the state’.[49] The concerns of legislators and judges in the South, that free black populations might inspire slave revolts and undermine the racial order, indicate that their motivations were not paradigmatic but pragmatic. This is to say that these political and legal elites were well aware of the fragility of the racial order that they had created. Indeed, on the relationship between the free black and the slave, a sketch of the thinking of legislators in the Northern and Southern states offers a radically different picture to Sexton’s. Rather than being a given, the position of the free black was both contested and geographically dependent. Interestingly, during an 1820 Congressional debate regarding a clause in Missouri’s proposed constitution which would bar free blacks from entering the state, it was the condition of Native Americans which structured the logic regarding the position of free blacks: ‘the Indians born in the states continue to be aliens and so, I contend, do the free negroes’.[50] Contrary to Sexton’s assertion of the exceptional nature of the Afro-American experience in this regard, legislators consciously rooted their position in a nexus of other ‘undesirables’ which included both Native Americans and white ‘paupers’. The preoccupation with the condition of ‘poor whites’ is certainly not a new phenomenon. Legislators in the antebellum South were consumed with the implications of (white) pauperism which meant that, ‘the adjudged pauper is subordinated to the will of others, and reduced to a condition but little removed from that of chattel slavery, and until recently, by statute of 1847, c. 12, like the slave, was liable to be sold upon the block of the auctioneer, for service or support’.[51] Moreover, it is important to note that the Northern and Southern states proffered different rationales for the contested status of free blacks, and that, at this time, the federal government’s role in determining the parameters of the claimable rights of individuals ‘was largely restricted to establishing the requirements for naturalization and the requirements for alien ownership of federal lands’.[52] The fragility of hierarchies of race is inherent to the project of racialism. Rather than emanating from some assuredness regarding the morphological provenance of racialised ‘personhood’ and ‘unpersonhood’, what we see here is the adoption of specific policy-practices in order to construct a world in which the insurrection against domination that the American Revolution represented could co-exist with the continued brutal exploitation that slavery represented. And so, the

slave was not created so that the American might exist; instead, the black was created so that slavery might survive republican fervour. Indeed, we must be careful about operating at a level of abstraction which would enable the post hoc justifications of enslavement concocted by Southern slave owners embattled by a crisis of legitimacy to shape the historiography of chattel slavery. Wilderson and Sexton want us to believe both that the myriad forms of exploitation – indentured servitude, ghettoisation, mass incarceration, police brutality et cetera – which followed the formal abolition of slavery constitute a continuation of enslavement (or its ‘afterlife’), and that the position of the slave is fundamentally different from the position of the ‘white’ or ‘Indian’ indentured servant who often performed similar labour and whose resistance incurred violent repression. Such a framework mystifies three crucial facts: first, that the ‘blackness’ of the category of slave was both contingent and unstable;^[53] second, that to exceptionalise African enslavement obscures the many categories of ‘alien’ which were comparable to the negro in the US context; third, that natal alienation was not from some African collectivity but from specific and diverse social formations in Western Africa.^[54]

B. The system results in the genocide of those deemed less productive members of society. This turns case as my opponent fails to address the central issues driving their harms.

Joel **Kovel**, Alger Hiss professor of Social Studies at Bard College, “The Enemy of Nature: The end of capitalism or the end of the World,” **2007**. [Chapter 6- Capital and the domination of nature, Accessed at: Google books] MD

Capital produces egoic relations, which reproduce capital. The isolated selves of the capitalist order can choose to become personifications of capital, or may have the role thrust upon them. In either case, they embark upon a pattern of non-recognition mandated by the fact that the almighty dollar interposes itself between all elements of experience: all things in the world, all other persons, and between the self and its world. Hence nothing really exists except in and through monetization. This setup provides an ideal culture medium for the bacillus of competition and ruthless self maximization. Because money is all that “counts,” a peculiar heartlessness characterizes capitalists, a tough-minded and cold abstraction that will sacrifice species, whole continents (viz Africa) or inconvenient subsets of the population (viz black urban males) who add too little to the great march of surplus value, or may be seen as standing in its way, or simply suitable objects of demonization to distract the masses. The presence of value screens out genuine fellow feeling or compassion, replacing it with the calculus of profit-expansion. Never has a holocaust been carried out so impersonally. When the Nazis killed their victims, the crimes were accompanied by a racist drumbeat; for global capital, the losses are regrettable necessities or collateral damage.

C. The alternative is to embrace historical materialism- a literal rewriting of history along lines of labor and production to account for the class-based incentives to produce violence. That’s a priori question to the affirmative.

