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Abstract

What follows answers a call made by cultural theorist Stuart Hall from the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies to formalize a “mechanism of articulation” for the study of race, ethnicity, and social movements. A mechanism is developed alongside a syntactic structure towards developing this general theory of Articulation. Articulation is formalized so as to be applied to the study of particular historical conditions without losing its analytic power to account for contemporary states of affairs. To do so, this thesis explores an encounter between youth and subcultural movements. The method developed is employed to provide an alternative approach and a historical basis to a particular mode of engaging with the field of Black Studies. Afro-pessimism, as set out by Orlando Patterson (1982) and through one of its most recent architects Frank B. Wilderson III (2009) supposes blackness as comprised of an absolute or universally total nihilism. The Pessimist forwards the impossibility of blackness’ contravening its subordination. This line grounds a philosophical and political perspective forwarded by Jared Sexton (2011) and others in what Sexton calls “The Social Life of Social Death.” I attend to problems raised by Afro-Pessimism—Black identity’s operation out of a cultural and, therefore, political death—which renders the formation of social movements to counter structural overdetermination and subordination impossible. In challenging Identity theory, we reveal the Pessimist’s position as internally contradictory.

Taking as its case study Black subjectivity’s articulation through punk—a musical and cultural form said to be devoid of an inner logic or mechanism for creating and expressing thought—the theory developed in this thesis secures a generative syntax for forms of Black expression. It provides an alternative method to the study of other subjects and movements as well as interrogates the political economy constituting various states of affairs as it pertains to Black study. This project firstly illustrates the syntax and assertability conditions of an articulatory mechanism. Next, it explores textual evidence relating Black literary expression’s tie to music in order to demonstrate musical expression as a product of this mechanism for creating thought; thus, a capacity expressing subjectivity outside of identity constraints. Then, we situate our articulatory mechanism within a set of historical conditions in which the initial call for and our formulation of this formal treatment was in response. Finally, we explore the implications of the application of this formal articulatory mechanism to further Black studies and the analysis of social movements.

The schema developed in this study represents an inquiry into how Black subjectivity articulates its agency in the world through punk. As a form of expression less ready and violent to the idea of being dispossessed of its agency or incorporated into a mainstream value system, punk modes of articulation lend themselves to the study of the formation of subjectivity outside of strict identification within a predetermined frame of reference. Black expressive capacity through punk is a prime subject to complicate an essentialized concept of “Black”-ness. Traditionally, the question of articulation and existence is formulated within the context of an entity whose very being questions the categories of that state of affairs. As a matter of syntax, negation cannot proceed modality. Syntactically, although we can express both, we understand "---may not . . ." as valid but, "---not may . . .” as unintelligible. Through this demonstration alone, the work of this thesis proves the negative existential predicated of blackness by the Pessimist as incorrect.
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“Music, as paradoxical as it might seem, is the result of thought. It is the result of thought perfected at its most empirical, i.e., as attitude, or stance.”

- LeRoi Jones, *Blues People*

“Punks are niggers”

- Richard Hell of *The Voidoids and Television* to New Musical Express, 1977
Note regarding methodological approach: This thesis unfolds on two independent yet not mutually exclusive levels. There is the main text, which can be read on its own. The second level utilizes appendices that offer an outline of the arguments developed in each chapter, along with a qualification of the technical terms employed to illustrate the inner logic of our articulatory mechanism. Appendices act as a supplement to the text and are not necessary to reading the overall argument; however, they do provide the syntax and engine to the articulation process producing the method implemented throughout this project.
INTRODUCTION

That must be the end of a theme which I cannot place. It came into my head today as I was thinking about my philosophical work and saying to myself: "I destroy, I destroy, I destroy —".

- Ludwig Wittgenstein. *Culture and Value*

The passage above does not have a phonetic form but nonetheless exhibits a deep structure, a syntax and logical form, indicative of a capacity to create thought. The musical sequence above does not refer to any "physical" fact. These chords cannot be physically whistled. Just as the predicate "physically" is used above, the notation can only approximate the subject of the song. Wittgenstein meant to whistle this tune, "I destroy, I destroy, I destroy . . .," the articulation of which would mark the destruction of its own grammar. This project is on blackness—and punk. It is to propose a theory articulating black subjectivity. I apply Wittgenstein to a study of blackness to illustrate from the thought, "I destroy", that meaning is not behind the musical notation on the page. Song expresses a thought outside of notation. The union of a logical form and a syntactic structure, deep structures indicative of the generation of thoughts do not necessarily require a phonetic form, something outside or behind what is produced that points to its meaning. And yet, the deep structure forms the subject of the song. I contend that the same deep structure representing a recursive operation constructing the continuity of thought to Wittgenstein’s "I destroy, I destroy, I destroy . . ." to no end, is the same subject heard in the Bad Brains "Banned in D.C." on the album *Black Dots*. The formation of a sonic thought does not find its meaning on the page, but in its function within a form of life. By uncoupling how an individual is categorized from what that individual means to and for a body of knowledge, it becomes possible to no longer conceive of language as sound with meaning. Language is meaning *with* sound. Blackness, then, is meaning with the various forms used to denote what is ‘Black’. Just as well, punk is meaning with objects despite how they are defined.
My treatment of punk's form of life differs from pre-existing accounts of "Punk" as historical object or genre. For example, *Subculture* by Dick Hebdige uses the terms "bass" and "treble" as code for Black and White, denoting in Reggae and Punk a distinction between ethnic, here, cultural endowments. By placing racial markers on particular frequencies, Hebdige misses aspects of sound and music that are evidence of the articulation of a particular cultural endowment. Aspects like speed, distortion, intensity, electrification, and the utilization of tones unaccounted for in traditional musical notation are crucial to the study of blackness' mode of expression in and through music. Removing these superficial limitations brings punk within the scope of a Black cultural endowment. This study formalizes the syncopation "submerged" (Robert Christgau, 1979) or "embedded" (Evan Rapport, 2014) in Punk, revealing—perhaps returning—it to its blues core. If, through that core, Punk articulates a form of life from a "nihilist" base, then blackness' form of life—a "collective improvisation" (LeRoi Jones, 1963) through the blues embedded in other musical forms—articulates a self that is no one thing and, therefore, the basis to express any thing. This will prove that blackness is not "absolutely nothing." For if Black identity was indeed Nothing, the theorist would remain silent.

Regarding terminology: if a term is capitalized then it represents a label or name which is a descriptor whose operation within a particular domain is a function of the identity of the subject/object it supposedly denotes. Denotation is not had by the interchangeability of a term by another term or definition. A term's meaning is expressed by that name's use in relation to other descriptors. If lowercase, the term is the irreducible object which through the function of those labels expresses an individual. An individual's operation is known by the function of those labels describing that "subject's " objective affairs, its role/position in relation to others. The apparent function of this operation expresses the concept of subjectivity. "Punk" is a genre, which makes "punk" a form of life. "Black" a racialized category, which entails that "black"-subjectivity is the expression of blackness. We will account for the subject which constructs the song if notation does not succeed in that effort and we will illustrate how the subject is expressed by focusing on *use* of sonic phrases and their elements. The subject is found in the putting together of these elements to form a thought. This, for all intents and purposes, is not in the phonetic, musical, representation of the thought, but is derived from its syntax. James Weldon Johnson in his *The Book of the American Negro Spirituals* locates a core element indicative of a kernel to the expression of Black subjectivity through song in the following structure:

![music notation]

The four notes are key to what follows. Their form is akin to a “word-like” lexical item in musical notation. However, these symbols do not point to anything in the extra-mental world. Despite the lack of experiencing the original sonic data expressed by this notation, these core terms are what I will
refer to as members of a specific kernel of Black expression heard in the pattern \[1 \emptyset 1 1 1\]. What is important is the relation or inner logic between tones that the notation suggests. If we are to assume both strings—each ordered set of four sonic elements—are held within a four-count, Johnson gives us another eighth through dot notation. The beaming of notes and the dot indicate the articulation of speed internal to the structure of the strings themselves. The rhythm indicated through the concatenation of these notes is not exhausted by a four-count measure and does not fit into the notational parameters assumed within the field of Music. Concepts like rhythm are not dictated by bass or drum but by the putting to use of tones and the way in which this sonic thought is articulated. The notation above represents an external grammatical description of this process.

The first element, \(\text{\textit{\textbullet}}\), contains a tie and dot connecting the first two notes. The first element is tied to the second which results in a doubling of the sound within the space of the first count of the overall phrase. This points to an operation that induces speed, dependent on the context in which this sonic thought is introduced. The function of this operation expresses the concept of syncopation; a concept intimately linked to the study of Black expression qua the subjectivity of blackness. That first note is emphasized and carried through to the next. However, to know the symbol \('[1 \emptyset 1 1 1]'\) does not necessarily mean that one understands the difference between the symbol, what it expresses, and how it is used. The symbol for null, \(\emptyset\), is key to this conception. It is the mark of syncopation. Between the first note’s emphasis and the next to be articulated, that space represents the limits of possibility for expressing any note and yet just that very next note. Everything or any “thing” can be had from nothing or nowhere, a void that is not empty. From within Black musical expression and through its spirituals, Johnson gives us the logical form of syncopation which reorients our focus to the way in which these sounds were put together to articulate a sonic thought. Our kernel presents the signature of blackness lying outside of identity with measure; the symbolic pattern is indicative of a function articulating thought, intimately tied to black modes of expression. With the generative structure of this embedded phrase in Negro spirituals and its derivative forms in hand, Johnson proves a link between modes of expression and "spirituality" as a function of subjectivity and, therefore, ethos. Ethics becomes a description or theory embodied by the ways in which individuals are and the relations they obtain in/to the world. Through this, we see the articulation of alternatives to present forms of life. This connection is the basis for the ethical interpretations made from that ethos and the rearticulation of realities qua the consequences of those interpretations within the creative capacity of blackness.

If null, here Nothing, is equivalent to no one thing, then it is possible to illustrate the articulation of some thing making a reformulated concept of null as the basis for articulation. For no one thing is logically equivalent to any—indeed, every—thing. The domain of all possible sound can be
considered both noise or silence until conditions arise in which a note or voice is articulated out of it. All possible—non-determinate—does not entail emptiness. Emergence from null does not mean that the forms expressed, articulated, are void. There is a distinction made between “no one”-thing, nominally Nothing, and “some”-thing. The cut is the marker of an imposition of a frame of reference. More precisely, it is a way in which individuals are identified and defined within that system of reference. This is the assumed sound that is to be identified, made interchangeable with a note within a musical notation. Sound is nondeterminate outside of this system. If we are to take the concept of number as the name of the function of a class of individuals which obtain an operation which orders a system of numerical reference, then ‘0’ cannot be a class that is empty. The number zero, therefore, asserts the existence of no one thing which is labeled Nothing. Thus, the prescription of Nothing to an individual is a function whose use asserts the indefinability, or rather the non-determinacy, of its object.

Blackness’ expression is represented by the syncopation evident in musical notation. The subject cannot be pointed to by the song expressed, as it resides outside of that notation, but is evident in how those notes were put together. What is brought about by this revelation is that the subject, blackness, is at once a part of and apart from that notation. Here, that notation is shown to overdetermine what is articulated by the subject playing those notes whose very being questions the act of categorization itself by virtue of its identity within a system. The questioning of this overdetermination, as articulated by Wittgenstein’s “I destroy, I destroy, I destroy –,” shows that the subject’s creation of this sonic thought with no phonetic representation cannot be exhausted by an act of overdetermination through identification. The fact that the tune at the outset of this analysis cannot be sung within notation, only outside of it, shows a capacity to create multiplicity out of a finite set of elements, appropriate to a context set by Musical notation but not caused by it and surely not limited to “physical” characteristics. Ultimately, what this gap between notation and expression shows is that within that act of identification itself, lies an internal contradiction. There exists a continuity outside of marked identity.

I will apply this conclusion towards the notion of the subjectivity of blackness outside of its identification within a system of racial categorization or nationality. Black identity models may be necessary to conceive of the distinctness, expediency of communicating, and the control over the expression of and value derived from Black cultural production; but they are insufficient for conceiving of blackness itself.

There is a conception held in the study of blackness which makes Black identity interchangeable with absolute nothing. This shall be termed Afro-Pessimism. Blackness as identical to Nothing is a categorical statement. By taking up the Pessimist position, their assertion amounts to a universal
quantification which elicits a particular point of view, for it is impossible to make an assertion which encapsulates an almost infinite amount of variables from a finite field of experience. These statements contain internal contradictions and will be shown inconsistent. When one uses statements like “every” or “all,” one becomes ontologically committed to the individuals sorted in a such a manner. Herein lies another contradiction in how blackness can be Nothing but all the while exist. One cannot reply when asked “are you sure that ‘Black’ is equal to ‘Nothing’?” by saying “By ‘equal’ I meant . . .” another thing, for this only raises the question, “Well if you ‘meant’ another thing, are you sure that you ‘meant’ what you meant?” The conclusion drawn here is that Nothing is a function over the use of the term ‘Black’, used to identify blackness in a way that only obtains a sense in and only in the Pessimist’s hypothesis which is indicative of a frame of reference imposed on the form of life that is black subjectivity. That frame, in order to get rid of those commitments, must paraphrase the propositions in which it expresses itself. In order to keep Identity rigid, in order to ensure knowledge over the inhabitants of a given system, the attempt to delete one’s ontological commitments to individuals while simultaneously requiring what is not of that frame in order to substantiate itself becomes necessary. Here, an “individual” can stand for a single, corporate, or unified body whose decisions are collective. I intend to make the case that blackness, stipulated as Null, is therefore apart from but nonetheless a part of the expression of that frame of reference, thus disproving the Afro-Pessimist’s position that blackness “is,” or is identical with, absolutely nothing which somehow distinguishes it as culturally dead.

In my view, Afro-Pessimism stems from a gross misreading of Fanon’s proposition at the end of Black Skin, White Masks. Fanon states, “The black man is not. Any more than the white man.” Blackness is here made distinct from ‘Black’ which is an open predicate, therefore, the name of a class. Blackness is not indicative of an individual’s attributes. To be identified Black is expressed by an individual obtaining the particular predicate, categorization, or description of a class. ‘Black’ is what is identified with Not, which turns on a theory of Identity in which Black as a category is made identical with another, namely, Not. Blackness, therefore is not a matter of identification but does, in some way, pertain to that individual which obtains the class, concept, category, ‘Black’. ‘Black’ is Not, and neither is ‘White’, which brings us no closer to the individuals whose expression is blackness. In all, the mistranslation of Fanon’s maxim, the split between Black identity and blackness’ subjectivity, is what has produced the Afro-Pessimist position which, akin to White identity, is the imposition of a reference frame that seeks to quantify and thereby identify and control the expressions of the individuals which inhabit that frame. This distinction makes that imposition vacuous if not for the individuals in which it incorporates for its own expression.

The indeterminacy of the imposition of a frame of reference that dictates blackness as “absolutely nothing” or “culturally dead” illustrates that blackness is the capacity to rearticulate or undo systems
of strict identification. As indeterminacy within a system cannot be categorized or, more likely, mistakenly categorized, in turn questioning the validity of the definitions composing that system, blackness conceived in this way is generative. Blackness becomes the horizon of possibility to articulate various forms of life. The nondeterminacy of syncopation, to be developed here as an analytic of black subjectivity, can be understood through Wittgenstein’s philosophy which sought to do away with the sign of identity, ‘=’. Strict accordance with that sign amounted to the “following of rules blindly.”

Certainty can only be had within a frame of reference held within a form of life. According to Wittgenstein, this comes with the lemma that one must doubt in order to have knowledge, that doubt is the horizon of possibility for knowledge. Systems of categorization, viz. the musical notation above considered as a framework to analyze racial quantification, is only indicative of the reference frame itself and not the actual being of those individuals. In order to use musical notation, one must presuppose what or know that Music is. I will illustrate how an affinity between individuals, an affirmation of blackness—outside of racial, gendered, social political, and economic categorization—can be had. Although these terms may be used to describe Black identity, they are not necessary for the articulation of the black subject from within its own form of life. The greater consequence of disbarring Afro-Pessimism by assuming its position to show its internal contradictions, is that blackness becomes the horizon of possibility for the articulation of identity overall within a U.S. state of affairs. Much like syncopation or the tones reached indirectly by virtue of the power chord, these sounds are articulated outside of musical notation but are crucial to the possibility of articulating a song at all. Blackness, as with Race, and syncopation, as within song, always harbors, in the break, the capacity to undo the strict categorization of song in the very same breath of its articulation. This much is seen in the very first bar of Wittgenstein’s tune, “I destroy.”

There is a link between the philosophy and ethos of Black subjectivity as harboring the capacity to rearticulate its overdetermination and the ethos and philosophy of black musical expression voiced, sounded out, in punk. Blackness is defined as what is Not; as identical or interchangeable with absolute nothing. If we assume the Afro-Pessimist position on Black identity being identified for use within a state of affairs not its own, of blackness as an entity within its own form of life, Black identity is thereby framed in such a way that its very being questions the categories of a state of affairs. With regard to its being identified within a form of life that overdetermines its very existence, blackness is a prime subject to take up the problem of subjectivity outside of Identity. By assuming the Pessimist position, not to prove it but to show its internal contradictions stemming from a misreading of Franz Fanon’s assertion, "the black man is not, . . . ," we will show their misreading as a disregard of the supplement to Fanon’s proposition, "neither is the white man." The function of identifying blackness within the Pessimist frame as "absolutely nothing" has been confused as an object of that proposition.
According to LeRoi Jones’ *Blues People*, musical expression—Black musical expression—is the expression of a people. It is also Jones’, later Amiri Baraka’s, contention that as a musical form obtained from a set of conditions that is the horizon of possibility for musical expression in the U.S., the blues, and therefore blackness, is the core or kernel of any expression that is the U.S. This kernel, formalized by James Weldon Johnson and utilized by Jones both in theory and practice, is evidence of blackness at the heart of multiple music forms. So, to take blackness’ subjectivity as a mode of expression is to understand it through music. Punk’s existence as a musical form and way of being in the world, and not a genre, is to challenge systems of categorization and overdetermination. I will look at Black musical expression through a punk ethos to illustrate blackness’ capacity to rearticulate and subvert its overdetermination through the function of Identity.

In a 1975 study entitled, “Subcultures, Cultures and Class: A Theoretical Overview,” the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies described many encounters between the youth and subcultures of that era. These encounters noted a transformation in the social and political dynamics of the US and the UK. One of the movements engendered from this convergence was punk. The punk subject manifests a vast diversity of identities from finite social, cultural, and political conditions. Stuart Hall, in the essay “Race, Articulation and Societies Structured in Dominance,” called for a description of the “mechanism” that generates identity through a process called articulation. I argue that an account must be made to describe the formation of subjectivity through the encounter itself rather than only describing what preceded it or followed. This project will research the tension between structural and institutional identification practices over individuals and the agency of individuals within those structures. In response to Hall’s request, I develop a formal theory of Articulation that accounts for this mechanism. By analyzing historically connected cases in which social and political encounters gave rise to a multitude of cultural phenomena, I will illustrate the emergence of black punk subjectivity. I argue that the existence of Black Punks is a critical example of articulation, and is therefore fundamental to studies of blackness and vice versa. As Hall was interested in the semiotics of these conflicts through political-economy and culturally critical lenses, I endeavor to analyze how these semiotic and semantic readings are possible through a syntactic analysis of subject formation.

I argue that these assertions are grounded in a historical paradigm ossified through a cultural and legislative nexus bound between parameters imposed on modes of expression. The capacity to form those expressions are indicative of the subject. The theory of Articulation that I propose attends to historical specificity but accounts for a process that crosses contexts. This will provide for the incredible diversity in black subjectivity despite racial regimentation.

In conceiving the distinction between “black”-ness as subject and “Black” identity, it is quickly apparent that Racial dichotomy is flawed. The assumption that either one is White and significant
within a reference frame or Black and Nothing leads to contradictions. Both are descriptions of an individual’s import to a frame of reference and equate two descriptions or definitions of one’s function within that frame, which only equates those descriptions requiring further justification. Following this line of reasoning, we are brought no closer to the objects which these functions obtain. Thus, Afro-Pessimism and White supremacy can be conceived as both internally contradictory in their assertions that Black identity is inferior within a White reference frame. Their internal contradictions turn on an identity proposition and its use, politically and/or as a function, within our state of affairs. To put the point further, the set or class of individuals identified or categorized as being either Black or Nothing fall within a paradox that there cannot be a set which consists of sets that are not members of themselves, for by definition that set would have to contain itself. A definition which is defined using the term which it defines is not a definition at all. Thus, the set of everything is Null—rather, as there is no set that is the collection of any and every one thing, the predicate Null is attributed to this fact as there is no one thing you can point to in the actual world that would substantiate the definition of that set. It is in this way that I conceive that blackness, if it is to be considered as “absolutely nothing” or the Null set, it is also an undefinable set that nonetheless persists. Thus, the Null set is a set without a name or identity; therefore, it has the capacity to form expressions outside the confines of Identity.

The existence of a Null set is the logical truth that there is no set of individuals ‘X’, that does not X themselves. There are particular aspects, features, or constituents that when constructed or arranged in a particular way express the property or label that is X. Thereby, the Null is a set that is a part of but nonetheless apart from any set or individual expressed by those sets’ construction from the set of no one thing. Its identity, as nominally Null or Nothing, is such only by virtue of a stipulation for there is always a member of the category that cannot be exhausted by a closed or all encompassing universal quantification. Identity cannot strip or exhaust all possible articulations of an individual. If we are to assume the Afro-Pessimist position that “Black-ness = ‘Nothing’ ”, this proposition yields the categorizing axiom, “if Black, then those individuals are Nothing.” We discover that we can form a counter example that asserts the existence of at least one individual which is not Black and is Nothing based on the logic of that conditional statement.

Let us take the conditional statement made above as a sorting mechanism, “if Black then Nothing.” The only time a conditional statement is invalid is when it returns a false consequent. What is asserted when making a conditional statement is some relation between the consequent and an antecedent condition containing the object which “causes” the consequent. It is not necessary to locate the exact cause because we can ascertain the conditions from which the consequent emerges, the antecedent object said to cause the consequent may or may not have been the case. If the antecedent is true, and we see a relation between antecedent and consequent, then we can infer the truth of the consequent. As an if/then statement, the antecedent or hypothesis does not guarantee the consequent, conclusion.
If Black then nothing implies that nothing is just nothing, not another thing or no one thing at all. According to propositional logic, we can replace "if Black then nothing" with its material implication "either not-Black or nothing" which does not guarantee that the relation between Black and nothing is secure.

Just as well, universal statements can be vacuously fulfilled and remain true. This much was the purpose of Bertrand Russel’s demonstration of definite descriptions. It may be the case that no thing fulfills the statement "for all x, x is such" which can be a valid statement even if there are no x’s and only y’s. The negation of that universal statement would be equivalent to the vacuously fulfilled proposition, “there exists some thing that is not defined,” for there is no thing that fulfills that definition. Thus, we can derive the existence of an individual outside of being categorized “Black” which is revealed as a description, an Identity, and not the entity in and of itself. Black-ness is the object of that proposition for which the description it purports alone is made equivalent to Nothing. For "if Black then Not" to be true, “Black” is identical to another description, “Not.” A description of a description does not say anything about the entity describes but only speaks of the act of description.

Taking naive set theory into account, within that system of classification we would need to state that there exists a category label “Black” for all individuals such that those individuals are Black if and only if those individuals are Nothing, and Nothing=Social Death. This is disproved by a counterexample for a universalizing class. The class “Black” cannot be a member of itself; an identity of an identity does not identify any one thing. If we take the formula ‘Nothing=Social death’—which functions as a predicate of the description Black—and replace it with the formula for Black identity such that the "group" of or label ascribed to all Black individuals is not itself a Black individual, we obtain the formula: individuals are Black if and only if they are not Black.

The counter-example can be illustrated in the following way. First, universal and existential quantification are co-definable.

"For all . . ." = "There does not exist an individual such that it is not . . ."
"There exists . . ." = "It is not the case that all are not . . ."
"Not all . . ." = "There exists an individual such that it is not the case . . ."
"There does not exist . . ." = "For all, it is not the case . . ."

Finally, the negation of "and" yields "or" and visa-versa.
Testing the sortal statement above, we proceed by saying: for all Blacks, “if Black then nothing”; this translated existentially becomes: there does not exist a Black such that it is not the case that “if Black then nothing.” From this follows, it is not the case that there exists a Black such that they are “Black and not nothing.” This statement is equivalent to, for all Blacks it is not the case that “there are Blacks and they are not-nothing.” Ultimately, this translates to, for all Blacks “either one is not Black or they are Nothing.” The universal statement’s assertion that “there does not exist a Black that is not . . .” affirms that Blacks exist and therefore are not nothing in and of themselves, but only by stipulation. We can reasonably deduce in accordance with conditional statements that stipulation as nothing follows from both Blacks and non-Blacks, making the universal statement trivial to assert. It is only contingently the case, dependent upon one’s frame of reference, that Blacks are labeled or considered nothing.

Despite how blackness is identified, the label "Black" does not exhaust the modes in which blackness expresses its self in the world. According to Russel’s paradox, the identity of the set, the label that denotes the class of individuals categorized as “Black” cannot itself be a Black individual, as shown above. There are some "Blacks”—if not all—who cannot be made identical to Nothing as those utilizing that identifier express how that label exists in the world as evidence of "Black"-ness.

Formally, identification/categorization proceeds by:

1. for all individuals, if "Black" then "Not."

According to the logic for if/then statements the truth of the antecedent "Black" is not necessary to obtain a true consequent, "Not." Attempting to prove the validity of (1) by testing its negation, and if a contradiction arises from that negated conclusion, if (1) is true, we assume:

2. it is not the case that for all individuals “if Black then Not.”

Negating the universal quantifier over (1), not-"for all...," according to the same logical rules we obtain (2), "some are not . . ." Some "Blacks are not-Not" is derived without contradiction, rendering 1. false.

Identity statements representing the interchangeability of terms are logically considered as a biconditional. These types of statements are of the form: “x if and only if y”; which is to say, “if x then y and if y then x.” We can state the following:

1. For all Blacks, “they are Black if and only if they are Nothing.”
2. There does not exist a Black such that it is not the case that “they are Black if and only if Nothing.”

3. There does not exist a Black such that they are: “Black and not-Nothing; or not-Black and Nothing.”

The universal classification of Black as Nothing is revealed as vacuous via (3), for it is self-defeating. The identifier “Nothing” is revealed within the structure of the proposition as having no scope. For all “Blacks” there is/exists the label “Nothing,” translates to: there does not exist a Black for all applications of that label followed by the negation of that sortal phrase. Even if we were to grant scope by way of quantification to that label, the statement remains self-defeating as the existence of Nothing would be affirmed. Thus its application does not come from that being identified but something outside of the scope of the context being described. We could stop right at (2), for it states that there is no Black that fulfills the description whether or not that description is negated, while simultaneously affirming the existence of Blacks because they do not obtain the description that follows that quantification. Blackness is thus both a part of that categorization and remains apart from it when considering the structure of that proposition. It states that Black does not exist within the structure of its own statement. By negating its basis, it is pointless to assert. We also see that in order to negate “Black,” there must be some thing there to negate, thus revealing the contradiction in the form of the statement. For “Black” must be some thing in order to negate and therefore is not nothing. Translating the existential quantifier for (3) back into its universal form, we obtain:

4. For all Blacks, it is the case that: “either they are not-Black or they are nothing; and it is the case that they are Black or not-nothing.”

Strict identification of “Black” with nothing is incomplete. One cannot reduce the black subject to a single category with “absolute” certainty. The universalizing statement is either vacuous, undecidable because they lose the relation between Black and nothing they wanted to assert by the very logic of that statement, or leads to a contradiction. We see this with (4) stating that in order for one to be classified as “Black” they cannot be Black. Thus, blackness is not universally reducible to nothing. In sum, if to be absolute nothing is to be “Black,” and to be “Black” is to suffer from a cultural death, then it follows that the label Nothing is, defined by, Cultural Death, not blackness. However, it does not follow that all Blacks suffer from a cultural death because their being in the world is absolutely nothing. Therefore, blackness is not equal to Nothing.

From the following, we can prove a similar conclusion. We rule out “for all nothing, there exists some Black individual,” as that presupposes that “nothing” consists of something, automatically disproving the statement. We proceed by our previous rules of transformation, with the understanding that “if x
then y” is equivalent to the negation of “x and not-y.” Taking the statement “for all Blacks there exists a label ‘nothing,’ ” in other words, for all B there exists a label N, such that “if Black then Nothing,” or if B then N, we can conclude:

For all Blacks there exists the category nothing such that if Black then nothing. It follows that there does not exist Blacks and not-not for all nothing, it is not the case that if Black then nothing. So, there does not exist Blacks for all nothing such that one is Black and not-nothing. Thus, for all Blacks and not for all nothing, not-Black or nothing. Therefore, to assert for all Blacks they are nothing, it would be the case that there are either no Blacks or just nothing—see note for proof.15

Ultimately, the formulation that Blacks are universally nothing is not a sound argument on its own. No one-to-one identity obtains. The above illustrates that a universal quantification can be stated but may be vacuous; we say “for all Blacks” but there are no Blacks’s fulfilling that description. It also shows that names are fixed after groups are constructed. This implies a contextual limit to universal quantification. Thus, identity is a secondary stipulation, an act made external to the form of life, the subject, expressing/producing blackness. “Nothing” is revealed as a descriptor without existential import as it is context contingent and only obtains arguments by the imposition of a reference frame.

We can assume that this is not the only frame in which Blacks exist. As quantification goes, the prior statement asserts that there exists a category such that all Blacks in that context are labeled nothing. However, a name cannot be a member of the set it labels unless it is of no value. Otherwise, the identity of the set changes as it would contain a member that is not itself. If some class named nothing is defined by the set of all Blacks, making Blacks=nothing mean Blacks=not-Black, then Black is not a member of its own set because it is nothing. Nothing=not-Black because it is nothing. This makes “nothing,” the property with which Black becomes a member of that class, inconsistent with the classification of Blacks as nothing. Thus, “Black” is “nothing” if and only if “nothing” is not-nothing, making Black something after all. It can be shown that there are Blacks that are identified as nothing; or that there are Blacks that are not identified as Black at all, “for all Blacks . . . not-Black.” This means that there are Blacks that are not-nothing for they are not identified as “Black” by the terms of the frame employed. Therefore, these not-“Black” Blacks represent an aspect of blackness unknown to that system of categorization. “Black” is revealed as merely a label. “Black” is not Black-ness in and of itself. Only as a label can “Black” be made interchangeable with “nothing.” However, a label of a label does not necessarily capture any one object. Black and blackness are not interchangeable. We can demonstrate within this context that although there is an account for “Black” identity, there are no Black subjects present; only nothing, i.e. an empty frame.
If what a label identifies is not itself, “for all Blacks”=not-Black, then that label is not necessary to those it denotes, only its context. If the user of that identity implies a context of use, then there is no way that the user knows the entirety of what they attempt to categorize within their finite contextualization of the domain they inhabit. Thus, if a label necessarily points to what it is not, its use reflects the user. An empty frame does not entail that blackness is empty.

The reorientation away from Identity—its function as a name or identity politic—towards conceiving and understanding the form and function of the subject, although nondeterminate, is this project’s goal. By opening the conversation, there is a profound impact on the conception of blackness outside of its overdetermination, as well as how to combat the act of overdetermination itself. This is one of the consequences of the Wittgensteinian conception of doing away with the sign of identity as indicative of the reference of a term or individual, and moving towards understanding these terms function or use within a form of life. In showing how the denotation of sound fails outside of a specific notation, but still showing the mode of creating a thought with a grammar outside of that notation, Wittgenstein's song, "I destroy, I destroy, I destroy . . . " undoes the connection between individual and referred meaning. LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka in Blues People and Black Music cites example after example of how this is the core to black modes of expression through music, which is the sound of a people.

It is no surprise that black musical expression through punk would show a family resemblance, a subject continuity, with this ethos. The Bad Brains in Washington D.C. shouting, "Destroy Babylon," Poly Styrene of X-Ray Spex singing, "Identity/ Is the crisis/ Can't you see . . . When you look in the mirror/ Do you smash it quick," or finally, if according to Amiri Baraka “Hell is definitions,” a continuity in the impulse to do away with the function of identity can be seen in a Black band from Philadelphia whose sole wish, and name sake, was to raise Pure Hell. (Figure 1) The mechanism of articulation illustrates that there is a structure or syntax to the formation of these frames of reference which overdetermine the subjectivity of the individual for the sake of identification. Modes of expression do not point to objects outside of creating thought, but are the means with which we come to grasp an understanding of that world. As with the illustration above, it will be my task to show how internal to any system of categorization, therein lies the capacity to undo the strict overdetermination of individuals, their becoming objects of propositions which seek their subordination. I will answer the Afro-Pessimist by demonstrating that it is possible to make a movement from "absolutely nothing."
THE THEORY OF ARTICULATION

The Void Not Empty

... mechanisms which connect dissimilar features must be shown... (an articulated combination) and not a random association... structured relations between its parts, i.e., relations of dominance and subordination.

-Stuart Hall in Race, Articulation and Societies Structured in Dominance

Etymologically, “articulation” finds its root in process. To become articulate is in the function of an expression; it is not what is expressed in and of itself. It describes successive states or instances within a set of conditions. Articulation has to do with language, but language should be understood as an action or movement, a coming together. In the past and now, the motivations for proposing a theory of Articulation were to avoid a reductionism in analytic methods that relegated phenomena to a single category. Being relevant within a category was not only had by becoming an object of that analytic, but to constitute one’s meaning. As a theory of social and cultural analysis, articulation attempts to identify the set of conditions that make it possible for a specific arrangement of individuals to become relevant within a context, field, or environment. The goal of Articulation theory is to study how different things are being combined to demarcate these sets of conditions and reveal the horizon of possibility for certain individuals to emerge. Most analyses that utilize this theory amount to descriptions of historical and context-specific manifestations of the results of Articulation. This works to create the questions for an analytic method or for becoming aware of one’s position in relation to the subject one intends to study. However, it does not account for the process this mechanism sets in motion. Conditions are constantly changing and, if held constant, their arrangements are subject to different points of view. Our theory must account for the encounter generative of these arrangements and the individuals held within them. We must show what it means if an encounter was named significant in one of the possible manifestations resulting from the articulatory process and provide an account for how it is possible to ascertain what happened in the encounter itself.

Hall called for an account of the “mechanism” of Articulation. This mechanism must capture both the set of conditions and the individual obtained by virtue of a psycho-social relation to that environment. It will then be possible to understand how individuals are in “relations of dominance and subordination,” what Hall in the 1980s called overdetermination. The significance of this emergent individual is dependent on a rearrangement of the elements within this landscape. The individual is conceived of having two distinct aspects from its post-Marxian formulation. An individual’s identity—what is expressed by how that individual appears and is labeled by others—is
distinct from an individual’s subjectivity—the inner logic to the generative mechanism with which it forms these expressions. The negotiation between these aspects, distinct but not mutually exclusive, articulates the concept of the individual in this study. Through articulation theory and the formulation of its generative syntax, we are able to offer a response to the Pessimist paradigm which devolves blackness’ agency in the midst of overdetermined social and political structures. I will explore the implications of looking at articulation, not as an “object” of socio-cultural analysis and political economy, but as a way of understanding these frameworks in order to understand this process in a way that is dynamic to contexts. From here on, when referring to the subjectivity of blackness I will use a lower case black, when dealing with how blackness is identified or labeled, an upper case Black will be used.

As it stands, Articulation theory contains certain assumptions. There are issues regarding the origin of individuals; the conflation between an identity obtained and acts of identification; and a disposition that assumes the results of overdetermination inductively. These issues amount to foregoing the acknowledgement of an assumed stance or frame of reference which dictates what is relevant to the context being analyzed and what is not. The disavowal of a reference frame or point of view in regard to the objects and events expressed is accompanied by a value placed on interpretations that indicate the “correct” way of reading a specific context, assuming results mostly on precedent. Verifying these assumptions is presumed to follow necessarily from a historically causal relation that is not acknowledged in that reference frame as being embedded within a set of conditions. The stipulation of what is “ontologically” relevant to a given analysis will be challenged through an analysis of Articulation as a mechanism. The question of how to define Articulation can go on to an antimony, as each term used in that definition stands in need of definition itself. However, there is a way to conceive of the set of relations that are the conditions for a term’s significance within a field of study. The description of articulate forms and their method of generation are two ways of analyzing the same thing. Much attention has been placed on the former. I will outline an understanding of the latter.

The issue with the original form of the question of Articulation is that it begins and ends with already articulate forms. Starting one’s analysis in this way renders these forms mysterious, as if the arrangement of the facts of the world came from nowhere. I question if this precarity is a categorical mistake. Perhaps, it is an ontological one, a result of placing Articulation itself within a system of categorization which renders lifeless a concept that is by definition a process.

I do not intend to put forward a concept that negates other descriptions of the effects of Articulation theory to date. Other explanations regarding the manifestations of this mechanism can obtain sufficient use within their respective fields. I put forward a formal analysis of the mechanism which makes these descriptions of the world possible. Formalism holds one accountable to the syntax of
their method of critique; showing one's stance qua a series of initial statements and the rules of constructing and transforming theorems from that position. The method of constructing the analysis itself is made explicit, not just its result. In this way, if the theory or solution derived contradicts the program set forth, it is invalid and must be changed, showcasing a checking mechanism inherent to one's method of analysis. There is not a “pure” mode of analysis, however in all analyses there is a method of construction by certain formulae, revealed or not, which produces that critique. Within the theory of Articulation is the ability to handle the contingency that certain identified positions or roles indicating what is accepted as a being in the world have in relation to certain social, political, and cultural conditions. The process of Articulation itself does not change context to context but what is created through it does. A dynamic theory of Articulation can aid in understanding how the formation of the subjects undergoing this process occur before stipulating that they are beholden to certain assumptions and categorizations.

With this in mind, I foreground this analysis within the following framework: a theory which can account for the immense complexity of an individual’s varying identities, relevant to their experience of the world, but not caused by or an exact mirror of it. This account is posed in a way that encompasses modes of expression that are relevant, not random, and not caused by external stimuli, and yet are built from that which is external to that individual. In this way, I create a theory of the subject through what it is doing in lieu of its being assumed under a categorical identity. Therefore, I analyze the process of identification distinct from identity. Finally, I make an account of the black subject in the twenty-first century through an analysis of the formation of Counter-Culture as Punk.

To begin, this study takes up the following argument: language is a form of creating thought. As there are many forms of expression, each form has a “language,” or the way in which that form is expressed. These modes of expression represent the ways in which a being is in the world. With language as mechanism creating thought, we have a basis to create a theory of subjectivity and, within that, the foundation for analyses of culture and ethnicity. A syntactic analysis is key to take up issues regarding subjectivity. It is within this frame that I propose a theory of black subjectivity through the language of music. This chapter will make a linguistic analysis of the social in which grammars are conceived as the organizing principle of society to illustrate the syntax or method of generating the expressions indicative of the subjects therein. I will first conceive of how language is to be understood, using words analogously to symbols or objects, and how these objects/words form social formations called states of affairs. I will describe the grammatical mechanism within language as the organizing principle to states of affairs, and explore the generative capacity of subjectivity within that socio-cultural and political milieu. By proceeding this way, I am able to outline my theory of the mechanism of articulation. This will provide a basis for a literary analysis of music initiated by LeRoi
Jones/Amiri Baraka in *Blues People* and *Black Music* to illustrate the method of generation of the Black subject outside of the limits imposed on it by Identity.

* Cultural theorist and historian Orlando Patterson's *Slavery and Social Death* marks the inception of the Afro-Pessimist paradigm. The architecture of this framework was produced by Frank B. Wilderson III in *Incognegro* and “Biko and the Problematic of Presence,” and then formalized by Jared Sexton. These theorists’ conflation of pessimism and an absolute nihilism is conceived as identical with blackness through, what I contend, a misreading of Franz Fanon. Blackness is made interchangeable with an "absolute dereliction;" just as well as, Black identity and culture are formalized as devoid, an emptied void, of the capacity to form movements as it is absolutely nothing. This absolute, totalizing, and universal description of blackness is what I contend is internally contradictory in the formulation of the Pessimist's program. Consider the following conditions prevalent in current discourses on Black subjectivity:

*Fanon’s Condition:* “The Black man is not, any more than the white man.” (Frantz Fanon: 1952)

*Afro-Pessimist’s Condition:* Blackness operates out of a social death. Blackness is the void. (Jared Sexton: 2011; Frank B. Wilderson III: 2008)

*Baraka’s Condition:* Modes of expression are the ways in which a being is in the world. (Zora Neale Hurston: 1934; LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka: 1963)

*Articulates:* Blackness is the foundation for a theory of articulation and subjectivity, thus illustrating the internal contradiction to the second condition.

My goal is to provide a proof and formulation of the conclusion. In going through these premises, the logical conclusion is that through the conception of language taken to be the case here, we can develop a syntactic method revealing that there is never "absolutely nothing," as Wilderson asserts; that there is always something there; that blackness is itself movement and holds the capacity of Articulation for the very reason that we are able to form these premises at all. It is within these premises that we can call into question a lineage from what I see as a misreading of Fanon through to the current Pessimist position. In the reference frame of linguistics and Philosophy, the Descriptionist asserts that blackness as “absolutely nothing” cannot form a movement to overturn its subordination. In Black cultural studies and Race, this aforementioned point is the Pessimist’s position. These two points of view must be differentiated as the terms of analysis within their fields are different, and have different functions. Although these operations obtain the same object of thought, their goals are the same. We see that in the use of these terms, one implicates themselves into a specific frame of
reference and that this implication does not negate that the same individual is held in other frames: that no one can hold themselves apart from states of affairs. In denial one asserts existence.19

In society, there is so much on the surface already articulate that it is hard to see the conditions which make what is significant to us possible. It makes the breaks themselves seem out of place amongst all the noise. However, if we see the breaks as through ways, and we have the courage to slip in between, this change in perspective shows those breaks as the points in which possibility interjects reality. These interjections come from a deep sea below; the articulate become islands skirting on the surface as a result of the way in which society is expressed. It remains to be shown that there may not be a mystery behind or before the articulate forms within a context. In the study that follows, I take up an argument against the Descriptionist position, mainly, in its Identitarian form which states that superficial description is essential to those individuals. My thesis takes punk’s use of a presupposed grammatical use of symbols to constantly rearticulate meaning in juxtaposition to their assumed meanings within society. Here, I will take the time to develop a vocabulary to read states of affairs to understand how this works by illustrating how this syntax is put to use with “words” as objects or symbols. This inquiry should provide a basis to change the interpretation of a Punk nihilism and a Black social death.

Section 1. Language as the Creative Capacity for Thought and the Syntax of Generative Subjectivity

Language

If it were not for language, truth would not amount to very much, neither would thought.

-Gareth Evans, Varieties of Reference

One aspect of Humans as distinct from other organisms was thought to be an innate creative capacity which is manifested most clearly in language. This was first clearly theorized by René Descartes scientific method of telling the difference between automatons and Humans. His method attempted to understand how it was possible to produce new expressions, new in our experience, new in the history of the language, that were also appropriate to situations but not caused by them.20 The situation or context a person is in now, say the room that they are in, does not cause them to only speak of “rooms.” If they so choose, they could speak of magic, childhood, the weather. Therefore, this creative capacity could not be accounted for by constructing some sort of machine. This technique was thought to challenge the typical “mechanical philosophy” of the mid-seventeenth century that was supposed to guarantee that a theorist understood how certain phenomena worked. However, it ran into many issues as there were limits to understanding these “workings” from empirical facts alone.
Language is the mode with which we create thought. This assertion characterizes notions brought to the fore in the seventeenth century, proving the foundation for linguistics today. If the capacity to generate thought is inherent to language, this capacity was philosophically handled by Ludwig Wittgenstein in the twentieth century as a form of life. Modes of expression were from then on understood as ways of being in the world. It is possible to say that in every system in which one generates expressions there is a language to that system. One does not only “think” by what comes out of their mouth. It follows that one does not only form expressions through their mouth either. This view was put forth by Antoine Arnauld and Claude Lancelot in *The Port Royal Grammar* of 1660 and the *Logic* of 1662. The authors came to this conclusion within the parameters of a rationalist tradition that wished to provide an account not for learning a single language but for the capacity to learn any language. This was forged under the assumption that there were innate capacities to humans, one of which being language, that seemed to be “known” without recourse to empirical fact. “This is why the different sorts of signification which are embodied in words cannot be clearly understood if what has gone on in our minds previously has not been clearly understood since words were invented only in order to make these thoughts known.”

Human language can create concepts that need not rely on facts outside of the expression formed in order to be comprehensible. Herein lies my critique of the strict identification of individuals with a predetermined set of features indicating restrictions to their form of life. How an individual appears does not exhaust how or what that individual is or could be. An individual can see two objects hit each other, but we do not see the concept “causality.” There are other examples of this, such as the concept of infinity, ideas around non-contradiction—something cannot both be and not be—and the psychic continuity of the subject. This seems to be known by children though there is no way to “see,” experience, or become physically acquainted with these concepts in the world.

The concept of language as thought was more fully conceived by Wilhelm von Humboldt, a seventeenth-century philosopher poised between the rationalist and romanticist schools. Humboldt proposed that language must be viewed as a generative creative capacity for thought to provide a basis for the possibility to study semantics at all. People “[d]o not understand one another by actually exchanging signs for things, nor by mutually occasioning one another to produce exactly and completely the same concept; they do it by touching in one another the same link in the chain of their sensory ideas and internal conceptualizations, by striking the same note on their mental instrument, where upon matching but not identical concepts are engendered in each.” It is not that, within a field of discourse, two speakers are able to translate the sentences that rapidly appear and disappear within the conversation. It is the case that understanding and communication is possible if and only if a community of speakers can generate “concepts” in the same way. What is semantically understood is only made possible by a syntactic “affinity of concepts” in modes of generation. LeRoi Jones, Amiri Baraka, in *The System of Dante’s Hell* would call these “association complexes,” shared functions
attributed to the use of terms. This is key and sets the foundations for how we will conceive a form of life which utilizes symbols, sounds, or some other finite lexicon of objects in the articulation of a thought. At times, these uses are against these terms’ sanctioned or “sacred” meanings, especially if “meaning” is understood as some other object by which we mean something else entirely. What generates the meaning-bearing elements seen on the surface is inextricably tied to the method of generating thought. This serves as the medium of psychic continuity which lends to fleshing out a theory of subjectivity. Noam Chomsky follows suit in the concluding section of his *Syntactic Structures*, “Syntax and Semantics,” stating that the only possibility for semantics is the ability to generate thought similarly. As there are an infinite variety of ways in which one talks about some thing, which depends on the relative set of experiences of the speakers and contexts, this innate capacity to generate thought crosses contexts and makes meaning possible.

A thought, then, is conceived as a proposition. This seemed to remedy Cartesian dualism. The Cartesian proclamation “I think therefore I am” is logically interpreted as follows: the object ‘I’ becomes the subject of the proposition, “. . . thinks. . .” Quantified as such, ‘I’ therefore exists in some sense by way of its use, it being the argument in the function of that proposition. The proposition only has meaning in so far as ‘I’ operates as the object of a function which sets its use within a form of life. Therefore, there is no split between the subject putting ‘I’ to use and the object or identity which it is to represent. The “self” proposition is merely one out of the set of all possible propositions. As language is a public tool for the expression of inner thought, representing the capacity to create thought overall, the ‘I’ is no longer a participant in any dualist notion. Consequentially, the subject is no longer illusory for each identity one experiences is formed by an inner creative capacity which is the activity of its subject.

