

Tab 1 · hus, anti-Black racism is ontologically incomparable to other types of oppression due to its component of non-humanness. Other types of dehumanization around the world, still recognized people as human, though degraded.



gegen raum
11:48 17. Dez.

This is a very bold claim, which you need to back up. My point would be here:

Colonialism (and also prior empires) have also enslaved and dehumanized people with Asian, Arabic or south American descent. Indigenous people around the globe have been slaughtered and enslaved. So have been religious believers, as the history of, e.g., Antisemitism shows.

Yes, colonial slave trade on the African continent has probably been the most systematic in scale, however, to me, this bold claim creates a weird particularism which does not make justice to all the violence colonialism has inflicted on this world. It is also not an intersectional argument you seem to hold dear as a perspective in the paper.

You could resolve this easily by just taking the point of incomparability out.

See: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slavery>

Also, a detailed history of western global oppression is well elaborated in:

Adas, M. (2018). Machines as the measure of men: Science, technology, and ideologies of Western dominance. Cornell University Press.



Victor Udoewa
22:30 2. Jan.

I don't fully understand what's wrong here. It's completely fine and ok if you disagree. Disagreement is good. This is just the Afropessimist positioning (and experience). Shouldn't that be ok?

1. Orlando Patterson's Slavery and Social Death examines slavery across 66 societies - including Greece, Rome, medieval Europe, China, Korea, Islamic kingdoms, and Africa. However, Afropessimists make a crucial distinction. Wilderson explicitly states: "The narrative arc of the slave who is Black (unlike Orlando Patterson's generic slave who may be of any race) is not an arc at all" This is the key point: Afropessimists argue that while Patterson identifies social death as a feature of slavery universally, the specific fusion of Blackness with Slaveness through the transatlantic slave trade created something ontologically unique.

[Weniger anzeigen](#)



Victor Udoewa
22:31 2. Jan.

2. Wilderson argues that "The Black is not a sentient being whose narrative progression has been circumscribed by racism, colonialism, or even slavery for that matter. Blackness and Slaveness are inextricably bound in such a way that whereas Slaveness can be disimbricated from Blackness, Blackness cannot exist as other than Slaveness."

The crucial difference is this: Colonial violence and other forms of enslavement created "degraded humanity" - people who could theoretically be "re-redeemed" or restored to full humanity. But anti-Blackness positions Black people as "object inhumanity" - fundamentally outside the category of human altogether.

[Weniger anzeigen](#)



Victor Udoewa
22:33 2. Jan.

3. I think it's important to avoid a type of suffering competition and Olympics with your points about Arabs and

[Mehr anzeigen](#)



Victor Udoewa
22:34 2. Jan.

4. I added a story to explain some of the global dimensions of anti-Blackness. It is global. This may be outside of your experience but it is well known among African peoples, including in Europe.



BAREIS Jascha
11:56 9. Nov.

this is a strong claim as many ethnicities and skin colours around the world suffer(ed) from colonialism. From the lowest castes in india, to Balkan white trash - oppression against the not-western other follows a system of dehumanization. You may add this discussion in your (?) or Afropessimist' reconstruction of argument

[Weniger anzeigen](#)

Aus einem importierten Dokument



Victor Udoewa
03:20 8. Dez.

Yes, it's different. Other types of dehumanization around the world, still recognized people as human, though degraded. Slavery positioned Africans as tools or as property. I added this.

*Is Black racism
ontologically
incomparable to other
types of oppression?*

What does being "White" entail?



BAREIS Jascha

19:12 7. Nov.



I would be careful not to do some "othering" here: I am not a futurist myself and I do not know the scene too well, but be aware that you are creating a salient category. I believe there is also plurality in futuring approaches in the West. I would be more specific and not conflate the White Futurist into the "other"

[Weniger anzeigen](#)

Aus einem importierten Dokument



Victor Udoewa

03:07 8. Dez.



I think you might be misunderstanding White. It sounds like you are interpreting it as white people or people with white skin color. Whiteness is not a skin color. I added a sentence to explain that.

Who are "white" futurists?

Tab 1



BAREIS Jascha

18:28 7. Nov.



As you make here a big claim about an entire discipline of thinkers, you may want to add some further sources or make clear that this is, particularly, your own reading of the (white?) role of designers and futurists

Aus einem importierten Dokument



Victor Udoewa

02:25 8. Dez.

It's not a discipline of thinkers; it's the dominant discipline of practice. Many people understand this. And this was a longer section with many more citations but they were cut due to the word count. I've added some citations.



gegen raum

10:57 17. Dez.



At this point, it would be very important to clarify your understanding of whiteness. In the response letter you explain: "White futurists are not futurists who are white. Whiteness is ontological as is Blackness. In Black studies, they are ways of being in the world. Someone of any color, race, or ethnicity can be a White futurist, especially and including people who are Black, including myself. I've addressed your comments in the paper, but that is something to keep in mind. There is no color line, especially in a colonial or neocolonial or postcolonial context. Whiteness is in all people." This should be added here to make the reader sensitive about your understanding.

[Weniger anzeigen](#)



Victor Udoewa

20:10 1. Jan.



I had added it later in the paper, but now I have removed it and moved it here.