Stephen **Tumino**, PhD student in English at the University of Pittsburgh, “The Red Critique,” **2001**. [What is orthodox Marxism and why it matters now more than ever before, Accessed at: <http://redcritique.org/spring2001/whatisorthodoxmarxism.htm>] MD

Any effective political theory will have to do at least two things: it will have to offer an integrated understanding of social practices and, based on such an interrelated knowledge, offer a guideline for praxis. My main argument here is that among all contesting social theories now, only Orthodox Marxism has been able to produce an integrated knowledge of the existing social totality and provide lines of praxis that will lead to building a society free from necessity. But first I must clarify what I mean by Orthodox Marxism. Like all other modes and forms of political theory, the very theoretical identity of Orthodox Marxism is itself contested—not just from non- and anti-Marxists who question

the very "real" (by which they mean the "practical" as under free-market criteria) existence of any kind of Marxism now but, perhaps more tellingly, from within the Marxist tradition itself. I will, therefore, first say what I regard to be the distinguishing marks of Orthodox Marxism and then outline a short polemical map of contestation over Orthodox Marxism within the Marxist theories now. I will end by arguing for its effectivity in bringing about a new society based not on human rights but on freedom from necessity. I will argue that to know contemporary society—and to be able to act on such knowledge—one has to first of all know what makes the existing social totality. I will argue that the dominant social totality is based on inequality—not just inequality of power but inequality of economic access (which then determines access to health care, education, housing, diet, transportation, . . .). This systematic inequality cannot be explained by gender, race, sexuality, disability, ethnicity, or nationality. These are all secondary contradictions and are all determined by the fundamental contradiction of capitalism which is inscribed in the relation of capital and labor. All modes of Marxism now explain social inequalities primarily on the basis of these secondary contradictions and in doing so—and this is my main argument—legitimate capitalism. Why? Because such arguments authorize capitalism without gender, race, discrimination and thus accept economic inequality as an integral part of human societies. They accept a sunny capitalism—a capitalism beyond capitalism. Such a society, based on cultural equality but economic inequality, has always been the not-so-hidden agenda of the bourgeois left—whether it has been called "new left," "postmarxism," or "radical democracy." This is, by the way, the main reason for its popularity in the culture industry—from the academy (Jameson, Harvey, Haraway, Butler, . . .) to daily politics (Michael Harrington, Ralph Nader, Jesse Jackson, . . .) to. . . . For all, capitalism is here to stay and the best that can be done is to make its cruelties more tolerable, more humane. This humanization (not eradication) of capitalism is the sole goal of ALL contemporary lefts (marxism, feminism, anti-racism, queeries, . . .). Such an understanding of social inequality is based on the fundamental understanding that the source of wealth is human knowledge and not human labor. That is, wealth is produced by the human mind and is thus free from the actual objective conditions that shape the historical relations of labor and capital. Only Orthodox Marxism recognizes the historicity of labor and its primacy as the source of all human wealth. In this paper I argue that any emancipatory theory has to be founded on recognition of the priority of Marx's labor theory of value and not repeat the technological determinism of corporate theory ("knowledge work") that masquerades as social theory.

The role of the ballot then, is to endorse the debater through awarding them the ballot and round, who best engages in historical materialism in order to tell and understand history.

Case

Turn- Radicale Thought

Turn- Double-bind- Either my opponent's theory is understandable and proves they reinforce anti-blackness, or you can't understand what they are saying and have to vote against them because you can't evaluate the theory's solvency or not.

Toulmin, professor of humanities at Northwestern University, 1990.

Stephen Toulmin, professor in humanities at Northwestern University, "Cosmopolis," 1990. [Chapter 5: The way ahead, p. 178-179, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, Accessed at Google books] MD]

The pillars-certainty, systematicity, and the clean slate, and when after 300 years John Dewey and Richard Rorty read the burial service over this program, their obsequy had wider significance.

The ideas that handling problems rational means making a totally fresh start had been a mistake all along. All we can be called upon to do is to take a start from where we are, at the time we are there: i.e., to make discriminating and critical use of the ideas available to us in our current local situation, and the evidence of our experience, as this is "read" in terms of those ideas. There is no way of cutting ourselves free of our conceptual inheritance: all we are required to do is use our experience critically and discriminatingly, refining and improving our inherited ideas, and determining more exactly the limits to their scope. More specifically, the last thirty years' work in the history of science, cultural anthropology, and elsewhere shows that, however impeccably we meet those demands, we are no closer to a self-justifying starting point. No neutral "scratch line" exists from which to jump to a self-sustaining, tradition-free intellectual system. All of the cultural situations from which we pursue our practical and intellectual inquiries are historically conditioned: this being so, the only thing we can do is to make the best of starting with what we have got, here and now.

Turn- Complicit

Turn- Failure to destroy the world means you are complicit to anti-blackness. Blacks cannot exist in the debate space, so symbolic extinction reinforces anti-blackness.