Language, then, becomes the ability to express a thought from the set of all possible thought. By conceiving language in this way, it was revealed that communication was not the central aspect of language. There are propositions generated that cannot be uttered and an immense diversity of the ways in which a single thought can be expressed. Many features intrinsic to the design of language as a system of thought are not externalized. Communication has since been considered a subset of expression. The aural and auditory modes of communication are unnecessary to externalization.

So, then, there are two aspects to the analysis of propositions: the conjunction of ideas whether similar or dissimilar and the judgment of that conjunction. Analysis of this copula has amounted to either a Descriptionist approach in regard to the “form” of these propositions, or to a generative approach. The Descriptionist account of language stays on the semantic level, which is only significant within specific contexts. It attempts to account for the variation of expressions by way of a statistical
correspondence regarding word order and how often terms appear. The generative account’s stance begins with the capacity to create the thoughts that appear within those contexts. The Descriptionist assumes the correlation of “signs” to their significance as “objects” in the extra-mental world. This seems true of other systems, and of those entities which are mirrors of their environment instinctually. In contrast, children in learning a language often seem to play with the parameters of the spoken language they experience, presenting evidence of a capacity to play with words as objects and, therefore, play with their public functions while not taking them as elements in and of themselves denotative of some other meaning-bearing thing. Children also seem to “know” much more of a language outside of what is being taught, and can switch between and learn languages more quickly than a solely experiential based model of acquisition would allow. It is only after children reach a certain age that this capacity ossifies. It seems that acquiring a “language” is akin to acquiring a culture.

The Descriptionist fails to answer a host of questions. They must account for their “explanation” of language through facts alone. As there are thoughts that do not surface and a still more interminable amount of ways a single thought may be expressed, the Descriptionist is hard pressed to depict the generation of the “thought” itself. This is a critical issue, especially now that there is the understanding that word and world do not have a one to one correspondence through signification. The modes in which a thought is expressed, and which object is denoted by its use, seem to picture a world, not capture it. This trouble is found in issues of identity, denotation, and in the definition of objects which could identify a class of properties or the properties themselves under the term predication. Descriptionist methods of verification, do not themselves have a method of verification which in turns strains the certainty of belief in their definitions.

This does not do away with an empiricist concept of acquiring knowledge of the world, but instead represents a change in view. We have these innate capacities, their shape or manifestation is contingent upon our experience of the world and persists outside of our experiences. If we take the pre-Enlightenment idea of the Human as tabula rasa, there would be so much more for which that a theory of the Human must account. No explanation could be provided for the elasticity in acquiring language for children across contexts of their experience. There would be no account of how one can think of things outside of experience which includes both things that can be thought but not said and things understood that have not yet been taught. Or why this specific form of thought is chosen over others. The empiricist or Descriptionist approach only runs into issues with the rationalist approach when grafted over the same process within subject matters. It may very well be that explanations of the phenomenon experienced in everyday life are mechanical, which has proven useful in scientific theory. However, language as a method for creating thought lies at the limits of
these modes of representation. We can still talk about the same subject, and can explain what that subject has done in different ways.

In this vein, Chomsky constructed a formal analysis of language. He used the Port Royal Logic to conceptualize how to create thought. He then developed three aspects of grammar: merge, substitution/move, and agreement. This development was in conjunction with a three-level approach that described the process of creating thoughts in a way that provides the ability to understand a grammar by analyzing what is considered its kernel—a group of core simple sentences that make up the base of that language. If we can understand this set of simple structures, it is possible to construct more complex expressions and understand their structure. A mechanism such as this encompasses the “derivational rules” of the language. Through Chomsky’s analysis of the concept merge, he could combine different objects in particular arrangements or sets to form an expression in the simplest operation, more so than counting the probability of their occurrence. Words and sentences are neutral linguistic elements. They only acquire their status as meaning-bearing individuals once they are utilized in a form of life. In merge, if there are two elements x and y, the function M(x,y) results in the set \{x,y\} that comes under the label or “head” of either x or y. The object is produced in such a way that we represent this process by \{x, \{x,y\}\} or \{y, \{x,y\}\}, where the individual is either y predicated by x from which x becomes the label for the set \{x,y\}, or vice versa. From this we extrapolate the projection of one or the other element in the set as a label over the pair to express what that object is about—the function of a predicate—in order to illustrate the concept of overdetermination. Chomsky then differentiates between external and internal merge: the difference between the Descriptionist and generative argument, respectively. External merge assumes that these individual elements, the two articulate terms combined to convey a thought, are separate from the sets they create. Internal merge does not stipulate that these elements are in distinct lexical groupings from each other. To avoid the issue of having to account for where these elements come from, it was illustrated linguistically that these lingual objects reside in the set of all possible elements with which to articulate that thought. The different elements x and y are contained within an overarching set, a lexicon. The thought expressed is articulated in their arrangement. It is the matter of making one arrangement of elements significant within this all-inclusive field which is the thought. The resulting sets from this function are nested within the first, like many islands scattered across a sea. “Nesting” entails that what is seen on the surface is dependent upon what lies below it, the elements that were put together and arranged in a particular way in order to express what is observed remain embedded in the set from which they came. Therefore, the set prior to what is articulated is larger than this one, this new set being “nested” within that prior set. It is in this way that a relation of dominance or subordination can be read. What is read or perceived on the surface is a matter of significance in relief to the set of everything which is no-one-thing in particular indicative of the Null set. If one is held
more significant than another despite its existence being dependent on the individuals and context prior, this is said to be a relation of dominance. Every surface structure has a deep structure, even if nothing appears on the service, as what is called “nothing” is expressed nonetheless. As nothing has an expressive form, it also contains an inner logic—the method by which elements once disparate were fashioned in a particular way so to express “nothing” at all.

As a matter of simplicity, Chomsky notes that internal merge is the better proposal for the creative apparatus of language. External merge must create a profound and almost interminable amount of rules to be placed over the articulated strings of thought to make them comprehensible. The probability of what elements goes before or after another within a sentential string raises this issue, hence why, through a structural analysis of the capacity to form expressions, a counting operation was found by linguists not to be available to the language faculty. As a result, the external choice must answer why it bars certain operations and certain concatenations of elements. Just as well, it must show how it stipulates that a particular element must not appear twice while creating these strings. Also, external operations must answer why it is necessary to add other rules on top of these strings to make them sensible. It must say what those rules are, how many, etc. The Descriptionist assumption of an external, therefore, hierarchical merge at the expense of an internal process is unfeasible. Perhaps, Descriptionist explanations have some superficial use. They still fail, however, to account for the actual method of generating thought, of putting these elements together within the domain of the capacity for language. Acknowledging internal merge, Chomsky discovered that external considerations come free without having to add stipulations.

There seems to be a rule that describes this phenomenon: the choice for internal as opposed to externalist accounts. Regarding studies of the language faculty, The Minimalist Program from the 1970s to the present can be summed up as: whatever can be accounted for should be; whatever cannot, will be left to be that which it is. From this, we form our basis for how we intend to account for identity as the former, the expression of the subject as the latter.

In the 1970s, Chomsky illustrated the structure of the “strings” produced through this process. The phrase structure on the surface of an expression follows the same logic of the conjunction of a noun phrase (NP) and a verb phrase (VP). It was then seen that an NP is constituted by a “determiner,” also called a specifier or definite article, such as “the” (T) and a noun (N). A verb phrase is constituted by a verb (V) and another NP which is the object of that verb. The “outer” or surface level aspect of a sentence renders their distinction trivial. There is no doubt a difference between an NP and a VP. However, structural analysis discloses something else. Phrase structure reveals a core to both NPs and VPs which are strikingly similar. They both contain a “noun” and determiner. There is a seemingly infinite variety of explanations to make sense of this conclusion. The multitude of explanations leaves
the Descriptionist puzzled. In this way, and through X-bar theory, labels can be done away with as form expresses the concepts of noun, verb, etc. It is the arrangement of elements utilized to form expressions that demonstrate what the roles or function of those elements are for the subject.

Theorists have held that the difference between these “forms” is found in the force of assertion in introducing elements in the matrix of the proposition. This view is on the correct path. A theory that can make an account for this “force” and the method of assertion, must be conceived without a Descriptionist framework. The difference rests with the internal aspect of the formation of propositions. Phrase structure, which was assumed to be part of the generation of thoughts, was whittled away from the generative capacity, and left only as an explanation of surface level articulations. Phrase structure analysis is a top-down approach. The deep structure to the production of the elements seen on the surface is logically and most simply the result of a transformation within the merge function itself.

Surface and deep structure analysis of the process of merge renders transformations necessary to produce thoughts. These are not in addition to merge but come with it. The distinction between surface expressions, which represent the data of language, and the deep structure which generates those expressions answers the question of the diversity of action in response to such a limited field of external stimuli. These transformations are recursive and, therefore, can work infinitely in producing a vast amount of thoughts from a limited amount of available objects. External stipulations foreclose the amount of thoughts that can be generated because the set of objects would then represent the set of possible thoughts, encompassing the Descriptionist’s failure.

A structural schematic for the language faculty as the capacity to create expressions appropriate to contexts but not caused by them, not random, and with the possibility of not yet having been experienced within the particular domain uttered is developed in the following way. There is a lexicon which is indicative of a particular form of life in which the inhabitants of that form and only that form of life have access. We shall also call this a “world.” The lexicon represents the finite set of elements with which expressions may be formed. Within that lexicon, there is a Syntax, the set of parameters within that state of affairs which arranges those elements in a particular fashion, appropriate within that world’s state of affairs.

Embedded within that Syntax there is a syntactic structure or S-structure with two aspects. These two aspects reside on the same “level” of analysis, however, once combined with the S-structure of a Syntax, forms the deep structure or D-structure to expressions. The D-structure provides the appropriate semantic interpretation for expressions, regardless of the context in which they are uttered. Paraphrasing and surface level transformational stipulations in order to make expressions
agree with the vocabulary of the context in which they were uttered are no longer necessary. Due to
the structure of the language faculty the material required for these processes are embedded in the
process of articulation. Deep structure represents the recursive faculty of forming expressions, not
random, and not caused by the contexts in which they are uttered. This represents the Logical Form
(LF) in combination with the S-structure of the expression, the syntactic function of the Logical Form
expresses the deep structure. Here, we have the logical basis to account for the capacity to create an
almost infinite array of expressions from finite means as elements can be put to different uses, held
within different relations, and the various combinations of those elements themselves can be put to
different ends obtaining different meanings with each combination. This capacity is not exhausted by
the a posteriori and externally determined imposition of categories and works outside of the limits of
description.

The second aspect maps a surface structure interpretation and appearance to what is expressed that is
appropriate to the context, as it is of the vocabulary available within the given context experienced,
but does not necessarily have to be expressed. Linguistically, this is called the Phonetic Form (PF) of
the expression, for us, the surface expression. As language is a system for creating thought, we now
have a structure which can create thoughts which does not necessarily have to, or possibly could not,
be expressed. D-structures persist across contexts despite the surface level transformations to what
was expressed. Surface representation may change in order to force an agreement between a
sentence’s appearance with others built from the vocabulary of the context’s idiom or vernacular.
Repetitions and syntactically valid but ambiguous to external “grammaticality” forms abound in the
deep structure which are known as garden path sentences. These forms are expressions we can “think”
but cannot express; however, all elements required for a correct semantic interpretation remain in the
deep structure of these expressions.37

The D-structure of an expression is evidence of the subjectivity of an individual. All modes of
expression and their forms have an inner logic and method of generation despite if what is expressed
is illegible, cannot be translated, paraphrased away or deleted, whether it be silent, an unintelligible
noise or distortion, a movement, or cannot be externalized at all. This will be the basis for building a
theory of black subjectivity outside of the imposition of Identity, its being forced to translate its
expressions for a dominant reference frame, or its expressions being relegated to nonsense, silence, or
signifying “absolutely nothing.” As the phonetic interpretation or surface representation is contingent
to context, PF represents the identity obtained within the particular reference frame within a state of
affairs. Therefore, even in silence and across the various contexts in which an individual may or may
not become subject of the propositions of that state of affairs, there remains a Logical Form and
method of creating thought indicative of subjectivity outside of the parameters set by frames of
reference and Identity.
An ontological aspect to this schema arises, in addition to this method of analysis, when language was reformulated as a mode of creating thought, as modes of expression as ways of being in the world. *The Port Royal Grammar* stated that the only true verbs are different forms of “to be” or “is.” . . . one can say that the verb in itself ought to have another use beyond marking the connection that we make in our minds between the two terms of a proposition, but it is only the verb to be . . . which remained in this simple state . . . For, as men naturally proceed to shorten their expression, they have almost always joined to the affirmation some other signification in the same word.” This brought the understanding that the existence of an individual is based on what “is”—the verb in the proposition—is doing, even if it is not experienced by the Other.

These considerations led to looking to language as evidence what there *is* in the world. W.V.O. Quine, in a 1945 letter to Rudolf Carnap, summarized this thought by saying, “every language, insofar at least as it uses quantifiers, assumes one or another realm of entities which it talks about. . . The question *what there is* from the point of view of a given language—the question of the *ontology* of the language—is the question of the range of values of its variables.” He elaborated this idea further in a paper entitled “On What There Is,” and states: “A theory is committed to those and only those entities to which the bound variables of the theory must be capable of referring in order that the affirmations made in the theory be true.” The merge function highlights different views as to how we meet this dictum by coming to an understanding of how one quantifies over the properties that become indicative of a class of objects, features, individuals, etc. According to Quine, whenever one says “some”, “every”, “all”, or “a,” they commit to a framework’s Ontology. The distinction between internal and external merge, and the decision that internal merge provides a better account for how the creation of thought works, made for profound implications to ontological commitments. Ontology as a system of categorization had to give way as existence became a matter of significance regarding which elements go into the formation of a thought. It follows that though some thoughts do become articulate, these thoughts could have been otherwise or remained inarticulate without having to deny their existence. The hierarchical distinction of assuming external formations and the primacy of communicability becomes hard to sustain by the Descriptionist in light of the elucidation of a deep structure to modes of creating thought. This generative structure is evidence of the subject through its capacity for language, despite any externalization of those propositions.

Identifying entities which have undergone articulation in juxtaposition to the field left inarticulate now comes into question. External merging processes must rely on a logic of identification based on a negative existential proposition. “This” *is* because it is *not* “that” in order to stipulate that which is existentially categorized and what is not. Quine, who did not want to commit to the existence of any and every entity, discussed a myriad of ways to paraphrase these ontological commitments.
Linguistically, this method can be shown through the work of Lawrence Bouton on “sloppy identification” and the verb phrase deletion rule. In merging elements, certain additions cause repetitions or ellipses. A recursive element operates within grammar to delete these repetitions for the sake of clarity during the process of externalization. As VPs contain both a determiner and noun, this deletion function can paraphrase out certain elements of an articulate string within the process of its being created. This is understood most clearly through the notion of appositive modifications to nouns. Appositives can be restrictive—remove phrases—and nonrestrictive—add a phrase—to clarify what could be the ontological commitments of a proposition with a particular state of affairs. If restrictive, this aspect clarifies the system and sustains the configuration of external controls on modes of expression. If nonrestrictive, these configurations remain opaque. The concept of appositives will be enlisted in an exploration of how to transform, rearticulate, the grammars of states of affairs in our case studies and the conclusion of this book.

If the structure of language describing our “world” or reality affords insight into the structure of the actual world, the linguistic model of the language faculty will be used to describe the inner workings of states of affairs. In particular, there will be a distinction made between reality—a frame of reference indicative of a form of life—and actuality—the structure of the world—as it pertains to the totality of its constituents which cannot be “known” by any one individual and is, therefore, the ground for the Null. The model of this faculty is as follows:

```
Actuality
Lexicon:
set of the world’s constituents
(Null, as not yet significant to any category)

Syntax

Syntactic-structure

/ \ Logical Form Phonetic Form

Reality
```

The above illustrates that a sentence's logical form is different than its phonetic or surface form. Lexicon through LF represents what is actually the case on the left side of diagram. Lexicon through PF represents an individual’s reality as the right side of diagram. Modes of expression articulate realities. An expression with the same inner logic and syntactic structure can have multiple phonetic forms meaning the way in which that structure is expressed and experienced can look superficially different dependent upon the context in which it is used. Analogous to the way in which various phonetic forms or surface expressions map onto a deep structure—LF and S-structure—multiple realities can map onto the actual world. We cannot state the relation between reality or experience and actuality, phonetic and logical form, by the same principles and terms used to express what is real. In other words, we cannot “diagram” the connection between what is stipulated as “actual” and what is
“real” but we can show this connection through the diagram which is the schematic for the process of articulation from the actual expressing multiple frames of reference modelling realities. This provides the basis for our need to develop a mechanism of articulation, that which shows this relation. You cannot "picture" the relation between a picture and what it depicts. We show this relationship through Syntactic-structure as the way in which those terms are arranged. Implicit in the use of a surface or phonetic form is the logical form and method of forming that expression, its syntax, which is similar to the moves possible in a game. This implicitly defines the relationship between pieces, in turn conveying what game we are playing. What is actual says "nothing." for saying that "it" is what it is, does not give us any information regarding actuality. However, we understand that there is some thing there. Reality asserts some particular thing from that set which is no one thing. In order to assert what is real one affirms what is being described.

Also, in this way, the linguistic model we employ to describe the structure of a sentence or expression can be used to study the structure of society. Taking the structure of the surfacing expression or sentence as:

\[
\text{Sentence} \\
/ \ \\
\text{Noun Phrase} \ \\
/ \ \\
\text{Verb Phrase} \\
/ \ \\
\text{Verb} \ \\
/ \ \\
\text{Noun Phrase}
\]

or

\[
S \left[ \text{NP + VP} \left[ \text{V+NP} \right] \right]
\]

NPs are identified and introduced into S or the surface organization of the expression. S, then, represents institutions, individuals, etc. and is the surface level organization of a particular arrangement expressing our state of affairs. Therefore, S is what is experienced as reality. What lies underneath is the structure of the actual world. VPs are what these individuals are doing. Embedded in each VP is an NP or the subject or self-identifying creative capacity of that individual. What is seen in S is only a snapshot, a static representation of what is actually going on as the affairs within that state expressed by virtue of the VP's embedded in it. The NP that stands alone is how an individual is identified within state S. The NP embedded in the VP is how that individual is expressed by virtue of the function (V) of who/what they are (N).

The interdependence of these two structures in expressing a thought through the language faculty will be utilized in our structuring and analysis of a state of affairs. It will also aid in attending to the consequences these structures entail to the individuals whose forms of life they present. For a
linguistic model to the formation of a subject, a “language” will be defined as follows: i) an individual unit of a language is comprised of a “set” of features; ii) a set of objects out of which infinite expressions are articulated; iii) language itself, then, is a mechanism which is both a part of and apart from the use of a vocabulary or lexicon that can produce an infinite range of expressions from this finite set; iv) an ability to generate expressions relevant or appropriate to context, but not caused by it, is innate to all individuals; v) as all have this capacity, no one is more significant with regard to this faculty than another.

With this formulation in hand, I contend that every mode of expression has a language. There are many possible languages, therefore there is a set that encompasses all possible languages which has no “verbal,” textual, or “lingual” representation. To every specific arrangement of things or facts indicating a context, there is a language that is appropriate to pronouncing what is and what is not meaningful within that frame of reference. The set of all elements that could be used to express a thought will be represented by the Null. The Null, because it is the set of everything, is not significant to one or another context.

In set theory, the Null or \( \emptyset \) makes the creation of a set possible and will be defined as follows: i) the Null exists outside of and is a subset of any set; ii) the identity of any specific set is not changed in its union with the Null; iii) any set that is equivalent with the Null identifies the Null as its origin. As origins are ontologically necessary, things must come from somewhere. Epistemologically, origins are context dependent as there is no one point in the Null that can be identified as the origin of any particular set, regardless of context, or the body of knowledge in which one is situated. Therefore, origins must be stipulated within a given frame of reference to be meaningful to one’s theory of the world; iv) every set is articulated out of the Null as every element of it both belongs to and is in excess of that articulate set. If this were not true, by definition for every element of the Null that becomes a part of a given set there would be at least one element of Null that is not present in that set. This entails the contradiction that there are no elements of significance within a particular frame of reference that is a member of Null, and there is no element of Null that is not a part of that frame; v) any proposition that utilizes the Null is not substantive, meaning it is not yet a part of the current context; it encompasses all that could be possibly expressed with no specification as to what is expressed. Therefore, everything is true of the objects and their features within the Null set, and that set is the horizon of possibility for anything to be at all. This is ensured by the principle of extensionality. The Null will be crucial to positing a theory of Articulation.

We have conducted our study by developing a syntax for modes of expression to look at the process articulating our socio-political and cultural domain, as well as how that syntax is applicable to other modes, languages, expressive of subjectivity, in order to account for the following. An analysis
illustrating the syntax for an individual's mechanism of expression handles how that individual is, their being, in the world. Our articulatory mechanism handles the formation of the contexts in which the possibility of those individuals coming to be in relations of subordination and dominance can be accounted for without presupposing a universal description of the context or the articulate individual already identified within the reference frame we bring to our analysis of that context. Without providing a structure for the mechanism of individual expression, we cannot ascertain how forms of expression are the modes in which one is in the world. Without an analysis of the capacity to form expressions, the question of how these now articulate individuals come into relations of subordination or dominance cannot be accounted for nor a mechanism developed for the study of the process of articulation. The issues that arise regarding the expression of relations of dominance/subordination between individuals and the resulting structure of that state of affairs would remain mysterious and unanalyzable, rendering us stuck with the socio-political framework we have.

In order to link modes of expression to modes of being in the world, we will take the verb form of 'is' exemplified by the modifier "-ing". Taking what is as whomever operates in our state of affairs, the Gerund is how we conceive of an individual by way of the mechanism expressing its self, outside of how it is merely identified by others. Linguistically, the suffix “-ing” expresses the Gerund form of a term, an individual conceived by what it or they are doing, and will serve as the vehicle for our analysis to come. A Gerund represents the (R) elation between a (W)orld or the context of expression and a (N) ame. Formally, an individual as Gerund will be written as the ordered triplet <W, N, R> in subsequent chapters but in Section II will be reformulated in a way that is integral to our discussion of music expressing subjectivity and other concepts outside of identity or mere words below. The function of this ordered triplet expresses what "is," is doing - what Amiri Baraka/Leroi Jones called the flow of is as indicative of the subjectivity of a people. (See Appendix I for the full formal treatment of this concept as well as a detailed description of the articulatory mechanism overviewed above)
Section II. Black Expression and Collective Subjectivity

You know, honey, us colored folks is branches without roots and that makes things come around in queer ways.

Zora Neale Hurston. *Their Eyes Were Watching God*

Syntax in hand, we are prepared to apply this form of analysis to this capacity’s musical expression as a faculty of subjectivity. Making meaning through a concatenation of the objects of thought is the method in which subjects become significant within states of affairs. This is accomplished through an innate creative capacity, an aspect of language use, and the becoming subject of the propositions of others most manifestly expressed in literary theory. It is this line of reasoning which substantiates Jones/Baraka’s claim in *Blues People* that the form of music is the sound of a people and the vehicle for the formation of the black subject. For Baraka, subjectivity is collective: a multitude of individuals; an individual as person, people, or the interface between individuals and groups expressing a culture.43 It is also in *Black Music* that Baraka suggests that blackness is first re-articulation, a changing same. “The Negro’s music changed as he changed, reflecting shifting attitudes or (and this is important) consistent attitudes within changed contexts.”44 The word “consistent” is key as it indicates an inner logic and mode of expression that is not exhausted by context. Baraka states explicitly that there is a mechanism of articulating the subjectivity of blackness which persists across contexts despite being identified in different ways. That mechanism generates expressions relevant to context but is not wholly caused by that context, although what is produced is always appropriate to context. Black forms of music, like the technique of improvisation, are not random. There is always the subject’s capacity, which does not appear in the “song” or its notation but is a result of that subject, putting together elements of a finite lexicon to express a self. Regardless of a notational or racial identification of the subject that states its non-existence, this capacity producing absolutely nothing, its products devoid of sense. It is through musical expression and the creative capacity from within that we see the features with which black subjectivity forms a movement that subverts efforts of overdetermination. Overdetermination, then, can be characterized as the act of becoming the subject of—subjected to—the propositions of White supremacy or equated with absolutely nothing by the Pessimist.

What "figures" into the mechanism of Articulation must be derived from the perspective of a mode of generating thought, as shown through how linguistic elements work in section one. In what follows, I will undertake a study of the formation of the subject. Until recently, the question was, “what *is* Articulation?” as an attempt to answer how we are to define the meaning of Articulation as if it were an object within some other field of study. The account I put forward demonstrated articulation as a
process. The question of Ontology in its simplest form is as follows: “what is in the world?” “Of what things does the world consist?” This question was reformulated in the mid-twentieth century to incorporate the stipulation that the question of Being is most easily formulated through an entity whose very being is under question. At that time, we were led to look at language as a window into the apparatus that creates one's being in the world, here called the subject. To do so, a look into the signifying practices of individuals was taken to uncover the syntax or method expressing subjectivity.

A literary and syntactic analysis is vital to show how one is implicated in defining what they are analyzing, the world that they seek to "read," or understand, or speak into existence. It illustrates how one may be overdetermined by others’ definitions. If we are demonstrating what this mechanism entails, we have to account for, as best we can, how we arrive at what figures into it our analysis, especially in regard to the language we use and its implications.

Where Ontology was shown to work along the concept of Identity and an axiom of identification, our reorientation to subjectivity brings into consideration the relations set by the process of articulation. The account made for this relation solidifies the existence of the Other. The practice of identification is only sufficient to positing the Other, thus setting one’s own relation in the world. However, the subject is not in its own identified position, but in the process of making that position the “subject” of a proposition.

The frame of reference that gave value to the original question of Ontology took it as a system of knowledge. Undergirded by this categorical system, Ontology utilized a visual metaphor to posit what is and what is not in the actual world. This visualization of a state of affairs, “I see this” or “I see that ” as indicative of one's knowledge of the world, inevitably led to a valorization of what is identified already and a method that dictates what does not exist through this same apparatus. This method granted force behind the claim “out of sight, out of mind” in regards to what is valid or invalid within a particular arrangement of what is in the world we will call a reference frame. This metaphor has led to an exacerbation of mind-body dualism as it posits a “veil of ideas”—a seventeenth century concept developed by John Locke—which stands between us as indicative of mind and the physical world or body. If this veil were the case, individuals would be an exact mirror of their environment, and due to their impoverished experience of that environment—as surely no one individual can experience all that possibly exists in that particular space—would negate the existence of any creative capacity which generates thoughts relevant but not caused by that environment. This veil does not exist and was shown to coincide with the failings of identification. I have proposed that surely something exists outside of identification. This innate capacity was proven to play with these parameters and founds the basis for creativity as subjectivity along these principles allowing for
variation. Therefore, there must be a syntax to this method of creation before semantic analysis, in effect making semantic analysis or any notion of value or significance possible.

The case for the subject’s existence outside of identification can easily be made through the language faculty conceived as a creative mechanism whose function expresses the concept of subjectivity. For example, it takes a tremendous act of will for a person not to talk to oneself. This doesn't entail solipsism, only that the concept of a “self” is apprehended by an individual by virtue of it becoming the subject of a proposition. This process occurs without having to externalize what is generated, although one can, if they wish, say what is “on their mind.” In actuality, very little is made external and one can externalize these creations in a myriad of ways. And even so, one cannot deny that there was something generated even if it is not made apparent to others save for one’s “self.” Most often in this process, not even full sequences of terms come to the fore but just a word which through the merge function of language can act as a proposition dependent upon the context of its generation. A proposition can be any statement or concatenation of terms. Its definition as interrogative or demonstrative, etc. is within a frame of reference which sets its function, how it is used. This subjective process sets conditions within which that “self” encounters others and it is possible to articulate a self to which meanings can be attributed—its use value. This has led to looking at modes of expression as the modes in which entities are in the world.

The move away from Ontology as first philosophy to Aesthesis is a move away from this visual metaphor. I contend that it is possible to write an account of subjectivity through a schema of sound as opposed to that of sight. Sound can be “out of sight, out of mind,” if unheard that entity nonetheless exists. The change in metaphor amounts to a reorientation of focus from that of identity and identification to that of an account of the generation of the subject. An analysis of the creative capacity as a faculty inherent to subjectivity that utilizes sonic elements in order to express what is experienced as Music, may be a better alternative to that of mere “text” in order to get at how subjectivity functions. If language has a syntax indicative of a faculty which utilizes words to express thoughts, so can sonic thought be expressed via this faculty whose output is labeled music.

It is with this claim that I now turn to the question of black subjectivity. This inquiry takes as its premise that the black subject is a subject whose very being questions the system of categorization within the current states of affairs: both from within blackness itself, that of Afro-Pessimism, and from outside of it, White supremacy. These views stake their claims on a historical and political matrix of legislation and cultural output which attempts to ossify the identity of the black subject and, thereby, grant its existence or significance within this state by virtue of how the Pessimist and Supremacist have tacitly defined Black identity. This practice inherently uses the terms of analysis in
the positing of their own definitions. The historical and political matrix used to analyze this state of affairs, as it were, is warranted but not the entire story.

If to look at blackness is to look at a mode of being in the world, this mode of being in the world as a mode of expression, and the means of creating thought as necessary to these modes of expression, then sound and the capacity to articulate musical propositions or thought is crucial. The codification of phenotype to race reveals a useful contradiction. This fixing of a term to an external referent works along a principle of quantification over predicates. However, this is a categorical mistake. For blackness is not an object of quantification, but is grasped by the way in which beings are expressed, a function which utilizes others in order to express a concept of self which represents subjectivity. To say, “there exists and x,” says no one thing about x, however, x is the basis upon which we can say anything at all.

It is not possible to quantify over predicate functions unless the domain in which they operate is universally closed, meaning all the domain’s constituents are universally defined. As an argument against essentialism, there is no way to tell exactly which, how many, or if any objects fall under a predicate unless strictly predefined. Thus, quantification by terms external to context essentially fails. Logically, universals can only be asserted after existence, domains of possibility exceed stipulated necessity. Quine’s point is affirmed. For Quine (1961), the attempt only leads to ambiguity in reference. So to call something, something else—to call a person Black—does not provide a proof to ontologically affirm what it is about that person that makes them “Black.” However, to quantify over “person” by using the label “Black,” we ontologically affirm the existence of what the function of that label is viz. blackness. This issue runs deep, as this axiom of ontological affirmation, works through identification. There is no hard or steadfast rule to apply to the quantification of blackness. An external measure of blackness does not exist. This only displays how interminably divisible stipulations over blackness is. To be Black is to become the object of that proposition. It follows, then, that “blackness” is found through signifying practices, what the function of the “function” of that label or role as Black expresses. Black can no longer be held as a rigid descriptor. A rule to what denotes blackness is transcendent and fails the principles of this conceptual scheme. The innate creative capacity within blackness itself utilizes the parameters of the functions that stipulate who is Black and who is not, to articulate different variations of the use of that predicate.48

For example, let us say that different frequencies of light emit different colors. The vibration of color, measured as a frequency of waves of photons, can be conceived as the “sound” of light as sound is conceived and measured as an oscillating wave of vibrations in air. Though one sees physical excitations they do not see “Black”, “White”, “Red”, etc. they have only learned the functions of those terms within a form of life which ostensibly is to discern between what it is, for that state of
affairs, to be Black, White or Red for others. A person who is color blind does not "see" these excitations but learns to name these absences within that form of life whose functions are a tool to tell what is Red and what is Not for them, but Black for others. The mental capacity to utilize the functions of these terms, for both the color blind and the ones who are not, is the same. The "picturing" or generation of the thought is the same, the function of the term which expresses the concept by virtue of its operation or use, though the object's appearance in the world is different. The relation between the 'picture' obtained and the actual world cannot be defined, only shown. Either one can assert or deny the existence of Red by virtue of the name alone. This exercise shows the fallacy in attributing the use of articulate terms to objects that lie external to the use-value those labels obtain. The names of these colors are contingent to context but their use within a context can lead to an understanding of what these individuals are for those who participate in the same reference frame. It is possible to know colors and not experience them since what is understood as this or that color is by a certain function within a specific context, not by definition. What I call Black may not be the same color that another experiences although it is known by the same name. Two color-objects could possibly obtain the same function, concept, within our state of affairs. The same color, across contexts, can be known by different names. However, the set of relations between object and function remains the same but does not have surface representation, does not appear in the actual world, it can only be understood or shown.

Hurston’s image of “branches with no roots” indicates a subject that is not fixed by the environment, the context it inhabits. In section one, we challenged the post-modern deconstructionist critique of developing a generative mechanism to the articulation of a subject. The criticism stated that by formalizing this structural apparatus, in effect one institutes a hierarchical tree structure rather than a root structure to capture the inner connectedness and contextual dependency in articulation theory. We illustrated the misconceptions founding this critique by turning that analysis on its head. Mapping these concepts through a “tree” diagram versus one metaphorized as roots is structurally the same and only viewed as one or the other dependent upon one’s point of view. Through Hurston we see that it is the branches that count—the capacity to analyze relations in the process of their formation—to our articulatory mechanism. It is through this dynamic view that blackness can be analyzed. What seems to be the case is that the formation of a subject is in the process of its generation which is not teleologically fixed to a dictated origin. If this is the ground for the Black subject, branches with no roots, the Black subject’s very being is its articulation and re-articulation. Black subjectivity, then, is indicative of the innate creative capacity demonstrated through language’s ability to change the parameters with which thoughts are formed. The first articulation of blackness is of being “singular plural.”
As the subject was theorized as possessing an innate creative capacity, I will look at the formation of Black subjects through their signifying practices taking sound as the objects within the lexicon which, with regard to a syntactic-structure and logical form, articulate blackness’ mode of being in the world. Language considered as a form of life has been studied anthropologically as well as philosophically. The function of sonic objects used to express a thought musically may or may not be externalized for communicative purposes. The language faculty as a function of the signifying practices of the subject taken as objects of particular roles towards the expression of a form of life are used in a poetic way. The formation of the black subject illuminates the capacity to articulate as well as rearticulate the identities of the same subject, contingent to the environments in which it resides. The arboretic issue brought to the fore in our first part is evidence of this principle. If Black folk are like branches without roots, according to Hurston, those branches may be labeled as roots with the sky representing the ground or vice versa. Branches without roots serves as a valid explanation for the basis of black subjectivity to be re-articulation itself. In contrast to this view, the Descriptionist attributes values to these objects from a stance that assumes their external position from the process of generation. This view fails to account for the simple question of how those branches were made. In the theory of articulation put forward, it is possible to account for the trunk of this tree with branches and/or roots leading to the complex variations that can be generated by a finite set of elements.

The connection between music and subjectivity has been proposed by theorists such as Sean Cubitt in a study titled Listening Subject regarding subjectivity and melody, as well as in analyses of improvisation and creative capacities in Jazz by Alan Perlman and Daniel Greenblatt. The tie between music and language, most specifically its poetic capacity, was made explicit by the work of Amiri Baraka, then LeRoi Jones, in the mid-twentieth century. For Baraka, musical performance is a book written and read simultaneously. His claim that music is a text suggests that there is a language to the generation of musical forms. Illustrations of this capacity have recently been made by Richard Middleton and Jason King who use notions of the concatenation of sounds as indicative of a transformative syntax to the formation of musical subjects. In line with our linguistic model, a transformative syntax relates to musical expression through the following: the changing of core phrases or strings of sonic elements in an additive fashion creating longer strings via merge; by deleting certain phrases from a part of that string, or the string overall, in order to make it harmonize within the context of the song via an agreement operation; or their rearrangement by the transposition of phrases to alternative placements in order to express another movement within the sonic thought entirely via an operation move or “order.” The latter two transformations, move and agree, are descriptions of what occurs on the surface level of sonic expressions. This entails that although a song
may sound different across performances, the deep structure to that expression remains intact ensuring that understanding of a sonic thought can be had as the syntax and function of their constitutive elements relate the individuals of that form of life. Zora Neale Hurston’s philosophy of language in “The Characteristics of Negro Expression” details blackness as a cultural endowment of signifying practices and lays the groundwork for a textual link between black subjectivity and modes of expression found from Frantz Fanon’s “The Negro and Language” in Black Skin, White Masks on through to Henry Louis Gates, Jr’s The Signifying Monkey.

Inquiries into Black music sometimes run the risk of exclusively linking these objects to their historical uses, attributing their significance to already articulate songs to explain what the significance of the form overall means to the genre of music, not to the subject creating it. This pushes us towards essentializing or ontologizing blackness within static categorizations. Explanations of existence amount to legitimizations which can quickly be invalidated through the example of improvisation in jazz which was seen as purely chance, caused only by randomness. These affirmations are no doubt significant but the method in which this inquiry of the formation of Black music’s creative capacities has profound effects on the being of blackness. Probabilistic models presume a notation, external to the performance, as primary or indicating whether or not the object of experience is Music or not. If this were true, one would be hard-pressed to account for improvisation as the repetition of kernel sequences which produce a variance in the meanings these phrases produce; or the capacity to not know the names of notes but still be able to create a song. A Musical notation only sets future performances for categorical purposes, it is not the music itself. Tests have shown that some “physical” actions are figured before they manifest. This does not prove a loss of free will but only affirms that there are operations occurring before they appear and/or recorded as conscious expressions. In musical performance, there is the ability to play off a crowd's reactions and make different but relevant expressions outside of the notation or pitch set by a score. Assembling meaningful expression occurs simultaneously with the creation of the objects which supposedly carry them. This is some of the evidence for a language composed of sound as a means of creating thought. This leads us to a discussion of the subject, sound, and existence.

Sound and Subjectivity

The use of sound rather than sight—I “see” some “thing” as “this,” therefore it “exists” in this, my world—is more apt to speak of the existence of individuals as it presumes being within a given spatiotemporal framework. This “being in” illustrates a sound's public existence. Etymologically, this is known as “ethos.” The ethical is merely a description of how one should be in that space. Ethos being the reality of an individual within that space obtaining a function and relation with others. Music is indicative of a language faculty but of a different form than words. We are all surrounded by
and submerged in sound. The ability to create thought with the objects that comprise this world makes it a prime subject for a theory of subjectivity. The issue regarding a subject forged by sound is whether a thought can be formed regarding objective entities which are non-spatial in themselves. By non-spatial, I mean that an individual sets a reference frame of space in a way that reference to that space already presumes being in it. We must determine what objective notions would be available to such a scheme. P.F. Strawson in *Individuals* showed the possibility of a scheme that relies on relating individual sounds to a continuous “master sound” which, as it were, defines something analogous to space. This “master” sound—the lexicon of all possible sound which can be utilized as the object of the function expressing thought—for our study is conceptualized as the Null. The ability to create one’s “self” rests within a spatiotemporal framework which can then be used to create thought about bodies—the objects of this lexicon falling under the function of the subject of which they are “about”—and the world they propose. In effect, this sets the frame of reference within which individuals can be identified. To identify the objects whose function express a sonic individual which set the frame within a sound world, we require a “spatiotemporal” framework which performs a role analogous to the ways in which we pictured that frame visually.

The sonic Gerund is represented by the triplet: <pitch, tone, timbre>. (For a full description regarding the formulation of the concept of the Gerund see Appendix I)

The major concern for sonically conceiving of subjectivity is the ability to reidentify a sound after its initial occurrence. This is only possible within a spatial scheme that allows for not the same experience of a sound but the understanding that “this” sound is a particular individual out of all other possibilities. This will be termed as an “understood” individual instead of merely being identified. Strawson speaks of a “master” sound as a space to judge the relation between this individual and others to understand its particularity. For us, this is handled within the concept of pitch. Pitch sets the conditions in which an individual sets a relation to other individuals. The encounter of these individuals within this pitch field express our concepts of time and rhythm by the rate of encounter. Thus, pitch serves as a range of frequencies over which a given intensity can be understood. Within our conceptual scheme, the pitch sets a world as the spatial matrix in which subjects are submerged.

Pitch, then, is the spatiotemporal plane upon which Gerunds move. Their movement effects the curvature of that plane dependent upon their significance within states of affairs. The more gravity to a Gerund’s articulation the more this plane bends, setting other Gerunds into motion. Gravity is represented in our scheme as the bends created within the plane or state of affairs delimited by a master sound and is better understood as the intensity of sound. The maximum and minimum intensity of a sound apart from others within this sonic plane are so loud or so soft that that particular sonic object cannot be registered. Therefore, sounds too loud or too soft reside outside of a reference frame.
mapped over the master sound. For all intents and purposes, these recurring max and min obtain the same Null value within that frame. However, their being used in the expression of a sonic thought achieve different affects. The depth of the curve representing the intensity of that tone’s frequency is what is conceived as the existence of that individual within that continuum. It is from this that a grammar is conceived as the measure of time but not time itself.

The domain of the master sound could be a plane of noise, distortion, or silence. All that is required is that this field is a continuous base from which tones are articulated. A master sound is conceived by the first tone articulated, which sets the world that is the song to be expressed, the context of the sonic thought. Held continuously, other tones are discerned with regard to their relation to this initial spatializing point.

Within a frame of reference over a field of pitch, a tone highlights a particular individual within that range. Tone is the occurrence of a particular intensity. Usually, tone is synonymous with note. However, here “tone” is used to emphasize that a notation differs from the actual intensity which it attempts to record. A particular tone can exist outside of notation. Within the lexicon of a musical language, tone is not exclusive to one of those marks sitting among the five lines of a musical stave. Tabs or “musical notation” do not exhaust the quality of a given tone contingent to the range within which it occurs. Neither does the existence of a notation dictate which tones may or may not appear within a given context.

Regarding Music, it is imperative to talk about time. Since Einstein, time has been considered a geometric entity. It is not a measure transcendent to the events that compose it as it is lived experientially. Time does not provide the truth conditions of its events, however, these events are real occurrences. Any measure is an abstraction from the continuum of time considered here as the substrate in which the state of affairs is embedded and from which it is expressed by virtue of the encounter of tones in particular ways. These abstractions can be useful, but only when used as a window into the actuality that is time as the interaction between tones expresses a sense of duration which harbors consequences to how we experience sound as well as make up the extension of our world. For how long, their intensity, and the way these tones carry demarcate the limits of that sound world. The various sounds identified as the limits of a sound world engender a relation between those articulating the sonic thought indicative of a subject and an other’s experience of their world. This implies that individuals create time as they are made articulate. A tone also carries temporal information dependent upon its use or the function it obtains in the process of articulating a sonic state of affairs. The same tone can be held over a different space within that range, thus creating a notion of tense.
Timbre is the relation that tone has with other intensities in the range or domain of the pitch field. The mix of intensities within a range provides the basis for the identification of tones in relation to others. The pitch sets the conditions of possibility for a tone. A tone can only be known as such by virtue of its relation to other intensities within that range, its timbre, indicative of a unique quality of tone which can only be understood in its relation to others.

Laying out the sound Gerund in this way, we can now represent the articulation of individuals in the same way as our first section. Articulation remains a mechanism through which sounds are generated relevant to context, not random, and yet not caused by context. From a finite set of tones, we have an almost infinite range of variation expressible from this innate creative capacity. This, in effect, provides a sufficient account for our example of improvisation as well as how repetition of the same musical “phrase” could also generate an infinite range of thought.

A sound world is possible even though the quantification or measure of frequency may be different across performances. The ability to discern a particular intensity as opposed to another within a range of pitch can remain the same. Though a song may sound different, one can understand it as being the same song due to the relation of tones within that field. This hinges on the assumption that the primary aspect of sound is that one must be in it—within the spatiotemporal matrix set by its generation—thereby setting the possibility of referential statements from which a “here” or an “I” is made possible. What is most important about this scheme is that it hinges upon the ability to conceive of a particular individual that continues to exist, even if it is not observed. Strawson elaborates that sound creates a space and, although a sound may be unheard, there is always a position conceivable from which it can. This is evident through the concept of volume. For the same reason that a sound can subsist below frequencies that can be sensed by an individual, that individual is still immersed in that sound or, even, can conceive of utilizing a function of that sound to create a musical thought, even if that “song” is never played. Volume can be conceived as a function of one’s relation to articulate sounds via proximity or location and intensity. One can recognize that they are in the field of an unheard sound by the vibration of that given frequency. Something can exist outside of knowing its identity by being understood, here felt, as being there.

* 

Now, we must relate our sonic conceptual scheme back to black subjectivity. In section one, we demonstrated through language as the creation of thought qua subjectivity and the axioms of set theory that the Null, as the set that contains all that could possibly be used to form an expression and, therefore, insignificant to any one particular context and yet a part of every context, is the foundation for any articulation. As the Afro-Pessimist's position, analogous to the Descriptionist’s position, takes
blackness' being as one that is "absolutely nothing," this Not was shown not to be a vacuum after all. One aspect of the articulation of blackness and musical expression that has been studied in detail is syncopation. The space between tonal occurrences is how we can conceive of this phenomenon. It is in the drop between articulated sounds in the process of being fashioned together to form a sonic thought that all possible arrangements can be found. Syncopated rhythm and melody, the silences between tones where the borders between individuated articulations seem to blur, shows that the Not is what holds the entire song and dance together. In exploring the encounter and the logical principles of excluded middle and inference, it follows that the Not is the foundation for any articulation. The combination of a logical form and syntactic structure reveal a deep structure to the music in such a way that by virtue of the musical description mapped on to that structure, the pattern between tones implies that elements once separate were merged together in such a way to express a song. This is easily shown in this linguistic model through the concept of adjunction.

An adjunct is an item that is embedded within an articulation but does not necessarily appear in its surface structure. In regard to surface articulations, adjuncts are empirically invisible to syntax—in merge they are not labeled as "adjuncts," they only behave as such—and are visible if that element is generated in the same way as another structure. Adjunction survives paraphrases as well as grammatical transformation on the surface, and subsists in articulation although subject to deletion or the additive and restrictive aspects of grammar. The most important feature of adjunction, however, is that it illustrates how the Null carries over, although not always apparent in what is articulate within a state of affairs. Even more so, adjuncts become the basis for the cultural aspects of this conceptual scheme. The stacking of tones work along lines of adjunction in order to create complete sounds. This is accomplished through what has been termed “feature sharing” in linguistics. Adjunction shows what is unknown—not visibly seen, as it is a relation, but whose effects and consequences can be empirically ascertained, shown, and analyzed—and understood to be there: a basis for the analysis of Culture. Propositions in which a culture or a people are expressed, not necessarily identified as that “people” but nonetheless are the expression of the relation that binds that people together as participating within the same form of life, can enter discourse which are grammatically correct, have no sense in one context, but do so in an other.

As this feature is an empirical fact, though invisible to the surface organization imposed on articulate individuals, adjuncts become “visible,” or understood, in feature sharing. Although unknown, this aspect is understood. These features are handed down through the generative capacity within articulation. Features are not physical traits but constituents to the formation of modalities, ways of being in the world. Cultural endowments through feature sharing serve as a workable concept of ethnicity as, despite superficial appearances as a relation along these lines is maintained. I do not have the space to go into detail regarding this formulation here, however, it has been elaborated by theorists.
such as Paul Gilroy in *The Black Atlantic* on the living memory of blackness as a changing same represented in music.

To bring this full circle, syncopation is the voicing of the Not and is where blackness is found. This Not, being formally represented as the Null in part one, interpenetrates every articulation. This is distinctly different from the Afro-Pessimist’s claim of the Not being absolutely empty. Blackness persists outside of notation. What is defined as Black fails the identity test but blackness is found within any construction. It is the field within which any articulate construction occurs. Time, the process of articulation, becomes integral to the formation of the subject. Time becomes a substrate and not a means of measure.

