



WORKS

urban renewal packaged in housing plans and commission reports as repressions that occur in the practice and relations of property. If the societal valuation of property is based on shared understandings of who can do what with space and resources, then the destruction of property is a rejoinder disrupting the property foundations of social life. It is of no surprise that property destruction is vilified in the media as ineffectual and juvenile.

Pathologies issued as indictments, imputations of communities who turn inward to destroy their own communities. Yet such accusations fall on deaf ears that effectively issue their own scathing doubt, exploding in the fault lines of territoriality antagonism.

Whose property, whose destruction, and how to ruin ruins? In the Watts Rebellion, the physical buildings themselves acquired symbolic value as their destruction performs a deprivation of economic value and interrupts the space of capital, but also as physical markers of their impoverished non-belonging.

In this articulation, property destruction, and theft challenge the structural foundations of White society expressed through practices of Black ghettoization that not only house Black populations, but on whose capitalist structures of accumulation and desire it depends. In listening to what the upheaval is speaking, the question of whose property, expressed in the direct action of property destruction, is a multi-layered critique. A leap from the ghetto, a leap to destructive alterity, a leap against White sovereignty. If property is the right to exclude, then property destruction far from indicating a desire for societal inclusion, is instead a rejection of its system in some.

While White society admonishes Black communities for having laid waste to their home and their autonomy, ruination may emphasise a form of critique punctuating that neither home, nor autonomy was ever in hand. To use the words of George Jackson, “their line is ‘ain’t nobody but Black folks gonna die in a revolution.’” This argument completely overlooks the fact that we always have done most of the dying and still do.” As Jackson invokes death as the condition under which Black people in the ghetto are already forced to live, he does not intend for Black lives to be executed in vain, but argues that the fight toward any alternative future may indeed come at the cost of violence against those who oppress, to destroy violence with violence.

This assessment runs perpendicular to the lugubrious judgement offered by the McCone Commission, that violence and lawlessness leads to a dead end, meant to occlude the revolt as a failed mode of freedom. Jackson’s words are indeed jarring