Evans, only coach to coach a college team to win both NDT/CEDA and graduate of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, 2015.

Rashad Evans, only coach to coach a college team to win both NDT/CEDA, and graduate of the University of Pennsylvania Law School, "Five Four Aff," August 21, 2015. [On White Afro-pessimism, last accessed on December 14, 2019, Accessed at:

<https://54aff.wordpress.com/2015/08/21/on-white-afro-pessimism/>] MD

Afropessimism is nothing if not an affirmation of blackness. It includes a negation of the world, but it is principally an affirming argument. For Black people. A white afropessimist makes no sense. White afropessimism is just anti-blackness. If you are a white afro-pessimist you should understand that your existence is complicit in violence against Black people and/or that your non-existence is a necessity to Black liberation. Under no circumstances should you understand your role to be to spread the gospel of pessimism further. Your engagement with the argument will always be theoretical (you have no relevant

experience), redundant (you can never be additive to this conversation) and objectifying (reducing black people to objects of study). Afropessimism is an argument about why Black people should be the subjects of the debate. It is about how Black people are always already the subject of all debates but excluded from them as such. It is not about white people. **All of this assumes that we are taking the argument seriously and not speaking in metaphorical terms**, something Eve Tuck warns against in the context of settler colonialism. Both the Settler Colonialism and Black Nihilism arguments rely significantly on Fanon. And **Fanon's main point is that the native/colonialist and/or black/white cannot coexist**. In practical terms, this meant that Black liberation in Africa required a violent war to the end. **It's an either/or life or death choice for both sides. But, understanding that anti-black violence is foundational is to understand that you have to fight back in literal terms. To end the world is to end the world**. I am not certain that debaters fully understand the implications of such. If the students in my lab understood this they would have found the Black Nihilism argument as difficult as the Settler Colonialism argument. But they did not, partially because they were introduced to the argument from the perspective of Gramsci and a theory of civil society and not from Fanon and everyday anti-Black violence, but also because I didn't take the time to explain the argument fully. Under no circumstances should non-Black debaters be taught to advocate for afro-pessimism from a non-Black person. And under no circumstances should two white boys think they have a better shot flipping negative and running afropessimism than reading their own Aff (something I had to explain before a quarters debate at the camp tournament). When that happens something has gone wrong.

Collapse of the system leads to wars on the scale of World War with nuclear weapons. This means anti-blackness will get worse. Just because we transition doesn't mean we transition

Poulos, contributing editor at "American Affairs," 2017.

James Poulos, contributing editor at "American Affairs", Foreign Affairs, August 20, 2017. [America's Liberal logjam, Accessed at: https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2017-08-29/americas-liberal-logjam?cid=nlc-fa_fa_today-20170830] MD

The sobering conclusion is that liberals who think they can safely abandon humanist culture for the high ground of citizen politics will be overrun by the left's identitarians and their intersectional allies. Politics will not save us from identity politics because politics can never save us, however inescapable and indispensable it may be. To pursue a truly shared vision of justice, humans require a deeper common ground. Yet **even for hostile critics of liberalism**—especially Christian or secular humanists on the right—**now is not the time to give in to schadenfreude. Today's deep crisis may have been inevitable**. It may augur some healthy or inspiring changes. **But if liberalism does collapse or shrivel up, history strongly suggests that the restoration of Western social order on a different foundation will require another great cycle of war.**

you can't guarantee what is coming after the collapse. It could be worse

Turn- Black/White binary

Turn- The Black/White paradigm silences and renders invisible the histories and experiences of other radicalized groups, reinscribing racial oppression.

Perea, professor of Law at the University of Florida College of Law, 1997.

Juan F. Perea, professor of Law at the University of Florida College of Law, "California Law Review," October 1997. [Race, ethnicity & Nationhood: Article: The black/white binary paradigm of race: The "normal science of American racial thought, Accessed at: Lexis Nexis] MD