By focusing on syncopated silences in the construction of songs, our analysis turns away from identification of song to the creative capacity that holds a song’s objects, their coming together, immanent to that frame of reference. By refocusing, question-raising issues external to the process of formation are reduced. A song is conceived as the “function” of the operation/function of sound. It is expressed by an operation which adjoins tones, the objects of that function, such that the “sound” produced becomes the object of the function of song. A song, then, only has a meaning within a reference frame indicative of a form of life. It is not that these silences make the song, but they are a window to the subject’s thinking in sound. We need to account for the ability to understand that a song is the same if sang by another. As well as different tones, and due to their prolongation, different cadences and/or rhythm are produced whether or not the same song is being performed. Therefore, it is necessary to construct a model that accounts for a sound outside of notation, outside of a specific and prefigured measure attributed to the features of a tone. It is these silences that form the arrangement that becomes evidence of items that were once separate being put together by something apart from what was externalized. If externalized, these items become the object of experience. The subject is in the process of forming the sounds, of creating thought sonically. The song “Swing Low” is still “Swing Low” if sung in a different key or by another person regardless of the musical notation to which it was subsequently fixed. The song retains the same relation between tones although it may be played with different notes. How one is identified is not transitive across contexts but bound to them. There are different ways to speak or sing the same “object,” with different meanings attributed to them, but the method of creating thought and therefore the subjectivity of that subject remains the same. Surely there is a way to account for this method of generation. Just as someone can, metaphorically, “speak” to themselves, they can sing to themselves as well.
**Tonal Features**

Music, as its proper name suggests, is a grammatical measure of a series of tone’s “musicality.” The function of the category Music expresses a characteristic of the songs held within it. Within that category, the class of sounds that make up songs express different features. In order to talk of the tones that make up the sound of songs, their “T”-ness, we must construct a theory of the expression of tonal features. We can syntactically account for a tone without some measure that appeals to a notion outside of that tone’s method of construction. If what Baraka states is true, the Western regime over sound within the category of Music is to deal with the subversive tendency of Black musical expression—the use of Black identity that expresses blackness, B-use to express B-ness—through which it is possible to avoid the trappings of identification as and/or with a musical notation or song title.69

For simplicity sake, I did not explore features in the conceptual scheme from section one.70 However, they are integral to a proper analysis of sound, particularly feature sharing and what could possibly be conceived as blackness outside of identification. Features are not phenotypic or “physical,” they are the ways that constitute a tone’s characteristic being in the world to which it is introduced in relation to other tones. The tonal signature of blackness then is implicitly structured in the relation held between elements by the scheme, \[1 \varnothing 1 1 1\]. A specific feature is not indicative of who or what an individual is. Here, sounds are not analyzed by making a correspondence between a physiological process and meaning, but as units used to construct thoughts with the possibility of being externalized. It is plausible to construct a scheme where one can imagine structures of these units before they are fingered through an instrument or sung. A simple illustration of the articulatory model put forward above, illustrates how tones fit into sound structures to express the object of the function of music, a song. From a set of lexical elements or tonal features, certain of which are put in relation to each other in particular ways, we articulate observable events or objects which are the “sounds” of the song.71

The utilization of tones in such a way that creates a relationship between the subject articulating a series of sounds and those experiencing that series of sounds as the object of the function of Music, for them as well as the individual playing, expresses the concept of a musical performance which comes under the label of “song.”

A study of features shows the components with which the subject articulates a self in relation to the world it inhabits. This articulation is the individual identified within the world, here analyzed as a pitch field in lieu of Strawson’s “master sound.” The individual is comprised of a tone and the function that tone obtains amongst others. Those other tones do not have access to the internal structure of this particular individual, they come to know it superficially as the note or name of a tone,
a predicate indicative only of a small portion of its features. Just because we cannot catch the whole of this relation does not mean that we cannot understand or propose a theory of how it is possible for the subject that created this tone from what was available to it. A formal theory is useful here as it allows for us to see the mechanism in which these features are assembled without predetermined notions of what these features and their tones are labeled and defined as prior to their being articulated and utilized in the expression of a song.

Let a tone be an object that consists of a feature matrix. The tone itself is not defined by the features themselves but the relation those features obtain articulate that tone. Each tone is expressed as that which binds this feature matrix implicitly structured by the relation between a set of features, otherwise known as its waveform. This set of relations is within a field of all possible features within a certain interval or space. We know this as a pitch field. All features sound simultaneously within that pitch field. A tone as it is immanent within a field of pitch can only be understood by the oscillation of its frequency within a limit imposed within that space. Therefore, a tone is continuous until it stops. Overall, a sound is the combination of different frequencies all of which "sound" together. Each object can be suppressed or held below audibility through the use of a stop measure. The culmination of stops cannot overstep the limits of that span of pitch set by the relation that tone has within that field. As all features sound simultaneously and at certain times are left to sound continuously or are suppressed, we can conceive of a waveform within a spatial concept of time. Syncopation is achieved through the encounter of tones, their "stacking on top of" or conjunction with one another, which expresses a sense of time through the space generated in between the overlapping stops and starts within a field of pitch. Both the notions of “stacking” and “space-between” are necessary to the expression of syncopation but not sufficient in and of themselves.

Stacking represents a spatial rather than a linear concept incarcerated by musical notation. This concept is required for the articulation of a sound world with its own inner logic and mechanism of generation. Stacking implies an intensional or inner logical sense of “meter” formed between the elements themselves. We need both working in tandem to illustrate a theory of syncopation along two lines: from within musical notation expressing the concept of rhythm with regard to an assumed meter with which the utterance of a tone develops an off beat relation to when measured against it; and with regard to the generation of a spatial syncopated concept via stacking so that multiple tones express an off beat form without recourse to an assumed external meter to the articulation of the song. If just one tone is used against an assumed meter, then syncopation is expressed rhythmically. However, a group of tones being expressed against and in relation to each other and played by multiple individuals can express an off beat cadence in the collective articulation of a song as well. Blackness can be found in the ability to transform these objects along feature sharing lines by moving the overlay of utterances
exposing different lengths of stops between articulate tones. We require a spatial conception of syncopation in order to show the construction of a Black world against the fitting into a singular definition of “Black”-ness. Against “fitting into” totalizing categories is analogous to the use of syncopation versus measuring the type of syncopation expressed with regard to a predefined notion of the concept.

If we talk about the "quality" or subject of a sound as expressed by a tone's timbre in pitch, we are indeed talking about how it fills/feels in a space as well. Analogous to creating space, we can speak of how this mechanism creates a world by the way in which a tone’s relation and stacking with others in that context express—which is to say how the encounter between tone’s express a “sound” indicative of that sonic world. World building is connected to the Future Perfect discussed in section one which is sonically fleshed here. The Future Perfect expressed by the function of the encounter of tones articulating a particular sound or world amounts to the creation of a space within the delimited space, venue, or society arrangement at present. As it must be articulated in that space, this Future Perfect sound represents the inner logic and description of a block or interval within the performance of a song with which other individuals create a relation of affinity at once a part of and yet apart from that space: a state within a state.

We will develop a concept called stacking to help us visualize this inner logic or quality. Stacking also aids in illustrating our reformulation of the issue regarding the representation of tonal prolongation within the General Theory of Tonal Music (GTTM). Syncopation through stacking represents a spatial relation both a part of the song but apart from linearly dictated, measured, and notated syncopation. This considers syncopation as a process in opposition to syncopation as an object of the category Music. In this way, the ability to stand beside one’s self which is also a standing with another, the ecstatic experience of music reveals in its etymological form *ek-stasis*, how an alternative form of life can be had within and alongside the parameters of a delimited or dominant one. This completes our formulation of the Future Perfect.

It is simple enough to model these with the elements of our system—see notes. The functions within a grammar of a state of affairs includes a start component which runs through a specific array. A “feature matrix” can easily be represented with a group of operators attached to the objects of the lexicon, in this study we will use the symbols +, -, # which represent yes, no, and stop respectively. For “not” we use the feature ‘-' which must be qualified within our study. In this system we presuppose a reading from left to right. This stipulation is arbitrary but useful for analysis. We account for the surface appearance to what is expressed by stating that ‘+’ means relevant and therefore appears in the surfacing expression. That which has a ‘+’ is relevant to further computations.
for the song currently being articulated which generally means that it has undergone the entirety of the process. '-' means that the feature is pushed out of reference frame yet still a part of the underlying structure of the song. A '-' moves the tone towards the front of the sonic string being articulated which has the dual effect of proving the conditions which make the surface level articulation possible. This is not a matter of reading notation or counting. If '-' is analogous 0, and as it is logically possible to derive 1 from 0, then all features with '-' as the basis for any one feature at all comes at the beginning of the process of articulating a sonic thought from a finite lexicon. The tandem of + and – can be stated by making the following analogy: a sentence is composed of everything that it superficially says and everything that it does not; the latter is the set that makes the articulation of the former possible. In this way, the sinusoidal wave characteristic of a tone can be constructed such that + means the addition of some feature, - the suppression of some feature on the surface but there none the less, and # means stop. Thus, a tone is the ordered sequence: <+,-,+,#>; equivalent to <up, down, up, down>, stop. The more +’s or -’s in succession, the longer the wave. These sequences, of varying lengths, can stack on top of each other creating both the effect of depth as well as a progression forward throughout the course of articulating a sonic thought. For example, a tone A encounters another B, both of which are of different length. That encounter produces C, representing the extension of A and B, which is stacked on A and B. A and B then are nested within the extension C represents, indicating a progression made in the overall song. C can then encounter some other tone, D, from the lexicon available or enter into one with A or B. Either way, A and B, even if considered Null in the encounter between C and D, are nested and the foundation of the E articulated. Null is a part of and apart from all articulations, thus, the lexicon as a whole is Null, as no one tone, so that every tone articulated must come from Null. Even if Null, A, or B are not apparent on the surface they remain in the deep structure of the sound produced. As the stack increases the sound gets deeper or higher, dependent upon the character of the tones or how one represents the articulation process, as well as continues forward.

A stop—in musical notation a “rest,” which is not sufficient for our purposes here—is a silence feature within the span of a tone or between tones. A stop within the span of a tone is not representable in musical notation but integral for musical expression. As a silence is effectively “inaudible” we do not have to account for how deep it goes with regards to mapping a representation of the inner logic of its intensity. This allows for these silences to exist as a field of possibility, the space from which a tone assembles itself. The features ‘no’ and ‘yes’ and their operation are restricted to the object itself to set their order. Features cannot stand on their own. The intensity, or what can be considered the frequency, of a tone can be considered in the relation between it and others within the pitch field. The stop operator, however, is a feature itself and can stand alone. The uniqueness of this operator will be detailed below. Features of a tone continue to sound in association with others until a stop marker is reached. Some tones have no ordering features at all meaning they continue until the
relation between an individual and this tone changes in a way which makes that tone inaudible despite the sound’s persistence outside of the reference frame.

For example, although the sound fades away to the individual perceiving it, that sound does not diminish in and of itself. These are most likely sound Gerunds which set the structure of the string that becomes a sound. The length of the collection of tones within a sound object is a function of the grammar in which those tones are an object. Functions can only take in tones as a whole and do not have access to the individual features of that tone. Without such a rule, a function could change the tone itself by rearranging its features rather than ordering the tones in relation to others to change the sound. This would be detrimental to the ability to compose a thought. Through illustrating tone in this way, I provide an account for the duration of a sound and the gaps in between without having to rely upon external coefficients to the current articulation process.

There are ways to describe the existence of a tone where volume is a feature of the tone itself. This has been the goal of conducting a constituent analysis of music, most notably by Lerdahl and Jackendoff. For example, it could be a coefficient or function of that tone which multiplies its intensity via stacking within a given field producing a frequency that that specific tone expresses in relation to others. However, it could also be the result of other effects such as the order in which that tone is heard in comparison to others within a spatiotemporal frame like in the Doppler effect. The latter possibility makes “volume” more about external factors and not the tone itself. In any case, volume is captured or resides in a set of relations and not to some external notation. If taken to be a characteristic of tones, it seems more a factor in the degree of confidence in measure than the existence of a tone intrinsically being “louder” than others. As a consequence of the conceptual scheme I put forward here, I concede to the latter explanation which emphasizes a relation change without a change in tone, without a change in subject, only in identification.

The Gerund is a relation of features that is set in relation to others, the tone and the field in which it resides. Within the encounter of tones, the Gerund produced and the force of its assertion within a state of affairs allows for a string to be ordered around it in accordance with those of other individuals. In this way, that Gerund accredits its character or what it is read as doing within that state of affairs. This is simple enough to recreate within any digital system: a finite set of elements subject to a set of functions that can produce an almost infinite variety of sequences.

Work on a literary approach to music has yielded some interesting results but ultimately falls short because of a crucial assumption challenged here. We see this assumption in empirical tests carried out not only by Richard Middleton, but most notably Lerdahl and Jackendoff. Based on Michael Schenker’s tonal hypothesis, the above’s program runs into the Descriptionist’s flaw of not being able
to account for the method of generation, but only of its manifestations. My reorientation away from notated and articulate series of notes to a focus on syncopation and the ability to create a series of sounds as an expression of self averts this issue.79 Lerdahl and Jakendoff’s focus on origin and articulate phonemes can be reduced to an identity correspondence between series of sounds, notation, song, and meaning. This is most notably tested in their development of GTTM. Jonah Katz and David Pesetsky have yielded fruitful work as well by representing the syntax of music in relation to a generative grammar.80 However, this group of theorists’ focus on the identity of sounds in correlation with their musicality assumes that notes or lyrics are the song. Any deviation from this measurement framework would reproduce something different. I disagree. These measures are useful in identifying the song, however, which “songs” are identified is contingent to the context in which their musicality is read. An externalist framework cannot be held to much confidence as the focus on the series of sounds motivated by their correspondence to some notational measure is itself context contingent. Inevitably, this raises many questions regarding the choice of this measure and the frame of reference it is dependent with regards to its value. The probabilistic model associated with many of these syntactic analyses into music take notation, lyrics and phonological occurrence in the sequential strings articulated in the same way that one would take scriptural occurrences on paper as the starting point for developing a syntax of the language ultimately creating a dictionary, not a consideration of producing those strings in the first place. In effect, these analyses work as a translation of one system into another.

I assert that yes, there is a syntax to music as music is a form of the faculty of expression. Colloquial expression or “ordinary language” does not refer to “mentally-external” objects in a traditional sense. Their “object” is the logical structure which represents the thought being described by that language faculty. Music does not signify but is used by this expressive faculty for the purposes of signification, to express a thought taken up by others to some purpose. From our linguistic analysis in section one, the phonetic form (PF) or surfacing expression only refers to the Logical Form (LF) which is connected by a syntactic structure (S-structure) shared between individuals. Many PFs represent or refer to the same LF indicating a S-structural relation that makes up the overall syntax or mode of expressing thoughts within a form of life. In other words, subjectivity is expressed by virtue of the affairs of that subject within that particular state.81 However, much is lost in translation as a literary analysis of music does not mean that it must be reduced to another system or grammar but that music itself has a grammar that can be represented with principles in a similar way to language in a conventional sense. The principles of the language faculty of “English” and Music are different with a linguistic analysis taking sound as the objects of the lexicon instead of words. Here, I go with the weaker but sufficient claim that these sonic objects are a means of generating thought and consider them as objects of the lexicon, the syntactic elements to form expressions, as opposed to a retroactive phonemic analysis. There is no reason to state that one cannot think sonically as well as orally,
orthographically, or otherwise. In this model, sounds become objects of propositions in the generation or concatenation of thoughts, not by their recording within the parameters of some other language, most notably musical notation. This notion is clarified in Baraka’s distinction between being a mode of expression as opposed to Music as a category of Art.\textsuperscript{82}

A sound not being able to signify on its own does not suggest that what constitutes "musical" objects cannot be used to produce meaningful expressions. Music does not denote one thing for it does not have an object(ive) meaning, but it can be used to mean almost anything. It is because of this that musicality offers deeper insight into how understanding occurs between subjects by virtue of a sound whose function or use is identified as being a part of the world those individuals inhabit and the frame of reference they construct. It appears to be the case that all we have are “signs” or objects of experience and the act of significiation (signifying) without recourse to a predetermined set of signified(s). Sign and their use—the function of signifying—can generate many solutions, produce multiple meanings, dependent on the arguments or objects of experience uses as input for the act of significiation within the context in which that sign is utilized. The use of these sonic-objects and/or songs produces a form of life in which understanding can take place. Taking our model from before, with a slight modification illustrating that this is a faculty of the subject and that we are talking about music, we draw the model:

```
Subject
   | (S)yntactic-structure
   /     \ Logical (LF) Phonetic(PF)/ Sonic Forms(SF)
```

where PF/SF is context contingent for it is mapped onto a Logical Form produced by the mechanism of creating thought or a generative syntactic structure. The mapping of a SF onto a LF is dependent upon the occasion of that surface level Sonic Form's use. The way a subject uses a PF/SF through an S-structure connects that sonic object to its logical form which can be understood between subjects despite various surface representations. The LF being an object of the "understanding" or faculty while the PF/SF is an object of experience. Expressions that are superficially different but whose inner logic or functional use are the same, represent the same thought. A single logical form is not connected directly to various PF/SFs due to ambiguities in reference, there being many ways to express the same "thing," this thing being an "object" of thought. An affinity obtained through the operation of a Sonic-object through the function of an S-structure allows for understanding to take place; for it is the function of a phrase which produces meaning. This is to say that it is not the phrase alone, but the way in which notes are put together, how the song is played, that conveys the thought. The "song" as a completed object in itself was used previously or is used in the future to denote many...
ways of being in the world. A word does not signify on its own, the subject uses these objects for signification; a song does not signify, but its meaning is obtained during performances, its use indicative of a mood or context.

In the terms of Articulation theory, the Deep structure (S-structure + LF) forms a basis for understanding across contexts. D-structure is indicated by the particular function of the sonic form used to articulate the thought expressed by that particular subject. Consequently, "feeling" is not a one to one correlation with the object produced but integral to the inner logic of the sonic proposition. A feeling known or labeled as an object of our experience is not vague to the one which possesses that feeling. However, the terms used to speak about what is "felt" are ambiguous as the expression formed denotes a range of feeling. This is analogous to the typographical note C denoting a range of frequencies. The closer we measure one part of its wave form, the less likely that measure will actually be the note we wish to identify. The use of this sonic form expresses a feeling dependent on the context in which it is generated and is evidence of the capacity to use any one tone to articulate a sonic thought. Thus, the capacity to form these thoughts at all illustrates that the production of the musical object occurs within a performance which includes a group of individuals with the shared capacity to create a thought, hence, a "self," in which the collective use of that object in the same or similar ways expresses a form of life. A particular song does not have meaning on its own but can be used to express a particular form of subjectivity or way of being in the world.

This will become important to the concept of the mosh pit. The production of a musical object only gains meaning or a function as the performance of that sonic thought moves into the crowd which uses it to express, in this case, a punk ethos. Our linguistic analysis revealing the structure to the faculty expressing thought is linked to the capacity to create music in the following way. As the phonetic or surface level form of an expression is context contingent while the logical form and syntactic structure of the mechanism remain the same, the faculty producing thought is able to express the same proposition in many different ways. Analogously, there are musical phrases experienced during a particular performance that sound different in others but express the same "sound" or sonic thought. For if there are two ways of saying the same thing, the "thing" expressed is the object of the thought expressed. It is this connection: SF₁, SF₂, SF₃, . . . to LF through S-structure where LF does not equal any SF, that is crucial to our study. To use Saussure, sign (SF/PF) does not equal signified (LF), but signification (semantics) is had by how those "signs" (syntax) are used (S-structure).

* The structure of a sonic thought, say a chord progression or scale, is implicitly established by syntax. "Implicitly established" indicates that the chord progression is "defined" by its own syntactic structure
qua the inner logic that sets this group of chords in relation to each other. A tone is not defined by some category or by some other term external to the “key” or reference frame in which it is used in relation to others within a certain progression. According to contemporary music theory, which is not necessarily a science of musical notation, a chord is expressed only in relation to others within the scale. For example, C is not interchangeable with a set of definiens D1, D2, D3, etc. but is understood as C only in relation to its articulation between B and D. To take this further into our syntax of musical expression, F# (F-sharp) and Gb (G-flat) are called enharmonic equivalents of each other. If we take a G major scale such that: G-A-B-C-D-E-F#-G, Gb can be substituted for F#. As the scale must be set within a key, the syntactic structure implicit in the progression is: tone – tone – semitone – tone – tone – semitone. This supplies the logical form of the progression which is subsequently heard and labeled as a scale. As F# and Gb are equivalents meaning they are of a different notation and yet are the same tone, the objects 'G-A-B-C-D-E-F#-G' and 'G-A-B-C-D-E-Gb-G' may be typographically different, but express the same proposition because of their logical form and syntactic structure implicit in the lexicon or form of life in which this progression is uttered.

It is now plausible to represent a tone’s possession of a certain quality set by its relation within a field of pitch. The ordering of these tones are motivated through the function of a grammar that extends over the objects of propositions regardless if they are represented in their articulated form. As merge functions work within a set where all elements are internal to a lexicon, each context or “language” having a different lexicon, the problem of whether or not the “subject” surfaces or the assumption of an articulate subject unaccounted for does not arise. When someone says “it rains” one does not force into the expression what is assumed, for example, that it rains from the “the sky” or “[the sky] it rains.” In the merge of objects to create the expression, [the sky] is somewhere else in discourse but nonetheless a part of the overall array of possible elements to be merged.

Aligning with our example regarding different notations or recordings of the surface level expression of a sound containing the same logical form and syntactic structure, we can show the idea of a wave form as the mapping of various features, here the deep structure of the expression of a tone labeled by a certain note in a given key. The same notation for, say, the tone C may be used to express multiple frequencies. The wave lengths, the measure between peaks and valleys or the shape expressed in the implicit structure of a tone by its features, is not directly correlated with that label. However, the individual utilizing the “C-form” can express the concept of C in multiple ways. Let us take as our key the range of frequencies for an equal-tempered scale where A4 = 440 Hz. The tone named C consists of a range of frequencies measuring the oscillation between peaks and valleys expressive of a wave form, three of which are as follows: C3 = 130.81Hz, C4 or middle C = 261.63Hz, or C5 here = 523.25Hz. The reference frame of A4 allows us to calculate multiple
expressions formed through the use of a single object. What this illustrates is that there is no one to one correlation between note and sound which is understood in contemporary music theory as an octave illusion. Thus, an individual can express the concept of C by utilizing a range of tonal frequencies that are both within and outside of the limits set by the notation or label for that note. The sign of C does not refer to an extra-mental “frequency” or some other measure, but the phonetic form or surfacing expression “C” refers to its use constituted by its logical form and syntactic structure in this tone's relation to others within a field of pitch or key.

The higher the frequency of peaks and valleys or waves in one tone in comparison to others of the same duration—the increased amount of crests and drops during that set interval in time—entails a higher intensity to that tone. This engenders different a/effects regarding that tone’s use value in the process of articulating a song. These different effects represent the various uses a particular tone can be put towards in expressing a sonic thought. Describing the sound wave in our system in this manner illustrates the direct connection between speed, blues, and punk. In this way, punk can be shown as both the blues core played fast as well as the utilization of higher frequencies creating different intensities representative of the transformation of traditional tones into new waves. This explains the use of distortion or noise to express a different thought by virtue of a tone traditionally used by a mainstream music form. Through speed in the wave itself, its frequency, we show the power chord transformation in our system. We also derive a working definition of subjectivity through a sonic lexicon. The same tone utilized in different ways, to different ends, can be identified in different ways.

Regarding the “height” of each peak and the depth of each valley, we could represent them by any ‘x’, ‘y’ or ‘z’. Linguistic work on sound has demonstrated that features constructed in this way create what they term “natural classes.” Tones are sorted in different types as they obtain different functions within the articulation of a song; their being utilized by certain operators, what those tones’ functions are doing, is different from their “function” as the note expressed within the song. Tones illustrated in this way can be used to build a vocabulary containing any tonal property of a sound equivalent to the characteristics of any musical note. It is the internal relation of features that is of importance which is overlooked in models that rely on external measure to affirm the existence and constitution of a tone, especially if the tone expressed falls outside of the frame of measure they have chosen. The merging of these objects gives the sound its character. An order and/or stacking of tones is constructed through a function which rewrites by recognizing the + or - features affixed to any tone ‘T’ in order to create the sound waves within [[A]].
Included in our discussion of tones is that which, in a traditional musical lexicon, would be considered noise. There are modes of sonic expression which are indicative of the use of what might be discarded from the Musical "dictionary" and, yet, of the same vocabulary of music utilized in such a way to express an alternative form of life from the finite set of objects which compose that very same lexicon representative of the process of internal merge. The blues with its "blueing" or utilizing the aberrant/dissonant quality of notes and punk with its repetitive use of distortion, uses these non-indexed items as tones to generate different sounds from what had been experienced in the context thus far, not caused by that context but somehow appropriate to illustrating a possible form of life individuals could obtain.

To play with exactly what is outside of notation or identified within a dominant musical frame of reference, utilizing aberrancy and indeterminacy, illustrates the use of "noise" or "nothing" in the same way we illustrated silence as the possibility of all, therefore, no one tone. If a tone is so loud that one feature cannot be distinguished, identified as distinct, from another within the vocabulary of sounds available, this characteristic is logically the same as a sound so soft that it is not able to be distinguished as sound at all. A tone so high that it cannot be audibly registered has a different a/effect than one so low that it cannot be registered but for representational purposes can be made to utilize the same symbol denoting it as outside of the audibly acceptable frame of reference. Both loud and low can be used to obtain the same function. However, what we are interested in is their capacity to be utilized at all in order to express a sonic thought. Thus, that which is Not of a given frame is again proven as the horizon of possibility for what can be articulated within that state of affairs. The set that is descriptively “Not” is indeed an operator within the Null foundation that holds all the constituents that do not appear in that tone’s matrix of features but makes up the set of all possible elements from which tonal expressions are formed, sentences made, phrases sounded. As such, the Null is so loud or so low that it cannot be “heard” but encompasses the range of all that can be heard or sung overall. This dovetails with Strawson's notion of a "master sound" with noise and/or silence serving this purpose.

* 

Through this model, we can illustrate the striking of a note as well as the carrying over of that tone to the next “note” struck. With that capacity one can utilize distortion or just pure noise as the horizon of possibility to articulate a song. This notation is amenable to our blues core, as [1 ⊗ 1 1 1] and the space/stop that represents Null as the set of all possible that interpenetrates each sonic expression, both connects each 1 as well as can represent the noise carrying over each aspect of that kernel phrase. From Memphis Minnie’s to Mamie Smith’s and Howlin’ Wolf’s blues to Jimi Hendrix's and most
Rock to Punk guitarists, when the guitar and song are electrified there is an inner logic and syntax to the thought of why a song is started with a period of distortion and noise, setting the World and Pitch in which this sonic thought is articulated from the vantage point of its own reference frame. It is in this way that our analysis of a language faculty to music connects Black expression through the blues to punk. This connection becomes explicit in the syntax to scat which reveals this language faculty as evidence of that subject’s putting to use what is representative of a blues core in order to construct the kernel phrases to punk musicality. As modes of expression are the modes in which the subject is articulate in the world, the language of Black music as the capacity to create sonic thought reveals the syntax to black subject formation.

There is no need for a phonemic description of every base feature constructing the quality of a sound. We can represent tonal characteristics and how these are utilized in the formation of or as the elements to blocks of sound through the articulation mechanism. This is done through the encounter between tones which illustrate the creation or articulation of a “sound” in the next level of description. In this way, the articulation of a range of sounds over various levels of description which form what is experienced as a song on the surface level, going on to be the input for an audience, and becoming the material from which they generate the thought with which an understanding is obtained, can be described by the following nested model. Moving upwards we see at the base tone and nested within that lexicon proceeding through levels of articulation: [tone, [ sound, [ song, ... ] ]]. For the purpose of the method of generation, the function ‘T’ of a lexical sonic object suffices for any tone. A description of the tones is unnecessary to describe what occurs in the generation of sounds at the transformational level but is sufficient on the morphogenetic level.

The mixing of tones occurs as they overlap each other through the mechanism of articulation. The resulting sound is easily shown to be comprised by a calculus of the features of both Gerunds. It is in their use or function that they acquire, and we can describe a host of phenomena like attack, rhythm, etc. in the formation of a song. These are relational traits, a movement, and not of the tones themselves. Tonal encounters propose the same limitations of a musically Descriptionist analysis of sonic thought for each tone within a given field as illustrated in the GTTM but in a simpler way.

With this model in tow, it is possible to apply our concept of the Null from section one to sound, in particular the illustration of the “master sound,” though pitch. As pitch fields are continuous, and if all sounds are present at once, the value of this field is the same as if it were silent. In accordance with the scheme laid out in this chapter, this presents us with the Null. This is not hard to conceive as it is hardly possible to imagine a field that is devoid of sound or a vacuum. Without recourse to external facts, amounting to the use of a description or name not of the context in which the expression is produced, it is hard to imagine a vacuum devoid of anything in this conceptual scheme. As these
elements carry or continue, # suppresses the sound in merge, providing a variable space between this tone’s features and the next. Although a cacophony of sounds may appear on the surface, the deep kernel structure buried in the prose, the inner logic or logical form and syntactic structure of the thought expressed and of the sound articulated, is generative of that surface structure. A phonetic form is mapped over this deep structure.

These silences cannot be externalized but can be recognized. Even if an instrument were out of tune, one could understand the structure of a sequence of sounds if at another moment that instrument was in tune playing the same structure. Some would say these two occurrences are different “songs”, but this is merely the object of labeling what song that string of sounds is as a matter of identification or knowledge of a specific musical genre. With the same spatial array, constituted by the same series of stops but inverted tones, we cannot say that we have a different “song” but, perhaps, a song in a different key if there is no recourse to categorical identification or a label that extends over this array indicating that it is different. The implicit structure of the tones express the sonic thought. What is more important to the array is the order or the particular rhythm, the timing of their occurrence, and the prolongation of each tone. If a tone continues until a stop is read by the articulatory mechanism, it is easy enough to represent the existence of these tones even if they do not become articulate through externalization. Therefore, one can understand that this is the same “thought,” if you will, without having to actually physically “hear” it as the same song or, even, experience the music at all. The structure is the same, therefore the method of generating that thought is the same regardless of its musicality or its ability to be heard as long as it is felt. This also goes for the repetition of a given sequence in different contexts as in dancehall culture with the use of riddims, repeated phrases during improvisation, or one chord Punk songs. The meanings associated with the statistical occurrences of these phonological sequences are contingent to the contexts in which they are produced, the structures generated can remain the same.

Black articulation

Amiri Baraka, then LeRoi Jones, was one of the first to formalize and practice how the process of articulating musical subjectivity works in Blues People and Black Music. Baraka takes the social landscape itself as a text. For him, this landscape is inherently poetic. The method of generation of black subjects are buried within the landscape’s prose. Though “buried” they are not inaccessible. For Baraka, black expressions are in and of themselves musical. He was not averse to cutting words and placing lyrics in his prose to force the reader to sing. Baraka developed a formal vocabulary with which to read these subjects in the act of writing out their existence.
Baraka distinguishes between Music as a form and the ability to create music: the difference between the imposition of a grammar and the capacity to form an expression. In accordance with feature sharing, we can formalize that, “the song and the people is the same.”95 This first premise directly links the subjectivity of a people to musical expression. The innate creative capacity of this subject is the flow of this “is.”96 The Gerund represents this flow. The force of the assertion of that Gerund is a flow conceived as what sets that subject’s relation to the world. It represents the movement from one instance of an individual to another.97 Baraka’s conclusion: the black subject is a changing same, “an un-self . . . The direct expression of a place . . . [seeking] another place as it weakens a middle-class place.”98 This “middle class” here is the difference between the aesthesis of blackness and its overdetermination by virtue of its identification as Negro, Black, or otherwise.

The formation of the subject in this light has unique implications for blackness. For Baraka, the Black form is an idea tied to a lineage founded in constant improvisation and re-articulation.99 The imposition of the identifier, description, Negro was theorized by Baraka under the analogy of a Musical attempt to solve the problem of blackness’ musicality on its own terms. Blackness, for Baraka, is a collective improvisation. He finds the tension in labeling Black folk as the attempt to represent them as a cultureless people: a “no-thing-spirit.”100 A cultureless people would not have a memory. However, blackness, like memory, is inscribed on bodies.101 The body itself is a text: a literary body. This body’s existence is only by virtue of the Other, for Being is simultaneously a being-with.102 As the subject is found in its relation to the Other, becoming significant within a state of affairs constitutes that being’s existence. Being is in the process of expression: “the real to be seen.”103

The pitch field theorizes space and time as a plane. Time as a substrate out of which subjects become significant is critical here. For the subject is found in this substrate and black subjectivity in syncopated time. The form of this subject is the rhythm of this social text. Rhythm is a formal change. Blackness is music with or without occasion and thus undetermined: the yet to be seen. Baraka was keen to emphasize this in Blues People. A formal rhythm attempts to define, rhythm as form is the becoming or formation of a self.104

As I explored the articulation of subjectivity, I distinguished between the inner sense of an individual’s capacity and the extension of labels over these individuals. Baraka terms this the technicality of that individual: the ability to utilize ideas contained in the “residue” of their history, inseparable from content.105 This use or inner logic is fleshed out in accordance with my formal analysis of the blues core to Black musical expression which generates, according to Baraka in Blues People, the kernel or atomic structures to blackness’ articulation. Baraka’s methodology uses a literary analysis which, according to him, seeks to make a picture in total; one that makes an account
of the significance of the context and the historicity of black articulations. It also includes the method of generation which exists across those contexts. This, in turn, provides Baraka’s definition of essence. The subject becomes a changing same, process is primary, a triumvirate between the “. . . freedom to exist (and change to) in the existing, or to reemerge in a new thing.” Any process which challenges it is automatically called into question. Although this is an Enlightenment ideal, Baraka states that blackness is “anti-western western”: the conscious expression of where we (blacks) are. . . The separations, [are] artificial oppositions.” Music, although it may be seen as “anti-linguistic,” can still possess an inner sense or just another language that does not necessarily have to be communicated but still creates, syntactically, a world that can be understood by others.

Through articulation, it is possible to formally ascertain what Baraka meant by his description of black subjectivity through musical expression. The kernel to a Barakian concept of this mechanism is the Blues. Baraka focuses on the syntax of this form to show how the black subject is articulated. The structure of this mechanism is centered around a three line staff and the “shout” or voicing of tone. The three line staff is the surface organization, the grammar, to the state of affairs. Voicing, then, becomes the act and process of articulation through that surface structure. The notion of “voicing” in Baraka is key. It is not the label of a tone, hence our focus on tone instead of notes, but its generation that is significant. This was shown through Baraka’s description of the guitar as voice in Black Music. “Purely instrumental blues is still the closest Western instruments can come to sounding like the human voice. . .” The chords fingered by the instrumentalist write the text of that subject.

Performances, in accordance with the vernacular of the blues, are called books in Baraka’s lexicon. The act of writing a book is the articulation of this sonic form of thought. The focus on the act, the function of the “function” or operation of “blueing” notes, emphasizes, for Baraka’s, that it is within the act itself that we see the turning of as many nouns to verbs as possible to illustrate in his descriptions of this process blackness’ capacity for expression. This posits the being of an individual in its act of articulation, its force of assertion through this three line structure. It is in this vein that Baraka makes a link between the changes in musical form to a change in the patterns of speech, which in effect links a means of creating sonic thought to subjectivity.

The three-line structural aspect of this kernel can undergo a series of transformations produced by the merge function. The first transformation is the application of a “blueing” operator to the function of notes. This leads to the aberrant quality of scale, the sliding and slurring of tones. This blueing operator is found in Punk as well. The Stooges’ Iggy Pop consistently references his blues roots and the blues kernel sped up to express Rock and Roll that was utilized by the band MC5 in their proto-punk debut Kick Out the Jams’ rendition of Chuck Berry’s song “Maybelline.” The “Maybelline” lexical kernel would subsequently be utilized by many Punk bands later on. A Punk philosophy in musical expression moves the subject towards the limits of legibility. Punk took society as text and
rearticulated the cultural lexicon to generate new forms of expression from dress to music to prose. And like blackness, the punk subject’s very existence is in its re-articulation. Punk, then, is to be understood as the blues played fast.

Another transformative operation is the riff or repeated phrase. Another transformative operation is the riff or repeated phrase. This aspect works along the substitution/move principle and allows for the rearranging of the same kernel phrase across the surface of an articulation. Repetition of both gaps, as well as tones, can be done in an almost infinite variety of ways. This leads to a difference in interpretation contingent to context as these elements do not carry semantic information themselves, but are utilized in a way that expresses that information. A probabilistic description of the order of notes with regard to their syntax would lead to such a variety in interpretation, rendering their semantic categorization too complex for useful expression.

A third transformation that can be figured into the mechanism of black articulation is the flattening or diminishing of chords, most notably the flattened fifth and its subversion of tonal dominance, here, termed overdetermination.114 As the significance of a voice within an arrangement is tied to tone, a tone can only be identified in the relation set within a pitch. The possibility to become significant is within this relation.115 As pitch sets the spatiotemporal frame, this transformation fleshes out the relation of tone in timbre. The arrangement of these tones within that matrix is the state of affairs articulated by virtue of the transformation of these kernel structures. The voice’s sound, taken as a tone in its own right and not as an auditory mechanism, is the becoming of the subject.116

It is with the mixture of these three levels that almost any variation can be created that is not directly caused by the context within which it is articulated but a result of a particular set of conditions. Taking these aspects in tandem allows for the subject articulating a sonic thought to remain relevant to that situation as well as proves the basis for improvisation and what Baraka called the “changing same.” Improvisation, then, is not random or left to chance but remains appropriate to but not caused by the environment in which a performance occurs. Our three aspects above reveal the inner logic and method of generation implicit to the act of improvisation itself. Although, conventionally this analysis conceives of improvisation as a solo act, this concept entails the ensemble overall as it can only be conceived in the relation forged between stage and audience, through “shout and response.”117

The kernel of Black articulation sets derivation conditions for other forms of music. The evidence of this claim can be seen in the chords recorded in the Punk ‘zine Sniffin’ Glue in 1977. These tones would later come to be called a “Punk” sound which Lenny Kaye would note in the liner notes to the album Nuggets in 1972. They are the same chords found in the first “articulate” versions of the Blues, most notably the “Dallas Blues” (1912) and the “St. Louis Blues” (1914). These dates are only the
historical evidence of recording these songs which no doubt go back further than the early twentieth century. The character of these three chords—tonic, subdominant, dominant—are integral to this kernel and the process undergone through articulation, relations of dominance and subversion according to Stuart Hall.

These structures are also found in songs from bands such as The Stooges. Their placement of substitution options at the bass pitch changes during their performances was written into their song “T.V. Eye” in 1970. These substitution options were indicative of an improvisational blues and jazz endowment. The Ramones 1976 song “Blitzkrieg Bop” utilized the blues core sped up to 176bpm, Pure Hell’s song “No Rules” in 1978 on the album Noise Addiction, and others display this trait. These articulations follow the same derivational rules to the kernel structures that are the object of the merge and substitution transformations outlined above, most notably the riff.

The subject, then, is conceived as the act of signing one’s self, through the articulation of sound, as opposed to the stamp of a signature in musical time. Baraka worked out that the syntax of this signature resides in riffs off of a 4/4, 2/4, and 6/8 tempo or measure. Now it is important to note that the identification of these rhythms is set within a context that ultimately fails to causally link the adherence of these signatures to black subjectivity. However, what is important to account for is that the form of these signatures indicate the set of conditions within which a black subject articulated its self. It is how these signatures are used in the act of articulation that is important; how they are used against and with each other. Baraka is interested in the act of “signing” one’s self, not in the resultant signature. These signatures are defined as, “a deliberate and agitated rhythmical contrast,” or syncopation.

As stated above, blackness is in the re-articulation of forms, its basis is constant movement, subsisting in the logical form and the syntax of the structural foundation that makes those contexts possible.

**Future Perfect: Ethos and Making worlds**

It is now possible for a fuller description of the Future Perfect and how it is possible for a subject to musically rearticulate its state of affairs. The ability to do violence to regimes of control, grammatical functions external to this frame of reference, is found in the expressive capacity of blackness. The consequences of this re-arrangement, of what makes up a world, manifest real effects. As the state of affairs is organized by virtue of a grammar, the imposition of a frame of reference from another context, it is important to look at some grammatical principles and their aspects aside from “transformation” overall.
The fissure between identification and subjectivity is captured in the difference between the name extending over that subject and that subject’s creative capacity to take a variety of objects to form an identity. I claim that a grammar fixes this identity. Its political economy translates individuals into categories organizing a social-cultural matrix. I will now go on to analyze how the subject, particularly the black subject, creates a “self” outside of a grammatical and structural adherence which places a value over its form of life.

In exploring the merge function, and in accordance with our encounter formulations above, it was shown that merge and the agree function preempt any move/substitute operation because the former are simpler operations. Agreement is when the form of an object changes dependent upon the others it is in relation to within the context of its articulation. This change of form will be explored in fuller detail below by virtue of an analysis of scat. Objects and features were shown to merge and agree nonsensically without considering semantics first in regard to the object in section one and their features in this section. Their internal sense-making capacity differs from their extension or presumptively-sensical/externally-grammatical use. This order of operations was taken to show how the individuals generated from an encounter are taken up into the functions of a grammar as wholes to be used in other operations. As a nonsensical individual can be taken up into grammars, there is the opportunity for a catachrestic violence. This break or gap between the sensical creation and nonsensical existence that is bound in these operations is the break in which the subject appears. The subject in the break is the existence of and the possibility for a conception of black subjectivity. This distinction is made in our state of affairs because existence is based on significance or force within its surface manifestations organized viz. the reference frame’s grammar. As there is a deep structure to surface appearance, racial hierarchies appear on the surface with the black subject being stipulated as insignificant. However, it is this Black subject that makes any articulation possible as frames of reference are legitimated by what is not of their domain distinguishing members of that frame and others.

We can now see how these hierarchies are put in place. It is in the extension of names that those roles, the ascribing towards a function of which an individual is an object, are created. The individuals produced come to fill in those names as they come to agree with, assimilate into, the surface structure. Their use is motivated by the move or substitution functions of a grammar as any proposition, regardless of appearance, must have an object, even if it resides in the Not. Not statements nevertheless affirm the existence of what they deny. An individual is stipulated as Not by virtue of a deletion process which piggybacks off of forced agreements by virtue of this move function. This is why we made a distinction between internal, generative, “grammars” and the external imposition of a grammar qua frame of reference from a context outside of the one in which expressions are formed. Forcing an agreement is an explicative procedure, and how assumptions, even if they are not
represented in what is articulated, are made to appear. It is in this way that what is generated through articulation is made significant or insignificant through acts of identification. The focus here on subjectivity, however, provides an account for the existence of these individuals even if they are paraphrased out of reference frame, rendered insignificant within a form of life. The push for explication within states of affairs is to order by virtue of a process of translation, who does and does not benefit within this assembly expressing a state of affairs. If left untranslated, that individual would not exist.

Here, the concept of tense figures back into my analysis. Movement “tenses” individuals in the relation set between their name and the state of affairs in which they are articulated. Zora Neale Hurston makes a key insight to Black modes of expression as always having a tense, whether it be past or future. In “Characteristics of Negro Expression,” Hurston cites “verbal nouns,” the Gerund in this study, and asymmetry which generates movement within expression in regard to the object expressed, as indicating a feature of Black forms of life and the faculty with which it is articulated. It is in the tension between tenses within a reference frame which seek static qualification that there can be a concept of the present.

It is my contention that the operation derivative of the syncopation of tones—both linearly and spatially through stacking—along with the function of time expresses our musical concept of speed. Tense, speed, and syncopation underlie the connection between blackness, punk, and blues through the language faculty. Linguistically, time is expressed through the function or use of a tense feature which does not appear on the surface save by the transformation to the component of the sentence it modifies. Musically, the concept of tense is analogously constructed through the method of arranging tones in such a way that an increase in speed is generated by taking advantage of certain features of tones. These features become apparent on the surface in different ways, dependent upon how they are set in relation to each other during the articulation of a sonic thought. These various arrangements bring out different characteristics as opposed to others contingent to their position when played against each other. The same tones put to different uses indicate the generative syntax of a finite set of tones functioning in ways that induce faster play in some situations as opposed to others. The use of sound to structure our articulatory scheme allows us to picture how an individual can be unheard but nevertheless exist. The aspect which evinces membership to the realm of “existence” may not be highlighted in this context although the capacity to become a member of that reference frame remains latent to that individual. The silences which become apparent in the merge function evoke a subject that exists in its relation to others, thus, rendering silence an identity description of one feature out of the many which constitute the same subject. Concepts such as a sound’s volume and others were shown not to be innate to tone itself but obtained in their relation within the world expressed through the function of the tone in the sound world of a particular song. A tonal function is revealed in the
formation of propositions with sound as its object. This point was to emphasize that a tone can still be presently a subject past, re-presented in future, as well as presently change the set of relations it has within the world. A social example can be found when certain institutions act as if they speak for the “other” or give “voice” to the unheard. A contradiction arises as that institution’s voice obtains a function not of the subject it intends to represent. The institutional function overdetermines the “voice”-ing function of a subject which does not exist within the frame of that institution. Through the syntax of scat below and in accordance with an alternative conception of syncopated speed, I hope to demonstrate Hurston’s analysis of the connection between blackness and tense in order to show how Black subjectivity articulates different forms of life.

Descriptionist models lose their force by creating stricter descriptions of what constitutes a song rather than focusing on the ability to create sonically. These models are useful in mapping what are already considered songs into a conventional linguistic syntax. However, they are attached to a translation of notations by what is considered Music on a measure of musicality external to a song’s mode of generation. This measure misses the simpler notion which I illustrate here: the capacity to create one’s self sonically.

**Sonic Subjects**

Sonic objects do not carry semantic information themselves but are used to express propositions on which semantic interpretations are mapped. There was a peculiar aspect of language that Chomsky famously illustrated claiming that one can create nonsensical sentences that are syntactically correct showing that semantics are made possible by syntax, as semantics are secondary to the principle of formation. His example:

1. Colorless green ideas sleep furiously.
2. *Furiously sleep ideas green colorless.

The second sentence is both syntactically incorrect and nonsensical, but we must show how one accounts for the first. The program he put forward and that I take into this theory serves as evidence that there is a deep syntactic structure to the first sentence which can account for its generation. The sense of the sentence can be incorrect in this context but there is some other context in which it does have an “external sense,” a function it obtains. I go further in stating that the syntactic generation of that sentence has an internal sense or way in which it is produced.

We will now explore how this works musically. There has to be an account that can be made for operations such as in the “blueing” of notes. The stanzaic structure which Baraka details provides a
similar deep structure, exemplified by the use of the flattened fifth, all of which were seen as aberrant and non-sensical. Other examples include the syntax of scat or later Punk’s use of these “Blues” kernel structures such as the use of distortion and the power chord. I argue that there is an internal sense or syntax to how these forms were generated. Their externalization enters a process in which the functions of systems that seek to organize or translate them take in the means by which these structures later change.

