



destruction extrapolates debates of this objective in the provocation of disorder. Powell's words calling out the participants for wasting precious energy and futility and citing misdirection, as it was aimed inwardly against ourselves, illustrate many of the problems that violent urban uprisings raised for our political imaginaries, structured by loyalty to state authority and lineal reformist transformation.

Its temporal and orientational grammar faithfully envisage state repair and ardently dismiss vandalism as no better than a pernicious exercise. Powell or any other reformist is not the obstacle, of course. Given the promise of violence and the closure of politics to the practice of the gratuitously disenfranchised, this spatial elaboration of urban uprising is not a romantic one and it does not portend obliteration of the state, or for that matter any easy reflection. What it is however is the query of the fire, a turn to the intellect of destructive disruption, or what Mable O. Wilson, Shaun Anderson, and the Black Reconstruction Collective term "unbuilding" as an aperture of the antagonism and interruption of state prescripts and prescriptions. In the act of property destruction, we are struck with the suggestion that ghettoization is neither a state aberration, nor an instantiated and established place, but a deliberative process.

Rather than a moment in which Black rights are simply being revoked or ignored, destruction as a method of taking apart in order to understand how the built fabric came to be reveals a non-habitation where any claim of ownership ruefully initiated by the state cannot also be suspended at its behest. While the popular admonishment of the urban revolt as riot deploys imagery of uncritical destruction that is pointlessly disruptive and generally ineffective, destruction asks what it means to absent absence to leave the ruins of failed reconstruction in utter ruin.

As I have discussed elsewhere, creation and destruction are coeval to Black Anarchist politics, not in a naive hope, but with an understanding that practice, destruction, and violence may provide constitutive thrusts summed by the belief that violence is necessary to the destruction of violence and the anticipation of alternatives.

This recognition of direct action is best conceptualised in the axiom "the propaganda of the deed." The deed of destruction is in this way communicative. In his elaboration of Black Anarchism, William C Anderson, conceptualises ruination as a revolutionary abolitionism, where the bold confrontation with the state requires the process of destruction. But if the Watts Rebellion as cataclysm is speaking, what is it saying?

Rather than provide declarations, destruction may be better understood as asking questions. It asks of the anti-Black conditions fundamentals to state solutions of