One could defend the Black/White paradigm on the grounds that it represents the efforts of scholars to study the most virulent form of racism in the United States, White racism against Blacks, and that study of the most virulent form will naturally encompass less virulent forms such as those experienced by Latinos/as. The extent of White racism against Blacks, cruelly manifested in slavery, was unprecedented. Pervasive and continuing racism against Blacks justifies every effort dedicated to its eradication. There are at least three reasons, however, why an exclusive focus on Blacks and Whites is not justified. First, it is important to work to eradicate all racism, not just the racism experienced by Blacks. Second, it is wrong to assume that racism against Latinos/as is simply a less virulent form of the same racism experienced by Blacks. As Blauner described, racism against Latinos/as has a different genesis. It may also be different in kind in ways that are very important. For example, Blacks may or may not ever experience the language and accent discrimination faced by many Latinos/as. Finally, our national demographics are changing significantly. One cannot simply ignore the concerns of an increasingly [*1254] large and subordinated group of Latinos/as forever. A society is just only if everyone can participate in it on equal terms. Some readers might object that Latinos/as are now, late in the game, attempting to lay claim to civil rights already hard won by Blacks after long struggle. I think the abbreviated slice of Mexican-American legal history presented in this article begins to refute this argument. In fact, Mexican Americans can lay claim to a long struggle for civil rights. Ironically, it is largely because of the Black/White paradigm of race that more people do not learn Mexican-American and other Latino/a history in the United States. So readers and scholars must begin to ask whether Latinos/as are invisible because they have not participated in social struggle or because scholars have been indifferent and have neglected to tell the stories of their presence and participation in social struggle. I suggest that the latter is the more accurate explanation. It is not my intent to fault Black and White writers for writing solely about Blackness and its relation to Whiteness. Indeed, such writing has improved everyone's understanding of White racism against Blacks. On this subject, we need more, not less understanding. An important justification for focusing on Whiteness is that White racism is the source of the problems they explore. n206 Such writing and scholarship is an act of struggle in itself and it need not be made in conjunction with or on behalf of any other group. My objection to the state of most current scholarship on race is simply that most of this scholarship claims universality of treatment while actually describing only part of its subject, the relationship between Blacks and Whites. Race in the United States means more than just Black and White. It also refers to Latino/a, Asian, Native American, and other racialized groups. Accordingly, books titled "Race in America" or "White Racism" that only discuss Blackness and Whiteness claim a universality of scope that they do not deliver. These books offer a paradigmatic rendering of their subject that excludes important portions of civil rights history. Authors of such books need to be aware that they promulgate a binary paradigm of race that operates to silence and render invisible Latinos/as, Asian Americans and Native Americans. Accordingly, they reproduce a serious harm.

Turn- Ballot

Turn- My opponent's performance reifies the dominant power structure. They give a performance in exchange for the ballot. Thus, the performance is giving value or devalued by the very power structure they are trying to dismantle.

Phelan, professor of Drama and English at Stanford University, 2003.

Peggy Phelan, professor of Drama and of English at Stanford University, "Unmarked: The politics of performance," 2003. [Chapter 1- Broken symmetries: memory, sight, love, Accessed at: ProQuest ebrary] MD

In *The History of Sexuality* Foucault argues that "the agency of domination does not reside in the one who speaks (for it is he who is constrained), but in the one who listens and says nothing; not in the one who knows and answers, but in the one who questions and is not supposed to know" (Sexuality: 64). He is describing the power-knowledge fulcrum which sustains the Roman Catholic confessional, but as with most of Foucault's work, it resonates in other areas as well. As a description of the power relationships operative in many forms of performance Foucault's observation suggests the degree to which the silent spectator dominates and controls the exchange. (As Dustin Hoffman made so clear in *Tootsie*, the performer is always in the female position in relation to power.) Women and performers, more often than not, are "scripted" to "sell" or "confess" something to someone who is in the position to buy or forgive.

Turn-black queer

Turn- Afro-pessimism can't account for black queerness because it assumes uniform violence. Thus, it misses the unique suffering of the black queer.

Warren, assistant professor of American Studies at George Washington University, 2014.

Calvin Warren, Assistant professor of American Studies at George Washington University, "Onticide: Afropessimism, Queer Theory, & Ethics," 2014. [Accessed at: <https://illwilleditions.noblogs.org/files/2015/09/Warren-Onticide-Afropessimism-Queer-Theory-and-Ethics-READ.pdf>] MD

Afro-pessimism, conversely, explicates the violence of captivity and rightly understands it as constitutive of the world itself. It, however, is caught in the "double-bind of communicability" that repeats the very violence of undifferentiation that it critiques. This double-bind is not the "creation" of the Afro-pessimist, but is, instead, an unavoidable violence that exposes some black-objects to forms of anti-blackness not properly theorized (e.g. if we think of "anti-gay" violence as a particular form, or iteration, of anti-blackness itself). Because undifferentiation assumes a homogenous object pulverized by a monolithic violence, it often conceals the insidious ways that anti-blackness cuts the object differently. Some violence is directed to specific "object-forms," and although we can not properly call this specificity "identity," "sexuality," "gender," or "orientation" because these are human attributes, we need a way of describing the violence directed toward the "inconceivable being-ness" of the black queer. The lack of a proper grammar outside of humanism to name both the target of this violence and the violence itself is a theoretical problem that

redoubles itself in physical forms of destruction. I have given a name to this physical and theoretical violence—"onticide." It is the meeting of the non-ontology of blackness, sustained through the viciousness of anti-blackness, and the extreme condition of suffering, sustained through compulsory performances, practices, and pleasures (anti-gay violence).