For this, I return to the merge function—the encounter between objects of a particular lexicon which create syntactically correct strings of individuals with no external sense outside of how they are being used to articulate a thought. Later, they can be made sense of by fixing their use within states of affairs viz. ascribing to a role or function. This is how a Future Perfect is formed: the “as yet” Baraka calls blackness in Black Music, a beautifully efficient “nihilism”. Within our terminology, blackness has the capacity to utilize what is denoted as Nothing—in this case, what has been termed “nihilist” has been because it has no value or is dangerous to White supremacy—in order to express a thought and, in so doing, form expressions not yet known within a dominant frame of reference.129 As grammars extend across states of affairs, setting the limits to articulations are a function of those grammars. These limits are set by the name which is placed over a set of conditions which sets the relation of that individual to the context it is now known to be a part of. An example of this from Baraka is the stanzaic limitations and recording practices stipulated over Blues once it was articulated into mainstream U.S. culture.130 There was an external limit placed on blues articulation. For instance, the technology of recording practices in the “Limited” play or LP forced blues songs to become shorter, written down in advance, and structured in a way conducive to the technology not the method of creating a blues thought. However, these limitations were only placed over surface articulations of the Blues. Their function did not have recourse to the objects that comprised the encounter that initially generated the form. Therefore, a deep structure persisted although the significance of the Blues, its use external to the context in which it was generated, differed from its initial coming together. Its blackness could not be erased. There can be transformations applied that can result in almost infinite permutations and combinations despite finite means, the basic computation available to the language faculty. These limits are the basis for this phenomenon as if the potential to be anything would ultimately render nothing from the Null as there would be no encounters possible for articulation.

These cultural products are taken into grammars specifically from other contexts. As this occurs, new merges become available. As merge does not have recourse to internal sense, nonsensical individuals can be grammatically put to use. Scat is a perfect example of this phenomenon as well as the musical statements of Punk and the improvisational core of Jazz. For Baraka, a “statement” is the repetition of certain chords for improvisatory use. Improvisation, the power chord, and the repetitive simplicity of
Punk songs have the same internal mode of generation. This repetition works by generating difference itself by playing off of or rearranging these chords; difference in repetition. Therefore, the subject can play with the concept of inference as if it were an element in the lexicon itself. This serves as Baraka’s definition for improvisation.131

This is clearly seen in Black music. The literary connection to music in Baraka’s analysis demonstrated by Brent Hayes Edwards’ “The Syntax of Scat,” attempted to flesh out a syntax of a vocal Jazz form called scat. Edwards describes the initial baptism of scat beginning with a fall. When Louis Armstrong’s sheet music fell from the stand during a recording session, he created the musical form that came to be known as scat. This scene draws a connection between expressions and thought which Edwards suggests, and with this much I agree, has a syntax or mechanism of generation. It explicitly shows how thinking occurs sonically as its method of generating the objects experienced in the scatted performance. This illustrated a finite set of sonic objects that were once apart, being put together in particular ways to a specific, context appropriate, function.

For Edwards, music signifies potentiality. It does not refer to objects but exemplifies or expresses a form of life.132 Therefore, music is a means of creating thought indicative of a language faculty. Language itself, as the capacity to create thought, is non-representational. As a mechanism which makes use of a finite lexicon to form multiple expressions with that very same set of objects, what is “expressed” is not language itself. One cannot “represent” a function, the “operation” itself is not present in the actual world but is only indicated or expressed by a catalogue of its inputs and results. What is “expressed” indirectly indicates what produced it, the language faculty. Language is composed of a syntactic-structure and inner logic, an operation whose function expresses what we see or know representationally—either through phonetic form, symbol, or song—as “Language.”

Therefore, meaning is not carried by "objects" external to the process of articulating/forming a phrase indicative of an expression’s significance within a given context or reference frame, but that frame sets the conditions for the potential to articulate thoughts overall. This is why certain strings of sounds in scat can carry different meanings contingent to the context in which they are created.

Edwards’ example shows music as a means of creating thought but then goes against the program. He cites Jacques Nattiez’s work, which states that music does not carry meaning, but its meaning is in how it's used. Edwards’ focus on origin and only the historical significance of this performance as a way to account for why these scatted elements are used in a specific order, is contestable as it takes semantic formations from a probabilistic view with barely any syntax developed in his analysis. Edwards takes the “grammatical” sequence of words and assumes they are set to predefined rules outside of the act of generating the sequence itself. This has been shown to be false with regards to language. Contrary to Edwards, those sonic objects the subject uses to articulate its self, whose result
is a tone, do not have predefined meanings. If they did, their use would change the meaning dependent upon the occasion, leading to a contradiction. As helpful as they are, Brent’s study loses its force if we do not adhere to his descriptions set to the examples he utilizes. In the generative view, we can see what is going on despite how these performances were notated. Notation, however, does illuminate the creative capacity inherent to subject formation through music as long as predefined notions of what is articulated are avoided.

Scat’s beginning with a “fall” highlights the fact that Louis Armstrong’s scatting was prompted by the capacity to generate thought sonically outside of the grammatical constraints of the musical notation on the page. Baraka describes improvisation as the performance, the expression, the function of inference itself. Just the same, punk pushes the limits of grammatical notation by repetitively merging simple structures to express different propositions in accord with the occasion, even at times to change it. This similar capacity in Punk allows for us to conceive of the repetition of the same core elements to generate different meanings contingent to the contexts in which they are uttered. Punk is a rapid improvisation with time itself. We will see how a punk mode of expression is connected to blues and scat through a notion of speed and tempo that is not merely a description of the music played but indicates the use of core phrases arranged in different ways so as to produce the effect of speed; articulating an alternate form of life utilizing the same core. A blues core, if indicative of blackness and utilized by punk, entails that the core to punk is also an expression of “Black”-ness which represents the function of those core elements within a form of life. Hence the need for a syntax indicative of that subject’s putting to use of the elements in that core rather than a description as the semantic interpretation of what was already produced. For if speed is to merely be a genre description, Punk would come from a vacuum. We know this is not the case, for punk expresses a form of life indicative of the function of a finite set of elements utilized in various ways, rather than a name with no objects with which it may be defined. A name that denotes nothing, amounts to a function without terms.

All of these forms—Blues, Jazz, Rhythm and Blues, Rock, and Punk—were studied as transformations of the same kernel structure. Baraka describes a level of transformation which articulates certain musical objects in different ways. The unity of these differences “express” or “harness” a “total world.” Surely the method of generating a “Blues” subject exists outside of its being named as such. These individuals create new constellations which create states of affairs within states of affairs: an ethos under a Future Perfect. This in effect creates many possible worlds within the actual world. These possible worlds are just as real as they have consequences in their relation to the world in which they are derived. Possible worlds are different forms of life, different ways of being in the world, which have to be taken up as wholes within the propositions created of a context external to the one in which they were initially formed, yet still within that state of affairs.
A musical example can be shown in the following way. The encounter between Gerunds expresses a sound that is centered on the rests or silences created in the encounter between different tones. It is here represented linguistically through the operation merge, and an inner logical syntax, its function. These silences give structure to the overall utterance. However, adherence to the surface structure alone leads to an ambiguity in analysis. This ambiguity revolves around motivation and intention. It is ridiculous to ask whether the sound or the notation came first without asking the motivation for placing one prior to the other. To introspect into these forms and the questions they engender, would be difficult if not impossible. The fact of the occurrence of certain sounds in accordance with certain notations is merely indicative of an accumulation of correlative data. This process is akin to an underlying assumption of racial constructions only tied to outward appearance: statistically, they can be narrated in this way but logically are untenable. It is evident in examples utilizing scat. Although the choice of sounded syllables or phonemes vary to a great degree, those examples tend to render a statistical model with regard to the syntax of scatted strings that makes analysis impossible. We posit a function that utilizes a finite lexicon of elements within a given field of pitch that engenders the relation between the tones within that field in order to create different expressions indicating the activity of the subject outside of attempts at notational identification.

Current studies in phonetics consider the elements of sounds—their tonal constituents—as utilized to articulate words. A systematic analysis reveals that vowel sounds are on a continuum. The set of vowel sounds we identify are not discrete objects and exist in a range. Each vowel is perceived different from another as a matter of degree not kind. To articulate one vowel sound rather than another has been likened to moving up and down a sonic scale. Vowel articulation is accomplished spatially with regard to the environment in which they are being utilized and the inner workings of the mouth and throat. Trapezoidal in shape—suggesting a movement from a finite set of conditions towards a larger region of possible articulated utterance—this spatial dimension represents a phonetic domain of possibility in which consonants punctuate the function of the various vowel segments within that space. As the domain of possible tones are those not yet actualized in the formation of an expression, the field of inarticulate vowels is real and thus a part of while distinct or apart from each sound articulated when utilized or identified by a affixed consonant. Any one vowel is present even if no one is yet represented in the articulate surface level expression. Herein, we find our sonic characterization of the Null.

Consonants, on the other hand, are utilized as discrete objects. As separate objects that are not mutually exclusive from the lexicon in which they are utilized, consonants demarcate the boundaries or limits to vowel categorizations within the phonetic domain. Consonantal functions put to use parts of the sonic domain indicating how vowels are identified. Thus, the way in which consonants and
their vowel objects are used indicate or express various categories or types of tones/words. The movement of the tongue and constraints on the throat instantiate stops within the carrying of vowel sounds.

As vowel sounds exist on a continuum, they are connected to our study of the non-exhaustibility and non-determinacy of blackness and racial categorization. I contend that this is analogous to the power chord and the fifth interval in blues and punk which lead to errancy and non-linearity. This proves problematic in regard to the possibility of fixing an orthographic notation to denote one tone rather than another. Here, this is considered as a regime of representation making a one to one correlation between sound and musical note on the page. The limits a category imposes on the continuum of the vowel domain work to stop a vowel’s tone from carrying or continuing, at least until that tone reaches another consonantal function which, ultimately, does not exhaust the possibility of that tone’s continuing to fill or carry within that space; or the possibility of that or other tones being used/identified differently within that continuum. If identity did exhaust tonal continuity, there would be no difference between 'a' or 'e' for a single category would have to encapsulate the entire domain of sonic objects, making the continuum itself a discrete object separate from others which is in blatant denial of the diversity therein. Under infinite use of finite means, the relation held between tones represents the form of thought indicating the tie we seek between this syntactic and generative capacity to subjectivity. A vowel sound can be utilized in many ways with regard to the function of the consonants that put it to use for the pronunciation of a "word"/sound dependent upon the context of the thought in which it is to be uttered. Just the same, blackness can be identified in multiple ways, carry multiple identities, but is not exhausted by the taking up of one identity as opposed to another with regard to the context in which it is articulated. That we can determine a phonetic space at all makes an explicit connection between the creation of definite worlds both distinct from and yet within the same state of affairs by virtue of the various “shapes” they obtain. By shape we are to understand a form of life indicated by our formal analysis of articulation. The directions of various identified or named positions by virtue of consonants, and the segments within this vowel continuum they make, form the coordinates of various “shapes” of life within a sonic world.

As vowels are non-determinate they are the subject of a finite yet various set of consonant, constant, identities. We will see in Bad Brains that in the scream "iiiyyyyyee!!!" during the song “Attitude” is the sound of blackness articulating a punk world; the inner logic of which is P.M.A or Positive Mental Attitude. Phonetically, /iy/ae/ represents a spatially syncopated word/sound in conjunction with traditional linear conceptions of phonetics. However, its expression fills and creates a space. The coupling of the spatial as well as the linear syncopation of tones illustrates the up and outward movement from a set of conditions into the reformulated space that we study through our stacking of tones example. This dovetails with the trapezoidal shape of the vowel domain in phonetics. With no
consonants or stops, /iy/æ/ signifies a continuous subject that carries despite limits of breath or musical notation. We will find this in accordance with our formal analysis of scat and the tonal functions we derive from it.

Scat is an optimal example as it blurs the lines between language, in its conventional sense, and Music. The musicality of voice as instrument is illustrated through Baraka’s analysis of music in *Blues People.* Superficial description after the merge and move functions of this capacity fails. An account of the values of these tones—their musical notation or phonemic representation—is contingent to context. However, merge, move and the ordering of these tones are enough to understand the deep kernel structures that are not above or below the act itself.

Take this excerpt from William Bauer’s transcription of Louis Armstrong’s 1926 solo in the song “Heebie Jeebies,” lines 9-11. (Note: analyzing excerpts is key so that our structural analysis can be internally reliable and not reducible to our preconceived knowledge of the song and method. We must also take care to realize that /æ/ and the like are not words or lyrics, but are the character of an articulate sound):
From Bauer’s phonetic analysis and the behavior of vowels and consonants, we are able to propose a finite lexicon of sonic objects. We have five non-terminal and four terminal components within fifty-two tonal occurrences which yield four formal groupings expressing the total arrangement. It can be shown through the merge and move functions that a certain transformation occurs which generates the object of the propositions made by Armstrong as he creates the song. The constituents of the sound string, /iy/ and /æ/, are two elements that undergo merge, encountering each other in the process of articulating “Heebie Jeebies,” and creating strings with consonant phonemic elements such as /g/ and /l/ in the opening sequence. The results of this merge generate a string: /iyf#/gæ/. Note that consonant sounds are usually surrounded by or produce a stop/rest while vowel sounds are allowed to continue until they reach consonants.

Further along in the song, a subsequent merge occurs in which these elements appear again but are modified, articulating the proposition: /skiyp#/skæm#/ski/bap/. This shows that the two elements /iy/ and /æ/ act as Gerunds becoming the subject of Armstrong’s propositions that undergo morphemic transformations under the function /sk/. Due to this proposition’s reference to a previous base in the arrangement, it is hard to say that /skiyp/ or /skæm/ are “new” elements altogether for there would have to be an account made for their introduction into this pitch field and the relation which differentiates them. It would also mean that the form of the overall piece would have no limits to the elements available and therefore no way to secure any form at all. It is more plausible that the original two elements underwent a function which ran recursively over the array of available objects and obtained the function /sk/, producing a new form from this finite lexicon in agreement with the musical thought.

As the grammar qua creative capacity recursively runs through the set of elements available after a Gerund is produced, it sorts the other objects and orders them in relation to each other. This ordering begets the addition of affixes and suffixes to objects as a function of agreeance dependent to the context in which that Gerund was produced and how it is being used. The introduction of /bap/ to this string and /ip/ take these two modified elements as their objects creating within the overall structure a “shape” that articulates this particular, sonic, state of affairs. This shape revolves around the stops introduced by consonant transformations to key vowel structures. It is in the agreement or affinity between these stops and those in the overarching string of sounds that create a syncopated rhythm. The encounter/merge between two or more Gerunds of different or the same tones creates a matrix that unites a difference, generating an overall sound and, in this case, a different world out of the available elements. As it was illustrated that these worlds are nested, one within another, the kernel to these articulations persists throughout.

This can be formally represented through merge:
M(+sk, iy, -p, #, æ, -m, -bǝp) → [[[+sk[iy]] - p ]] [#] [[[+sk[æ]] - m ] [#]] [[[+sk[iy] - bǝp ]] [#] ] → 

... / skiyp / # / skæm / # / ski / bǝp / ...

Note that merge does not order the individuals (/skiyp/) intrinsically—that is a matter of rewriting rules generated by, not external to, the intrinsic structure of the strings—but by the affixes and roots, the function of /sk/ overdetermining /iy/ entails that /iy/ becomes an object in the operation of the function /sk/ which still come together in agreement with the notational data. Their order could be represented otherwise with each ordering still able to be read as having a sense dependent on context. However, from Bauer’s analysis we see that the rhythm and form remains the same due to stop and consonant properties.

By our method, we still obtain Armstrong’s solo. If anything, each sonic element may be a different tone—expressed by a certain relation to pitch and timbre—but obtains the same relation or key—the relation between pitches—within the tune. This allows the sonic articulation of this thought to be recognized as the same song although utilizing a different sound. From an overview of the entire piece, when /iy/ and /æ/ are uttered, they continue until met with a terminal like /-m/ or a stop [#]. This can be seen with their interplay in the overarching instrumental notation: the notes and rests. It is simpler to make /iy/ and /æ/ the objects of transformations so that they are modified to create the form /skiyl/, /sk/ being the function of /iy/.

We could take the Descriptionist route which would result in each term of the song having to be defined separately. In this way, an immeasurable amount of rules to get to this particular song would have to be derived. These rules and the representation of each tone can change interminably in the process of creating this dictionary. It could be done, but it would be very complex and probably useless. The solo example gives an overall shape to the song and would seem to come out of nowhere if it were not accounted for by a transformational description of these terminal and non-terminal components. Regardless, this method shows that through transformations with a finite set of terminal and nonterminal objects, we can get the range of tones that make up this song, regardless of their representation.

From here, I can show the nested constructions in which certain auxiliary components are ordered on the surface and affixes are put to use around key elements or roots from the structures underlying what is finally expressed. However, it is a crucial mistake to say that these objects act as nouns or verbs. The overall scheme is helpful to see what certain bases are doing. It is the rearrangement of these elements that generate different variations within the same event. This illustration also shows that the notation over the scattered forms is immanent to the same piece. Although musicality attempts
to confine what is scatted, it is the relation between the two, method of construction and what is
articulated, which gives either value and without which both become arbitrarily important. Any
hierarchical organization must depend upon the state of affairs. It is through this interaction that there
is the potential to change, otherwise, it bears no consequence for what it is trying to control.
Therefore, in setting to use the individuals within these affairs, organizational regimes are forced to
change. From here certain derivational trees, structures illuminating the formation of these strings
illustrating an inner logic and syntactic structure, can be constructed which I do not have space here to
illustrate.

Many Descriptionist models are available in line with the studies of Lerdahl and Jackendoff which
within a frame of reference can give valuable information on the musical structure of these objects
within and because of notation. The Descriptionist’s focus on merely the representation of the syntax
of sounds already defined runs into a lot of issues. The tones themselves change with these
transformations as well as the choice of how these tones are represented within the lexicon used to
describe them. Any actual sound can be represented by a /sk/ but what is more important is what the
set of relations within a field of pitch are doing in the generation of an overall thought; hence, the
mode of generating these sequences. The “voicing” of a “sound” is outside of its notation. What is
sufficient for this study is the illustration of a deep structure which can recursively generate a variety
of expressions and, therefore, is evidence of a creative capacity within subjectivity outside of the
extension of a notation or rule. In all, the Descriptionist fails to show evidence that the innate capacity
itself is the movement of these parameters and not a confinement to them.

What connects Punk to the Blues is what occurs in the relation between the tones throughout the
articulation of the song. The illustration scat provides can be tied directly to Punk music, more
specifically Hardcore. In this subgenre of Punk, beginning in the 1970s, the most noted change was
the transformation of voice to instrument akin to scat. The lyrics of songs during a performance were
at best illegible but all the while comprehensible. They worked along the same parameters as scat
relying more so on cadence, vibrato, and attack rather than communicable precision to get their point
across. How this portrays the Future Perfect is evident in the Washington, D.C. Black Punk band
Bad Brains and their 1979 performance for a majority Black audience in the Valley Green public
housing complex of southwest D.C. What comes to the fore during their performance, what is
articulated, is the Bad Brains’ and blackness’ capacity to rearticulate blackness from within itself,
outside of lyrical or socio-political census or notation.

Officially formed in 1977, before becoming a Punk band, members of the Bad Brains were a part of a
Go-go band called Mind Power and prior to that, a Funk band called Stress. The capacity to play at
the speeds they introduced to the scene is found in the generative capacity from the blues embedded in
those previous musical forms. In Bauer’s analysis the tempo and rhythm of the song do not directly stem from a stipulation of a meter but more so in the relation obtained through the generation and juxtaposition of tones. Previously, we argued for a concept of syncopation both from within and outside of musical notation. This was necessary for showing the capacity of blackness to build a world, a space, and sonic form of life. We now show this through an illustration of speed in the syntax of scat. The concept of speed is generated in the use of these tones to articulate a thought. Punk mentality, then, is connected to blackness through the signifying practices possible within the various arrangements made out of the finitely many sonic elements found within the blues core. The way in which these elements are utilized, their juxtaposition next to as well as stacked on top of each other, and the various arrangements of these tones made in distinction from previously articulated songs, have been shown to generate speed through syntax. This is different from the external imposition of a meter at once stipulated prior to the expression of this song indicating a particular semantic interpretation, but derived from a previously notated performance. The syntactic structure generating speed and tempo has been shown through the quickness induced by the use of consonants in scat and our symbol # in both the inner logic to tones as well as in scatted lyrics. Both increase the rate at which one moves onto the next element in the sonic string or within the sound wave itself by increasing frequency and intensity. Therefore, tempo is not inherent to tones themselves and later transcribed by musical notation. Increase in frequency produces an intensity experienced as speed.

Evident in scat, our concept of speed can be applied to the kernel phrases that Baraka saw in the blues that were subsequently utilized by and expressed the speed emblematic of a Punk sound. Blackness at different speeds is blackness all the same. The inner sense and method in which both a punk and blues sound are articulated – the inner logic and syntax representing the deep structure to the core of the subject’s expressive capacity identified in various ways – is the same although used to different ends and expressing different aspects of black subjectivity.

Baraka notes a three tier stanzaic structure for the Blues in which “voice,” as instrument, periodically interjects. For him, the guitar has a voice just as much as the auditory-articulatory organs of people. Punk uses the same stanzaic structure in which voice becomes an instrument which interjects regardless of the notation on the page. Most often, a notation or page did not exist for Black artists. Tempo is felt as it is articulated through the breaks in the formation of sonic strings via #, the repetitive use of consonants in scat, and the power chord’s additional fifth, all of which induce a speeding up of the articulatory process and express a different rhythm and tempo indicative of an alternative form of life. The juxtaposition of lyric, voice, and musicality create a Future Perfect in performance.
In the Bad Brains song "Attitude," we see how Gerunds are articulated and set the matrix in which other objects interject the prose. The Gerund /iy/ sounds until it reaches a stop or a consonant. The repetition of the affix /d/ at the beginning of the other objects creates a tempo regardless of a noted meter. In all, this simply shows the merging of objects to articulate the thought, "P.M.A.," Positive Mental Attitude. See the example below:

/i/y/ae/ [###] dae/duwn/dae/dae/duwn/ [###] →
"/iiiyyyeeeee!/ got that PMA./"

where /iy/ is equivalent to a tone T with an ordered series of features x of a given length, such at

/i/y/  T: <x, #, ... x_n>

During a performance, there are multiple experiences of the same event. The sum performance is understood as the collection of various features of that event and experienced by a group of subjects. The performance is vicariously lived at the intersection of those individual’s experiences and given a particular property during that song’s duration. This property indicates a “set” of groupings whose image becomes the collective object of those at that event. The features experienced during that performance become the object of each individual such that when aggregated make for a shared image of that event. That set is composed of the experience from each individual, enumerated one to one in such a way that it does not preclude others. The result is the object qua image of that particular performance. Each feature or aspect of the performance, indicative of an individual’s experience, gains that individual access to a different characteristic which they can attribute to that particular event. However, the collection of the pairings of individual experiences, the function of that operations expressing the concept of the event of a particular performance, allows for that group of individuals to have gained a shared form of life. This form of life assumes a stance other than themselves, in and of that moment.

Vicarious is defined by Merriam-Webster as an experience realized through imaginative participation in the experience of another. For us, imagination is expressed by the function of image. Vicarious here means that the song proposes an alternate reference frame, outside of the domain of the mainstream, dominant, or presupposed system of values determining what kind of performance to expect. The genre in which it was performed is not directly correlated to the function the song plays in organizing the value derived and who is to benefit from it. Formally, each individual, by the creative capacity expressive of its subjectivity, constructs a set of experiences x, which on the whole is a subset of a performance p. That subset of experiences is a function of x. By that capacity aggregating a set of features of that performance, x creates an image of p. The function of the operation aggregating the images of p expresses the concept of a performance, indicative of a particular form of life. The object
produced is lived in vicariously, meaning that each individual x remains itself and, yet, gains access to
p via the shared image constructed. An alternative frame of reference then and its form of life is the
following. If the set of individuals x is expressed by some operation collating the features of their
experience, and those features are one to one with a subset of p, also expressed by some operation,
then the function of the operation labeled a function of x produces an image of p indicating the form
of life of x. This is a form of life to which others—y, z, etc.—may have access to, but only
"vicariously" so by virtue of their also being an image of p. These frames, both the mainstream and
alternative, exist simultaneously. The subject participates in both, one is not completely subsumed,
overdetermined by/in the other. The song becomes the argument of a function indicative of a mode of
thought that persists across different contexts. As argument it may produce different outcomes, not
random but also not necessarily caused by the context in which it was performed. The song can be put
to different means, “mean” something different to some one/end. However, these different functions
obtain the same object, even if by different operations. The use of these features to articulate a certain
form of life means that function’s obtaining the same object is indicative of one’s membership within
the same form of life. The relationship between subjects, despite their varied identities, and fashioned
together in this way, embodies that form of life.

The sound schema utilized here is apt to describe how this works in the world to account for an
impoverished set of external experience, not a single song object, but the difference of forms of life
that can be generated from it. This is particularly important to the experience of the Black subject and
its mode of expression qua way of being in the world despite the external limitations placed upon it.
Identification of blackness as “Black” quickly becomes untenable as it stands. No predication or
nominal extension exhausts all its features. It only acquires properties in the relation set between its
naming and the world in which it resides. This raises the question of whether being “Black” is a
definite description or is it just to have that name. Definite descriptions can only be represented in a
proposition within a signifying practice, otherwise they describe nothing and reside nowhere.

Not all articulations become actual, but they are still real. Their significance and therefore their reality
may have consequences to the actual world. Without this, how could one account for such
impoverished states, limited experience, and the emergence of regimes of control over the subjects
within and composing those states of affairs? How does one account for those subjects retaining their
ability to create a self, outside of those constraints and introduce new forms of expression from one
context to another? When the blues was introduced into a dominant form of life, it was only seen as
new to some. Others understood it as a form of expression which encompassed the subjectivity of a
people. Although it was unheard of, it existed nonetheless. This blues kernel persists up to and
through Punk. While these individuals live this form of life within the same world as others, this form
of life came to change the actual world outside of the social political and economic limits imposed. Blackness persists in all of these forms. Blues changed the form of “American” music.

It is the case that blackness permeates all possible articulations if it is indeed the Not in this current state of affairs. It follows that blackness is the foundation for that state as what is not for one context, then that former context represents what is not to the latter. As blackness is a changing same, branches without roots, its essence is this innate creative capacity which by its very being does violence to grammar. Essence is change. A static conception of essence is impossible save for one’s definitions which also change over time. Blackness accomplishes its own essence in its modes of expression to articulate Future Perfects within actual worlds, providing alternative modes of expression which change the set of relations within the structures which limit it. Thus, the naming function which seeks to overdetermine individuals holds within it the means by which it can be undone. As naming is a recursive function, blackness even if named “Black” or by any other name, can cite itself from those other contexts. Though unheard, one cannot deny the existence of sound as all are immanent within it. As blackness has been theorized to be Not, this Null could not be empty as it is the basis for everything, otherwise, all would truly be devoid of meaning.

For blackness, this means these realities are the motivation for tactics to rewrite the existence of the actual world. That within that world’s structure lies the capacity to change regimes of control. These performances expressing the affairs of the subject affect how one is read but for this, there must have been a writing of the existence of a people in the first place. Creativity or improvisation presupposes a set of principles implicit to the capacities of the subject: the set of conditions under which one conducts creative acts. The notion that one cannot change a subject by external inputs but can change its identity via description is as simple as one cannot change a human to a frog by some external factor. Identities change, but the innate creative capacity of subjectivity remains, we just know it by another name.

Our linguistic model has revealed that the notion of language itself is the movement of parameters. Through articulation, we can formalize ways to avert forced explanation, to illustrate civil disobedience, ideals of opacity to regimes of categorization, fugitivity from systems of oppression as the changing same, and formalize open structures to be useful in future articulations. The structural analysis of these modes of expression highlights the simple but sufficient claim that there is something that works outside of the imposition of identification. Despite efforts to invalidate an individual’s identity within a given framework, it is still possible to conceive of that individual’s existence and with this comes the consequence that alternative modes of being within the same context can be created and actualized.
Through this literary analysis of sonic modes of expression, it is possible to see black subjectivity within different genres or prescribed forms of being in the world. Punk and improvisation are extreme but useful examples of the kernel structures immanent to blackness and therefore persistent through these forms and their derivatives. They illuminate the subjectivity of a people outside of the parameters, or grammar, which seeks to fix their existence. The Pessimist view is illogical as subjectivity entails a capacity to operate outside of how it is identified by both structures immanent and external to it. Within this conceptual scheme, outside of identity, all can be conceived as individual but not mutually exclusive of each other. The subject creates itself in relation to other individuals. But in this way, no organizational apparatus, no hierarchy or system, is devoid of the arrangement of these individuals or held exclusive to it. No structure is beyond articulation itself.

Black Subjectivity

If the Blues consists of a simple kernel of finite elements that can produce almost infinite permutations or sounded strings despite context—from core phrases composed of various arrangements of notes or chords mapped onto our model from section one that, although superficially different, still consist of the same inner logic or internal structure—it is also possible to show the Blues as a way of life. “Blue”-ing notes indicates the way sonic objects are put together and, therefore, is evidence of a particular subject’s capacity which reveals their way of being in the world. That subject’s affairs illustrate the operation of the function of this Blues modality. It is the capacity to utilize these core phrases in different ways that indicate the subjectivity of the individual being articulated. As this individual’s “Blues” is its mode of expression, it is through this capacity that despite environmental constraints the subject therein can be identified in multiple ways. As the blues is the expression of a people, then blackness is able to articulate various identities both within and outside of a dominant reference frame. The inner logic and mode of expression implicit in the articulation of black subjectivity remains even if labeled as non-existent, as “absolutely nothing,” or is unknown to a system of categorization. As labels are context contingent, the faculty whose capacity produces various identities, or none at all, remains; the inner logic of blackness cannot be argued away. This capacity is not exhausted by notation or a preconceived notion of Music. We are able to account for the ability to think sonically and generate one’s self without recourse to notation. Despite the finite materials with which one produces these sounds characteristic of a genre, the articulation of a blues subject can be found both identified within and residing without, and therefore providing the basis to know what genre one is participating in at the moment. This simplicity is evident in the Blues up to and through Punk; many were not technically trained or “read” sheet music; many songs were never recorded. It is possible to account for both the meanings contingent to the context in which the repetition of certain phrases occurs, as well as improvisation as a creative capacity and poetic faculty. If the meanings attributed to these phrases were predetermined, both of these phenomena would be
incredibly impoverished or worse impossible. The initial claim of this section was that the basis of black subjectivity is its constant re-articulation. It is through a metaphor of sound that this relation cannot be denied existentially even if that individual is not represented on the surface level of cultural and political representation in that state of affairs. Even when not represented, an innate creative capacity persists.

Black and White as labels are ascriptional. They represent functions yet to attain an object or subject with which to express their significance within a form of life or frame of reference. A web of empty functions represents the various roles to be obtained within a state of affairs. Their purpose is to fix a set of relations so as to refer to and produce a use value maintaining racial hegemony. As fixed solutions to the superficial organization of society, Black/White identity is dependent upon the state in which those names and their positions are utilized. How they are used indicates their significance. What I hoped to show through language and music was the fallacy in the assumed fixity of this state of affairs. In so far as these identities and/or objects of the function of the state maintain a relation between individual and value, Black and White identity produce a particular arrangement of individuals indicative of a specific state of affairs. Logically, if one changes a function’s arguments or objects, it produces alternate solutions. “Black”-ness within this state is both an attribute which cannot be quantified as it is not a constituent of the reference frame. Just as well, it is the mode of expressing the subjects identified as such within that frame’s attendant state of affairs. If read through Baraka, blackness as a signifying practice is the way of life of a people. “White”-ness by racial definition has been utilized to set the roles and functions to which individuals are forced to obtain in order to organize a state conducive to extracting useful expressions which further its domain. This has the added benefit of setting “White”-ness as the dominant reference frame. If this were not the case, White would become a part of the domain of blackness as there are no essentially “White” individuals. This logic asserts the precarity of the distinctions made within certain states of affairs; the stipulation of one over the other reveals the process of overdetermination. By showing Black/White as functional descriptions not essential to individuals, we show that this state of affairs is one of many and, therefore, can be changed.

This realization has two consequences. It is impossible for the Black subject to operate out of a cultural death or vacuum. This Pessimist assertion is based on an axiom of identification which ultimately fails. The subject is found in the breaks between the contexts in which it asserts a self and immanent within it is the creative capacity outlined above. Endemic to blackness is the capacity to generate new relations within context, obtain a difference in meaning across contexts, while maintaining the same tone throughout. Using sound as a model for subjectivity illustrates that there is no certainty available to the notation or identification of tones or a people. If one adheres to a given framework of identifications or notations, the external recourse required to give force to those
stipulations raise so many questions to qualify those choices and define their relevance, that those definitions fall apart when a person picks up an instrument and just plays.

If it can be said that a basis to understanding is the generation of expressions in the same way, two or more functions of the same object, then in matching the silences so that within grammars an affinity is reached, the signifying practices of a culture can be understood. 149 Therefore, the subject is decentered: it creates its self in the world. It writes that “self” into existence. This conception can illustrate notions such as rhythm and melody being the syncretism that is a culture, a people as movement itself. In the theory proposed by Hall, Articulation is the ability of difference coming together within a set of conditions that can generate a unity, a harmony, and, sometimes a united dischord.

Baraka’s emphasis on blackness and music as a changing same is crucial here. I referred to the Doppler Effect to illustrate the point that a tone may remain the same, but its frequency or volume may change relative to its position with an other. The connection between form and content that Baraka emphasizes is not to stultify blackness’ signifying practice with a connection between its sign and what it signifies. It is that the forms produced are relevant and appropriate, but more importantly “new,” to a context despite concerted efforts of control; that blackness is constantly changing the relation that regimes over meaning attempt to tie it down with. It is in the constant negotiation of these relations that subjectivity is found.

Baraka states that this is the “flow of is.” What “is,” is doing. The subject is more the function organizing what comes to matter within a state of affairs. It appears that subjectivity is due to the subject’s capacity to organize these elements through these functions. The body is a text written in concrete time working towards abstraction. As it moves, it writes out the poem that is its self and the matter of worlds. A singular reading of this process does not exhaust the totality of what it can be or is becoming.

Through the process of articulation we came to understand through a syntactic analysis the strategic formation of societal grammatical structures, their linguistic expression as institutions, and how they may be overturned through subjects’ signifying practices.150 This concept was developed through a linguistic scheme and, ultimately, the language faculty of music to illustrate the strategic societal overdetermination of individuals through these institutions and the possibility of a subject’s subversion of that process in the act of naming. Articulation was developed in this way in order to understand the tactics set in motion by these bodies, these subjects, in the event of overdetermination. These tactics could include the planning of a party, a performance, or other actionable options within
the arc of socio-political and cultural strategy. With this theory in hand, its manifestations can be explored in a systematic analysis of particular "world" conditions and the affairs therein.

**Prelude to a philosophy of Not**

With the account of this mechanism of articulation and the illustration of how it works, it is possible to conclude that the Null set is Not; that it is indeed a void that is not empty. The concept of the void that is not empty, expressed by virtue of the function of the functions or roles of those objects, is utilized to articulate the individual constituents whose set of relations therein express a state of affairs. The horizon of possibility for any articulation is sufficient to make a start towards a philosophy of Not. In *Black Skin, White Masks*, Frantz Fanon states that the Black man is not, any more than the White man. The Afro-Pessimist states that “not” exclusively pertains to “Black”-ness, equating Black identity with a cultural death, “absolutely nothing.” From here on, let “Not” or Null, represent what exists outside of the naming of a subject. The subject is the internal sense-making capacity of the individual. Outside of that event exists the set from which that subject pulls to articulate a self.

Fanon’s “not” conceived as an operation expressing the Null, therefore, adheres to the following principles:

1) There exists a set of which no other set is a member. Let this now be referred to as the Not; ii) There exists a function that carries elements from this set to other sets; therefore, the Not is the foundation for every subject; iii) Every non-empty set contains a member such that that set and that member are disjoint or “distinct.” This implies that no set is an element of itself and that every set is spatiotemporally grounded within the Null. This was illustrated in the nesting of contexts within states of affairs and states of affairs within the Null. Without such a stipulation, no set would be significant and would remain a member of the Not. There is no hierarchical distinction between significance and insignificance to states of affairs. Any stipulation that asserts a position outside of this set, therefore, has no basis and is transcendent, not an entity of this world. This entails a vacuous assertion. As the Null cannot be vacuous, all are implicated in this conceptual scheme. Anything that comes to be identified out of the Not, asserts its existence. Thus, the Pessimist view of Black individuals operating out of an empty void, what they have termed a “cultural death,” inevitably leads to a contradiction.

What can be deduced through my analysis is that hierarchical structures have to account for much more. Here the socio-cultural and existential consequence of this conceptual scheme can unfold. As a consequence of this formalization, any assertion of categorical purity is transcendent and impossible. If all was once Not, the organizational axioms of a Grammar are revealed as what has imposed an Ontology over states of affairs.
From this view, and in conclusion, a move from the notion of Ontology as first philosophy must take place. Too much rests on theories of identification and one’s knowledge of what exists and what does not as what fits into one’s categorical scheme, not what is there. This knowledge usually turns into an imposition because it is through that knowledge that categorizations gain their force. Ontology is exhausted by its very utterance. What exists from the Descriptionist point of view, rests upon a retroactive distinction of what is and what is not. Surely this cannot be the case and indicates a dependence on categorization without an inquiry into how these categorizations have come to be. The reorientation of what exists in states of affairs must then focus on the ways and methods by which individuals come to figure into one’s conception of the facts. To each signification practice, there is a language in which their modes of being are articulated.

I propose Aesthesis as first philosophy. Aesthesis’ etymology entails a receiving aspect, the relations obtained to/with the other as ethos, and a creative aspect of meaning making or poiesis indicative of an innate creative capacity. Aesthetics is a description of what Aesthesis sets to motion. As first philosophy, an individual’s being within a state of affairs is captured in their relations within it. Aesthesis captures both poiesis and ethos: the capacity to make meaningful expressions and the set of relations an individual has with others. Capacity to express thought most clearly manifests itself literarily. By putting Aesthesis first, ethics, morality, and Ontology then become possible.

“What is Hell? Your definitions”
– LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka, *The System of Dante’s Hell*
THE SINGING BOOK

Outside of society, that’s where I want to be/ . . .
Jimi Hendrix was nigger/ Jesus Christ and Grandma, too

- Patti Smith, Rock N Roll Nigger

It is not the case that if one knows the symbol ‘Black’ that they understand its use. Equating it to another term in hopes of obtaining a definition brings us no closer to understanding the object of that description. We must show how one builds a repertoire of uses for the terms of blackness outside of its identification with a symbol.

There are two lines along which blackness and its expressions are analyzed: Identity and Subjectivity.
This of course leaves a third space: neither. Blackness, or rather its identification as “Black” developed in the previous chapter, was equated with Not by the Pessimist. I will take the position in which blackness resides as the region denoted “neither.” Blackness is neither ‘this’ nor ‘that’. It is, therefore, no thing. Ultimately, this leads us, if we are to accept the Pessimist position, to a crossroads. For “Black” and “Nothing” being equated as descriptions or predicates leaves blackness, the object of these propositions, unscathed. Ultimately this amounts to the predicate whose function is Black being equivalent to another predicate, whose function is Nothing; both of which obtain an undefinable object such that ( . . . ). Conversely, if Black is to be defined within the scope of Nothing, then it would yield the same issue: Nothing(Black( . . . )), a categorization of a categorization. The category “Black” becomes a named categorization without referent and Nothing becomes a function of the use that name obtains in a frame of reference, the “function” of a function. Nevertheless, we still have no clue as to what blackness is—what is the subjectivity of blackness.

We must show how one can say that they know what and whom blackness is if the function of a term used to define it obtains no object. There is no fact about one’s past usage of a function that determines the right answer. Right or wrong does not even enter into the scope of the question because any retroactive justification can be applied in order to harmonize a desired result within a system of categorization.157 No thing justifies giving this answer over another. We cannot provide a dictionary for Black expressions to interpret such phrases, themselves, becoming subject to interpretation and requiring other and subsequent interpretations to ensure blackness’ circumscription within identity. We can, however, make an account for the mode of Black expression—the inner creative capacity to create thought, and hence, subjectivity—without appealing to Identity or blackness’ identification within a category merely named “subject.”

The singing book is a concept first developed by Houston A. Baker, Jr. in an attempt to distinguish between what I called the Identitarian position of the Descriptionist in the previous chapter—which for Baker is represented by Booker T. Washington—and the subjectivity position as illustrated by W.E.B Du Bois. Washington, according to Baker, creates an instruction manual for blackness as interpreted within the category Negro. Du Bois’ Souls of Black Folk is a book wherein what is indecipherable and deemed nonsense is not constrained by identification within a specified vocabulary. Rather, what is deemed nonsense or not of a dominant reference frame highlights the capacity to form expressions understood by those who participate within that repertoire of signifying practices; a language faculty and creative capacity in which Folks are singing, not merely recorded as having done so.158 The difference is that Du Bois’ book sings, Washington’s merely transcribes. The singing book provides a continuity of thought whose function or form of life expresses the subject of blackness. This cultural endowment is brought forward through Richard Wright’s linking the Black subject to the expression of Modernity as “song on paper.”159 To express the subject is distinct from
merely labeling it ether as “subject” or under a different name. Modernity, here, is taken as the self-referential or as Wright purports, “the forms of things unknown,” lying outside of identity which amounts to the ability of what is not identified to be able to form expressions as an entity within its self.\textsuperscript{160} We must show how, then, a singing book, one that expresses the subjectivity of a people, was produced instead of merely making a “song book.” Linguistically, the question becomes: How does one use a finite lexicon of objects, words, etc. to express what cannot be said on the page? We can show the syntax of an expression that has a structure and logical form but no phonetic representation or semiotic interpretation. In so doing, we show how the use/function of ‘Nothing’ can form expressions indicative of subjectivity.

Du Bois saw the capacity to make infinite use of finite means as a profane activity. One which undoes the overdetermined translations of the expression of the Black subject. Black subjectivity’s literary practice utilizes sonic objects as well as scriptural ones. We saw this in James Weldon Johnson’s \textit{Negro Spirituals}. Du Bois’ book represents a program or handbook to profane the proscribed position identified for Blacks in the U.S. so that the souls of these Black folk could undo the strict dominance of Identity over their subjectivity.\textsuperscript{161}

In the 1960s, Black modes of expression would become inextricably linked with the articulation of a Counter-Culture. At the crux of this process was the Beat poet Amiri Baraka, then known as LeRoi Jones. In his essay “Gatsby’s Theory of Aesthetics,” Jones states: “Identification [as Black/Negro] can be one term of that possibility [of blackness]. That is, showing a thing with its meaning apparent through the act of that showing. Interpretation can be another term. That is supporting a meaning, with one’s own life. That is under, standing. And using that position as a map, or dictionary. Depending on whether you move or sit.” For him, the singing book uses interpretation and translation against itself. It reveals translation as trans-position – the moving of an individual from its context to produce a use value in another.

Linguistically, this creative capacity to form expressions is opposed to behavioristic models which rely solely on brute force rationalizations of empirical evidence. The ambiguity in interpretation is a result of the use of finite means to create multiple expressions appropriate to context but not caused by them. This approach is decidedly against a description of the language faculty produced as if we were to look at language as a dictionary of terms. Ambiguity would be insurmountable if object and phonetic structure had to obtain a one to one correlation in order for understanding to occur. If the expressive capacity were of the behaviorist model, one would be a mirror of their environment, no other possible modes of being in the world could be formed. Therefore, the behaviorist model—now understood as a reference frame—is vacuous unless substantiated. Hence, the failure of Booker T. Washington’s position. One must presuppose a system of categorization in order to be identified but
in doing so cannot account for how that system got there, assuming that these categories are essential to whom an individual can be. In accordance with the view combatted here, what a frame of reference dictates is outside of its purview cannot exist. In this chapter, I will explore the capacity to articulate a “self” outside of an overdetermined mainstream position through this very realization. I aim to show that that mainstream as well as “White”-ness as a reference frame are vacuous and, therefore, expression can be formed outside of their purview. This much is made clear through Jones’ introduction to Black Magic. Jones writes: “You notice the preoccupation with death, suicide, in the early works. Always my own, caught up in the death urge of this twisted society. The work a clod of abstraction and disjointedness, that was just whiteness. European influence, etc. just as the concept of hopelessness and despair, from the dead minds the dying morality of Europe. There is a spirituality [subjectivity] always trying to get through, to triumph, to walk across these dead bodies like stunting for disciples, walking the water of dead bodies Europeans call their [my emphasis] minds.”

It is from this capacity of generating expressions that trite and hackneyed expressions enter thought by virtue of memorization or mimesis, but are also put to use in creative ways. The dictionary does not confine what can be expressed, but the limits of the creative capacity of language as a means of creating thought do limit the worlds that can be created or accessed by groups of individuals. The hackneyed expressions are evidence of an imposed frame of reference; the ability to form different expressions outside of that frame is what I will explore below.

The Beats would become the progenitors of the Counter-Cultural movement later known as Punk. During the 1960s, the singing book provided the cultural endowment, a repertoire of signifying practices, that later became today’s ‘zine culture. It is through the singing book that a repertoire of signifying practices was constructed and put to work, creating an ethos within Black subjectivity which, in turn, is expressed through Punk. It is with the help of LeRoi Jones that I will formalize blackness’ mode of expression through punk as a form of life, an ethos. Language as indicative of a form of life, as the means of creating thought beyond restrictions of communicability, will be illustrative of a punk use of that which is determined senseless; of what is labeled Not in our state of affairs. If blackness is Not, the inexpressible ‘( . . . )’ can be understood through its use: Punk (P) formalized as a function of blackness, P(. . .). Leaders are not interchangeable with movements. So, a Punk individual is not identical to one thing, neither is a Black individual identical, interchangeable, with blackness. Punk as a movement will be shown as having a logical form and syntactic structure—a deep structure—with no need or requirement of a phonetic or surface form communicable to an external context.

LeRoi Jones and his then-wife Hettie Cohen moved to 27 Cooper Square in 1954, off the Bowery in lower Manhattan. By 1958, Jones and Cohen self-published a journal entitled Yugen. The practices
developed in their home workshop would provide the cultural endowment in which ‘zine culture in the incipient punk scene developed off the Bowery in the early 1960s. Their practice itself was derived from the Harlem Renaissance exemplified by Zora Neale Hurston’s publication *Fire!!* (Figure 4) which included hand drawn images and text during the time artists began experimenting with collage which was seen soon after in Europe’s Dada movement.

A tentative continuity of thought can be drawn between that movement and the title for Jones’ 1964 poem “Black Dada Nihilismus.” Black Dada represents a function of Nothing, *Nihilismus*. In 1960 at the Five Spot, a jazz club in the Village neighborhood of Manhattan New York, the jazz musician Charles Mingus calls Jones a young punk. The praxis of profanation at the core to punk musical expression and as a cultural movement in the 1970s can be derived from this moment as the term “punk” at that time was inextricably tied to sex and sexuality, much like the term “jazz” and “jook,” linking dance and social interactions, both in the club, on the street, and at times in prison, to the act of and one’s orientation to sex. *Fire!!* was shamed for its deliberate use of vulgarity and sexual tropes to break down an enclosure of respectability externally imposed upon black subjectivity through Negro identity. The punk lineage in signifying practices can be drawn through Hurston to Jones in this way. In railing against the academic rationalization of black musical forms, Jones lays out the lineage “a long time before dudes started calling themselves PUNKS!” illustrating that the horizon of possibility for the articulation of an American subject at all comes from blackness.

Jones had already begun to develop the function of the blues as a text and the mode of expression of a people, that provided the basis for American subjectivity during the late 1950s and early 60s. In his autobiography, Jones discusses a White frame of reference posed as mainstream culture. According to Jones, because this frame was held dominant and static over others, it must be dead. The reality was that “White”-ness was vacuous and required blackness’s expression not only to posit its identity, but also to substantiate its imposition of a mainstream reference frame. “White”-ness could only define itself by that which it is not; and that it is not of this world because it is transcendent to it due to its stipulation as dominant over it. In so doing, “White”-ness leaves itself undefined and wanting of its own definition or identity. Jones developed the notion of the body and performance as text in *Blues People*, which writes out its existence or is read from the material and language available within a certain set of conditions. This was the basis for the Blues.

By 1965 the inauguration of a punk ethos was founded under the term “punk rock” by future Patti Smith guitarist Lenny Kaye’s liner notes to a garage rock compilation entitled *Nuggets: Original Artyfacts from the First Psychedelic Era* (Figure 5). This represented a self-referential mode of being in the world rearticulating the state of affairs in which it is embedded. In those notes, Kaye would state an explicit link between the blues as the generative core to the formation of punk. Having “. . .
reacquainted American musicians with those roots (blues, early rock) that they long appeared to have
forgotten, but providing models for a whole new breed of band, . . . opening the once-rigid boundaries
of individual musics—folk, jazz, more exotic and foreign forms—as well as cracking open the door to
a world in which youth felt they had too long suffered a pat on the head and a kick in the ass . . . The
name that has been unofficially coined for them ‘punk-rock’ seems particularly fitting in this case, for
if nothing else they exemplified the berserk punk pleasure that comes with being on-stage outrageous, the
relentless middle—finger drive and determination offered only by rock and roll at its finest.”

Blackness as expressed by a function of its way of being in the world indicated by the blues retained
subjective continuity despite of and outside the “rigid” boundaries of identification within a system of
musical categorization and racial segregation. The blues core to punk, for Kaye, was able to generate
multiple “musics” and a new breed of band from the finite lexicon of the blues by providing a syntax
and inner logic, a “model” of its mechanism of articulation, which generated the punk ethos. The
subject indicated by this mechanism’s making infinite use of finite means and, despite efforts to erase
it from Rock and Roll and other musical forms, was the generative articulatory blues core of the mode
or expressive capacity of blackness.

By 1969, the MC5, a band and progenitor of Punk music, LeRoi Jones, Sun Ra, Allen Ginsberg and
others performed on stage together and cemented the literary conception of the articulation of
subjectivity through a sonic language. (Figure 5) Later in 1978, Patti Smith would confirm this
lineage and sing that she was a, “Rock N Roll Nigger.” “Punk” was not used to identify the bands so
much as to articulate a “sensibility” that started to challenge systems of categorizing varying and
divergent forms of life in the U.S. Punk was a reorientation of subjectivity integrated in its own
culture, a set of signifying practices that holds a familial resemblance across individuals who
participate in that form of life. This self-referentiality, amounts to a tautology which does not say
much about the world save that it exists. It is from tautologies that any expression can be formed at
all.168 It is in this way that punk was able to offer an alternative form of life up and against that which
sought to overdetermine those expressions it had not yet actualized. For in the process of being
formed, “Punk”-ness, nonetheless, was lived vicariously with and through the position of the other in
that present moment. A Punk ethos was a sonic method of creating thought that articulated a visual
form.169 This visual form was experienced sonically—our spatial concept of syncopation from chapter
one, section two—and in ‘zine form. Punk was not a prescribed identity politic to which others were
made to submit, albeit it may have become so after its inception as a musical genre.

The literary roots of the punk mode of creating expressions could be mass-disseminated and used by
persons to self-organize outside of identification with a specific leader or political program. For
Wittgenstein, this is explained through the notion of musical themes being propositions: logic leads
to understanding the construction of frames of reference within states of affairs and inversely back to the innate creative capacity of the subject sonically. Blackness remained an undefinable object within a White reference frame save for how its expressions were identified. Thus, blackness became a matter of concern to the upkeep of a dominant frame. We will see this below through Ramdasha Bikceem’s ‘zine *Gunk* and her analysis of a White woman stating that Bikceem was not “American” for she did not “dress” the part, which only affirms the lady’s identity as American being identical to White, and only made possible because Bikceem—as Black and not dressed appropriately—was not. It is in this way, and through latent connections, that punk was formalized as a genre so as to control its expressions, that seemed to come out of nowhere. This “coming out of nowhere” merely asserts the impossibility of completely translating one form of life into another by virtue of descriptions and its identification within a fixed frame of reference. Through this conception, signifying practices were developed outside of being identified within a genre or categorical form of life and was accomplished through a DIY ethos within blackness articulated through punk. The elucidation of an ethos is engendered through an analysis of affinities what is developed by virtue of the concept of family resemblance below. Just as one does not see physical relations in the world and, yet, realizes their effects, the question as to how and what comprises the reality of these affinities, or relations, can be formalized through the dissemination of a form of life outside of identification.170

The context set, we now look deeper into Jones and the form of life of a Black punk singing book. *Yugen*’s first ‘zine arrived in 1958. For Jones and Cohen, *Yugen* meant “elegance, beauty, grace, transcendance of these things, and also nothing at all.”171 This first pronouncement of the subject articulated through these pages was one that was integrated within its own culture, out from its own modes of signifying. We even have here blackness’ putting to use of ‘Nothing’ viz. Jones. In “Lines to Garcia Lorca,” *Yugen* illustrates that Black subjectivity was articulated through music being a text, making Black music, Black magic, and the articulation of blackness’s being in the world.172 This sentiment was ratified by *Yugen*’s second iteration in which the mission of this practice was to find a world “fashioned in my [Jones’/blackness’] image.” As punk later adopted this mode of expression, the capacity to articulate thought sonically, the sonic language of punk was able to picture worlds.173

By the fourth iteration of *Yugen* in 1959, the iconic cut and paste practice adopted by and emblematic of most punk ‘zines of the late 1970s was used on the cover. (Figure 7) This predates the supposed inception of a Punk cultural lineage from William Burroughs in the Mayfair Academy Series of 1973. Just as well, it affirms its use in Black modes of expression in a way un-reliant on the imported version of Dada collage by Hannah Höch but more so on Romare Bearden, a black Harlem Renaissance artist practicing in the 1930s. Bearden’s cultural endowment from the Harlem Renaissance did not stop him from developing a Counter-Cultural ethos utilizing the practices of that period. During that renaissance, Bearden painted primarily in watercolor and at that point was only
experimenting with collage techniques. However, by 1934 in his essay "The Negro Artist and The Modern Artist," Bearden states his discontent with the "hackneyed" and "uninspired" practices of the time, content to "rehash" forms from the past. Bearden critiqued the growing conservatism towards a standard of what the Negro ought to be that had been developed during the latter years of that Harlem movement. In an act of transgression, he went against the dominant culture from within Negro identity taking the elements around him to articulate something at once of the form of life of blackness and, as of yet, not experienced within the Negro reference frame or White mainstream.

Blackness’ signification practice had to be a call and response, or a "call and re-call" according to Bearden, reminiscent of the vamped riffs and improvisation in the blues and jazz. His use of collage would rearticulate that renaissance endowment along those lines becoming the mainstay of his work at the same time that the Civil Rights movement of the 1960s garnered more attention and force. Bearden's collage technique linked rhythm and syncopation to subjectivity through a visual landscape that was meant to be heard and seen. This much we gather from his previous work in music, writing the song “Sea Breeze” recorded by Billy Eckstine and Dizzy Gillespie in 1954. For Bearden, rearticulating Black/Negro identity was concomitant with the expression of subjectivity. His collages during the 1960s-70s—such as The Dove and Pittsburgh Memory (1964), Jazz Village (1967) and Soul Three (1968), to Empress Bessie (1974)—would focus on the subject's faces. The collaged elements of the face in the foreground with the background left as an oil painting expressed the rearticulation of identity emphasizing the subjective capacity underneath. Each individual became many-faced, expressing a multitude of identities although maintaining subjective continuity despite frame. The traditional oil paints in the background of his compositions denoted the past which offered a finite set of elements and references, while the foreground illustrated the creative capacity of the subject taking that finite set of elements and using them to express a self in a multitude of ways.

Like many punks to follow in the 60s-70s, Bearden would take print media images of Black life and from this finite lexicon reconstruct blackness as he saw it in the vernacular in which he participated, utilizing the syntax and creative capacity of blackness itself. This act was inextricably tied to the fight for Civil Rights in the 1960s as Bearden, an ex-serviceman in the U.S. military, started the group Spiral in Harlem in 1963. During this time, he would produce the Projections series—The Dove, Pittsburgh Memory, and others—exemplifying Bearden's rearticulation of identity and the DIY cut and paste collage aesthetic taken up by the nascent punk movement. Aesthetics and ethics became one for Bearden in the Wittgensteinian sense of these terms. Ethos or the way in which one is in the world is tied to poeisis, the world making capacity of the subject, the conjunction of which forms aesthesis itself.
These formulations did not come from nowhere. The kernel to this thought was laid out when Bearden stated in the same 1934 essay referenced above, that the mode of expression of blackness is expressed as "rhythm poured into art." The syncopation of Black music was reduplicated visually. David Murry in *The Hearing Eye: Jazz & Blues Influences in African American Visual Art* would comment on this by referencing a 1945 letter of Bearden's in which he began to develop this spatial, world-building, procedure to the mode of Black expression in the rhythm with which Bearden utilized collage.

Bearden would go on to say, "I'm beginning to see what time and sense means in a picture... taking the time as music does—a composition extended in time." The use of cut and paste techniques within an improvisationally syncopated ethos from blues to jazz elicits a speed and urgency in the expression of the subjects in Bearden's work. Robert Farris Thompson would comment on the quilted collage pattern of Bearden's *Patchwork Quilt* (1970). Thompson’s essay in *Who'd a Thought It* entitled "From the First to the Final Thunder: African-American Quilts," linked the cut and paste technique of Bearden to the simultaneity of two beats heard in the same audio-visual field. Thompson would call it a visually "rhythmic clash" which induced a speed and syncopation in the work itself. Bearden himself would link this to the articulation of space. For us, the syntax of constructing a sonic world found in the visuals of Bearden is at once a part of the canvas and yet apart from it for it cannot be seen in its totality. In order to occupy that state of affairs, one must hear the rhythm on the canvas.

Bearden adopted this train of thought philosophically during his studies with Gaston Bachelard in France. Shortly after his encounter with Bearden, Bachelard would write *The Poetics of Space* in 1958. Bearden would go on to say, "What I've attempted to do is establish a world through art in which the validity of my Negro experience could live and make its own logic." 174 A repeated difference utilized by Bearden through collage helps us hear the rhythm of his work like a one chord vamp as the repetition of a riff or a repeated phrase during improvisation.

Jones’ evocation of this cultural endowment is found throughout this fourth issue of *Yugen*. Jones writes in the poem “Parthenos” of the multiple mothers of this endowment—one for each “race” and some nationalities. In the poem, blackness is portrayed as a witch doctor “who clutches the past in his bony fist shaking it viciously at those finally visible hierarchies of angelic intelligences.” It is blackness’ position outside of and yet a part of the frame of reference of a U.S. value system that harbors the capacity to rearticulate that system of categorization. Jones takes the definition of blackness on in “Parthenos.” As blackness is a known unknown to this state of affairs, blackness goes “... home to make love to some dead man’s mother. Who is our child, who is ourselves (only the mothers survive).” If a cultural death is to be placed outside of a regime of identification and value and blackness’ relegated to Not is the foreclosure of all potentialities to express a self, this does not have to do with bodily demise. To make love to some dead man’s mother is to find life on the other side of death, to create on and out of it. Through this illustration, we are able to come back to
subjectivity outside of regimes of identification, to express out of that which is Not a symbol to express all that there is and could be.

Another conclusion from these lines Jones noticing that without blackness there would be no life at all. If we call the dead man “Identity” and say that he is dead because his life is static and one of those identities comes back home to procreate with the mother of this dead man who is their child, then the one that we call “Black” and the one we call “White” are members of the extended family. They are the mother’s cousins, making this still-born child their son: their creation, and their cousin all the same. This “dead man” is both father and child. The heads of this house can only produce “children” or identities born dead. If to be “Black” is a cultural death according to the Pessimist, then Jones tells us it is because someone named “White” and/or someone named “Black” has fathered this still-born child with someone who is also their mother who is, nevertheless, them. Their theory of validation has no means of justification. White and Black identity are cousins living under the same roof, in a single parent home. The reference frame in which they reside, which they have also created, becomes the fatherly head of that household. In naming this predicament, they become subject to the very same system as they must identify themselves by that system’s terms. The mother is the horizon of possibility for these children. Mother is at home but is outside of the story, referenced only by virtue of this “dead man,” her son. One of blackness’ progeny comes back home and makes love to the one that is both a part from them and yet apart of them. They “come home” meaning that they had been there before but no longer live there. The child bears a family resemblance to the parents, but remains dependent on that dead man’s mother, that dead man being them. In the act of birthing this dead child, the man identified remains blackness’ cousin, but their child Identity is doomed, still-born. The mother, that which is present but not represented in the frame of this tale, is the only one who survives. Jones gives us a logical proof for subjectivity outside of identity.

Blackness was formalized by Jones to be able to come home to a family which is very much alive although one member is described as dead. Blackness is at once apart from that description of death and, yet, remains a part of the family. Blackness, representative of the subjectivity of Black identity now dead, was shown to retain a capacity to form expressions outside of the external categorizations of a cultural death by mainstream culture and from within itself—Afro-Pessimism. In a way, blackness remained free to articulate a form of life outside of the nuclear household and, yet, remain within the family overall. Blackness held a resemblance to the mother despite its being labeled by the overarching community as insignificant—under a dead man within that “White” frame of reference. This is possible because that system of categorization transcends life and is not of this world. By this formulation, Jones profanes the notion that there is one acceptable frame of reference or form of life, insinuating a generative sexual act of creating new forms outside of respectability. In all, blackness comes before Black identity. Keeping it in the family despite its creating the dead White man, only
the Black mothers, of both the child and the father, survive the ordeal. Motherhood, here, represents Black subjectivity, for blackness is an inner creative capacity, i.e. is emblematic of reproduction and the ability to give birth.

By Yugen’s sixth issue, the function of Not and its form of life were an explicit theme. The prose of Yugen embodied a method for forming an argument from propositions in which logical schemata, the formal structure and internal sense of those propositions, could be utilized to articulate alternative Black identities indicative of the subjectivity of blackness. In the poem “Node”, Jones calls this capacity “music from my hands.” In this sixth issue of Yugen, Jones lays out the logic to blackness’ mechanism of articulation: i) the nameless as all things closest to us, blackness is the closest in proximity to what seeks to overdetermine its expression, but the farthest thing away from comprehension for it is an undefinable object within a White frame of reference; ii) a non-coercive affinity expressed via an indiscreet avowal, barring indelicate assumptions becomes poetic operation to “signify” black subjectivity and which is the subject’s “heart’s content.” It is in this way that Jones undoes the overdetermination of Black bodies through the subjugation of blackness’ subjectivity.

Black identity is on the other side of blackness’s subjectivity. Black identity for itself and from the stance of “White”-ness represents an inner and outer aspect of analyzing systems of overdetermination as different propositions obtaining the same undefinable object. However, Jones goes on to show that Identity fails along similar lines of the mind-body split which he previously dispelled, for “matter” or “physical” has no meaning outside an explanatory theory of Identity.

Therefore, these claims over the subject are vacuous unless substantiated by something other than itself. They are at best ambiguous or, which is most beneficial to blackness, internally contradictory; iii) as White frames of reference are proven vacuous in and of themselves, the assertion of the existence of blackness is confirmed as that which is required to assert a “White” frame of reference because “White”-ness can only substantiate its claim as dominant by dictating that which it is not. Jones challenges the subordination and overdetermination of Black identity by “White”-ness: “You question my motives? And you do not even have a name.”; iv) the capacity to rearticulate out of finite materials is secured viz. an inner logic and syntax embedded in, not behind or before, black expressions. Jones describes the tearing down of this sacred church that an Identity supposedly secured as, “standing among the ruins of ourselves.” In the profanation of the alter of respectability, blackness is able to articulate a self that was not known within the sanctioned frame of reference of our state of affairs and not caused by it but appropriate to it;175 and v) finally, if overdetermined to Nothing, blackness becomes the potential to express anything at all. “It is close to me and uncaring. It stands in my chest cavity. It is unmindful, & has no name.” Jones solves the puzzle to the negative existential stipulated of Black identity. Nothing is a description, which does not negate the existence of the object of which it is a function.176
Jones subsequently makes a statement in the following issue, *Yugen* no. 7, regarding the ethos and logic put forward. The *Yugen* form of expression to overturn overdetermination is decidedly against brute force Marxism and adheres to the tendency of thought to check the legitimacy of institutions that would become a signature of the Punk movement. The logic formulated through Black subjectivity renders trading one totalitarian regime for another inconsistent—White supremacy or African-American respectability lead to similar ends. Blackness neither can accept the subjectivity of a people or a social-political movement as being interchangeable with a leader or founder. Jones prefaces *Yugen* no. 7 with, “We the kinda cats like to turn Hegel upside down just to see the pennies fall out!” calling out a theory which, when institutionalized, disavows capitalism but in its enactment lines its pockets with the tithes of those workers it has sworn to protect. This was not against Marxism as a tool to critique political economy. It was against the way it had become fashionable to enact the critique. When brought into a racialized context, working along a proprietary stance that dictated what it meant and, therefore, instituting a particular measure of radicality, if unchecked, this mode of critique tended towards the re-suppression of the proletariat that did not fit into a sanctioned, predefined, measure of Marxist ideology. Origination of this subject and its movements are ontologically necessary, but the necessity of having to identify one individual as representative of a movement is subject to the propositions of a state of affairs that seeks Black overdetermination. Therefore, that "leader” is only able to articulate a movement out of a language in which blackness is already overdetermined and burdened by prescribed definitions for the very people the leader wishes to uplift. By taking on that burden, the only manner in which to gain significance within that state of affairs leads to that people’s own subordination.

The straight interchangeability of leader with people or movement leaves the structural inequities unchanged while the state of affair’s expression, how it appears on the surface of society, changes only nominally. Jones ended the issue with an unlabeled, cut and paste image of Marcus Garvey (Figure 8). Possibly a nod to his overall critique and reformulation of the connection between nationalism and control. Beneath the image, Jones crafted a list—a constellation of persons, individuals, and their terms—that constructed a dominant frame of reference which supposedly ensured blackness’ overdetermination. His intent was to remind them where they came from, sending them back to the “dark continent” not to be literally confused with “Africa” but as a reminder that blackness was the horizon of possibility for expressing any cultural significance at all. With the program formulated above, Jones illustrated the vacuity of that frame of reference, using an image of the black nationalist to show how, without blackness, this web that ensures a power relation represented through a White frame remains incomplete.177

By its eighth and final issue, *Yugen* had become a wholly self-referential document, a tautology. With the schemata formalized for the articulation of a Black subject out of blackness, the ethos that was
opened up for Black modes of expression laid the groundwork for what, in Harlem, became the Black Arts Movement. Consequently, in the spaces opened up by the Beats and Counter-Culture, Punk came to fill those gaps. We will situate this process in the historical context of the 60s period in the next chapter, the Electric Church.

Outside of Yugen, Baraka had direct ties to the generation of Punk downtown with ‘zines such as Zazen, in which William Burroughs makes an appearance. This comes full circle at the Nova Conference in 1978 as a convening of Beats and Punks downtown highlighting Punk’s ethos and music’s literary ties. Baraka downplayed his involvement with the Beat scene in his biography so as to undergird the political and populist underpinnings in the creation of the Black Arts Movement. BAM, for Baraka, changes Black expression into an identified position rather than focusing on Black subjectivity. Uptown in Manhattan, the Black Arts Movement later worked with Sun-Ra, who then worked with the MC5, as well as Jennifer Jazz and the Hardcore Punk scene.

LeRoi Jones moved from the Village to Harlem in 1965 after the assassination of Malcolm X. Most of the Punk scene would be created in the wake of his move uptown. The subjective continuity of blackness was maintained outside of a mainstream discourse through the DIY practices developed during Jones’ work in the Village as a Black Beat poet. It is because blackness was made identical to Nothing, its denotation being outside of the reference frame of White superiority, that blackness was able to articulate a subjectivity and form of life outside of what it was identified as within that frame; thus, retaining the capacity to rearticulate the definitions of blackness within that state of affairs’ strict dominance over its forms of expression. Jones eventually changed his name to Amiri Baraka, an example of rearticulation itself, and went on to begin the Black Arts Movement in Harlem.

The Black Arts Movement attempted to integrate blackness within the subject of its own propositions as an entity of its own being. The subject of those propositions was expressed through poetry and theater to create a set of signifying practices for its own cultural endowment. Culture was to be conceived as a repertoire of signifying practices. This endowment was cultivated in Baraka's Black Arts Repertory Theater in Harlem. Theater, for Baraka, was the staging of the state of affairs so as to rearticulate how the relationship between individuals and their function/roles within it were expressed; it was the mapping of the encounter and conflict found between those in relations of subordination to those of dominance so as to apply and test tactics to subvert overdetermination. The vocabulary of this staging had been worked out in Yugen; Baraka was able to utilize a vocabulary that did not have to be set within another category or cast in the terms of another form of life in order to substantiate its claims.
From LeRoi Jones a line can be drawn starting at 27 Cooper Square down St. Mark’s Place to Alan Vega’s apartment and studio. This line formed an artery through which punk would be articulated in downtown New York. Vega, a member of the band Suicide and whose cultural endowment sits at the intersection of Puerto Rico and the U.S. which, according to the Kerner Commission of 1967, dictated that he participated in the expression of blackness within that scene, though not to be confused with his being identified as “Black” or “African”-American. His two-ness highlights an affinity between individuals labeled one way but participating in multiple frames of reference or forms of life despite the ambiguity to markers of identity. Being marked “Puerto-Rican,” Vega’s cultural endowment is a part of the U.S. but nonetheless apart from its dominant White reference frame, exemplifying the capacity to express an alternative form of life by utilizing the vocabulary of the context but not caused by it.

Alan Vega’s apartment on 98 Bowery was a base for contemporary art and punk musicians due to its proximity to CBGBs, the venue that was the center of the New York punk scene in the 1970s. Lack of access to industry recording studios and representation necessitated a DIY model outside of the mainstream, and generated disdain for traditional practices. The creation of this scene can be traced through the dissemination of the ‘zines within that neighborhood. Printing that could not happen in apartments was completed at St. Mark’s Church, which later became a venue for Punk bands, and culminated in the move of the Beat poets to Entermedia on 12th street and 2nd Avenue, where the Nova Conference in 1978 cemented the literary connection between Punk and Counter-Culture. (Figure 2) The 5 Spot at 5 Cooper Square is where Jones’ literary analysis of music was developed. His plays and writing soon moved down to the Bowery Cafe and to Coney Island High on St. Marks, and the Electric Circus, later renamed the DOM. The blues core articulated through a jazz, soon bebop, and punk musical expression soon moved off Bowery to the Mudd Club, a staple to the punk scene of the 1970s, and Mercury Lounge. As the literature and language of Punk, both sonic and written, moved eastward in the Village and on towards the Lower East Side, Jones participated in the scene as far over as Avenue A, where in the late 1970s and early 80s the Pyramid Club and A7 would house the Bad Brains. Bad Brains’ performances in New York during that time would solidify the blues core to punk musical expression through their ROIR live recordings at those venues.

An analysis and theory regarding these tactics were developed by Zora Neale Hurston in her “Characteristics of Negro Expression,” two of which are of importance here: Lore and Dialectics/Inflection. Hurston—who started one of the first Black ‘zines during the Harlem Renaissance entitled Fire!! in 1926 (Figure 3)—argues that it is through Lore that a cultural endowment is formed. Lore contains a deep structure, composed of the logical formulations of a generative capacity to produce open structures that can be transposed from one context to the next, making use of the environmental parameters themselves. It also retains a syntax structuring those
forms so as to remain appropriate to the context in which they are uttered by using the objects available in that environment. This deep structure harbors a mechanism that attends to current conditions. The deep structure for all intents and purposes is a mechanism benefiting the maintenance of subjective continuity. The mechanism is able to subvert overdetermination by the force, inflection, of a term’s introduction within the propositions of the state of affairs. There are terms, such as “black” or BLACK,\textsuperscript{184} that can be utilized as both the subject of a proposition and/or as one of the constituents that form the proposition itself, a predicate.\textsuperscript{185} It is through inflection that subjectivity is maintained despite the overdetermination of the subject’s form of expression. Hurston states that inflection is a “living” capacity that is “. . . not of the past. It is still in the making.” Obtaining a relation of affinity between dialect and inflection or the way in which a thought is expressed represents the handing down of the capacity to put to use a finite set of elements to create expressions of self within their environment, as well as reshape the environment itself. Lore does not, however, require a surface level representation or need to be easily translated from the dominant language or body of knowledge within the state of affairs referred to above as the mainstream.

For example, a syntax and logical form yields a deep structure to forms of expression. Phonetic representation exists on the surface. There are many phonetic interpretations—as well as the possibility of no phonetic representation—that can map onto a deep structural form utilized across contexts. Phonetic form or representation only has a sense in and only in a given reference frame.\textsuperscript{186} This is where Dialect/Inflection comes into play. Dialects are a safeguard against overdetermination through the use of the indeterminacy created by the multiplicity of surface forms that expressions can take on. Inflection accomplishes the same task by the use of singular expressions in multiple ways to generate different meanings. Both, in tandem, encompass the adaptability of Black subjectivity as is appropriate to a context but not caused by it, in other words not a mirror of it, so that blackness can create a thought and maintain subjective continuity that “[speaks] directly to the Negro and let him speak for himself.”

This “speaking” comes to fruition in Jones/Baraka’s notion of the body as a text. In \textit{Black Music}, Jones refers to the lexicon from which musicians form their sonic expressions as “books.” When discussing particular performers and performances, Jones would quote musician Wayne Shorter who stated, ”I got a few tunes in the book too. . .”\textsuperscript{187} When analyzing the work of Don Cherry, Jones would often refer to, ”The band's book. . . [which] included a few of Dizzy's tunes like 'Things to Come' and 'Manteca' and even some John Lewis arrangements.”\textsuperscript{188} A ”book” became a technical term for Jones which linked Black music to a syntactic structure indicative of the faculty for creating thought. The same faculty articulates the subject, although the surface expression mapped onto the same structure differs in regard to the lexicon of “music” or verbal “language.” Music cannot be represented using the same terms as text, although the way in which the thought is formed can express the same subject.
The various chapters of the "text" were the songs. As many performers played the same songs emphasis was placed on the way these sonic thoughts were articulated apart from a one to one correlation between title and sound; the vocabulary was jazz or the blues; and the performance or mode of expression, Black Music. The repertoire of the books these artists perform becomes their “body” of work. The body is a written work—a body of knowledge or a reference frame—indicative of a form of life. Subject continuity is generated as this text or book created and handed down, the routes this text takes traces the contours the “body” of individuals participating in a specific form of life; it is the Lore embedded in the syntax to Black modes of expression. One reads bodies of text, and the act of writing and being read evinces the structure of a thought: the outer and inner aspects of that proposition respectively. Reading and writing are not silent activities. Historically, books were required to be spoken aloud and sung in order to truly become a “text.” To bring forward this concept, Baraka developed a style that forces a reader to sing the prose on the page, emphasizing the lyrical nature of his work through a ‘/’ operator as if each line were a verse of song. Jones/Baraka’s body, itself, was a singing book.

Musical performances were considered “books” throughout LeRoi Jones’ Blues People and Black Music. A performer’s lexicon of songs, from which a band articulates its “sound” is the book that represents their mode of being in the world. A particular lexicon of songs being used in a specific way indicates an inner logic, a syntax, to the method in which those sonic books were prepared. The book represents the mechanism expressive of the subject outside of those bands being identified within particular category or genre. It with this conception that the subject of that “sound” can escape the imposition a dominant reference frame by changing their “sound” while maintaining the subjectivity of the people putting it to use. A punk form of life articulated out of blackness’ modes of expression via the blues can be lived outside of a categorization, unrecognized in the surface organization of society but, nevertheless, present in that society’s state of affairs. Its introduction into this dominant frame, which was inevitably mistranslated as the syntax expressive of Counter-Culture, was different from the mainstream surface structure of society. As a result, it was labeled as “coming out of nowhere.”

“Nowhere” or what was once Nothing is an arrangement of terms outside of the vocabulary of a dominant frame. The Not in poetic musical form, yet based on the inner logic and mode of expression or syntax explored in our first chapter, is shown by Jones to be the set of all which is both insignificant within the mainstream but nonetheless a part of the same state of affairs, forming the base or deep structure to the genre that would become Punk in the late 1970s. Proving as the base structure, without it the genre, mainstream, or a relation of dominance would not hold. Coming from Nowhere is an aspect in addition to just coming out of blackness, for Black individuals were identified within that state of affairs. Coupled with the enforcement of Identity, there was a denial of culture.
coming from that which is Black. The relation these individuals obtain within that state of affairs comes out of nowhere because it is of a context and in a language unknown within a dominant frame of reference or “world.” Those forms of expression did not and do not translate. The statement "coming out of nowhere" is the aftermath of incorporation through dispossession, the taking up of expressions from outside of the dominant cultural frame of reference and putting those products to use so as to further the goals of mainstream culture. The modes of expression engendering a form of life from one context taken up for use into another, and the subsequent barring of access to the value extracted from that context once unknown to a dominant reference frame, is what is traditionally known as appropriation. The after effect of the imposition of a frame of reference is, in this case, a Genre to the music and an Industry to that music’s modes of expression being made equivalent, a text translated from one language introduced to markets abroad.

Through the mechanism of articulation, it is possible to illustrate the encounter between mainstream U.S. culture, founding a value system to be held across contexts, here referred to as a dominant frame of reference, and the Counter-Cultural product brooding in the late 1960s. The effect of the generation of a punk ethos from this encounter resulted in a form of life outside of identification, one which set a different relation between individuals within that scene. The constellation of spots drawn above are the evidence of that form of life. The individuals within that life have a family resemblance in their signifying practices. The bible to their profane church was the collections of ‘zines and their dissemination along affinities created by many functions obtain the same object of thought. Those functions, those forms of life were held in relation because of this punk/blues object.

An example of incorporation through dispossession, i.e. appropriation, can be provided through Music taken as a “text.” Take a state of affairs whose World, in the sense of our articulatory mechanism, is the "Mainstream" and whose expression has obtained a relation which was labeled the "Music Industry," representing the mainstream’s system of categorizing music and cultural production. Its encounter with a punk frame of reference whose relation was independent of that industry, namely “Counter-Culture” as it is not yet the genre "Punk," yields the following: a mainstream music industry overdetermines the DIY practices of Punk, while the industrial relation overdetermines the ethos of Counter-Culture. Subsequently, the mainstream state of affairs is able to appropriate the DIY practices of Counter-Culture in order to produce value, and its industry is able to utilize a Counter-Cultural ethos so as to bring these products to market, thereby incorporating Counter-Cultural expression in the act of its own subordination. Finally, the genre “Punk” was coined within the mainstream overdetermination of Counter-Cultural expression and the Music industry at large was able to subsume this Punk world into a system which produced value for those who owned that industry.
Although the identity of blackness as “Counter-Culture” and Punk were overdetermined, DIY practices were able to maintain a continuity outside of the stipulated mainstream. This “continuity” outside of identity within reference frames represents the subjectivity of that individual or movement. Punk within the extension of a Mainstream function and incorporated as an object of that function, is revealed to merely be a name from an external context placed over a punk ethos that context did not have access to. Therefore, the mainstream still could not participate in the totality of this ethos as its form of life was ambiguous and undefined within the dominant reference frame because punk’s vocabulary was outside of the terms defining that mainstream culture to date. Punk and Black subjectivity were able to take the finite materials present within the state of affairs, rearticulate their arrangement, and generate oppositional forms of expression outside of the strict dominance of Mainstream culture; expressions appropriate to context but not caused by it. There was an inherent ambiguity in translating DIY practices, which at their core were not amenable to mass industry practices, so to incorporate them in a Music Industry which could only equate the labeling of those practices with other mass media forms as they had no access to the practices utilized in actually forming those expressions in the first place. 

Through Articulation Theory, it is now possible differentiate between punk as ethos and Punk as genre or categorial class: a (p)unk as someone of a particular ethos p; or the Genre or category as there is some function of an individual x such that x is categorized as (P)unk, where P is a description within some system of categorization. An individual categorized in such a way that obtains or is the subject of the function indicated by membership in that category, is made identical with the name of that category, \( x = P \), which becomes a universal quantification for all individuals that obtain P, referred to above as a frame of reference. However, an issue automatically arises as \( x = x \) but P has no object of which it is a function, it is an open, i.e. incomplete, sentence. The former description of an ethos, \( p = p \), says nothing but is the basis for any description at all, as the category P is truly the function \( P(?) \) which is incomplete. The failure of Identity. Naming is, therefore, an act of identification, and is inherently ambiguous. If an individual does not obtain a description, role, or function indicative of its identity thus named within a particular frame of reference, it is seen as insignificant, or nonexistent, within that frame. It is not “insignificant” in and of itself as it retains the capacity to express an identity not legible to this frame but may be so in others. A description—a proper name or definition—is only made identical with another description within a reference frame and an incomplete function, a sentence with no subject, does little to ascertain the individual being described, amounting to a definition which defines itself or a name being used in its own definition.

To show how the materials articulating this form of life were gathered and put to use so as to articulate a subject unknown to strict cultural dominance, we take Baraka’s notion of performance as a book and, therefore, music as a text and apply it to the ‘zine culture of punk. These ‘zines represent
the concept of the singing book. *Sniffin' Glue* was a U.K based ‘zine that started in 1976. In the first issue, the editors decided to publish three chords that became emblematic of a Punk sound. The chords published came with the demand, "This is a chord . . . This is another . . . This is a third . . . Now form a band!" The chords published in *Sniffin’ Glue* were later re-published in ‘zines like *Sideburns*, which cited the three-chord structure that LeRoi Jones previously called the kernel to Black modes of expression in the blues. The distinctive feature of this singing book was the guitar chords printed on its pages and, in particular, the chord progression described. Printing these chords illustrated the rearticulation of blues into this iteration of a punk form appropriate to a state of affairs that sought to push blackness out of its frame of reference. It demonstrated the ability to change those parameters through the music itself. A state within a state, the chords published were indicative of a subject's sonic capacity for thought utilizing a finite lexicon provided by Mainstream culture so as to generating a different form of that and life.

The chords recorded in this *Sniffin' Glue* issue display chords above the imperative "now form a band." The surface structure of this proposition was left without punctuation. Lack of punctuation attests that these were not instructions dictating bands to be made in accordance with some rule with the expectation that their products would be identical with each other. Emphasis was placed on the form(ation) of a band, the creative capacity and form of life evidenced by the various outputs of this function across contexts. The drawing displays chords without an agent—most likely to highlight finger position—which leaves it ambiguous as to which strings are muted or left open. The ambiguity or non-determinacy of the imperative clause, "now form a band," with no recourse to a punctuating period or exclamation, as well as the chords themselves, illustrate that these forms were functions
awaiting arguments, i.e. individuals, to put this progression to use. Any individual could utilize these forms to articulate their own subjectivity as a band through a punk ethos. The syntactic structure of the form these three chords compose signifies no one thing but that these are just chords one can play to form a band. And, yet, these use of these chords articulate the possibility outside of mainstream dominance.

Punk, then, becomes a recursive operation and a method of generating expressions by putting sonic objects together in a particular way indicating a specific form of life. Power chords are made through the introduction of arguments to these open chordal functions generating a variety of solutions (bands or songs) by virtue of the operation of the functions/open-chords A, E, and G. By muting the other strings when striking these chords, in effect, we still "play" those tones which reside in the deep structure of the sound expressed but do not appear in the surface structure of the song. Even though the strings held down while playing the chord A do not "ring out," the encounter of tones on all strings generate a "fifth" tonal interval during their interaction with the dominant tones of that encounter. This is in addition to the chord that is to be identified as "A." The unheard tones are still there, and must be so, in order to articulate this one particular sound. The additional fifth interval (argument) utilized through the open chord (function) expresses the power chord. By this, punk is proven to be an unfinished project that is to continue providing multiple ways of articulating its subjectivity despite finite means.

Illustrating this chordal encounter entails a reality in which there is the possibility to change states of affairs. In other words, a consequence of the use of this technique engenders a change in the way that the constituents of the context in which they are played gather. The operation detailed above did so in music and culture. The fifth interval checks the legitimacy of the imposition of a "finishing" argument to complete the genre of which these bands or songs are supposedly members. As the remaining chords are muted there is no telling which one string produced the fifth which opens up possibility outside of the tone or individual identified as part of a group.

An example of this is cited by Evan Rapport in which the I-IV-V chord structure lends itself to experimentation and amateurism. The open structure of the chords utilized in the progression above provides the basis for the riff and the one chord vamp. Rapport shows how these forms were developed within the improvisation and syncopation in the blues and jazz by performers oscillating between chords I and IV. Rapport states, "Riffs [or the V chord inserted at various nodes in the syntax generating the sonic thought] and I-IV oscillations imply such a strong harmonic foundation [the vamp] that virtually any sound or noise can be made to fit, without the improviser concerning him or herself with adjusting to harmonic movement." This made for infinite use of a finite set of sonic objects allowing for the introduction of noise or distortion as an element to be utilized in the
articulation of sonic thoughts. The possibility opened up by I-IV oscillation and the use of noise allowed for the development of musical forms both within and outside of presupposed rhythmic and melodic time signatures as well as their predefined harmonic functions.

The power chord is comprised of a root note with the addition of a fifth interval. It was introduced to the blues through the newly electrified guitar in 1942 by Memphis Minnie in Chicago. Howlin’ Wolf and other blues musicians would keep the practice alive through to the formation of Punk. Most notably, James Brown utilized this particular chord progression in order to transform the blues repertoire latent in Rock and Roll and Rhythm and Blues form. Brown’s chord progressions can be seen to connect early expressions of these forms to punk via the one-chord vamp and riff in the song “There was a Time.” This connection is found from Brown, through the Stooges, to The Velvet Underground, and will be further analyzed in our Electric Church chapter. The addition of the fifth is evidence of the rearticulating capacity to Black modes of expression. The kernel phrase of black musical expression, $$\text{IV}$$, noted by James Weldon Johnson and formalized in our previous chapter as [1 Ø 1 1 1], is amenable to this transformation in the redoubling of this pattern with the addition of the fifth on the first object in this series. The emphasized first note, $$\text{IV}$$, and the first 1 with regard to our inner logic to the syntactic structure of that expression induces the speeding up of play—see chapter one, section two. The use of an additional fifth to generate a power chord leads to ambiguity and an aberrant or dissonant tonal quality. This is what Jones defined as the “blueing” of notes as there is no representative notation possible that expresses the logical form and syntax of the effect of this transformation and, yet the sound articulated is present within the repertoire of musical expression. Blueing automatically brings to the fore that the namesake of this form of expression, the “Blues,” is not founded upon its categorization within the realm of Music, but is an act or process. The blues is a way of playing music which for LeRoi Jones is a form of life—the expression of a people. This practice resists overdetermination, what Jones called “harmonizing” with elements outside of the range of the song to be characterized within a prescribed harmony, melody, or notation.

Linguistically, this transformation of the inner logic that implicitly defines the chord qua the syntactic structure of its expression is called an appositive, a phrase which modifies another phrase. The appositive, musically and for the singing book, is a trend of thought that checks and sets legitimacy conditions for institutions, prescribed notation, or the concepts of Harmony, Melody, or Musical categorization. The addition of a fifth to a major chord articulates discord and cannot be identified within a dominant frame of reference. Within the technical notation of Music, if the major chord harmonizes according to the grammar of that notation, the notation overdetermines the sound meant to be produced by that chord. One knows what to expect upon reading a set of notes, what it should sound like for implicit in the notation is a particular frame of reference. The fifth resists
overdetermination and leads to an errancy of tone. The addition of the fifth to the chord reveals a deep structure that is evidence of the subject's putting these sonic elements to use, articulating a self outside of an existing regime of Identity within and made legible to a Musical as well as racialized frame.

Although the fifth is in addition to a major chord, it creates an open structure that can be handed down throughout the course of a song and between performances or bands as an additional tool articulating the subjectivity of the performer and the form of life this capacity entails. Chords on their own must be used in an additive fashion so as to articulate a complete thought. The blues played fast needs fewer chords to convey a more complex thought. Faster play increases the indeterminacy of reference to a predetermined category, for if more tones are experienced throughout a performance the ability to discern between them does not increase even if the same chord is continuously repeated. It also expands the output of the generative capacity to produce meaningful expressions, for the more accurately we categorize each chord played, the less precisely we are able to conceive of the limits, the extension, of the wall of sound being produced.

The former correlation between indeterminacy and generative capacity is an example of a restrictive or clarifying appositive, the latter is an example of the additive case. A single power chord evinces a subject that can be identified in multiple ways. Blueing notes generates an appositive—invisible to the surface grammar of the state, yet syntactically valid with regards to its logical form—that leads to a clarity of the capacity to create thought without confining and defining the individual producing it to some external measure of musicality. Literally taken up in the prose of many ‘zines, the multiplicity of modes of identification challenges the external categorization of singular subjects rendered articulate within that reference frame. Singular chords must be amenable to notation and genre, and thus are merely predicative of a subject bound within a reference frame. This yields the control of expressions of subjectivity in accordance with a dominant grammar imposed upon the form of articulation, which in turn leads to the mistranslation of the subject’s creating thought for the sake of a valued Identity. Ultimately, this process is the mainstream industry of musical review and literary practice that Jones railed against.

The test of whether a song stays together or falls apart is represented by the additional fifth applied to a major chord. This model reveals that in the deep structure of that sonic expression, the additional fifth is considered a transformation that yields an open structure, highlighting the generative capacity of the subject by its blueing notes. The fifth yields a sound which is incomplete within the genre of Music, allowing for a finite set of elements to be utilized when forming expressions in multiplicitous ways—even though, in a Blues or Punk context, a song consists only of one to three chords. In a closed structure, one which harmonizes with the dominant reference frame, a major chord and thus the subject utilizing those notes is overdetermined.
This same technique was utilized in ‘zine culture and was brought to the fore with the three chords presented as sonic text in Sniffin’ Glue. If we are to suppose that music and language are related by a faculty indicative of an inner logic and syntax, the visual equivalent to a major chord would be a vowel—see our first chapter, section two. For major chords consist of a triadic relation within a field of pitch measured by taking a root note or interval in addition to a third that constitute its deep structure within that form that is then augmented by a fifth interval which colors its surfacing expression. The triad that we have been working with consists of a syntactic-structure with a logical form constituting its root or core and a phonetic form which augments or maps onto that structure. Vowels in the process of articulation represent a core modified by consonants so as to express “words.” However, vowels outside of an alphabetic notation are not defined by terms external to their use. They are implicitly defined within an alphabet by their relation to those elements that surround them within the extension of that phonetic domain. Very few words are completely made up of what are indexically labeled as “consonants” or “vowels,” but the triad of vowel, consonant, and inflection or the way in which the “word” is expressed produces an object experienced as a “verbal” product of language. The specific use of language in ‘zine culture through a punk ethos is what makes these books sing. The individual expressed through a mode of creating thought sonically, the subject as a book in the sense of Jones, generates a "book" that actually “sings” when read or used, its form of life. Sniffin’ Glue becomes a call and rationale to doing violence to the grammar of the surface organization of a state of affairs, constructed and constituted by a mainstream or dominant form to being legible to the powers that be—to a Music, Media or Political industry.

In the above analysis, a question arises as to why the blues and, therefore, the Black core to punk, has not been recognized within a U.S. cultural endowment. The U.S. system of value is based on racial categorization. The axiom of identity within that is based on hyphenation: the incorporation of a cultural endowment from one context for use in this one to substantiate that frame of reference. In the following chapter, blackness’ identification was made equivalent with Counter-Culture through the Huntington Report and Justice Powell’s Memorandum. In those documents, blackness' expressions were determined dangerous to the U.S. state of affairs and, both from within blackness and from White overdetermination, were pushed out of the reference frame of a U.S. mainstream system of value(s). If a group’s form of life or mode expression is not easily translated and incorporated into the expressions of a U.S. state of affairs, for example, the rerecording Black musician’s songs by White artists under the banner of “American Music,” that group’s existence was called into question or erased. As hyphenated identity is indicative of a White frame of reference assumed as the base of what is nominally "American," "White"-ness would not accept blackness’ expression of subjectivity unless transposed into another frame of reference. Blackness would have to be reduced to the language in which that frame was expressed and imported back into this state of affairs. The same as
one could be "German"-American, so too could one translate a cultural endowment in order to substantiate a power position within the U.S. We see this culturally in forms such as "Kraut"-Rock, a description or function equated with another. But what and where the objects of (K)raut (R)ock or (G)erman (A)merican, where K(. . .)=R(. . .) and G(. . .)=A(. . .) remains ambiguous. Rock as a musical genre has its basis in the Blues, and therefore the expression of black subjectivity, exported from the U.S. Thus, in the expression of a Rock form from Germany or the U.K., blackness is self-referential, which automatically places the parameters of the surface organization of society purported as White overdetermination over others in jeopardy. White overdetermination becomes internally paradoxical for what it cites as the basis for its assertions within a reference frame which makes it dominant is founded on exactly what it says is inferior or cannot exist.

An example of this can be illustrated by Malcolm McLaren's visits to the U.S. and Paris around 1973 in order to build out a New York base for his London shop SEX. For all intents and purposes, we have three states of affairs, with different frames of reference, from which expressions and their objects are taken up from one for use in another. SEX was to propose an alternative form of life by virtue of the clothing made by McLaren's then partner Vivienne Westwood back in London. After his visits, McLaren brought back the punk ethos to the U.K., which was then exported out to the world through Sniffin' Glue and the like in 1976, forming a world in which the Sex Pistol's first album in 1977 obtained a function that made sense culturally and economically. We can formulate this course of events as we recall that the term "punk," was taken from the U.S. scene and was first used in Lenny Kaye’s 1965 liner notes to The Nuggets! album. McLaren did not like the term and wanted his movement with the Pistols to be called "New Wave" so to make a distinction between the U.S. and the U.K. scenes, but stuck with the Punk label as its use gained currency across these two contexts. The cross context use value of the term reveals that the function of the token become genre of Punk took certain bands as an argument so as to provide solutions for economic gain within the Music and Cultural industries. New Wave was nominally adopted in what was mistaken as the post-Punk movement. Punk was, therefore, founded within a system of value that incorporated the expressions of one context for use in another. It is in this way that the Black core to the genre was discounted for the sake of economic gain and the preservation of White cultural hegemony in the U.S.

This encounter shows punk as a movement can be formalized in our mechanism of articulation if we take the two contexts of the U.K. and the U.S. as the state of affairs whose encounter articulated the genre of Punk. The U.K. scene set individuals named “Punk,” which McLaren wanted to call “New Wave,” in a market or Music industry relation, for McLaren saw punk’s cultural expression more so as promotion for his store SEX. In the U.S., the individuals who produced a musical form whose basis was strictly "American," viz. the blues, were named “Negro” or “Black.” Black’s relation within that state of affairs was posited as Counter-Culture, here handled as a punk ethos by virtue of the blues.
The most interesting result of this encounter is the overdetermination of a punk/blues ethos by McLaren naming it “Punk.” Secondly, the market relation of this Punk genre overdetermines the expression of Blacks in the U.S. denied access to, or representation within, the system of value represented in the Music industry. Ultimately, the overdetermination of the expression of blackness for use in another context is the incorporation through dispossession of a cultural endowment that will be explored in fuller detail in our chapter on Rearticulation. 195

Formally, if we move our focus to within the U.S. state of affairs to look on the one hand at a U.K. Punk individual whose relation within that state of affairs is Counter-Culture, we see how punk was translated within a U.S. context and harmonized with the Music industry. On the other hand, we look at Rock as a categorization whose relation now obtains a mainstream function. The surface organization to the U.S. social-cultural matrix cannot accept a Black Punk, since blackness has been identified as Not. Nothing + Punk = Punk, Punk already having been made identical with “White”-ness because that reference frame required a form of expression to substantiate it. Thus, the rearticulation of this encounter yields a U.K. Punk overdetermination by the mainstream industry. U.K. Punk and Rock now become constituents of the mainstream within the U.S. The reverse can also be true. The identification of an individual’s relation to the constituents of that state of affairs as Counter-Culture overdetermines Rock. We know that this is not the case as one can substantiate this contradiction through correspondence within the historic record and recorded music. 196 However, this possibility elucidates the internal contradictions within overdetermination itself through this rearticulation model.

It is possible to derive from this illustration why a U.S. frame of reference did not hear Punk as the Blues. 197 If Black expression was a language incomprehensible to White frames of reference, then either Black identity had to express itself in the language that overdetermined it, or it had to remain silent. Otherwise, the expression of nonsense would enter the state of affairs and trigger confusion in the process of overdetermination through the act of identification. This confusion was beneficial to blackness, as it rearticulated states of affairs and actively brought blackness’s expressions into the lexicon. “Black”-ness becomes a function of Punk producing various identities non-determinate within the reference frame. As for the silence, the identification of blackness with Not did not erase Black subjectivity. Linguistically, possessing a syntactic structure and logical form, and nonsense having a sense just not of this reference frame, does not necessarily have to have an apparent surface level or phonetic representation but forms the deep structure of the language in which the state of affairs is expressed overall. 198 This formulation highlights that expression is a mode of creating thought, hence subjectivity, and not necessarily communication or becoming legible to the imposition of a mainstream grammar and system of classification. Blackness’ function, therefore, can attend to and change structures without having to trifle over surface appearance. There are many structures to a
form of life that one can think up which have a logical sense, but cannot be expressed. The capacity to change structure, the syntax, of states of affairs marks that superficial political identity is less the point; structural inequities are.

Rearticulation is important here: the encounter detailed above yielded a genre, was then rearticulated into a legible form for commercial consumption, exported by the U.K., then incorporated within a U.S. system under the name of Punk. This process is much like the hyphenation of one’s identity to incorporate a cultural endowment from one context or nation for use in another. The process encapsulates, although in a very truncated fashion for the sake of illustrating the articulation mechanism in the context of this study, that a disavowed blackness is at the core of the musical and literary articulation of the mainstream. Blackness is cemented as both a part of the subjective continuity of this musical form, but apart from the frame of reference in which its presence was determined insignificant.

Identification is arbitrarily, overdetermination is structurally, stipulated on the basis of effect and productive use within a dominant system of value. Their references are ambiguous but have an effect and, therefore, consequences that are real. They are the result of a definite process, whose imposition does not exhaust Black subjectivity. Blackness retains the capacity to rearticulate the state of affairs itself, and undo the grammatical positioning of its identity within a state of affairs to incorporate it in the mechanism of its own subjugation because overdetermination references ambiguous objects. Since identification is contradictory across contexts, a White frame of reference remains at best ambiguous and, more likely, vacuous without blackness. Thus, within any expression of the cultural endowment of the U.S., blackness forms the basis for that expression, even if determined as outside of the mainstream U.S. reference frame as absolutely nothing.

The subjectivity of Black folk within the U.S. was not exhausted through acts of overdetermination, the punk/blues ethos continued. This is emblematic of two individuals both sonic and literary: Jennifer Jazz, and the ‘zine Gunk by Ramdasha Bikceem. Jennifer Jazz’s contribution is important for her work connects the Black Arts Movement in Harlem to the downtown New York punk scene. She also serves to connect LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka to the movement as well. Bikceem’s contribution was from within the punk movement through Riot Grrrl and is important to this study because her critique from within the movement itself revealed that by discounting the Black core to the music and movement, not only to punk but to feminism as well, that the inner logic of the movement overall falls apart. Bikceem allows us to draw the connection between the music and the syntax qua mode of expressing social movements, thus, providing a clear case in which to apply our articulatory method towards the analysis of Black subjectivity through a punk ethos.
The Hurston-Baraka endowment was ultimately handed down to Jennifer Jazz, who in turn brought it back downtown and became a fixture in the thriving Punk scene of the Village—just a few years after Jones/Baraka’s exit. Jazz illustrates blackness's ability to cite itself in both her writing and the music she made as a member of the punk band Guerrilla Girls. It was at this time that the shortcomings of the Black Arts Movement—namely, the nationalistic tendency and populism of Baraka—were able to be circumvented. The creation of a “living text” which disseminates the punk ethos developed through blackness’s modes of expression were able to challenge overdetermination. ‘Zine culture and a DIY ethos embodies these sonic and literary texts’ forms of life. Protest became intimately linked with the articulation of a punk subject. Marches are effective in affirming one’s political stance amongst others who feel the same way, but the relation an individual obtains within a state of affairs, indicative of a dominant frame of reference placed over their being in that world, remains the same. The focus of protests through this alternative network of being-with, the ethos to a punk form of life, were reoriented back to the creative capacity of the subject in lieu of how they were identified so as to rearticulate that relation and change the structural organization of the state of affairs. This was done in order to not merely change how that subject was named.

Born in 1960 in the South Bronx, Jazz would be affected by and participate in the environment produced by the Black Arts Movement ethos during her childhood. After her participation with BAM uptown and migrating downtown after dropping out of Swarthmore College in 1978, Jazz would produce two plays entitled A Table by the Window and I Heard About Your Cat while being an active member of the punk scene in New York of that time. The covers to these plays would utilize the same cut and paste aesthetic developed prior to her move downtown. Jazz’s plays would show at St. Mark’s Playhouse—the same theater Baraka had shown his plays Dutchman and The Slave—through the Negro Ensemble Company, which formed in 1967 and refused to have blackness confined or solely identified with Harlem. Her plays would return to Harlem in 1986, being produced by the National Black Theater. The National Black Theater, formed in 1968, continued the BAM ethos in Harlem after Baraka left for Newark with his Young Spirit House Movers to focus more on spoken word.

By 1979, Jazz was downtown in a culture she said was “heavily informed, even legitimized by its connections to the Black and Latin street.” 201 The punk derivation from the blues and jazz, as theorized by Baraka, was evident in the mix of jazz and punk musicians reported by Jennifer Jazz in the same venues. “[T]he downtown streets were an experimental paradise for blacks too ‘out’ for the hood. . . .” who were found at Max’s Kansas City, Tier Three, The Mudd Club, and more. The mistranslation of a Black presence in those scenes as nonexistent is evidence of the incomprehensibility of blackness within a White reference frame. Jennifer Jazz would cite Michael Holman’s, part of the Black punk band Gray whose members included Jean-Michel Basquiat, disapproval of the inaccurate portrayal of blackness in those scenes. An example would be that of
Neon Leon, a Black punk star of the time, in mainstream films such as *Sid and Nancy*. The 1976 documentary *Blank Generation* begs the question as well: how can something “blank” articulate anything; which was quickly answered by the blank Black presence in the film, who were in the same breath affirmed as integral to that scene. This contradiction is plainly seen in that the documentary’s name comes from the 1976/77 song “Blank Generation” by the band Richard Hell and the Voidoids who included a Black founding member, Ivan Julian. According to Jazz, Punk as derived from blackness showed a subjective continuity outside of that Mainstream mistranslation. Basquiat channeled Charlie Parker in his performances, not some referent from the U.K. or one dictated by a White dominant frame of reference external to the form of life of blackness’ mode of expression through punk. Michael Holman would confirm in Jazz’s essay that, “Jean-Michel swinging his axe through the streets of Downtown 81 [a film documenting the downtown New York punk scene from 1980-81 written by Glenn O’Brien and directed by Edo Bertoglio] is Jean channeling Charlie Parker.”

Blackness citing Black identities, rearticulation viz. citing the process of articulation itself, Jazz would chronicle in her writing and recollections of the late ’70s into the ’80s that blackness, through punk, was mistranslated as assimilation into a White frame of reference. This mistranslation ultimately led to internal contradictions within the parameters of that frame as the incentive of keeping blackness out was culturally beneficial to a White mainstream. Jazz currently writes an internet based zine *Offline*.

Jennifer Jazz writes in a way which generates an open architecture whose design was picked up by the likes of Ramdasha Bikceem, a member of the Punk feminist movement Riot Grrrl through the band Gunk. Bikceem would also start a ‘zine of the same name. Beginning in 1990, *Gunk* the ‘zine, developed an acute manifesto that centered on rearticulating the violence of a grammatical imposition concerning the correctness qua validity of the expressions of those overdetermined within a White and patriarchal reference frame. By the fourth issue of *Gunk*, a picture of Bikceem as a child appeared on the cover with the cut and paste aesthetic developed earlier by LeRoi Jones in *Yugen* and *Kulchur*. (Figure 9) The title stated: “Have you seen me? What Degenerate Created this Abortion?” (Figure 10)

As the signifying practices of blackness had become integrated into self—utilizing the terminology of its environment in its own way indicative of a syntax separate from dominant modes of expression—blackness was revealed as a tautology. The concept of “integration into self” was developed in Richard Wright's *White Man, Listen!*, particularly his chapter on "The Literature of the Negro in the United States." Due to slavery, Blackness in the U.S. articulated a self without a direct reference to any one "root.” The reference was a set of conditions with no sole object, demonstrating the capacity of infinite use of finite means. This forced its form of expression as an entity to be, "... integrated with their own culture. ...” which became the formulation of an alternative reference frame outside of White dominance. For blackness within a state of affairs whose parameters were set by a logic external to their form of life, "... the development of Negro expression as well as the whole of Negro
life in America hovers always somewhere between . . . entity [subjectivity] vs. identity [within a
White-dominant system of categorization] . . .” One to one correlation with regard to identity via the
location of one’s roots leads to many issues. Analogous to the problem we studied regarding a term’s
ambiguity in reference, a single term can refer to various "objects" and the vagueness of identity
statements as there are many ways of saying the same thing in our study of the structure of language.
Without a one to one reference to a "root," blackness' mode of expression developed in such a way
that resembles branches. The relation between term and use, not term and definition or object is key.
The function of the terms of a vocabulary expresses the thought not how these "terms" are predefined
within the reference frame of a dominant grammar and state. These branches or alternative uses were
to span both the dominant reference frame of the U.S. and reach outside those conditions to
alternative frames and the other forms of life of which blackness is a part. Black entities, then, are
both a part of the overall state of affairs and can exist apart from the imposition of a dominant
reference frame. Blackness as an entity exhausts national identity and racial categorization to the
benefit of the dominant frame.

In a sub-section entitled, "The Zone of Silence," Wright would state that, "[o]nly a complete reversal
of the economic and political situation can give him [blackness] back his birthright, can enable him to
speak, to allow him to grasp a language, a vocabulary, that he can feel his own." Black entities were
to develop their own vocabulary that "branched" out in ways that expressed a people who fought
against the incorporation through dispossession of their modes of expression and the value created in
the daily operations of their form of life within that dominant frame. Wright called this an, " . .
.imaginary, entity culture . . .," highlighting the creative capacity and expressive faculty of the subject;
one that was against, " . . .identity, men who are at odds with their culture, striving for personal
identification," within that dominant frame’s working towards their subordination. We see this
through our example above as Basquiat would cite Charlie Parker for his articulation of a punk sound
through his band Gray. Outside of an identity that strove for personal identification within an other’s
reference frame, Bikceem's challenge issues a modernist criticality. Modernism here is taken from
Richard Wright’s definition of blackness as an entity of itself, which here becomes the ability to cite
one’s own cultural endowment. For the function and the predicate of “death” expresses an operation
of negation, not the negation of its object blackness.202

Bikceem’s title was a statement from the other side of cultural death, the dead man Baraka stated in
Yugen years prior, which blackness parented and yet retained the ability to produce other progeny.
Utilizing a tautologous proposition from that which is Not to form a proposition asserted blackness’
existence even if denied.203 By evoking a creator through the posing of a question, the proposition
highlights that a White reference frame which can be utilized both from within and outside of
blackness, Black identity as a token of respectability or White supremacy setting the referent of
blackness to cultural death, is revealed as an imposition. A universal categorization of blackness through identification as "absolutely nothing" or an "abortion" reveals the frame of reference itself and the imposition of identity over the subjectivity of those individuals within that state of affairs.

In an excerpt titled "Amerikkkan Gurl," Bikceem discusses a job she took over from her sister in which she was to clean an elderly woman's home. She speaks of a particular encounter with this elderly White woman who questions her being "American." To the question, "why don't you dress like an American Girl'? . . " Bikceem details her reaction as one of, "a wave of 'I know this was coming ' came [sic] over me & I replied, 'I am an American girl.' As soon as I said that she immediately started going into hysterics about how I wasn't an American girl & how I just better get out of her house that instant or else she'd call her Son." "Dress" becomes a code or identity function, as Ramdasha does not dress as though or within the parameters set by the function of "American"-ness, therefore, she must not be American. An image of a younger lady is placed in the middle of the printed story in cut and paste fashion holding a cup upon which Bikceem writes "100% White" as a nod to the historical implication to the behavior of her older patron. The image she uses shows that a particular frame of reference has been constructed in which certain features are indicative of membership within categories conducive to the upkeep of a particular system of value(s). Once instituted it must be protected. The lady's son represents how the maintenance of this system is immaterial yet objective. The "Son" or "White"-ness is not there but can be evoked in order to sustain the particular arrangement and system of value within this state of affairs. From this, we reason that there are also features that exempt individuals from this critique, however, those who are exempt require the maintenance of the status quo. This is to be identified with the individual who benefits from the setup of this frame, distinct from those who are to work within it. Bikceem, after making herself comfortable on the lady's chair, replies: "'Listen I came here to clean your shitty toilets & get paid not to get a lesson on how to be American . . . '" Within a punk 'zine, this encounter mirrors the other stories Bikceem writes of the purposeful relegation of Black presence in Riot Grrrl maintaining the movement's system of value to the benefit of a Feminism which became "100% White."

The movement from one context for use in another does not have to be one of incorporation through dispossession but can be generational as well. Through the function of their depiction of the woman’s "Son," Ramdasha cites a cultural endowment in which Jones/Baraka worked. In so doing, Bikceem created an explicit connection between the lyrics in her "book" and the set of signifying practices and mode of expression whose continuity was undergirded by the inner logic in the articulation of Black subjectivity. Logically, the handing down of lore as expressed through Hurston's syntactic description of Negro expression can be conceived as an at minimum two-place relation in which a prior lineage of individuals is said to be the set of "ancestors." These forbearers are the converse of the current subset of this cultural endowment. By converse is meant the product of a particular lineage in which any one
arrangement of conditions and their constituents can be said to precede this individual—in our case, Ramdasha Bikceem—in such a way that provides the basis in which that individual obtains a particular endowment of signifying practices. The arrangement of this particular set of forbearers forms the set of conditions that make it possible for the articulations of the individual at present. This relation is generational as well as transitively and reflexively communicable. Even if one does not "know" the full lineage or "roots" from which they came, the group of individuals providing the conditions for the expression of the descendant citing this prior form of life can be said to be logically ancestral. As the descendant cites this endowment, the relation obtained is asymmetric as those continuants of this lineage are not mirrors of their forbearers but further the endowments articulation. The conjunction of these transitive, reflexive, and asymmetric relation within the subjective continuity of the endowment or repertoire of signifying practices establish the branching relation a descendant has within this particular lineage that Hurston develops in Their Eyes Were Watching God. Bikceem is not a mirror of a Hurston-Baraka endowment but within a cultural endowment of blackness continues the formation of its subjective continuity.204

Continued from a theme in Yugen into his collection of poems Black Magic, Baraka spoke of a dead son coming home to have sex with his mother. The son fathers dead children. For Baraka, this represented a White reference frame being reproduced to sustain relations of dominance and subordination over others, hence the father-son dynamic. As far as the stipulations of this form of life are static identities, the frame is dead. In so far as this framework is transcendent to the world, for the son must come home, the frame is immaterial but objective as it sets an identity for others to the benefit of the mother of the household. Systems of oppression are iterative as represented by the mother and reproduce, the substitution of Black's into the system, writing law, or destroying one member of the family, does not erase the set of relations it puts into place. The son has children by his own mother, the result of this aforementioned process is that the children must also be dead.

For Bikceem, the White son—who's authority is a part of while remaining apart, external to or absent from the scene—comes back home to substantiate and re-enforce the organization to that state of affairs. The son's objective is, if and when called upon, to make it so that Bikceem's work is conducive to the upkeep of the mother's home. The son—like racism, misogyny, patriarchy, etc.—troubles the relation obtained between Bikceem and the older White lady who enacts the maintenance of that frame. The dead man's children from the lyrics of Baraka's poem return to haunt the present. Racism is embedded in the expression of our current state of affairs through the progeny of the dead man identified by Baraka, understood by Bikceem. The absentee White father either represents a White frame of reference that is immaterial and yet has a clear objective expressed through his son who, according to Baraka, is also the father. The parents as the authors of this frame call on the son's authority to protect the household. "White"-ness calls on its progeny to protect the status quo by any
means for any identified position becomes property to those who seek to extract value from this particular arrangement. Through the concept of cultural endowment, we have an explicit connection, like branches, between Hurston-Baraka’s endowment and Bikceem.

It also connects her literary critique to Punk music. Riot Grrrl disavows the blackness at the core of the movement and Punk but allows Black identity and certain features to work for the progression of this overdetermined critique of White Male Patriarchal dominance. Bikceem writes, “I guess it means that punx, like African Americans often reflect what alot of people don’t want to see. They don’t want to see the result of their oppressive society. Punx are revolting against a society that has repressed personal expression, which has intern [sic] resulted in the way of alot of them (us???) . . . act. . . But, what this concept of "white nigger" fails to realize is that white punx couldn't possibly come close to the stigma that is attached and associated with African-Americans." (Figure 4—notice the link between the drawings in Fire!! and the self-portrait rearticulated picturing the deconstruction of an identification as happy, laughing, within a system of oppression and revealing its ugly contradictions in Bikceem’s image) Bikceem’s outsider-within stance illustrates that Black identity as "African-American" and from the stance of White superiority is overdetermined and set within a system of oppression which is demonstrated by blackness' being Not of that White reference frame, in other words, "not American.” However, "White"-ness requires “Black”-ness or that which is not in order to express any thing at all—the "white nigger." The ways and how blackness expresses itself—its syntax—is incorporated for use to generate value within a White frame of reference by virtue of dispossession. The move of a form of expression—hair style, piercings, music, collage, etc.—from one context for use in another substantiates a frame which would be nothing all the same without it. Within this state of affairs, American music is "American" because "Black" is not American; for "American" has been made identical/interchangeable with "White." (Figure 10) Bikceem's writing in Gunk, however, shows that blackness can reside outside of its overdetermined identity stipulated by "White"-ness as well as taken up as a token to protect by "African-American” respectability in this reference frame and retains the capacity to rearticulate these parameters from the inside with her writing and her music.  

Near the end of the fourth issue of Gunk, Bikceem announces her appositive reading of the state of affairs: "apathetic bastards—[I] see right through you." This check of legitimacy to the surface organization of the state of affairs illustrates Bikceem's challenges to Race, Gender, and Sex as social institutions. She lists facts and definitions of Black identity as well as those indicative of “White”-ness’ frame of reference particularly in the folk-lore and reports she produces throughout the issue. Through an array of language games viz. Hurston’s “dialects,” Bikceem distorts and rearticulates these definitions out of the dictionary on Black Identity in order to generate different meanings and highlight the internal contradictions to these Identity propositions. The act of naming is shown to be
violent on both ends and demarcates a place of contention. “What Degenerate Created this Abortion?”

By playing with the syntax of these definitions, Bikceem enters into an affinity with *Gunk’s* readership, creating a counter-mood in the dominant political discourse of Riot Grrrl overdetermined by the political-economy and mainstream culture of the U.S. In the end, she is able to espouse her own punk ethos checking the legitimacy and “seeing” right through these institutions.

The schemata Bikceem illustrates in *Gunk #4* were further developed as the zine progressed. It is in the next issue that she would state that the ‘zine had saved her life. Bikceem takes a stand against elitism in punk which centered around the imposition of a rigid definition of Authenticity. As punk becomes an iterative form, a role governed within the propositions of the market and thus a genre, it was deterred from its ethos and became a mold with which people became subjected. The impetus was to fit in to this predetermined, sanctioned, and therefore a measure of the Authentic that must be protected by any means. To “fit in” was and is antithetical to the conditions in which punk articulated itself. As punk and blackness do not neatly “fit in” to a system of categorization external to its form of life, what is and who is Black constantly questions the system of categorization organizing a state of affairs. The incorporation of Punk into the mainstream dispossessed those within that form of life a the reference frame whose development began in the late 1960s. An external measure of Authenticity which by definition is external to the subject and, therefore, is in-“authentic,” eschewed the internal contradictions that it would generate if punk means of expression were taken in, and put the products of the articulated forms to work to generate value to which no punk had access. Punk as a genre would expand once the "capital" in those previous fields were exhausted. More and more offshoots of Punk began to be utilized in the market and with sub-genre, after sub-genre was created, the punk ethos was pushed farther and farther away and outside of the label with which it was initially characterized.

By 1994, Bikceem conceived of this process of incorporation through dispossession as "brain dead revisited" and did not produce any more iterations of *Gunk*. However, the syntax structure, and inner logic of the Black punk girl passed on an open structure that could be utilized within blackness' expressions, appropriate to contexts but not caused by them. The final zine of Gunk was left incomplete providing a function for the continued tendency of thought to check the legitimacy of sexual, gendered, racial, and national institutions. The continuity of the subject was able to continue outside of regimes of identification. As the product of this subject’s form of life were incorporated into the expressions of a value system in a society that deemed its existence identical with "absolutely nothing," the subject expressed out of this repertoire of signifying practices remained outside of the overdetermined role placed on that identified position within that society. We see this with Bikceem’s last “book.” Her final ‘zine remains open, incomplete. In showing the textual evidence of a continuity from Hurston to Jones, the development of a set of signifying practices handed down from Baraka to
Jazz, and emergent in Bikceem, we form the basis for the kernel of expression utilized in and forming the lexicon of a Black punk form of life.
The development of Articulation theory was in response to a particular post-World War II reformulation of socio-cultural and political theory alongside post-structuralism. Our study takes Fredric Jameson’s “Periodizing the 60s” as our reference frame. The 60s period starts after World War I through the late 1970s, and was a time that marked a particular response to government and culture in the U.S. These conditions consisted of servicemen coming home after world war who challenged notions of citizenship and civility, the galvanization of the Civil Rights Movement of that period, and the development of an Anti-War movement in response to U.S. interventions in Vietnam/Laos/Cambodia during the 1960s-70s. A particular response was engineered to attend to these issues through the formation of a contemporary concept and particular brand of “governmentality” fostered by Samuel Huntington of the Tri-lateral commission, Justice Powell Jr. to the chamber of commerce—fathering our current notion of political conservatism—and the psycho-pathology of Black identity by Daniel Moynihan. How one understands the state of affairs and their participation in it was concretely inflected by this particular historical conjuncture shaping the field of governmental intervention into the forms of life constituting the U.S. The work of Jacques Lacan (psychology), Louis Althusser (philosophy), and Antonio Gramsci (political-economy) are situated within this particular historical moment and are key to the development of the concepts of articulation, overdetermination, and ideology.

We will first look at each of these theorists to see how these concepts became the conditions in which articulation theory emerged. Lacan’s analyses on ideology, economies of desire, and the mirror stage—the point at which the subject becomes an object or “I” in the world; one’s own “world” being overdetermined, or an entity identified as a part of another’s—has had a profound effect on Articulation theory. However, Lacan’s development of an object called rather than a procedure expressing the psychology of individuals leads to a preconscious determinism of subjectivity and calls into question not only agency but will. Lacan’s analysis tended towards holding the individual instead of the system to task when considering the reproduction of relations of dominance and subordination. Our study will forgo a determinism of identity within some behavioral system, or the determination of subjectivity by identity. Strict psychological analysis becomes a description of the after a/effects of
articulation. Its formulations are reactionary as it only accounts for identity, making it easy to discount the subject’s creative capacity.

In *Reading Capital*, Althusser accounts for the process of articulation without the "direction" determinations of subordination are coming from which makes for a strained applicability of his theory to current states of affairs. Non-directionality masks a universalizing concept’s attempt to reduce non-determinate possibilities within the scope of finite experience. It only focuses on the effects of overdetermination rather the structures producing them. This allows one to absolve themselves from their participation in what they are defining. We account for Althusser’s idea of contradictions producing overdetermined positions or roles in society by either incorporating them into its operations or displacing them to other contexts by treating movements as vectors. (See Appendix I) By the definition of vectors, movements and, therefore blackness, have magnitude and direction. The asymmetry of relations of power in our system has a syntax or method of construction, opposition to which is shown to be valid, non-random, and sustainable. Without a sense of the relationship between agency and subordination, there is no room to imagine the world otherwise. Ultimately, this induces a pessimism that may lead to nihilistic outlooks.

In his *Prison Notebooks*, Gramsci’s intervention into Marxist thought proves useful in that, for him, culture is fundamental to political objectives, not ancillary as was the case in Leninism. Culture as form of life becomes the base from which political objectives are articulated into conditions set by hegemony, which in our study represents the dominant reference frame imposed upon states of affairs from a context external to those affairs. “Articulated into . . .” indicates a process in which what Gramsci calls the “subaltern” are made legible to the superstructure of society. Gramsci’s concept of hegemony becomes a particular arrangement of roles in the surface organization of society where individuals are coerced into the project of furthering their own subordination. However, Gramsci’s concepts revolve around consent to dominant ideology, one’s coerced identification with a system that works against the consentee. Gramsci theorizes the necessity of an intellectual leadership from within Counter-Culture acting against hegemony, running the risk of trading one totality for another as moral and intellectual leadership connotes a measure to which that outside of dominance must aspire. Our use of the term “Counter-Culture” intends to emphasize going against the adherence to the strict identity of individuals within dominant structures (Counter-Culture) as opposed to further classifying those individuals within categories constitutive of that structure (Subculture). Gramsci’s formulation runs the danger of installing leaders as a managerial class for the dominant over the subordinated. Our analysis averts this by providing a map of hegemonic arrangements to subvert them while not stipulating an individual do it for us.

Although Stuart Hall describes the results of articulation, indicating a generative structure—which is why he requested a mechanism producing the conditions in which these formations obtain—he does
not pursue the development of that mechanism thereby presupposing it in his analyses. To ameliorate this requires the formal analysis developed in chapter one which will be situated in a particular set of historical conditions set by the reformulation of government intervention. To stretch the parameters demarcating the extent of traditional articulation methodology mapped above is to be able to account for Black identity as one of many expressions from the subjectivity of blackness. In doing so, we account for context formation alongside the forms articulated.

The conjuncture of these prior formulations of articulation provide the hinge from which we move into the particular historical conditions in which we apply our formal analysis of articulation towards the study of black subjectivity.

1960s Counter-Culture

In this chapter, the articulatory process will be discussed through an encounter between and the affinity obtained between Youth and Subculture and the subsequent incorporation of the Counter-Culture expressed into a mainstream. Incorporation into a dominant frame through dispossessing the cultural product of individuals from their original affinities through the extractive operation of the Mainstream illustrates the concept of governmentality that will be explored in this chapter. This movement indicates a structural apparatus towards dominance at that encounter. What I attempt here is not a record or sequential list of events, but to demonstrate, through our mechanism, the logical form and syntactic structure inherent to the popular formation of this culturally and socio-politically particular articulation of Punk. The subsequent mapping of a representative form or "historical" narrative in response to and as a consequence of this articulation renders certain aspects legible or illegible/non-existent within a dominant reference frame. This latter description is structural because of its organizational aspects. By conducting our analysis in this particular way, my hope is to show that even if rendered illegible, dangerous, or insignificant in the surface organization of society expressed through the mainstream, the deep "popular" structure of affinities persists as surface representations are not necessary to the subjective articulation of an individual. In accordance with the articulatory and syntactic theory developed in chapter one, we know that representation is only necessary to how the subject of that expression is identified. I hold that this is the case, even if overdetermined by the purported function of mainstream society.

With Langston Hughes’ 1942 report to the Chicago Defender paying witness to the electrification of the blues by singer and guitarist Memphis Minnie, Hughes concluded that “Negro heartbeats [had] mixed with iron and steel,” through the riffs of her guitar. This moment evinced a form which by 1969 sets the stage for Jimi Hendrix’s appearance on the Dick Cavett Show. The continuity (S-Structure) between Minnie (Phonetic Form) to Hendrix (PF) displayed through Hughes’ illustration.
Logical Form pronounced Black expression’s mode of being in the world as the Electric Church. In an interview with Ted Dahlin for Louder Than War, Kenny “Stinker” Gordon of one of the first, as well as all Black, Punk bands Pure Hell from Philadelphia, would describe the scene during the band’s formation in the late 60s through to their first shows in 1974:

”[O]ur music was a reflection of the violent 60’s, where Presidents and social civil leaders were murdered in public. A turn of tide technically and culturally was in full swing, exceeding to shape the 21st century. I was exposed to everything from the chitlins circuit (US live music club/venue circuit). . .

In response to a question regarding the supposed White Male music culture and history of the genre of Punk, Stinker would reply:

”We were around The New York Dolls in 1974 when Vivienne Westwood and Malcolm McLaren were assisting them, and Patti Smith and Television first played CBGB’s. All of them listened to Keith Richards, and Keith Richards listened to Chuck Berry! White working class and sorts of labels I think were tagged on as it [punk] grew.

From this we will draw the set of conditions—not necessarily a list of the events which occurred during that period—in which a Black punk ethos was articulated. From “Stinker” Gordon, we will show a subjective continuity through blues “chitlins circuit.” This continuity provided the deep structure within the kernel from which Punk was later articulated.

*

The Electric Church describes an ethos in the period known as the “60s.” This period expresses a continuity of thought marking a period longer than the decade itself. According to historians such as Frederic Jameson and the economist Ernest Mandel, this era began after WWII and ended with a concerted international management of a world economic crisis in 1974. By the 1970s, the language used by the social movements of that period to challenge dominant societal structures was reified and offered up for consumption in mainstream cultural discourse. In lieu of those movements being a function whose object changed the surface organization of society, they themselves became objects of a function of what Frederic Jameson called governmentality. Governmentality encapsulates a trend that started with post-WWII McCarthyism and coming to fruition through technological innovation and the Media industry.

The 60s period was identified by crises concerning social and political institutions in the U.S. and Europe. In the U.S., a countercultural movement, of which the Beat poets and Black Power movements are emblematic, began to take hold; offering alternative value systems and forms of life
outside and against societal and political institutions. In France, the New Left movement criticized regimes of power domestically and its assertions abroad. Central to this is the work of Amiri Baraka, then known as LeRoi Jones, conducted in the Village of lower Manhattan. The union of these affairs connects the Punk Movement to the conditions that birthed it, induced by the civic and cultural unrest of the late 1960s to early 1970s. The articulation of blackness will be explored as the subjective continuity that links the expression of social movements through to the punk movement.

We will consider this period by way of two levels of analysis: structural and ideological. The structural level is analyzed through the configuration of a descriptive, governmental, apparatus which attempted to channel the cultural production of that time to its benefit by organizing the surface articulation of society through media and legislative influence. This surface structure will be termed a grammar of cultural production, the function of cultural products is its object which, in turn, go on to express the concept of governmentality. The collection of these objects and their function represent a frame of reference in which the categorizations of certain segments of society gain their meaning by virtue of a definitive value system. The second, ideological level, represents the set of conditions in which this governmental apparatus emerged. This will be analyzed through an encounter between Youth and Subculture. Youth, as a segment of society, emerged out of the generation gap posited between those who were able to participate in the creation of this frame of reference and the ideological domain from which it was constructed. This gap between the generation who participated in WWII, their involvement in the shaping of institutions which yielded governmental influence, and their offspring born between 1946-64, constitute a massive expansion of the U.S. population now known as the baby boomers.

What I attempt in this chapter is not to record a list in sequential order of historical events so as to provide a dictionary or encyclopedia of what occurred. I hope to illustrate through the mechanism and method developed in our general theory of Articulation to show the logical form and syntax to the formation of this culturally and socio-politically specific articulation of blackness through punk. By doing so, I will be able to account for the subsequent mapping of a representational form onto this “deep structure” as a consequence and response to the expression of that punk subject rendering certain aspects of that expression legible or illegible within that reference frame—profitable or nonexistent because merely a product of chance. The purpose of denoting what the value of this form of life, its function, and the individuals which obtained and furthered punk’s operations, was to quell what was determined as dangerous to American sovereignty. This was considered in terms of political-economy due to the onset of a newly forged conception of governmentality concerned with the control of “the blacks” and their pronouncement of a Counter-Culture. The ideological level between Youth and Subculture is the former, representing its inner logic and expressive structure; the nominally structural, because of how it organizes states of affairs, is the latter. By conducting our
my hope is to show that even if rendered “illegible,” dangerous, nonexistent, or insignificant within what is considered the surface level expression of mainstream society, that the deep structure to the way in which individuals were put to use within a finite lexicon with which were produced a multiplicity of expressions, unknown because outside of that reference frame and yet present within it, persists. Superficial representation is not necessary, and mostly retroactive, to the subjective articulation of an individual; a representational form is only necessary for how that subject is identified and, consequentially, overdetermined by the purported function of mainstream society.

The Conditions for Articulation

Here, it is important to stress the technical use of ideology as a process of “idealization.” The process of idealization in research is to study events in abstraction in order to get closer to them in (a) reality. Abstraction is not created out of nothing but is developed within a form of life to construct a frame of reference so that the consequences of that form of life can have a meaning, a function, from this point of view. These consequences are real for the individuals which are subject to being the objects of that framework. My use of this term, represented by ideology being lower case, is not to be confused with the concept of Ideology that is expressed as the function of a belief in a belief or value system. Setting a function for how belief operates allows for individuals who benefit from this construct to eschew responsibility and/or accountability for singular action in the name of that system, whether by intention or not.

This chapter details the mechanism in which an encounter between the ideological expressions, the form of life of individuals represented between the intersection of Youth and Subculture, interfaced with a structural apparatus that made those individuals legible within the surface organization of society and a state value system. The methodology developed in our first chapter will be directly applied to our historical analysis here. This encounter yielded or articulated what was defined as a Counter-Culture. The process of articulation is the method in which subjects from one context are identified in another. How certain individuals are identified is determined by their articulation from an ideological base through a structural frame of reference within a state of affairs. It is through this formula that the connection between the modes of expressing a black radical subjectivity and Punk can be seen through the process of articulation.

A frame of reference is required so that the set of conditions and the interpretation of the objects studied therein can be meaningful within this historical analysis. The objects of a particular historical frame of reference are always subject to a point of view. Without this admission, any analysis remains incomplete. A “frame” is a set of designated uses and definitions for a term or individual that can be
relied upon for evaluation and creates a consensus over how they are to be understood. In other words, a frame of reference is a structure for how to dictate what events are to mean for and in society.

Applying the mechanism of articulation to historical analysis in this way will avoid a historical determinism which dictates a sole History as both object and method in governing the significance of these events and the way they are spoken about. This would amount to defining History as just merely the object ‘history’ which only it alone can be. A historical narrative’s institutionalization as “History”—as the sole framework—can only seek substantiation for that view from what is not a part of the lexicon of events it considers. Therefore, the function of the term “History” made identical with history is not valid on its own.

I will show that an identitarian, or what I see as purely descriptivist, praxis of dictating which history is valid or invalid fails on these grounds. A frame is a web of definitions which have terms that are themselves in need of defining and/or the existence of multiple webs defining the same objects. This is most evident in the Identitarian function of the Census which allows for the quantification of cultural dissidence to be attached to segments of the population. The Census is a prime example of the problems with quantification over subjectivity as it has been shown to be statistically wrong, under representing those it wishes to label “minority” within the U.S. In order to make a start, the domain of this Historical function as indicative of a particular frame of reference will be mapped by the frame created by Powell, Huntington, and Moynihan’s governmental reports of the 60s period and their effects in expressing governmentality; the function setting the operation expressing what and how one governs the state of affairs.

The frame through which the articulation of these objects, events, will be analyzed has four dimensions: the ethos or form of life; political movements; cultural movements; and an analysis of the management of economic cycles and crises. To accomplish this task, I will first discuss the formation of a radical subject and socio-cultural movement that would later become known as Punk in the same manner as our first chapter. A capitalized Punk will be indicative of the category imposed on the movement, in other words Punk as a genre made an object of the cultural and economic function of the mainstream. A lower case punk indicates punk as an ethos, a way of being in the world. The subject that was articulated will be shown through the material produced, a punk sound, whose kernel and core to modes of expressing its subjectivity did not disappear but continued to take on different identities so as not to be the object of superficial identification appropriated by commercially mainstream groups. In this respect, a difference between blackness and merely being ‘Black’ will be made. To be Black is to be known or identified under that label and subject to definition within a frame of reference that is not of blackness but, mostly, a framework meant to govern black individuals.
Blackness, then, is equivalent to a repertoire of modes of expression indicative of subjectivity; it is the creation of frames of reference outside of being overdetermined through identification within social and political structures. Blackness is not an object of a frame of reference and, therefore, is undefinable for it is found in the ways in which these forms of expression are made, the structure of possible expressions with any finite set of elements. The former is a matter of setting a semantics rigid across contexts. The act of overdetermination is the attempt to hold one frame of reference absolute over others. The latter is a matter of syntax, thus, revealing a creative capacity.

I will then describe how the Black subject was articulated and the mechanism in which it became legible within that 1960s-70s state of affairs. This will be shown through the formation of an ideology through the encounter of Youth and Subculture. The product of this encounter is the object [Youth x Subculture]: the structure of the encounter is symbolized in this way to show that the individuals flanking the x are those involved in the encounter which were once considered individual but, once put through the mechanism of articulation, are no longer mutually exclusive. What this encounter produced was labeled subversive to social and political institutions when considered within the internal, i.e. domestic, frame of reference of the U.S.’s state of affairs. It was labeled as such because it offered alternative forms of life outside of the structural values proffered through media and espoused by capitalist expansion into burgeoning markets at home and abroad. The black subject and subcultural ideology will then be articulated by the mechanism described through a social structure whose axioms are to be found in the governmental reports by Justice Lewis Powell, the Trilateral Commission’s Samuel Huntington, and finally Daniel Moynihan. These reports represent the set of conditions for the articulation of that Punk subject. This structure is the object [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan], for it is through these three documents addressed to government that an explicit connection between social movements, blackness, and the literary roots of punk are made. Through this triangulation, Youth’s modes of expression were incorporated into an adapted governmental framework and offered up for societal consumption. This was done in order to control countercultural efforts whose aim was to subvert the mainstream value system.

Once this process has been illustrated, I will explore the articulation of an ideology through the expressed value structure of the surface societal organization of the U.S. Illustrating the articulated ideology will show a way in which this subject is to be read within that state of affairs and its consequences which is not wholly reliant upon how it was identified for Identity, because contingent to context, dissolves once we consider that this subject occupied multiple identities but was not limited to an “African”-American lived experience, punk ethos, or Leftist paradigm. An object articulated from this mechanism was the event of LeRoi Jones, Sun Ra, and the proto-punk band the MC5’s 1969 performance in New York. Their performance together illustrates a continuity held through a blues core through to a punk ethos as evidence of the mode of expression of black
subjectivity. First, we must make clear the distinction between a dominant, mainstream, and popular frame of reference indicative of three particular, but not mutually exclusive, forms of life.

**Individuals in Context: Dominant, Mainstream, and Popular Frames of Reference**

In this chapter, it is important to layout the structural component through which we map our study into a culturally and historically specific context. We do this by making a distinction between the expression of a dominant, a mainstream, and a popular frame of reference. This is becomes a distinction between a function that creates “markets,” i.e. the mainstream, from a population considered as the sum of the constituents of a society in order to produce value for a subset of those constituents considered to be dominant therein. For example, a relation of Dominance is expressed through the overdetermination of one form of life by another.

**Scenes of Subject Formation**

Next, we qualify the terms of our articulation mechanism within the context of an Historical analysis. We will consider each aspect of the Gerund – World, Name, Relation – within the context of the 60s period.

Black culture is the only true “American” language, proclaims Leroi Jones in *Blues People*. By 1975, Stuart Hall in *Resistance Through Rituals* characterized the 60s period as an encounter between Youth and Subcultures. This encounter’s cross product engendered a subject most evident in the cultural form of life of that time. From here on, a culture will be considered a repertoire of signifying practices, a public tool for the understanding of private life. The attempt by mainstream cultural and political institutions to write out blackness from the history and music of Punk mirrors the same attempt in the socio-political sphere barring their access to the value of their own cultural and political products.

An individual within a given state of affairs can be conceived as a triplet with three interrelated aspects: World, Name, Relation. The encounter between Youth and Subculture produced the Ideological term that became articulate through the Structural frame of reference constituted by the Powell Memo, Huntington’s report, and Moynihan’s case study is detailed in the following section.

**World: Post-War Boom**
It is impossible to interpret the actual world in total. The actual world is accessed by a set of features which are ordered and coupled with descriptions made of them as a function constructing one’s reality. A subset of those descriptions represents an image of that world. We produce images of the actual as a function of the possible arrangement of features and the finite domain of our experience. If the application of that set of descriptions qua image are useful, we denote this by the ascription of a property identifying what we determine to be the “actual” world as a function of that process constructing a reality indicative of the subject doing the construction. Actuality is altogether too complex, only features of it are described as a function of the relations obtained between an individual and the world in which it inhabits. These features figure into experience and compose an object of thought whose “image”—accounted for within one’s reality as the result of the function of its mode of expression qua being/experience in/of that world—is fashioned together by the group of individuals sharing the features of their own experience. A feature of each individuals experience is grouped with one from another’s such that the set of all these groupings binds the context considered the object experienced by those individuals. That shared image is reduplicated by the internal sense-making capacity between those subjects. There is one actual world and many different realities upon which a structural component is imposed. An “image” is shared, i.e. understood, contextually, and is indicative of a form of life; the operation of creating the groupings of features composing the image of that world is an object of thought. The function constructing reality, however, can be represented as or obtained by different operations unique to individuals. The function equivalent, the operations indicated by those functions are not necessarily identical. Due to this we can account for a multitude of realities obtaining the same object(ive) reality constructed from finite means. The range of features or aspects produced by that internal capacity within a form of life actively constructs an “image” of a people. Modes of expression as ways of being in the world are the interface between actuality and the reality of a single subject, that is the frame of reference constructed to be an abridged interpretation in which individual roles have a defined meaning: a grammar. The subject is the internal sense making capacity within the surface structure in which individuals become the object of these functions. One has to do with what one is, their Identity; the other, how one is, their subjectivity.

Youth culture was a newly invented concept in the 60s period. It coincided with the Anglo-American agreement of 1941: a lend-lease program which brokered the absolution of British debt to the U.S. after WWII in agreement to break up the empire. This endeavor folded into the Marshall Plan of 1948 for the rest of Europe. The result was opening opportunities for US capital in the ruins of war abroad due to the untenable financial relationship between colonial burdens and the depth of the U.S. loan to the British. With regard to the surface organization of society, violence to old forms of life signaled increased opportunity as well. The surface structure of the state of affairs studied was represented by the products of culture organized and transmitted in society. It is the level upon which they are consumed. Consumption becomes a function which is not present but represented in how individuals
are read as significant within the apparent organization of society. These cultural products can be studied as evidence of the innate creative capacity of individuals outside of how they are identified. These products do not have meaning in and of themselves but are the traces of how the subject combined elements to make meaningful expression and their syntax.

The economic boom created by the dissolution of the New Deal legislation of the 1930s and 40s in the U.S. through oncoming neoliberal agenda was the result of a war complex generated from WWII. The industrial boom out of the pre-war depression created a leisure class from the working classes. These were then subject to a rearticulation of the value(s) of society overall. The move from Keynesian, which in some respects encouraged government interventions into the market, to Neoliberal economic policy, market over government, prevailed after the Bretton Woods Conference of 1944. The produced an environment where European colonial interests broke down. With expanding opportunities in markets forged abroad, would later be termed by the U.S., France, and U.K. as the “Third World.” The U.S., French, and U.K. conception of that group of nations was distinct from the non-aligned movement this “third” option between capitalism and communism wanted that term to mean. Some of the benefits from increased efficiency in production and lessening time constraints passed to domestic constituents.211 The workings of these conditions sought to overdetermine what Youth can and ought to do with their newly found “free” time. However, most were not free. Due to racial segregation and Jim Crow legislative practices, Black Youth were put to work through a penal code and civic legislation under the auspices of a war on poverty. This “new” war effectively became the criminalization of poverty’s symptoms, not the conditions producing poverty itself.212 This finds its roots in the compact between the Northern and Southern states in response to freed slaves and reappears with Ronald Reagan’s presidency under the guise of “law and order.”213 Newly freed corporations due to deregulation and government interests under neoliberalism sought to criminalize Black life so to capture a labor force within the state. This was done through taxation of private individuals and the tax exemption of corporate interests.

By 1972, the U.S. no longer backs their currency using the gold standard in order to open up markets and lessen restrictions for corporations and government influence. It did not free up the working class to move between these markets thus alienating them from accessing the benefits of increased technology in labor power or by negotiating the terms of their use within this system. It did, however, free corporations to move abroad. The reconfiguration of the economy made ownership over modes of production obsolete as it was not about what kind of machines you owned but how processes, detached from any “physical” standard, were utilized to create value. This was most evident in copyright law and ownership over intellectual property. Derivative logics actualizing the future presently became the norm under the auspices of high finance.214 Financialization saw to the cultural products from Youth and Subculture being appropriated, allowing blackness to be co-opted as well
due to the fact that industrialization was a direct derivative of the legacy of slavery. What ensued was a massive defunding of social programs. Its effect was the engineered disintegration of inner cities and rural infrastructure.

**Relation: Setting Blackness in a Subordinate Relation Within a Dominant Frame**

Post WWII, blackness’ identity by the Census was reset. In 1954, the verdict of Brown vs. Board of Education won the right to desegregate schools, ushering in the formation of the Southern Christian Leadership Coalition in 1957 to protect these newly won rights. This win was subsequently undercut by interest convergence between structural reform and reactionary backlash towards policies regarding integration. These were not directly opposed at first but forced ideological concern on the basis of Race. Integration had the peculiar effect of dissolving community solidarity forged during racial segregation. The movement of individuals across neighborhoods, corporations, and schools increased due to a desire to go to previously forbidden markets. Walter Lippman in *Public Opinion* stated that in order to curtail the “beasts” that are the public who may feel inclined to participate in democracy, the state needed to manufacture opinion so that voters vote against their own interests. The strategy enacted used an economic vocabulary to criminalize poverty. This allowed “White”-ness to operate outside of the jurisdiction of laws.

The production of legislation acts on a reactionary basis. Its major premise is to prohibit. The prohibitions also protect vested interests by defining their use by what and whomever owns the means to utilize that legislation viz. the practice of law or the property it protects. These operations could be “unlawful,” because outside the law, but legal because there was no written law prohibiting that action. However, those actions were sanctioned uses of legal means that could be utilized, mobilized, to further their goal. How the law is read becomes a tool. “White”-ness does not have to say “Black” anymore but still understands the objects of the propositions of the legislative function. “You start out in 1954 by saying, ‘Nigger, nigger, nigger. By 1968 you can’t say ‘nigger’—that hurts you, backfires. So you say stuff like, uh, forced busing, states’ rights, and all that stuff, and you’re getting so abstract. Now, you’re talking about cutting taxes, and all these things you’re talking about are totally economic things and a byproduct of them is, blacks get hurt worse than whites…. ‘We want to cut this,’ is much more abstract than even the busing thing, uh, and a hell of a lot more abstract than ‘Nigger, nigger.’” This is clear evidence that what is meant is not necessarily in the words that appear on the surface. The terms may change, but their use in fixing a relation maintain that state of affairs.

In the 1960s President Kennedy signs Executive Order 10925 prohibiting worker discrimination. Poor Whites, suffering the same structural issues as Blacks, only with Blacks being subject to the additional objective function of a racial apparatus, combatted this order by segregating unions along racial lines.
The formation of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee or SNCC follows. Soon after was the 1963 march on Washington. This brought on 1964’s 24th amendment—the Civil Rights Act, protecting voting rights—which was recently changed in 2013. The 24th Amendment contained a time statute in its protection against racial redistricting practices that attempted to absolve the potency of the Black vote. The effects of this change manifested in the 2016 elections.

The process of setting Black identified individuals in relation to specified roles/functions within the societal value structure is directly tied to U.S. governmental intervention in the control over labor markets. The goal was to decrease participation in democracy by fostering concern towards one’s survival within that market. Labor, then, is held captive domestically through a debt system based in consumerism. Decreased popular democratic participation was also encouraged to free markets in such a way that business could move across the globe. This prescription finds its roots at the end of slavery with the idea that labor must sell themselves in a market rather than be hired. A technique that was endorsed by convincing the South that wage labor was equivalent to slave labor. The labor force would have to sell themselves without recourse to upkeep by owners. Worker movement decreased while corporate mobility increased now that the 14th Amendment, meant to ensure the rights of slaves, created corporate personhood. Rooted in a violent history opposed to organized labor in the U.S., this lineage can be traced through to the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947 which effectively aimed at diluting labor solidarity. The act restricted the ability to freeze labor supply through strikes, and stood in support of actions that could be easily governed. Marches are a prime example as one must gain permission for this form of protest. This was another attempt to deter participation in the democratic process for the sake of consumption and spectatorship. By imposing a debtor system, rooted in the founding of the U.S. by individuals such as James Madison and Alexander Hamilton, “person” now meant to own debtors.

By 1976, what was to determine, produce, and define value within the structural framework constructed in the U.S. was cemented by the Buckley v. Valeo case. The decision made money a form of speech. This effectively barred individuals that did not already own capital from participation in governmental modes of expression. Although there is a superficial division between business and government, the interfacing problem of how to bind government and economy comes to the fore in the efforts to solve this issue exemplified by the actions of the American Legislative Exchange Council. ALEC acts as translator between its business lobby and Senate representatives in government; effectively writing laws to be introduced by its members that are co-written by its stakeholders.

With social movements as inspiration and Justice Louis F. Powell Jr.’s recommendation of their needing to be appropriated by the state, the tactics developed by Youth and Subcultural movements to
challenge strategies to control these populations were adopted by the overarching governmental structure. The appropriation of these tactics was subsequently turned to commodities through media to sell the idea of democracy back to those segments of society. Political participation was redefined through a lens of consumption of cultural products with no access to the value generated by them. Youth and Subculture were made to consume fictions of themselves.

**Name: The Teen-ager as a Known-Unknown**

The roots of the inauguration of Youth culture can be found in Labor law reform. The imposition of a frame of reference through the structural apparatus of [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] created a gap or empty category in the system organizing society. This gap was a known-unknown segment of the population that was labeled Youth. As a yet to be determined group, this subset derived from a particular function of its constituents produced a shared image, form of life, through a particular operation that challenged the status quo. The imposition of this identity was to manage this segment of the population, a process whose history is permeated by racial categorization as well. Systems of categorization cannot handle non-determinacy. Labor laws restricted youth from working after WWII. Some populations of this segment of society continued or were forced to work. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 and its amendment in 1949, 1955, and 1961 mostly affected working class Whites as Blacks had been barred from these jobs unless utilized to break strikes. Its constant reformulation serves as evidence of the issue with attempting to enclose, within finite categories, the products expressed by the function constructing a form of life, making or producing multiple objects from that same operation. These categories are based on past articulations, a finite set of cases, which were determined, external to that form of life, to be emblematic of the group.

Subsequently, the “GI Bill,” Servicemen’s Readjustment Act, of 1944 created a “middle class” through access to education. The expansion of markets, age restrictions regarding who could work, as well as the reorganization of the workforce created a sub-class of Youth that was more educated but did not have the same working obligations and opportunities as previous generations. The connection between labor reform and the barring of Youth participation in the workforce fostered the notion of delinquency which, to quell uncertainty regarding that group, was deliberately tied to youth as a rationale for why they must be identified and managed. For Blacks during this period, now known as Negroes on the Census, this difference in the conception of the young was only intensified. In the framing of the U.S. Constitution—which brought on the institutionalization of a Census practice by government so to codify, measure, and motivate political and economic impact against mere popular interests—blackness was considered to be within law only through notions of property. Blacks were not understood as being part of the law but only its object.
The inner sense making capacity of the individual holds even if its relative presence in society may change. The volume of its expressions is not inherent to itself, but is understood by the ability to rearrange the relations it forges with others regardless of name. The relation it forges maintains a self-identity and yet changes how that individual is perceived. At times, it changes the very conditions that try to overdetermine its mode of expression. This created a double consciousness in regard to seeing itself through the lens of being “Black,” from their perspective, and that of “White”-ness. This is connected to the framing of the “teen-ager” inaugurated by articles in Popular Science in 1941 and LIFE magazine in 1944. The translation of this phenomenon abroad is also documented by Stuart Hall in Resistance through Rituals.

The relation of Youth to society was inaugurated as a known-unknown through its being named “teen-ager.” This domain presented an opportunity to engineer roles for the interpellation of “youth” into society to generate workers through education and value systems tied to regimes of control. What this axiom of naming individual subjects within states of affairs entails is most clearly seen through Identity. The relation of individuals within this matrix was set by a naming function through Census statistics. Blackness, which was present in the Census under different names—slave, colored, etc.—in 1950 was under the function of the label “Negro.” Two censuses later, blackness becomes a self-referential referent under the label “Black.” As a categorical label for a segment of the population, Black had first appeared in 1850 but was removed up until 1970. There is a correlation between the categories created out of blackness—its operation under different signifiers: Colored, Slave, Negro, Black, etc.—the years of label change and Civil Rights legislation produced (1965 Voting Rights Act). These changes are isomorphic with efforts at devaluing and weakening the potency of Black political expression through the creation of “new” racial categories or redistricting/dividing Black populations. We see this in 1970s with Congressional Redistricting efforts. With each advance or concession made to Blacks, more categories were created out of that block in order to weaken the numbers of that base, siphoning voices off into newly created categories while leaving the collective political voice of White’s intact. It is through this mechanism identifying individuals under rigid labels that segments of the population are rendered articulate to society. As an individual cannot be represented as identical with a universal categorization, there lies a capacity to do violence to the grammar of a state. No finite categorization can capture a population whose limits are unknown to that reference frame.

Blackness becomes those individuals that could be identified within Black racial categorization but also inhabit a culture and utilize signifying practices that are not exhausted by that label. Outside of Identity, Black individuals are able to use the conditions themselves to articulate a self in that context. Taking the products of culture that surface within society, blackness rearticulates the world it inhabits making different meanings with those objects present in the state of affairs that the dominant culture
has not seen before or as yet cannot understand. These ungrammatical expressions still have a sense, an inner logic, despite their being overdetermination by identification from a context external to their form of life. These categorizations, these ontological commitments, set the formulae in which blackness is codified in order to control the movement of this population. As this name does not exhaust the entirety of Black being, blackness has opportunity to subvert control by creating alternative forms of life within the same set of conditions which seek to make these determinations rigid.

Articulation

*Here we run our World, Relation, and Name terms through our articulatory mechanism:* [Youth x Subculture] *produces an ideology articulated through* [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] *structure which expresses Counter-Culture*226

The emergence of Youth as a mode of being in the world and the structural formation of a Subculture crossed in the mid-to-late 1960s. Through our articulatory mechanism, it is possible to understand what came to pass at this intersection.

The triangulation of the Powell, Huntington, and Moynihan reports are represented as an individual object of analysis in which its constituents are separate but no longer mutually exclusive. That object as whole implies the encounter of all three of its constituents. This encounter created a rigid reference frame in which the function of government was to be expressed. From now on and to make sure we conceive these three individuals as the objective of the operation whose function expresses governmentality, they will be made bold and represented as the encounter of multiple individuals expressive of a single concept. Through this matrix we represent the lens of Governmentality applied to contexts external to its formation. As this formation was structural, it is descriptivist and expresses itself through legislation which describes and attempts to delimit the environment that generated a sub-cultural individual. An individual in and of these movements within a value system poised between politics in Huntington, economics in Powell, and the social in Moynihan is identified through this lens. Law does not produce subjects, just prescribes an identity. The triangulation of these reports generated an axiom of identity within the state of affairs that attenuates and contours the rights of the subject’s everyday life.

Within subculture, individuals collected to form what would be known as Hippies, as the Beat generation, and as organized dissent by various Civil Rights movement groups. The relation that these entities had to the environment was structural. They were marked by their distinction in contrast to a dominant, parent, or mainstream culture. This relation was forged within the value(s) system set by
the triangulation of the governmental reports of Justice Powell Jr., Samuel Huntington and the Tri-Lateral Commission, and Daniel Moynihan, represented as [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan].

Youth is non-descriptivist. As such, it is a mode of being in the world. The relation that this group of individuals had within this state of affairs was ideological. This ideological base was marked by a revolution regarding notions of sexuality, and the New Left—not as an organization but as a sentiment that undergirds this mode of begin qua mode of expression. This was most pressingly expressed in music and other cultural forms. Legislation identified the environments and circumscribed the emergence of a Youth culture although it was not known as such at that time. This known unknown was labeled the “teen-ager” in the U.S.

The cross multiplication of these levels articulate the conditions in which the individuals considered of that context emerge. This process, then, serves as evidence of the expression of subjectivity within a domain of known unknowns, namely Youth. What their affairs merged together, the elements or features from the different contexts in which the repeated ritual of their encounter articulated, countered the structural value system that governmental reports described as in crisis. The point of view or context in which [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] looked upon the articulation of this subject directly influenced the creation of an apparatus through law to identify these individuals. Strict identifications were made in order to incorporate expression of youth in the maintenance of the status quo. This, in effect a naming axiom, created genres which had the dual effect of naming these subjects as well as creating a grammatical space in which these subjects would ascribe to specified roles. In other words, attaining a role was to fill particular positions of benefit to the system. This “grammatical” space was one in which Youth’s actions were made intelligible, legible even, within a dominant frame of reference. Legibility was obtained by virtue of a mandate given to mainstream culture. Politically and economically, this mechanism can paraphrase or smooth out deviant subjects. In creating a function of authenticity, we can see how blackness, which was of top concern to these reports, can be devalued while simultaneously to the dominant grammatical functions of the U.S. state, be used to express what is “most American.” We see this historically in how blackness was used to promote the U.S.’s political praxis and international policy of that period. At this point, Identity becomes a precarious position as blackness is not subsumed within the regime of—“regimentation” over—representation. Identity regiments modes of expression and attempts to circumscribe the products it may produces. Blackness cannot be ontologized within this system. This was most evident in the Census but, nonetheless, was present in the paranoia in how to deal with “the blacks” as cited through memoranda and reports at the legislative and executive levels of the country.227 Blackness was forced into the nominal categorizations: Black, Negro, African-American, so to extract value in the wake of slave labor and forced segregation. The categorical name was to serve as a “function” over the operation indicative of blackness’ mode of expression. In turn, this expressed the concept of
Race within the surface organization of society; rendering what was most dangerous to democracy, according to the Huntington and Powell reports, beneficial to the furthering of a governmental agenda. [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] cross product produced the conditions in which Youth culture was articulated, breeding the rebels in what the social, judicial, and legislative grammar labeled “Counter-Culture” motivating their wish to harness it for economic and political gain.

By utilizing the articulation mechanism in which (W)orld as the state of affairs is the U.S., (N)ames as the identities constructed and imposed upon the individuals considered as members of Youth and Subculture, and the (R)elation these names obtain—one being Ideological for the former, the other Structural for the latter—we find that Subcultural identity overdetermined the ideological relation of Youth culture. As a result, it was able to create a philosophy that its adherents could utilize within daily life. The event of this encounter provided a syntax to the deep structure producing what became apparent to the mainstream. Just as well, it provided an aesthetic that did violence to legislative descriptions. The difference in stance exposed the structural relation that overdetermined the subjectivity of Youth culture. This subcultural environment became an ideology that had to be controlled which engendered a concerted reaction of social movements. We can show that a structural component overdetermined the relation that youth culture had obtained in the U.S. One which had identified them as Youth to their benefit. The Subcultural world overdetermined the subjectivity of Youth culture and what emerged was a Counter-Culture. The identity produced by sub-cultural movements overdetermined that imposed upon Youth and generated what became known as Punk within this frame of reference. The Electric Church, Jimi Hendrix’s metaphor for the electrified modes of expression within Black music, is expressed through the function of the operation or forms of life encountered through the [Youth x Subculture] encounter detailed above. The inner logical form and syntax to this encounter’s expression remained present in the relation obtained between its individuals. It maintained its continuity despite the discrepancies in individual identification. Thus, rendered articulate from this encounter was a radical subjectivity.

**PUNK produced by [Youth x Subculture]**

*LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka from the Village to Harlem*

LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka was at the heart of the upsurge of the Counter-Cultural movement in the Village neighborhood of New York City. Here, I look at the ethos—the way of life, not necessarily the products of culture—that Jones/Baraka embodied. Baraka moved to the Village in 1954. He was a Beat poet, alongside Allen Ginsberg and Frank O’Hara, whom all resided under the shadow cast by William Burroughs. Baraka cites Ginsberg and his relationship with O’Hara as making and inspiring him to pursue the surrealist tendencies in his writing. In a sense, Jones captures a move from
nineteenth century poet Arthur Rimbaud to Black Rimbaud. A name noted by Jack Kerouac in *Yugen* no. 6, 1960. Victor Bockris notes that these Beats were the source of a Punk ethos emanating from downtown New York in the 1960s-70s. In Baraka’s autobiography, he speaks of times he and his associates were called “punk.” Baraka, while writing in the burgeoning scene of the Village, tied literary expression to musical expression, blues to the writing out of black subjectivity. The simpler structures of blues can be heard in the beating riffs of punk. Its lexicon is a transformation off of the repertoire of Chuck Berry. The first power chords from Howlin’ Wolf, Memphis Minnie, and Willie Johnson would become the signifier of a Punk sound. Lightnin’ Hopkins and John Lee Hooker’s relation to Richard Berry, as the writer of “Louie Louie,” would have a great influence on what would later become a major reference point not only for Rock but for Punk. This simplicity and speed challenges musicians to pay complete attention to the relations obtained in performance, working together on a musical idea, a unified thought produced between the crowd and those that they are playing with. An open recursive structure, deep in the prose articulated by this subject by a bridge cast by improvisation through repetition, is heard in the pitch changes available on the bass during performances of the song “T.V. Eye” by the Stooges in 1970s. Bass change options indicated substitution opportunities mid-performance in order to respond to the crowd. This mode of producing a sonic thought was taken up from the blues. It is the use of a finite set of elements that can be transformed, contingent to context, to produce different meanings: digital recursion electrified. The Stooges’ blues endowment is emphasized on the same 1970 album, *Fun House*, on which the songs, “Slide (Sliding the Blues)” and “L.A. Blues” both appear. Baraka formalized his analysis of black subjectivity within the same spaces that were generative of punk subjects. He was one of them. Baraka lived at 35 Cooper Square, “a nerve center for us” according to John Sinclair, a poet and musician most noted in his involvement with the MC5. A band from Detroit, the MC5’s Afro-donned Rob Tyner, after the jazz musician McCoy Tyner, initiated the rallying cry “Kick Out the Jams.” The 5 spot, Mercer Arts Center, The Fillmore East, St. Marks Playhouse, Entermedia—which marked the first convening of the Beats and other subcultural progenitors of punk during The Nova Conference in 1978—provided the umbrella under which a youthful congregation gathered to the epistles of Beats and punks alike. This congregation solidified around Alan Vega’s, of the band Suicide, loft on East 2nd street on the Bowery. Vega’s loft became a hub of the “scene.”

Baraka’s literary production began in the Village. As acting editor to *Floating Bear*, and *Kulchur*, he also submitted to those journals and penned *Preface to a 20 Volume Suicide Note*, *The Dead Lecturer*, and *The System of Dante’s Hell* during that period. Frank O’Hara’s poetic letters waiting faithfully for Baraka to meet him along that street play testament to Baraka’s foundational presence in the scene. Songs like “Turn Blue” from Iggy Pop, whose lyrics reveal Pop’s singing to Black women in the
His membership in the Umbra Poets society from 1962-65 also connect his literature to a Sub/Counter-Cultural ethos. Participation in this network of venues demarcated a radical space for punk later on in the Lower East Side and cemented Jones’ place at its beginnings. With Malcolm X’s assassination in 1965, Jones left the Village and went uptown to Harlem to become Amiri Baraka. The birth of Counter-Culture ensued in the space that opened up in his absence. A punk scene bloomed in those Village and Lower East Side neighborhoods. Jennifer Jazz, a black woman from the Bronx, comes downtown, after having been under Baraka’s wing in the late 70s. What was punk at that time was not considered under that label. No one expects to look in a cup of water and see H₂O. Shortly after the riots in Harlem and the social unrest in the Village, no one could look in a club and find “Punk” either. However, something was beginning to articulate itself out of the ruins of uptown black fire and downtown economic fallout. This arrangement was to become the conditions producing a punk subject. Syntax, the relations not present in the articulation but represented in the use of the objects it produces, helps to understand these relations without ripping them apart in order to describe each element which came together. By 1968, the MC5 and Stooges are in New York’s Tompkins Square Park. By 1969, the MC5 performs in New York playing covers of SunRa with appearances by LeRoi Jones and Allen Ginsberg. This represented a convergence of poetry, theater, and punk before the genre “Punk” came to be. The same year in London, Hendrix describes the situation back home as the electric church.232 Punk is black magic music according to John Sinclair.

Although it was colloquially in use within the scene from 1965 on, the term Punk was not “officially” used in the U.S. until 1971 by Dave Marsh in Creem and Robert Christgau in the Village Voice. Punk would become a term of endearment when used in 1972 by Nick Tosches, the poet and Rock and Roll novelist. Baraka had been profiled as part of that scene in the Village Voice since 1964 due to the openings of his plays The Dutchman, The Toilet, and The Slave. By 1973 the term begins to travel with writers such as Terry Atkinson of the Los Angeles Times. The term did not fully go into wider circulation until 1975 in the U.S and to international acclaim, along with some disdain, in 1977 with the Sex Pistol’s. Baraka would later return to write for the Village Voice in the mid-1970s-80s. By that time, Jennifer Jazz’s plays would gain traction off the Bowery.

The Syntax of the Electric Church

It is now possible to derive a formulation which expresses the articulation of the ideology during this period. The cross product of Youth and Subculture yielded an ideology which was rendered articulate through a structural frame of reference. Subcultural formation emerged through the active
construction of alternative structures or networks of cultural dissemination within that state of affairs. The determinate value of cultural output was based on the socio-economic class in which individuals were defined due to relations set legislatively. This amounts to a declension from a Parent culture.

Youth culture emerges as an ethos, a way of being in the world. A Descriptionist account is not possible here. Youth is a declension from dominant and/or mainstream culture. 233 Stuart Hall goes on to say, “Ambience has come to constitute, vis-a-vis youth culture, something of the force of a conscious avant-garde.” 234 The force of the introduction of this encounter into the propositions of this state of affairs was a result of the [Youth x Subculture] encounter. “It is at the intersection between the located parent culture and the mediating institutions of the dominant culture that youth subcultures arise”. 235 The encounter of these two vectors generated what has come to be known as a Counter-Culture. One not yet named, but understood in the relation it held within and towards social and political institutions.

This ideological level is the formation of the domain that makes future articulations of black subjectivity possible as well as reveals the structural and existential subsistence of the black subject in the cultural life of that period. Black folk, most evident culturally in musical expression, are the interminable field within a U.S. state of affairs that make the identity of “white folks” possible. 236 From this cultural and ideological state of affairs, a naming function acted to force positions in society to which individuals would ascribe: a grammar imposed as a function of their being significant within the socio-economic structural configuration of the state of affairs. This bore the force behind Counter-Cultural practices to undo overdetermination. The 1965 assassination of Malcolm X signaled the internal contradiction between increased Identitarian political praxis, its association with subjective freedom, and his idea of a world making creative capacity for Black people. The assassination also signaled the upper limit of the encounter alongside the rearticulation of a radical subjectivity hallmarked by LeRoi Jones’ transformation to Amiri Baraka and his move from the Village to Harlem.

Here called the Electric Church, the scene articulated from the [Youth x Subculture] encounter is most easily ascertained in and through music. Musical expression is the expression of a people. 237 This encounter mapped musically takes the cross product of these two expressions as a way of being in the world, a modality. The syntax of musical expression charts a creative capacity on the cultural level, highlighting the subject enunciated at that time. LeRoi Jones, now known as Amiri Baraka, called this a “collective improvisation.” The socio-economic and political grammar through which this subject was articulated made it the object of the propositions of [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan]. The focus here is on proto-punk, which, as a moniker, only highlights that which came to be labeled or known as the genre Punk came from a field that pre-existed its nomination. Bands such as Death in 1971, Pure Hell in 1974, and the MC5 and the Stooges prior to that, are no less or more
punk the descriptive antecedents to what formed after them. Neither were the crowds in those scenes. Their consequents were transformations from this core, riffs off these sets of conditions. *Punk is the blues louder and faster.*

Paul Gilroy describes Jimi Hendrix’s pronouncement of the church in 1969, as “a source of meaning from a world in which all meaning had been drained by the politicians ‘ego scene’ . . . The faces of a large section of the assembled multitude have been captured as they listen raptly. . . They seem to have become a community of listeners.” Jones’ description of these listeners in what he and Gilroy call a “profane” space is found in Jones/Baraka’s references to Saint Simon in his novel, *System of Dante’s Hell.* The college of Simonists, these saints of listening, are active though at times seen as still or silent. Aesthesis has suffered a categorical mistake. Aesthetic contemplation was made passive within the frame of Kant’s empiricism that masked his epistemologically based Ontology.

For Kant, the phenomenal are the objects of experience that we develop the concepts with which we organize what counts as a constituent of our world, our reality. The noumenon—unknowable to sensation or experience, the subject in and of itself—reside at the limits of our ability to assert that Ontology *viz.* system of knowledge. Ontology along this vein quickly slips into a system of categories in which membership to reality, now an Ontological distinction founded upon a system of knowledge, is by membership within the categories we have created. For Kant, knowledge of our "given representations" is based on experience and if outside our field of experience those objects are outside of the system in which those objects obtain membership to our "world." W.V.O Quine goes on to prove that there is no way to verify this notion of justification by experience with regard to Ontology because the method of "justification" required does not have a method of justifying itself. The program enlisted is self-defeating. This is how we will attend to the paradox presented by the Afro-Pessimist.

Used to discount or avoid having to make a formal account of subjectivity, as the subject is the object in and of itself and not available to sense or perception, it does not follow that the subject does not exist. It does not follow that the subject is "absolute nothing" because it is not an object in the world, but “abject” according to Wilderson and other Pessimists. Just because it is unknowable to sense or experience, an attempt to disregard subjectivity is futile. We do experience the subject's products. If the goal was to develop a theory of the constituents of our world based on "experience," it is possible to take the articulation of subjectivity by virtue of the objects of thought it produces as evidence of the very same capacity the analyst displays in forming their own theory. For, according to Chomsky, without justification for their method which requires justification for proof of existence, the Pessimist's theory does not come from something that is a part of the world yet apart from them, but from them as a member in that very same world. Basing a theory about Black identity without making
an account for the subjectivity of blackness, the subject that produced it, fails because it removes the basis for making one's analysis overall. The Pessimist program can be seen as the hope of corroborating a previously held position based on a preferred set of historical evidence that suits the theory applied.

For Kant, if unknown then that individual exists but not as a member of the Ontology organizing what constitutes the members of our world. If an Ontology has been conflated with an epistemology organizing the body of knowledge constituting what is considered a member of our world, and if there are individuals that exist but unknowable, then these known unknowns do not qualify for that Ontology because they do not obtain our epistemology. The mistake of conflating existence (noumenal) with Ontology (phenomenal) is made clear here. For Jones/Baraka, “[t]he limitations of that view are repudiated by the common mood etched on their faces.” For Jones, the Simonists could only be represented as mouths without faces. These forms and their expression lie outside of Identity: heard, yes, although their faces remain invisible. Jones emphasizes “face” analogously to his theorizing the failure of Identity. The subject remains outside of racial identification as well as retains the capacity to utilize that identity to change strictly determined conceptions of “Black”-ness. The sound of the chorus of the college of Simonists is the trace left of their subjectivity despite overdetermination.

A focus on music that negates the creative capacity of the performer is derived from a passive disinterested view of aesthetics. Aesthetics is merely a description of Aesthesis. That description only has significance within a frame of reference that states that one can only know the world through their senses alone. One must account for the process of making sense. Aesthesis is not passive, and neither is blackness. It captures both aesthetic descriptions made after sense experience but also ethos, the space in which those experiences are had or “felt.” Within that is poiesis, a creative capacity that can occur in listening: making sense. A performance is not solely the object of the propositions of the one listening, but also of those on stage. Listening is not a passive act. Different forms of propositions are able to have the same object. The individuals within this encounter are not only possible victims to “subjection” from the outside—becoming the object of the propositions of another and subsumed within a dominant reference frame—but can also become the subject of their own propositions—subjected to their own frame of reference, whether it be of their own concepts, or those internalized from others. This view better captures how different meanings can be made of the same object, same performance, contingent to the experience of individuals, but nonetheless acknowledging the same activity of creation occurring on both sides.

The syntax of images and tones evinces the subject buried in the prose of its modes of expression. Music means with sound. It is not sound with a preconceived meaning. It is a language with a
different sense-making capacity. For syntactic modes of expression as indicative of thought do not just come out of the mouth. As language can only picture, not point to something externally real, music can paint, not point to meaning by virtue of its use within states of affairs. Its meaning is this movement, meaning is not a thing behind or before it.

In the basements and clubs in which punk began, tones merged to articulate this dissident punk subject. This was conceived as a move from multi-part, three chord, harmonic schemes to riffs and pentatonic scales. Punks utilized monophonic textures of voice which in turn doubled instrumental melodies. In these improvisations the grammar in the voice is the song “Louie Louie” of 1957. This core can be found in the “Dallas Blues” recorded in 1912 and the “St. Louis Blues” of 1914. Blues artist Lightnin’ Hopkins would fall in the cultural endowment of that blues and had influence on the writing of “Louie Louie” with his, and other blues musicians, proximity to Richard Berry. “Louie Louie,” as the first recorded “Rock” song written and performed by Richard Berry of the Pharaohs in the 1950s and made famous by the Kingsmen in 1963, has undergone multiple revisions and covers. Infinite use of finite means. The bands covering this song were the likes of the MC5 in 1972 and the Stooges in 1974; Patti Smith and Lou Reed in 1976 and 1978; as well as Black Flag in 1981 which featured Richard Berry on the A-side of the record and their version on the B-side. The core to these different functions of the same musical object comes from a blues tradition which Chuck Berry introduced to mainstream U.S. culture. Viewed as the merge of kernel structures to form a song as indicative of the modality of a thought, we find that there is no code hidden behind the sound. The performance itself is the code found in the differing, contextual principles negotiated on the surface of these performances and the three line, 12-bar elements merged in different ways. Linguistically, when elements merge to form part or the sum of a proposition, some of the properties of each element do not make it to the surface because they are repetitive or not “useful” in computation. However, it is these parts that are needed for communication.

The I-IV-V chord progression has been referred to as the kernel of the blues. It is now possible to show how we move from “Louie Louie” to Punk through this particular progression. The critic Robert Christgau called this move in 1979 the syncopation “submerged” within Punk’s “rhythmic patterns.”” Louie Louie” is based off a variation from a three chord base, what in musical theory is called modal interchange. For example, a transformation occurs off of the clash between C# and A on that three chord blues base which generates the space to experiment with other chords in the articulation of that musical thought. We have discussed above and was studied in detail by Evan Rapport in “Hearing Punk as Blues.” Modal interchange is one way in which a DIY ethos is produced within the music itself.
The punk transformation from this core phrase occurred with the introduction of the riff and a subsequent oscillation between chords I-IV, also known as a vamp. James Brown's experimentation with the use of the power chord in the riff and vamping of guitars in 1967 forms our bridge from blues through Rock and Roll to Punk. Brown’s "I Can’t Stand Myself (When You Touch Me)" and "There was a Time" lay the groundwork for The Stooges' "No Fun" and Velvet Underground's "Foggy Notion." The riffed portions of these songs and the oscillation between chords solicit crowd participation in the generation of a collective sonic thought during each performance. Each articulation of the song due to crowd participation results in a different performance, thus this signifying practice cannot be totally incorporated into the mainstream by merely making a record of output. For Brown, it was the call and response with the crowd and the music itself during his performances which expressed the song. This was then modified by the Stooges orchestrating call and response through instrumentation alone. Crowd participation occurred during the chordal openings discussed above and will be formally discussed through the mosh pit in our conclusion.

LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka stated in 1968 that James Brown was our greatest poet, emphasizing the language and syntax to the form of his musical expression. Working in the Black Arts Movement alongside Jones/Baraka, Larry Neal would pose in the essay "Social Background to the Black Arts Movement" the question: "what if James Brown read [Frantz] Fanon?" marking an indelible link between Black modes of expression and questioning ways of being in the world. A recurring object of study, Albert Ayler represented to Baraka the articulation of blackness through jazz being the articulation of freedom; freedom from categorization and a move toward an acknowledged unintelligibility within dominant forms of life and/or White supremacy embedded in the mainstream. For Ayler, the improvisational subject’s core is repeated difference. James Brown, then, represents the creative capacity putting to use a finite set of elements from the blues to express alternative forms of sound, therefore, worlds. Speaking on Ayler, Baraka would write in “You Ever Hear Albert Ayler?”: "That [Ayler’s] sound was literally devastating. It wailed and it wawed, not a scream, but something nature only sowed the seeds of, like the singing from a black hole.” Non-determinate, Ayler expressed the syntax and form of that which, on the surface, was un-representable with words or notes in open transgression to the imposition of genres upon his musical output. Ayler’s horn sowed the seeds to many of the riffs heard in the Stooges’ “L.A. Blues” in 1970. This continued on through to the famed 1978 No New York compilation which gathered together the U.S. response to the importation of commercialized Punk. This rebuke of commercialization articulated punk’s evolution into the No Wave scene. Most notably James Chance & The Contortions whose “Dish it Out” exemplifies the Ayler saxophone connection and our blues core in the underlying rhythm pattern. James Chance would perform many covers of James Brown, most notably “I Can’t Stand Myself.”
After hearing Ayler, Baraka, in a Wittgensteinian sense, had to adhere to the *Tractarian* maxim: “for that of which we cannot speak, there we ought remain silent.” That silence, however, was pregnant with meaning. Both Brown and Ayler represent a continuity founded on difference rather than subordination to musical and racial identity. A black cultural endowment is the coming together of this set of signifying practices through difference, which is not despite difference for the sake of categorization. James Brown's experimentation became the lab in which some elements of punk were made and illustrates the link between Black music, Black power, the blues, and punk. Blackness' mode of expression was linked to the capacity to create worlds—explored in our spatial conception of syncopation in chapter one—and made explicit by Jones/Baraka in the poem, "In the Funk World.” In it, Jones utilizes the '/' functor discussed in the Singing Book to elicit the singing of a James Brown link between blues and punk:

If Elvis Presley/ is
King
Who is James Brown, God?

Linking the creative capacity and inner logic of the faculty of Black modes of expression and the syntax of its musical aspect was explored in our Singing Book chapter as being embodied by Jennifer Jazz. Born of the Black Arts Movement, Jazz becomes a punk of the downtown New York scene. According to Evan Rapport's "Hearing punk as blues," two chord oscillation as the riff's extension to the vamp became an open recursive function lending the use of blues chordal progressions to amateur and untrained experimentation. Outside of the dominant grammaticality of predetermined musical notation, a Do It Yourself, DIY, ethos develops, particularly using noise as an element in improvisation, which is directly tied to black musical and artistic modes of expression.

In framing an expression, what an object is doing, and the term used to denote that doing repeats. That object appears twice in the deep structure of the expression so to maintain subjective continuity with regards to understanding what is expressed. This is a key feature of the linguistic conception of merge and how syntax produces the objects required for semantic interpretation which do not necessarily appear on the surface, but are understood in the function of the phrase produced. The surfacing form of that thought may not reflect a deep structure. However, that deep structure is presupposed in the capacity to understand what is said. In accordance with current work in generative linguistics, the deep structure to the sentence “can the man swim” is (can the man [can] swim), which explains why we understand that the man can, in fact, swim so to be able to question that man’s ability at all, rather than question whether or not a man exists in the first place. The reference to that object when forming other parts or subsequent sentences lies in the use of terms in forming an expression, those object’s
movement or function in the deep structure. If these expressions refer to the object of another proposition either within itself or following it, the object that is left out for the sake of prose leads to ambiguities. Proper names and labels are more often than not deleted in what surfaces for ease of combination.

What are termed garden paths can result: internally grammatical expressions that are nonsensical when considered from a reference frame external to the one in which it was created. The dozens or scat are prime examples of playing with what an object is doing despite external qualifications of use or predetermined definition. Studies regarding Black modes of expression such as humor in “the dozens” have revealed that the effect or impact of utilizing these forms come from setting the ambiguous “objects” of these expressions to use revealing an underlying logic to creating thoughts underneath. Ambiguity, denounced by strict identity and grammaticality/respectability, is key to Black modes of expression which only illustrates the fallacy inherent to categorization and racial identity overall. Elements needed for communication, elements of experience—such as guitar and treble—can be focused on to identify a song, but it is the syncopated structure and the lower frequencies that make the song. Melody is usually the focal point for identifying a song. The elements deleted from those identifications are, in actuality, the signature of the song marked in time, its rhythmic pattern, etc. What is needed for understanding is present in the lower registers undergirding the surface and provide all that is needed for a scene that looks different in each singular performance but understood in each collective improvisation.

**Governmentality: Powell, Huntington and Moynihan**

Now that the ideological formulation is complete, the structural component that it was articulated through will be discussed. This structural component is what I have termed the surface organization of society or grammar, and will be referred to from here on as the term \[\text{Powell x Huntington x Moynihan}\]. For Stuart Hall, social structures provided the conditions for the generation of Subculture. The encounter between the Powell (1971), Huntington (1975), and Moynihan (1965) reports to U.S. Government and Commerce created an environment in which an axiom of identity could set into effect a naming function that framed the encounter between structure and ideology. It is within this triangulation that the U.S. made the move away from defined government to the enactment of governmentality: the administration of people, not necessarily the creation of legislation. Governmentality is expressed as the function of the “function” or operation of governance. In effect, this function created a socio-political mechanism through which a culture articulates itself. \[\text{Powell x Huntington x Moynihan}\] is the structure in which conditions were set that mapped the expressions of the \[\text{Youth x Subculture}\] domain so to extract value from that form of life and control it through census, here understood as an identity function. This effort of mapping, identifying, and then
extracting value was put into effect to solve what these reports called a crisis in democracy. This crisis became known as Counter-Culture.

The memo written by Justice Lewis Powell, Jr. to the U.S. Chamber of Commerce was seen as one of the foundations of the modern U.S. conservative political movement. This much is understood from its title: an “Attack on the American Free Enterprise System.” Powell makes an account as well as recommendations for how to manage the social movements of the time. He attributes the characteristic social and political unrest of the 60s to the lack of governmental administration to keep up with expressed cultural attacks against the values of the U.S. These values were expressed by Powell in economic terms. Social movements represented a blatant attack on this value system. For Powell, the system should be articulated out of an economic vocabulary which defined “freedom” in terms conducive to the movement of corporate individuals who benefitted from being defined as persons within U.S. legislation.

The report authored by Samuel Huntington, part of the Trilateral Commission’s *The Crisis of Democracy*, analyzed the state of Western democracy and made an explicit link between social movements and what he termed, “the blacks.” The dissemination of an alternative form of life within U.S. democracy was attributed to changes in literary practices that brought about the rearticulation of U.S. culture and its value system. Huntington attributes this to an “excess of democracy.” This meant that increases in democratic participation by the general population challenged governmental authority and legitimacy. This occurred in urban centers and university campuses and was directly correlated to suffrage granted to Blacks in the U.S. Huntington’s recommendation was to define “freedom” and, thereby, democratic society in a way that decreased public participation in governance. Government was not to be a stolid institution but a formula which functions over the societal domain so as to identify individuals and put their cultural production to use in a way conducive to ideological and popular control. The result was a reorientation of government focus towards incorporating the practices of these mass movements into the governing of these populations themselves, with the hope to control what was considered this “crisis of democracy.”

Daniel Moynihan’s report solidified the connection between an attack on the U.S. value system, as construed in the economic vocabulary of Powell, with the growing concern over how to deal with “the blacks” and their inextricable connection to social movements, as expressed by Huntington. The connection detailed in the Moynihan report makes for a contemporary racial pathology in the U.S. Moynihan, through a socio-anthropological lens, equates blackness with economic disparity by linking Black women’s use of Welfare and Black men’s joblessness to single parent homes and incarceration. This disparity was directly correlated to democratic participation: an increase in Black participation through Brown vs. the Board of Education of 1954, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, and
other civil rights legislation. Changes in these two sets were considered symmetric with increases in economic disparity. This direct relation is indicative of the implementation of control measures as formalized in the Huntington and Powell reports. Although he makes sure to highlight that the statistical evidence is flawed, Moynihan nonetheless portrays Black life in such a way that substantiates the racialized frame of reference that is the U.S. value system. By doing so, the report redirects accountability away from the structural means overdetermining the value of Black life back onto “The Negro Family.”

Governmentality, then, was to be defined in the terms set by Powell’s Memorandum and Huntington’s contribution to the Trilateral Report regarding Western democracy. Governmental interests were shifted from the administration of legislation towards the administration of populations. The reigning concern between these three reports were the ambiguities regarding the terms “freedom” and “Black” in regard to what they were to refer to in the 1960s. The ambiguity of these terms inevitably led to ambiguities over the ownership over the means to produce value within the U.S. state of affairs. The prior determination of how these terms were to be used was cast in the light of Huntington’s so-called, “crisis of democracy.” Governmentality, in effect, becomes the attempt by those who create the means to organize the surface structure of society to fix the relation of its term within a frame of reference. This fixing of term to referent was the fixing of a definition of freedom that allowed government to incorporate its use so as to extract value from its articulation by individuals who composed the cultural expressions of dissent at that time.

**Reading Articulation through the Census**

An expression of U.S. Governmentality is found in the 1970 Census. The census became a sorting mechanism which actively constructed the frame of reference in which individuals and groups are defined, value attributed, and access to democratic participation controlled. The administration and control of populations rest upon the ability to identify and divide that population into segments. This method of identification allows for the construction of a frame of reference as it sets an individual to a specified definition or value within that state of affairs. The triangulation of Powell, Huntington, and Moynihan circumscribes the meaning of “the blacks” and Youth within an apparatus that seeks to utilize their expressions to cultivate value. In this way, it incorporates those expressions into the articulation of the U.S. itself as a means to produce those groups own subordination. The result of this structural component to the organization of society defined freedom in a way that made Black autonomy dangerous to U.S. sovereignty.

[Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] inspired legislation against collective assembly and the rights to protest which forced Counter-Culture to take different forms: underground societies, clubs, café’s, and
a move into art and culture, specifically music. In the 1958 NAACP v. Alabama case, the people won against the state rights to hold protest. By 1967, the Taylor Laws inhibited this ability while also constructing a mechanism that utilized workers’ rights legislation to undermine First Amendment rights. Collective assemblies cannot “cause” riots. Up until the Public Order Acts of 1986, which attempted to prohibit the unlawful “reading” of caveats to the First Amendment, most protests brought on state force in concert with the militarization of police. Issues around assembly are based around criminality and private property. Public space is included in this as “public” does not mean free, but that there are multiple proprietors of that space, usually based on a logic of taxation, and which ultimately upkeeps the state of affairs. Hence, the government permits required for marches and other demonstrations. This is so to keep these displays clear from enacting change in the environment they are critical of so that power structures do not have to interact with them. Relations to power are structural as it only allows for dissent in channels that it could profit from. Hence, representational forms of protest were effectively appropriated by the state. Under the banner used to combat gangs, state force used against collective assembly were a product of these reports fixing poverty and criminality to “the blacks.” McCarthyism and COINTELPRO are manifestations of this mechanism used to paraphrase the ontological commitment from “Black”-ness’ within state propositions.

One of the culminating effects of this triangulation of reports was the linking of Black cultural expression to what became labeled a Counter-Cultural insurgency. In order to define government agency as the use of legal means as opposed to their mere production—merely writing the law—the census became a function which set an individual’s position and definition in society. The 1970 Census changed the label of blackness to “Black.” The Triangulation of these three reports around this change in label simultaneously codified as well as attempted to validate this inscription. These documents explicitly tied cultural movement to a political and legislative token so to grammatically fix a population to this referent. The reports described what occurred during the social and cultural upheaval during the 1960s. It made a literary tie that garnered flesh as it moved across a U.S. statistical description and proffered an Identitarian link in order to perpetuate a false semantic structure in the language in which these individuals became the subject of legislative propositions. In other words, blackness was made the object of that reference frame’s discourse.

To Baraka: Hell is definitions. Codified in the Census, these terms became the pinions to move governmentality: the triangulation identifying, thus controlling, the constituents of that states whose surface structure was organized by the descriptive matrix of these reports and tied together under [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan].

Reading the Product of this Encounter through Articulation
Now with both vectors, [Youth x Subculture] and [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan], formalized, it is possible to read the formulation of Ideology’s articulation through a Structural matrix. Formalized in this way, we see that the encounter between these levels yields Counter-Culture. There are two levels to reading the cross product of this articulation: culturally and socially. The cross product articulated through the socio-cultural landscape of that time, one completely verklempt with how to deal with “the blacks”, traces a radical black subjectivity in the punk ethos on stage at that 1969 concert of the MC5, Sun Ra, and Amiri Baraka. In a lecture at the University of California Berkeley in 1971, one that surfaced on his record The Creator of the Universe, Sun Ra once stated, “Black people need a mythocracy, not a democracy because they’ll never make it in history. . . Truth is not permissible for me to use because I’m not righteous and holy, I’m evil, that’s because I’m black and I’m not subscribed to any types of righteousness.” The electric church would be profane. Righteousness is a matter of point of view. The electric church, as Black as it was, was to profane stereotypical portrayals. This church had its own language qua set of signifying practices.

The work of translation within [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] attempted to quiet the church’s attempt to counter the dominant tongue. Though coopted by the music industry from 1977 on, coinciding with the release of the Sex Pistols album and its acceptance in the U.S. mainstream, the profane church still retained its sense although used incorrectly by mainstream culture. The work of Counter-Culture is to acknowledge that from different contexts and points of view, different languages that are just as rigorous as one’s own can express more eloquently their subjects than any translation could. Taking the social from the perspective of the language in which it expresses itself, Counter-Culture rearticulates the syntax of how this society is organized and seeks to change the meaning/use of these expressions within the frame of reference provided. This is in order to change how each individual’s significance is read within those conditions. Counter-Culture sought to use the law to make hegemony write itself out of existence. By providing an alternative form of life within that state, overdeterminations can be undone. As Black culture is the most “American” of American culture, proven through its use in the cultural exchanges to combat communism, punk-ness is endemic to blackness as Blacks are Punk: the grammar of the blues remains in the voice of all that sound and fury.

[Youth x Subculture] was articulated through a matrix set by [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] in which it became the object of the propositions which composed the state as defined by [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan]. This was accomplished through an assortment of legislative and Identitarian functions. With the overdetermination of blackness from outside of its own context, and on the Census nominally Black, it was up to this structural apparatus to fix that identity’s use within the state of affairs. Blackness internally articulated itself as counter to this notion, as underground. With this comes the understanding of the scene of this subject, the occasion of its emergence as the set
of conditions in which it emerged. Having illustrated the vectors producing it, to read blackness through this reference frame is to discuss its aethesia. Breath and sound and the syntax of putting them together in conjunction with experience provide a window into the subject of that time. Black music, heartbeats mixed with iron and steel according to Langston Hughes, is electrified.

‘Black’ used as a noun becomes an object of propositions external to it but can only be known by what that identifier is doing. The propositions controlling its use takes on the form of a predicate of another predicate. As such, it is incomplete. Constructed as such, the noun utilized by blackness still harbors the same elements in its verb form, its being the object of its own innate capacities and propositions. Therefore, regulating how blackness can express itself attempts to regulate what it is to be Black. The doings or affairs of blackness in this verbal sense, and as a matter of linguistics, repeats, accumulates, in the process merging to form the expressions indicative of that subjectivity. A movement is a collection of the affairs of a multitude of individuals now the subject of a single proposition. The upper matrix of [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] attempts to paraphrase these repetitions out to render individuals singular and exclusive.

As a noun, Black seems to fail by the simple fact that despite one’s nomination as “Black,” and the particular array of features they personally have, the category of features the name denotes, a particular phenotype never truly obtains an isomorphic relation with that personal set of characteristics. This isomorphism asserts that merely having dark skin is that which that label is to refer. It seems it is more of a determination, a means of political and social control when utilized as a categorization. This does not discount the ancestral and beautiful traits of blackness in its bodily form but to admit that blackness is more varied than we tend to believe. The Black body is not static but a process of making beauty, endemic to its blackness, its signifying practices, its poetry. These poetics and their music are elaborated upon by Baraka in his poetry and literary criticism of the time.

Sonic objects, “sounds,” images, do not have meaning in and of themselves. It is in their use by the language faculty articulating that subject that blackness is found. A punk ethos is a rebellion through ritual, an innately creative mechanism. Society can be described as a network of politics, economics, and what is determined as a dominant value system: a culture as an object articulated through this mechanism. What is named as the “culture,” or value, or an individual “people,” are contested spaces. They are subject to many points of view. Politics over this space, demarcated by name, is inevitable as each point of view or context has a different mode of making meaningful or significant the objects that are being utilized within those subjects’ form of life.

The articulation of a Counter-Culture “represents definitions of the situation different from, counter to, those which are maintained as valid and legitimate in the taken-for-granted routines of American
middle class society: ‘an island of deviant meanings with the sea of society.’ American society is powerfully integrated around a web of values and attitudes—recognitions and confirmation—which blind them to ‘the system’. That matrix of values, the society’s dominant normative order, is not—as many social socialists would have us believe—fixed, immutable and static: indeed, it is a part of my argument that it has generated in time its own inner stresses, contradictions and conflicts which are now being openly and vigorously expressed. It remains, nevertheless, an embracing value structure.”

By “embrace,” Stuart Hall turns our attention to the arrest of the semantics of a grammar through which inequality enters into the state of affairs organized by [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan]. This problem has been identified since the times of Rousseau and his concept of the social contract.

Against the concepts Origin and Authenticity

[Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] fixed the norms in which principles of governing blackness were set. Its purpose was to govern identity by virtue of the administration of a sorting technology, a set of processes and principles. This sets up an argument over origin and authenticity, as those individuals, which can be known by many names and remain that individual, must be sorted by some sort of means which affects both concepts.

The origins of “the blacks” in the U.S. as a symbol or object, is inaugurated by the triangulation of these reports. Where did “they” originate, under the sign “the blacks,” is a question of meaning that only makes sense within the reference frame of Race, a social construct with material effects. Names cannot supplant the being of an individual by merely obtaining the function or role of a given name. Being known by this name, their mode of being in the state of affairs, becomes something different. Within the act of naming there is the attempt to render a form of life fixed to an individual. That “individual” is a rigid description in which the concatenation of individuals to be considered under a single identity to which they must align in order to fix their phase, their roles, with a norm. Within different individual expressions, there exists the same core as the subject that is the individual in itself. In paraphrasing the verb form, the actions of the subject we eliminate modes of being.250 Racial categorization changes from context to context, but it cannot deny the existence of an apparatus that sorts individuals. Blackness is not exhausted as it is a mode of being, a repertoire of signifying practices, and because of this contains the capacity to do violence to the principles of this apparatus. Within those contexts, there is a cultural endowment or ethnicity within blackness that is passed down.

The concepts of origins and originality are used to deny access to named or sanctioned sites of being valued within society. “Origin” devolves around an argument over authenticity. Authenticity, like any
indication of purity, is a “dame quickly” of a term—damned if you do, damned if you don’t. If someone asserts the inauthenticity of an individual, that individual can reply: “what makes something authentic or not?” “Are you not measuring a self against an external standard, an ideal of authenticity?” “And in so doing, in that act, is one not acting inauthentically as they are likening one’s self to something else?” “Is it not the case that the only relation that one can surmise of that perfected ideal of authenticity is through a deductive inference? Again, making one’s self inauthentic?” Authenticity can only be inferred and, therefore, is not based in actuality, but a constructed norm. Purity is tainted by some moral or ethical fallacy ensnared in identification.251

As the frame set what “the blacks” was to mean, it simultaneously set a standard to which they should ascribe according to legislative functions of value. Their identification was poised in contradistinction to an assumption: “acting White.” It is impossible to “act White” in a society that is constructed so that in order to be significant within that state of affairs, one must be present, or named, in it. The language in which individuals become legible to that society is in “White”-ness, but White as category, is not “technically” present in legislation. White is represented by how the Census is organized. The articulation of a given proposition denotes not an individual but a conception indicative of the state of affairs itself. One is White, allowed to be, or is not. That which is not within categorization is blackness: that which is inarticulate, something that can only be understood, not known, but lived. In order to know it, it is denoted by a name. That definition is posed by other names in need of definition. That which is “not not White”, is not White. If considered as an identity or name, “not not White” is not not White, which is blackness all the same.252 For nothing is new but may come from nowhere as evidenced by “the blacks” seen as both a surprise but also, somehow, having always been there. It follows that the only way to act, to act out, are those modalities by virtue of the Other. If “White”-ness sets the grammar of a state of affairs, in order to control the Other, it must be an ascription so that individuals can “fit in” to that frame. Individuation can be by a property such as psychic continuity, regardless of changes that are named “physical”. Thus, the property with which individuation is made becomes evidence of complex structures that are imposed.253 Words do not have physical properties. Baraka notes this in the preface to his volume Black Magic in which he formulates that it is “White”-ness which is empty, void, and must be deconstructed.

The matrix of values that individuates only to subsume what is made external to it within its system of categorization was concerned with the existence and articulation of “the blacks” in order to make sense of their increasing participation in democracy. Outlined above, we found that this coincided with that system’s so-called crisis. The consequence shows an increased confusion between Nation, Ethnicity and Race as seen through the troubles with Identity and naming. This in turn motivated pursuits towards ethnic purity and its being tied to the idea of the construction of nationhood. As such, the affairs of the state sought to further racial segregation through law and policy.254 The focus was to
train populations and create consumers that bought into the value system, the categorizations, generated by this apparatus. The encounter between individuals within this frame articulated an operational list that can be taken up into mainstream cultural production. The encounter between these individuals braided together the aspects or properties that those individuals had brought with them. The surface grammar of the state of affairs attempted to accumulate notions conducive to its function and paraphrase away those that were not. Externalized was a program projected as the image of the U.S. that utilized blackness’ forms of expression while erasing its existence in the domestic representations of the U.S. This operation is syntactic, not semantic. Black music as being the most “American” product of the U.S. gives us insight into these states. Blackness was deemed dangerous to White hegemony’s system of values.

PUNK!

Punk, as a movement, is loudly proclaimed through its music. The music does not preclude the movement. “Communication and analysis were conducted through the subaltern channels of distinctive sonic and musical culture, transmitted unwittingly through the inhospitable infrastructure of greedy industries that had been colonized and had their dismal commodities bent to unorthodox purposes. It is abundantly clear from the musical forms and styles that were then popular right across this black world that hearing together had become connected to the possibility of thinking and acting together . . .” When Paul Gilroy in Between the Blues and Blues Dance: Some soundscapes of the Black Atlantic, describes an “infrastructure,” what I term the grammar to states of affairs, in which commodities were bent to unorthodox purposes. The focus here is on the way in which these bends occurred. There is a syntax to this infrastructure, an overt reorganization of the social to determine what is meaningful or not. This is not to be conflated with semantics, the trading of one meaning for another, or finding a synonym for a word. For that does not change the meaning of an expression, merely its appearance. Through the noise and discord, if semantics and communication were primary, what Gilroy called the “contending vocabularies,” with which these subjects expressed themselves would have destroyed any chance of understanding what was articulated by those involved in the movement. There would have to be only be one vocabulary to ensure that those messages got across. For if there were multiple ways of saying the same thing, no shared inner logic or method of creating those expressions would emerge in which the different functions of those expressions could all obtain.

And yet, there was a subjective continuity, a shared inner logic, present within these different contexts that played with the semiotics of the principles that sought to overdetermine it. As in most studies of language, it is communicative efficiency that is usually discarded for the sake of creative combinations. If it was a matter of semantics first, the means with which one articulates a self could
only come from prescribed notions which in turn only re instituted regimes of control. The efforts of a mechanism of control external to this subject sought to translate these individuals into useful categorizations to maintain hegemony, the grammatically productive expediency of the political and economic sphere. This matrix was a fight over the setting of the frame of reference in which values can be assigned; thus, presetting the meaning which ought to be ascribed by the principles in which this culture ought to articulate itself. Hence, the worry over the semantics of terms from [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] to deal with the danger of what seems to be a violence to the values they proffered.

Powell, Huntington, and Moynihan’s call to control “the blacks” in the U.S results from their stipulation that blackness proposed an alternate frame of reference with which to criticize the U.S. This was especially so after the war forced the introduction of Blacks and Women into mainstream roles so as to support efforts abroad.259 To answer this call, the need for a mechanism to enforce a semantic regime over the positions, roles, and their functions these reports identified came to the fore. Segments of the population we divided up so that they could occupy these functions that served to fix how these roles were defined for the U.S.’s benefit. The ability to do violence to the grammar which now sought to fix a form of life over others was found in this electric and profane church.260 The methods developed by Counter-Culture sought to undo the syntax to the construction of these institutions that made the means with which this value system expressed a mainstream form of life. If Gilroy’s concern was the transformation of the body in its encounter through this different form of sound and protest,261 and transformations are the means with which the creation of thought through language is conceived, then, here, our analysis is to be focused on how these bodies were made; how they make meaning with sound. It is this notion of relation and reception that is captured in aesthesis. The ability to register a “here” that then becomes a self is in how the body as the subject of that proposition is identified and conceived within the positing of a frame of reference.262 Punk plays with our bias towards the primacy of semantics so as to confound or move towards the limits of being a “legible subject” within the surface organization of society. In so doing, punk is able to subvert regimes of control.

Throughout the 1960s and into the ‘70s, [Youth x Subculture] articulated a Counter-Culture. Counter-Culture becomes a part of the social and political environment by articulating a different arrangement to the objects whose function express a form of life within this socio-political matrix. Counter-Culture showcases alternative forms of life within that state of affairs. The identity or naming functions created out of the [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] reports set yes/no conditions for dictating the significance of what was socio-culturally produced by placing those products within a dominant societal value system. This encounter was identified in such a way that the Counter-Culture did not make sense, did not obtain a function within mainstream society, and remained outside of the
reference frame set by these reports. The individuals that began to appear in the scene were not the same but obtained an affinity, a “family resemblance,” because of the inner sense in which they came about. Each individual may have been formed of a different operation, separate way of being, but obtained the same objective function, a particular form of life. In other words, individuals of the Counter-Culture expressed the same form of life, although, and possibly, by different propositions. This inner sense, these sets of relations within a surface discord, was pronounced as a crisis to democracy. However, this label more so acted as a description relative to the reference frame organizing the surface structure of society. Subjects obtaining that description remained related to each other, yet, utilized identities outside the one which named them a part of this group of within that dominated context.

The cross product of [Youth x Subculture] and [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] allows one to draw a continuity of expression among these individuals. Continuities through what seems isolated expressions, because named or identified differently, reveals that these individuals remained related despite segregation into different categories.263 The relation maintained was a “Do It Yourself,” DIY, ethos that formed in the Counter-Culture. The theory of articulation made it possible to see what occurred in the event of the encounter.

Placing John Savage’s England is Dreaming within our articulation mechanism sets up this encounter well before 1973, when Malcolm McLaren went to New York with the hope of bringing back what he called a “new wave” from the U.S. This new wave shared features with Leftist political sentiments rising in France. Sentiments with which McLaren was well acquainted and wanted to uncover outcrops of elsewhere. In the U.S. state of affairs, (W)orld, the combined subcultures of the Hippies, the Beats, the second wave of the Feminist movement born after women’s suffrage in 1920, and Civil Rights movements became known as an attack on dominant culture. They were most heavily expressed through music, literature, and methods of organizing. In the French state of affairs, the composite functions and activities of the Rockabillies, a sexual revolution similar to that in the U.S.—with more of a focus on experimentation rather than “freedom”—as well as the New Left movement, boiling over in May 1968, expressed a subculture therein. Social and political Movements in the French context were primarily focused around the (R)elation that Youth Culture had and expressed through fashion and resistance to norms. This was not merely “dropping out” of society. Therefore, the focus was on operating outside of regimes of control. The Beats and Hippies in the U.S. and French forms were distinct but not mutually exclusive. They were different operations expressing the same object. During this period an encounter between these contexts due to commercial market as well as the cultural expansion of these countries created crosses between the following: the Beats and Civil Rights within a burgeoning Youth Culture; Subculture provided structures for new ideas around sexuality encountered by the New Left and Rockabilly sensibility; the rise of Youth as a substratum of
society in the U.S. and the mediation of French subcultural organizations; and, finally, an upsurge of a
U.S. Counter-Culture and the blooming of the events of May 1968 in France. This formula created
what was opportunely named “Punk” by Malcolm McLaren, a U.K. music manager most renowned
for his London store SEX, in order to capitalize in a context outside of the U.S. and French state of
affairs. McLaren’s incorporation of these forms for use in his home context resulted in the articulation
of a British band we now know as the Sex Pistols.

Sonic Subordination

The relation between these individuals, otherwise known as a scene and named Punk in the U.K.
existed in other contexts under another name. A different repertoire of modes of expression was
utilized by this set of relations for “Punk” to articulate itself within the U.K. The resultant articulation
was not punk in and of itself. Punk was before then and remains an ethos with an inner sense, a
function that in each evocation of its subjectivity utilizes a particular set of objects as a way of being
in the world. Its rigid description under the label Punk amounts to incorporation through
dispossession. Definition becomes appropriation and results in Whites playing while disavowing
black musical forms. Many of these ideologies and individuals, such as neo-Nazism in bands such as
Screwdriver, would use this disavowal in order to substantiate the claim that finally there was a
“White” music they could call their own. From the inner sense of other contexts, modalities were
cultivated by Malcolm McLaren and others in order to create and identify, through the act of naming
it a genre, something that would be valued in his home context. The subsequent bands that formed in
England under this name, only later began to cite the influences garnered from what was conveniently
called proto-punk bands in the U.S. However, though deemed outside of the genre, there stood a
continuity that persisted in the global conversation that punk is and was through its debt to black
subjectivity: a family resemblance to the modalities of expression that evince the becoming of a
people rather than a genre. This view does not have to take national origin into account. This stems
from a notion of ethnicity, a cultural endowment, to solidify “White”-ness as a dominant frame of
reference which is in actuality void save for incorporating what is outside of it in order to provide a
definition for itself. This process amounts to obtaining objects external to its form of life to further the
function of its propositions. Ultimately, this represented an internal contradiction harbored in a
“White” music which is revealed as being the blues played fast and, therefore, not White. Blackness
permeates these possible sonic articulations as the foundational structure of and within each riff.

Within this state of affairs, the need to attend to the following issues arose. Governmentality had to
determine how it could incorporate subjects in the mechanism of their own subordination; the
operators of governmentality had to also figure how to co-opt the Popular into administrating
institutions in the name of those couched in maintaining the Dominant’s hegemony. Finally,
governance had to attend to how it gets the Popular to run institutions without want for access to the benefits derived from those very institutions. Within these sets of conditions ran a mapping function to identify individuals so as to derive value from their cultural production. This induced the creation and maintenance of a “mainstream” industrial mechanism. It is within this idea of a dominant culture that a sorting mechanism was created that extracted value from the product of the [Youth x Subculture] encounter. This becomes most evident in the advertising industrial complex’s aim at creating consumers of democracy and not participants. These suggestions were made by Edward Bernays264 and operationalized in McCarthyism. This process’ brute force strategy culminates in the advent of the Culture Wars. It is in nomination to roles that overdetermination occurs, the process in which an individual becomes the object of a function not of the context in which they were articulated. The cross product of economic and political affairs created a mechanism that interprets bodies into positions which can be objectively controlled in order to absolve the so called crisis of democracy that earmarked the 60s according to [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan]. The legislative term today is Census Designated Place.

It is the encounter between [Youth x Subculture] that conditions merged to create a different scene. It is in the process of articulation from a field that contains both the elements indicative of this encounter and the constellation of terms which are the conditions for the function of the [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] mechanism that Race, Patriarchy, Gender norms, etc. can be traced. In each encounter, the fixing of terms to predetermined referents solidifies practices so that a rigidly defined form of life may carry over contexts despite the differing apparent articulations of the subject. The language in which subjects are expressed was parsed by this sorting mechanism so to produce value within the dominant expression of a fixed state. Even if subjects operate under the auspices and function of other names or roles, it is still possible to trace, due to the syntactic-structure buried in its prose, how the act of fixing one’s relationship within the organization of society happens.

The coming together of the [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] apparatus can be shown to be coming out of war. These include the Vietnam war and economic destruction at home. The war at home was highlighted by the fallout of social services and institutions in the late 60s and into the 70s, as well as cities coming under “urban redevelopment” that emptied and in most cases destroyed those cities’ centers due to the motivation to break up enclaves of solidarity and resistance.265 U.S. Justice Lewis F. Powell Jr.’s memorandum was addressed to the U.S. chamber of commerce in 1971 and propelled this urban renewal: a paradox that destroyed Black political and economic strongholds in urban centers. In turn, renewal created dependence on the state while restricting Black’s movement within the economy in accordance with Powell’s recommendations. The dissolution of Black community strongholds was also found in the “redlining” of Black communities, motivated by the “crisis in democracy” with what W.T. Lhamon called a, “deliberate speed.” Redistricting placed
Blacks in locations that prohibited access to the value derived from these developments. A rehashing of the link between property, propriety, and power motivates this development. Imposing a Black consumerist ideology was the focus of this form of governmentality. The consequence of these measures, indicative of the control of populations, ranged from housing projects to barred access to benefits. Blacks could not own property but became a captive consumer base for goods within a U.S. value system. This model would then be exported to other communities and countries. To date, the U.S. and its allies have been involved in eighty-one elections worldwide and thirty-six by Russia since WWII. These interventions were conducted with the hope of solidifying systems of value in other contexts to import back into home contexts.266 The strategy employed was to fund statecraft in one context in order to do away with issues in the home context. This amounts to a surface social political grammar that created a semantics in which subjects were to be exploited.

The activity of subjects, the syntax in which they articulated their being, became the object of these propositions. The object of functions that mapped them within this matrix were imposed to extract value for those with access to the means of power. The management of global crises were included in this effort, not limited to the oil crisis in central Asia and eastern Europe, the funding of coups and “contras” in South America and South East Asia by the U.S., and through urban neglect. Neglect included state sanctioned indifference to drug trafficking, militarized police, and arms provisions to poor Youth.267 New York city was near bankruptcy by 1975, which precluded the U.S. recession in 1977. Although these wars were not domestic, most of the U.S. looked as though it too was bombed due to a decaying social welfare system, which was in turn blamed on the populations that system was to serve. Yet, this was a population created by capitalist and government neglect. Youth became a primary target to solve the “crisis of democracy.” This concludes the 60s period; however, the effects continue to present and are no less real today.

**Overdetermination and Identification**

Our study must explore what motivates this compulsion to name or identify the constituents to the surface organization of society. Incorporation of socio-cultural production by way of dispossession was accomplished through processes of identification. The identity function names the role or function within the dominant reference frame of these individuals. It attempted to set the expected utility of that identity to the expected utility of the subject’s creative production, its form of life within that state of affairs. The motivation of the function of identification to name an individual is based on the benefit of a positive ascription of value within that context. This decision within the strategy to overdetermine individuals is the product of the significance of value in opposition to the remaining benefits to be had by others in that state against making that identification in another way.268 This is so to create a “norm,” not a law, in which individuals can be iteratively identified and re-identified
with or without policing. This solves the question of how to incorporate individuals within the process of their own subordination. Superficially, assimilation seems mutually beneficial. However, it is univocal structurally. Strict dominance bars access to value derived from those who are identified this way. The equilibrium attained sets up norms so that actors continue to work for a system in the name of those who are represented, i.e. expressed by it, but not present in it.

This process was illustrated in the 1970 Census created within the conditions produced by [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] mapping itself over [Youth x Subculture] to extract value through this identification function. The reformulation of the Census was used to substantiate a litany of descriptive statistics to ratify the belief in this “newly” articulated value system. Descriptions, which can be formed in multiple ways over the same object, become the facts of our own fictions. The descriptions placed on the set of relations structured in this particular way became the narrative constructed to substantiate the claims made in the reference frame expressed by [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan]. The capacity to do violence to this overdetermination is in the overflow not captured by the identification of individuals within the definitions of their functional roles dictated by that frame. The axiom of identification can never obtain the goal of totally mapping the cultural territory in order to derive value no matter what. It is in what is buried in the prose of the dominant frame’s determining a static state of affairs, the fragments in society utilized to express the product of the [Youth x Subculture] encounter, that the capacity to do a concerted violence to grammar lies. With or without the mapping of an interpretative representational device, the inner logic and generative structure indicative of the way in which a subject expresses its self persists. Subjectivity could not be accessed by these functions, they only set the value in which these subjects can obtain an identified individuality.

Identity can only be set equal to another identified, assumed, role or position. Otherwise the second Identity undergoing that operation would be set to an unknown, making it ineffective in the production or expression of a value system. The fact of a subject’s existence within the state of affairs is only by virtue of its description by others. However, different sets of facts can obtain the same individual. That individual becomes the object of many propositions. The reformulation of the Census failed as it remained incomplete. Only 78% of the population responded which inevitably embeds an internal contradiction in the policy derived from it. Therefore, each description is only partially representative of that subject’s expressive capacity. These facts produced do not lead to certainty. There is room to do violence to grammar. The method to validate the action of extending an organizing principle or name over a group of individuals and qualifying their existence in accordance with it, is not all encompassing. The Census attempted to fix the modalities in which blackness can be expressed and must always change in order to keep up with the ways alternative modalities of being
“Black” produced by its subject. Identity can only be known within a reference frame that is, ultimately, contingent to context. Black expressivity is appropriate to context but not caused by it.

Although individuals are composite, only a set of those features are reliable for identification. However, those same individuals may be subject to the deletion of the form in which they are represented in the surface organization of society. The forms deleted are those which are not accommodated in the value system of that state. Due to the social and political functions of identification, what is paraphrased out in the merge or encounter of the elements, symbols, objects, constituting the lexicon of an individual’s mode of expression, the function of their operations indicative of a way of being in the world, what was deleted is what is needed for understanding as well as the communicating that form of life. What is needed to communicate that form of life lies outside of that frame. In operating outside of the grammatical surface structure, in an alternative way but still maintaining a sense, it is possible to communicate forms of life that are seen as new but nonetheless have always been there. These modalities and their various forms were just in another context unknown to the value matrix above. This will form the basis for how we conceive of states of affairs changing. The same function, the negated expressions of an individual becomes the basis for an alternative, and therefore, change of context. Even if the same function, different domain generates different output.

Conceived from the point of subjectivity, the means to deconstruct identification are within the very act of naming itself. In the articulation mechanism, the structural relation set by the naming function overdetermines individual social movements while cultural movements subordinated the ideological stance of Youth. The structural overdetermination of the identity of Youth movements within that state of affairs utilized a strategy to divert the tactics of subject formation so as to extract value through dispossessing the creators of that value. This was accomplished by name or identifying segments of the population that were deemed beneficial or dangerous. By this process, various stratagems of subversion were denuded of their efficacy and incorporated into a system that turned symbols of protest into commodities. More often than not, the name extended to that individual did not have the effect of capturing anything of the subject itself. Subjects are constantly doing something different than before for subjectivity is an operation, not a thing.

The use of the products of an individual in a reference frame external to the context in which it was produced and, yet, within the same state, world view, or system of value/reference is an act of translation. In that external frame, what was translated is merely a description of that individual in a language opposed to the one in which it expressed its self. It has been shown above that translation fails. Any act of translation is ultimately mis-translation. Most violence comes from trying to speak in place of the other. This has the effect of only asserting the Other’s being overdetermined by a
dominant frame of reference. Just as well, this is the basis for discrediting the articulation of blackness as being mere nonsense or lacking rigor. Making the states frame of reference semantically static disallows access to the generative syntax and inner logic which forms the basis to the mechanism creating meaning, regardless of context and, yet, appropriate to it. Without that access, articulation is seen as random. Sense is left to chance. The practice of speaking for the Other also necessitates a description under the assumption that someone knows another’s form of life better than that individual knows themselves. This is a logical fallacy, as it remains to be determined how someone is able to describe someone else’s experience better than they. The structure to a system of Dominance may have different words, but that does not necessarily entail that it captures the same meaning.

Section II. Incorporation Through Dispossession

Distortion as a Tool of Expression

There was a concerted reaction against the articulation of punk subjectivity. As this was an underground culture, we must account for how Punk was eventually brought into the mainstream and put to use towards the production of value for the state. This can be studied in the move from Lo-fidelity to Hi-Fidelity recording. As technology is inscribed with a language that forwards the progression of the dominant culture, this move in concert with concerns in the environmental reaction to this subject shows attempts to control modes of expression. Most of the clubs and venues for punk shows carried over from blues and jazz venues, as well as theater and poetry spots in the Lower East Side and the Village. Recording and performance technology overall were not of the highest quality. This caused many improvisations with the technology itself: the construction of speakers, amplifiers, and the electrification of guitars.

Punk is the blues played fast. This much can be ascertained from a battle over recording practices and the effects it had on the blues kernel utilized by Little Richard in the process of recording his song “Tutti Frutti.” Richard’s career began as a gospel and blues musician. That core remained at the heart of Richard’s practice. In 1955, a White musician Pat Boone was given directions by his record label to cover Little Richard’s song, which forced Richard to speed up the tempo in order to subvert these efforts. This was along the lines of Chuck Berry and his song “Maybelline” would undergo a similar process by the MC5, the rearticulation of that blues kernel into the creation of Rock and Roll. The song’s original recording on a 45 rpm record, due to technological limitations, forced the blues core of the song to be compressed, making these songs faster than most experienced at the time. It would seem that with the advent of Extended (EP) and Long Play (LP) formats, the increase in the time allotted for recording would lead to an increase in song length. However, an inverse relation was obtained due to the practice of White covers of Black songs in order to introduce singles into
mainstream racialized markets. The imposition of an external grammar by a frame of reference to the vocabulary of musical expression, here the racist surface organization of our state of affairs, produced conditions in which to subvert that overdetermination, Black songs became faster and louder in order to express their subject matter from within blackness.

On 29 November 1955, “Tutti Frutti” was released on a Redita Record’s LP. Soon after, Richard incrementally increases the speed of the song after each effort by Pat Boone to cover it. By 1956, the speed of “Tutti Frutti” doubles and Boone no longer can keep up with Richard’s lyrics and speed of play. The speeding up of the blues core generating Rock on then to Punk was chronicled in a biography of Little Richard by Charles White. On 12 November 1984, Richard Harrington, staff writer for the Washington Post, quotes Little Richard in his article “a ‘Wopbopaloobop’; and ‘Alopbamboom’”: “They didn’t want me to be in the white guys’ way . . . I felt I was pushed into a rhythm and blues corner to keep out of rockers’ way, because that’s where the money is. When ‘Tutti Frutti’ came out . . . they needed a rock star to block me out of white homes because I was a hero to white kids. The white kids would have Pat Boone upon the dresser and me in the drawer ‘cause they liked my version better, but the families didn’t want me because of the image that I was projecting.”

The speeding up of the blues core that generated punk musical expression was solidified by the band MC5 covering the same song in 1970 along with a cover of Chuck Berry’s song “Back in the USA.” The speed at which those songs were played constructed the basis for punk in the following years. With each attempt to overdetermine the musical expression of blackness, the blues core to that mode of expression was sped up so that that finite lexicon could produce expressions not directly caused by or a copy of the environment, one that was not yet experienced in the vocabulary of the current frame of reference, but appropriate to it. Displaying this capacity, blackness’ ability to subvert overdetermination through cultural expression became dangerous to White sovereignty represented or expressed through the mainstream. The dominant reference frame’s response is shown through the technology and methodology of recording practices—here to be analyzed in the move to Hi-Fidelity.

Hi-Fidelity removes distortion and is a direct result of technological innovations after World War II. Progress was made in acoustical engineering by Harry F. Olson, alongside Avery Fisher’s focus on audio design, and Edgar Villchur’s and Henry Kloss’ experimentation with bass frequency in speaker and microphone design. Here, technology will be considered the mobilization and mechanization of a set of processes, not necessarily the products that those processes produce. The amalgamation of these processes can be seen as starting with the 1912 Radio Act, which facilitated the move of popular radio channels to FM frequencies which could handle higher fidelity. 

With the boom of Rock and Roll and admissions, most notably by Elvis, of its Black roots, Black
music was labeled dangerous to the Youth population in the value system erected after WWII. Black music was marked by its lower frequencies and its evocation of values outside of the coagulating hegemony of American identity stipulated as “White”-ness. Cold War McCarthyism sought to eradicate these threats to the system which led to the Culture Wars in the 1960s and their direct effect on policy as chronicled by James Hunter. During this period, Western Electric’s development of the Sound Surveillance System (SOSUS) in 1950 at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and utilized to track ballistic missiles and soviet submarines in the 1960s, became the precursor to the development of technology in 1958 for Hi-Fi recording and broadcasting. This was at the height of Cold War panic engendering the development of surveillance and motivating the erasure of deviance in sound recording based on both commercial and social value. By 1975, this technology was incorporated into audio and recording equipment by the same company, now called Westrex. Supposedly to ensure accuracy in sound reproduction, it also cemented the tie between sound and surveillance. By 1978, the Uniform Standard in Recording Act was set in place to secure this position, after the genre of Punk was imported from the U.K. with the Sex Pistols first album coming in 1977.

However, punk as an ethos’ very existence was/is to subvert regimes over its forms of expression and undo systems of control. By 1978, after U.K. imports and U.S. legislation, Hardcore punk and No Wave, most notably by the Black band Bad Brains, developed in direct response to the commoditized and glamorous Punk aesthetics coming out of the U.K. This was a direct rebuke of these forms being picked up by U.S. record companies. Makeup, hair, and clothing now made fashionable and expensive by McLaren and Vivienne Westwood were traded for hoodies and sneakers. The music was made faster, louder, and more compactly furious. This was done to subvert mainstream radio and recording limits imposed to increase the value of broadcasts through advertising. The imposition of limits to songs made editing radio programs easier as sound bites through a regular program could be rearranged and manipulated so as to articulate messages to the benefit of those who own the means of transmittance and despite the inner sense of the song. Like rearranging the words in a sentence or sentence length to change the meaning contingent to context, mainstream tactics we actively challenged by Hardcore. The change of LPs to EPs under the auspices of finally being able to record longer songs, giving artists more “freedom,” turned out to be another form of regulation—the order from the mainstream became: produce more songs of a certain length for the market.

The Changing Same

Baraka describes this phenomenon as a meeting between the reproduction of blackness mode of expression and the Classical. In *Blues People*, Black music is the only language that is strictly American but always confounds methods of identification. Blues songs were too long in the early history of recording and were forcefully truncated to fit on 45s and then LPs. Nevertheless, that core
lent to alternative versions of blues expression in Rhythm and Blues, Soul, etc. With Punk’s cooption of the EP, songs were made too short to highlight the wastefulness of industry regimentation. Black music’s tone is related to rebelliousness and meaning is tied to the pitch within a collective that is actively listening. With the electrification of the guitar in the 1950s, which Baraka describes as the voice of Black music that punctures harmonies, blackness’ modes of expression embodied an aberrant quality of scale found in its riffs and use of flattened or diminished chords. Distortion, as heard in the musical prose up through Punk, is forced back in to musical phrases with its assertion in the propositions of the Electric Church. Within this mode of expression, as the flow of what “is” is doing, Baraka’s notion of the “changing same” illustrates blue’s prose becoming the object of propositions that did not make sense within the matrix of values seeking to predetermine their meaning in the mainstream. These distorted phrases, nonetheless, had a sense or inner logic. For Gilroy, it was to “harness them in the causes of human creativity and liberation . . . woken up by the shock that elevated volume could supply, but also, because, if the wake-up-call could only be delivered on the correct frequency it could, in turn, promote a direct encounter with the souls of the people involved.”

The paraphrasing of the ontological commitment to blackness, in the attempt to quantify it by virtue of Census and legislation is analogous to removing distortion, removing any grain from the bass. This was found in the move from Lo-fidelity, the signature of a punk ethos, to Hi-fidelity. The grammar of improvisation heard in the distortion and the intervals of the flattened fifth were removed to erase the deviancy of the lower frequencies. It was to erase the danger inherent to blackness’ articulation. In remastering the relations that individuals had within the frame of reference set by a dominant, mainstream, value system, that system could be maintained. However, the lower frequencies, which are present though heard as mere distortion and noise, still harbor the ability to rearticulate these relations. The aberrant tone provided the preposition in which a mode of existence qua expression could be articulated by playing with the parameters of recording, the technology itself. In that encounter, individuals underwent catachresis collectively. In highlighting the wrong use in their identification, they still retain a sense or inner logic underneath that could be lived vicariously within that same state of affairs setting a different frame of reference.

Within the imposition of a genre, there remains sociolinguistic variation which plays with the parameters with which that category was fixed in the first place. Punk is a direct threat to the 4:4 time signature of mainstream musical grammaticality. For Baraka, it is more interesting to look at the act of signing one’s self into existence, “in time.” The change to 3:2 and 2:3 became more prevalent in Black music as overdetermination sets in. In each evocation and performance of the ethos, an ethics was built between players and listeners in the church. Solos were seen as individual indulgence. The band and crowd had to become a “collective improvisation.” The Power chord, a root note in
conjunction with a fifth, became the Church’s primary tool as it tended to non-linearity, distortion, and other modulations. According to Evan Rapport, oscillation between the I and IV chords from a traditional I-IV-V blues progression allowed for a complete rearticulation of musical form off of that same blues core and despite the confines of recording practices. The oscillation between chords: I-∅-IV-∅-I-. . . allows any thing, most especially noise and distortion, to be inserted at the Null position in that progression, during the articulation of that sonic thought. Finite parameters now become an open structure; infinite use of finite means ensues. The addition of the fifth imposes a violence to structure as well as asserts an upsurge that traces the field from which it came. That fifth is always buried in the prose though it may not be expressed on the surface. Finally, Lo-fidelity recording, beginning in so many lofts downtown and live records from performances, meant a rejection of the values in the grammar imposed upon Black punk articulation. It levied a charge against consumerism, and rejected the erasure of flaws in performance. By this, the music cut or left a mark because it was no longer amenable for “easy” listening or radio/record label programming. This practice made for a different locale for punk on the sound-spectrum, one not represented in the mainstream dominant surface but present.

Distortion became the force in the assertion of Black subjectivity despite state overdetermination. The census which became the naming mechanism within the frame of reference composed of [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan], when naming individuals Black, or African American, illustrated how blackness becomes its own referent because it constantly needed to be renamed. The confusion over “what is” blackness, and if it is to mean something other than it is, highlights that it is in the act of naming that we see a gap that could be used to cause violence to grammar. Blackness speaks in counterfactuals: a Future Perfect tense which articulates a world within the state of affairs that is real as it has consequences to forms of life, despite efforts of control. As such, it is not a shadowy reality, for the Future Perfect has consequences, therefore, is real. The articulation of a possibility lived in the present, it represents an alternate form of life. Totality cannot be expressed; therefore, any expression or grammatical form is imposed and does not exhaust what is actually there. If expressed, a form of life is really living. For Baraka, the body is a text and this text is musical. Music aims at bringing up elements that are buried between externalizations, evincing more to subjectivity, and doing violence to external impositions of grammaticality. Most of the styling cues of White Punks came out of blackness, a context alternative to their own which provided what is needed to express a Counter-Culture overall. Blackness conceived in this way destroys any monolith in the representation of a people, the epitaph that one is supposed to subscribe to and towards. What is more, an alternative conception of beauty was constructed. One not in the common discourse within that state of affairs typically evoked to denote the Beautiful. You cannot have Punk without the features out of blackness that come to form the matrix or state of affairs in which entities come to be articulate.
The Logic of Incorporation through Dispossession

Genre becomes an object of the propositions constructing the organizational structure of the dominant social value system. Blackness’ and, therefore, punk’s, mode of expression was effectively incorporated through dispossession by way of imposing the genre to sell in the market. Extraction from the context in which a product is produced is the initial trauma that is disavowed. Genre then renders that expression static to protect that claim from changing hands by being used in a different way. The cultural product of [Youth x Subculture] in punk is an articulated language. For Wittgenstein, “Language is articulated. Musical themes are in a certain sense a proposition. Knowledge of the nature of logic will for this reason lead to knowledge of the nature of music.”

The “[n]ature of logic,” is in sets of relations. The imposition of an individual(s) frame of reference, extended over the context of another is real within the form of life of the other because it harbors consequence for the individual that becomes the object of that operation. However, this relation is not a “thing” in the actual world, therefore, the extenstion of that dominant frame cannot be total. One does not see “causality” in actuality, but nonetheless, experiences its consequence. Within Baraka, there is a logic to black modes of expression through music. This in stark contradiction to methods of devaluing or discounting the black modes of being through music most notably in saying that it has no rigor or place in “White” genres of music. Much like language in a conventional sense, there are many ways to speak of some object and, therefore, many misunderstandings in communication. The way music means with sounds, gestures to a field in which the elements needed for understanding reside. The way those gestures are employed in the process of articulating an expression of subjectivity shows that they can be utilized to mean many different things. Music is a question from performer to listener: building relations between subjects; it is a mode in which one constructs a world. The idea that black music has no rigor or that improvisation is by chance not a method of adjunction with elements found within a frame of reference, becomes more so the belief in the dogma that there is a singular system of reference overall.

James Smethurst cites the MC5’s covers of Sun-Ra, along with the ones noted here by Chuck Berry and Little Richard, as an example of this capacity. The redoubling that occurs in a Punk cover reciting its blues foundation. We find the source of this citation on that same stage, the improvisation of Sun-Ra in conjunction with performances by Baraka in 1969 New York. This moment elucidates a simple structure in shorter intervals, lending itself to increased speed during performance. MC5’s performance illustrates the family resemblance of different modes of expression generated through, articulated from, the same object. It also makes clear the repetitions that occur in the encounter and merge of elements within an improvisational proposition, that subset within but erased on the surface when externalized in the performance of a song. Everything needed to understand this expression is
there where blackness resides, as that which holds the “collective improvisation” together. Baraka’s notion of the continuity of blackness through modes of expression as a changing same is the ground for the articulation of a U.S. culture in which blackness’ presence, although disavowed, persists in and through the expression of its subjectivity. The move from Lo-fidelity to Hi-fidelity as punk entered larger venues and recording studios mirror the fixing of a genre “Punk” to a mode of being in the world. This is the same as the top down fixing of blackness to being “the blacks” by a mechanism of determining value through Census codification. By inverting the identification function, it becomes clear that punk has always been a facet of blackness outside of its identification of a genre named “Punk.” Within blackness is the capacity to subvert the overdetermination of its modes of expression by showing the contradictions with the redoubling of its phrases, forcing the rearticulation of individuals’ conditions. A process evinced by the increased speed of the blues in such a way that it did not fit into current systems of categorization.\textsuperscript{285}

With the Barakian notion that musical expression is the expression of a people and, therefore, the syntax to the expression of subjectivity, the \textit{[Youth x Subculture]} product of the punk subject and the blues buried in its prose is an expression of black radical subjectivity. Baraka studied these happenings at clubs such as the 5 spot, Cedar Tavern, St. Marks Playhouse, the lofts on 27 Cooper Square and Bowery, now Capitale Savings Bank. These later became Punk venues, due to either their proximity to CBGB’s and Max’s Kansas City, or to Alan Vega’s, a musician and artist of the band Suicide, loft at 133 Greene. These venues were also close to William Burroughs’, the so-called “Godfather of Punk,” Bunker on 222 Bowery as well. This quadrangle of sorts mapped a “punk” territory. Within it, the DIY loft recording practices of lower Manhattan began the repertoire of DIY practices that became central to a punk ethos.\textsuperscript{286} Many punks later frequented these places such as Tom Verlaine of the bands Velvet Underground and Television, who named himself after the nineteenth century Poet and saw his music and self as poetic and literary. This is also found in Jennifer Jazz of the Guerilla Girls. Many bands vinyl records at that time were recordings of live performances without remastering. This constellation of spots created the Electric Church, the ethos in which its congregation merged the objects from their environment in a way that could not be identified by the value system at large, thus undermining the overdetermination of their subjectivity from with-out.

**Family Resemblances**

It is in this way that we can connect Harlem to the Lower East Side, LeRoi Jones to Amiri Baraka. A connection made through modes of articulated expressions found in the merge and encounter between the elements within these scenes did not exist at a fixed or finite point. It was found when these elements came together in various ways with a specific inner sense that held this relation.\textsuperscript{287} These
zones were understood to be there. With the double peddles and bass, the sound of fists reigning on ceilings, and walls cracking, their coming together represented a violence to the attempt to fix sound with meaning. The move from Lo-fidelity recording practices to Hi-fidelity became an attempt to paraphrase out the bass and vibration that is central to the live performances of this phenomenon. Punk reacted with the interjection of voice, the guitar in Baraka’s vocabulary, in order to destroy a fixed melody structured over an individuals’ music. This same process described by Baraka in Blues People prior to what was subsequently labeled Punk.

By the time Baraka leaves the Village as a result of the assassination of Malcolm X, the scene solidified not only its downtown New York location but its literary roots. During the Nova Conference in 1978, William Burroughs headlines the proceedings amongst the prominent punks and literati of the day. The ethos present there was illegible to the mainstream culture at the time and provided for the emergence of what came to be known as Punk later on. That relation only became known under that name to those outside of that form of life. The ten-year lag between Baraka’s coming to the Village, leaving, and the bands that ensued is accounted for through Baraka’s concept of a continuum of blackness as a set of relations, not individuals, that never left after the Beats.

Baraka in autobiographical form downplays his involvement in the scene due to his populist work and building a Black Arts Movement in Harlem. There is evidence most notably in the movement of Jennifer Jazz, whom became a cornerstone of the downtown punk scenes in the 70s and 80s. As one of the products of the Black Arts Movement, Jazz represents its link to Punk—most notably today in the documentary by James Spooner turned music festival “Afro-Punk.” Baraka calls for a guerilla/gorilla action from his colleagues uptown. This may be where Jennifer Jazz gets the idea to name the band and activities that she co-founds the Guerilla Girls. A continuum is maintained through what seems individual, because named or identified as different instances. However, the relations that hold underneath are indicative of the same subjectivity. In the elements utilized by this black subject through a ritual evoking that ethos across the performances within scene. Attendees become the surrogates that carry this components of this ethos from performance to performance, the materials within that continuum allow for affinities, understandings, to be reached in each evocation. This will be considered under the rubric of the mosh pit later on in this project. Baraka says he knew many of these people before they were or started calling themselves “Punks,” evinced by the MC5’s using Sun-Ra and poetry to create a sound that had not be subsumed by a genre at the time.

The relation held within the continuity of subjectivity works along the concept of family resemblance. This is opposed to mere similarity. Blackness is a generative capacity in which individuals are related within a repertoire of signifying practices. Merely cataloguing similarities between expressions allows for those outside of blackness to be identified with and take advantage of its products without
participating in their production. Through an analysis of the blues, Baraka offers insight to this church and how punk, as derivative from blues, creates open structures that are not rooted but branch and shoot out. Punk songs are incredibly structured, but, nonetheless, present an explosion of voice and noise in all directions. These songs’ meanings must be completed in a circuit created between listener and performer. This is the definition of difference through repetition and emblematic of the changing same: to be of the same core, but generate different meanings dependent upon context. A performance then creates an almost infinite amount of expressions out of finite elements. This is a solution to how to store infinite information in a finite set of material.289

If communication was primary, there could only be one vocabulary, one set of signifying practices, attainable whose “meanings”/definitions would have to hold across contexts. Otherwise, expressions outside of that vocabulary would be senseless in and of themselves. The study of a performance which denies the creative capacity of the performer while only attributing the meaning to fixed notions from the crowd, is a retroactive description most often based on the notion that we already know what we are looking at. This concept of music is based on a referential dogma, a methodological dualism, which assumes that each song and genre have a fixed meaning. Baraka in his surrealist biography comes to the conclusion that “hell is definitions.” Thus, eradicates this mind/body methodological dualism. One cannot study the meaning or the semantics of a performance from the crowd because “listening” on its own does not constitute a song. One would have to know someone else’s intentions during the performance. Also, the function of listening without the argument of a song, really is not listening to any one thing. Each individual assembles a meaning, takes value of what is performed in a way different from the another, but can also come to the same understanding of where they are, what they experience. Music is not encoded with meaning but is used outside of regimes over knowledge to get at understandings which are syntactically assembled. Each evocation of a tone or a 1:2:1 time signature—which resides within Blues, Rock, and Punk—can make meanings appropriate to their situation in accordance with their use, but known under a different genre or name. From the creative capacity view, one cannot say why the listener hears one sound instead of another, but can study the capacity to make meaning with sounds; one cannot say why one hears one instead of another meaning, but we can study meaning with sound outside of this unsubstantiated dogma of sounds with predetermined definitions. Hence, why improvisation requires musicians to hear and play simultaneously.

In all, a subject is created musically through the adjunction of sonic features, the concatenation of sounds and stops which express a musical thought. A marker of blackness that has been studied in reference to Black identity is syncopation in the merge process of elements. The encounter of these tones within a field of pitch expresses a sonic thought. Punk is begat by the blues played fast. “Syncopated rhythms of this kind accentuate the ‘off beat’ and in doing so draw the listener into the
music to ‘supply’ the ‘missing’ first and third beats . . . The presence of a recognizable syncopation in the music is a precondition for all dancing in the rock-based popular music sphere. The main reason for the ‘undanceability’ of much punk rock (and for its adoption of the ‘pogo’ as a suitable dance form) is that, to quote Christgau, it tends to ‘submerge’ syncopation in its rhythmic patterns.”

Photographer Syd Shelton would document the punk movement and a series of concerts called Rock Against Racism. RAR formed in 1976 after a racist rant by Eric Clapton supporting Conservative anti-immigrationist minister Enoch Powell, as well as David Bowie’s support for fascism voiced in interviews with Playboy and New Musical Express (NME) in the same year. RAR organized concerts by placing reggae and punk bands together onstage to combat racial conflicts and a White nationalist upsurge in the U.K. An upsurge that sought cultural validation through what had been falsely determined as White ethnic musical expression in Punk. In many of the spaces Shelton photographed and, in particular, a 1979 photo of the band Misty in Roots, spray-painted on the walls was the slogan, “Dead Punks Don’t Pogo” with Black subjects in the foreground. The denial of this and, thus, the assertion that blackness’ expression lacks rigor, deriding the creative capacity inherent to the subject, seemed to solidify White grammaticality over the creative mechanism in improvisation. A feature endemic to blackness as analyzed by Baraka, the operation of improvisation expresses black subjectivity. John Cage is noted to have been dismissive of jazz and improvisation in his work Silence, opposing it to other forms of experimental music of the time because, for him, improvisation mere “chance.” Association for the Advancement of Creative Musicians (AACM) member Joseph Jarman responded stating that improvisation and other forms of Black musical expression was a compositional strategy. Out of Jazz came a vast number of musical forms including Punk, No Wave, etc. In destroying the grammar of musical genre, the conditions were set to create other forms from the same elements which can only be accounted for through a creative capacity of subjectivity. If empirically studied, these forms would seem to come from nowhere, from nothing. However, in this chapter we aimed to show the continuity of the subject in its many forms.

These were the conditions for the creation of black subjectivity as found in a punk ethos. Race is a structural apparatus, which permeates history but is not History itself. Racism, its enactment, is always historically specific. Though racism and structural overdetermination may draw on traces deposited by antecedent phases, it is always context specific. Thus, racism arises out of present, not past, sets of conditions; its effects are specific to the present state of affairs, to the present unfolding of forms of life. Racism is a dynamic political and cultural process, not simply the description of a past thatpretends to be forgotten.

Definitions and, therefore, Identity are socially located and rooted. As such, identity fails to capture process. Subjectivity is evidenced by how the products of this operation are recursively enumerated and branch out, not by some root. All socially meaningful definitions must be made real through
social processes. Consequently, Counter-Culture requires subcultures or alternative forms of life, as its base. This is so as to counter definitions of reality imposed by a structural apparatus expressed through the function of overdetermination. Countering definitions as indicative of Counter-Culture challenges the system of values at the very points of stress and tension revealed through the act of identifying individuals so as to place them within a frame of reference. A Counter-Cultural frame of reference is an alternative web of terms critical to social organization and the surface grammatical ascriptions within the matrix of values in which these individuals were articulated. Counter-Culture, here a punk ethos, offers forms of social disaffiliation which are nonetheless one’s affinity with a counter force. A punk ethos from within blackness creates worlds. These worlds are a counterfactual or Future Perfect mode of expression that offers possible actions within forms of life that embody an alternative structure. A form of life distinct from what sought to overdetermine those individuals.
Figure 1. Pure Hell, “No Rules.”
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REARTICULATION

“Signification is the nigger’s occupation”

The task at hand is to show how the principle violence of overdetermination is enacted through the act of identification. The consequence being that in the act of naming or defining an individual’s value, creating a term or token that is to be substituted for that individual, a mistranslation occurs. In that act, the capacity to do violence to this mechanism yields the ability to transform or rearticulate states of affairs. The result is another state of affairs, with its own reference frame and form of life, within that context. I will call this a Future Perfect. The product of one encounter is articulated through to another. Through the mechanism of articulation, I will map how blackness’ modes of expression flow. With articulation conceived as what LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka, called the “flow of is,” an analysis of Henry Gates Jr.’s concept of “signifyin’,” and Zora Neale Hurston’s concepts of mimicry and repetition, blackness’ mode of expression as rearticulation will be illustrated through the linguistic concept pied-piping. Piping reveals how this flow works through the rearticulation of the syntactic structure of the surface organization to states of affairs.

The purpose of formulating a mechanism of articulation and a methodology for its application was to counter the Afro-pessimist’s assertion: “One cannot build a movement out of absolutely nothing.” This “absolute nothing” is to be identical to what is termed by the Pessimist a “social death” made equivalent to blackness. However, this proposition as it stands is ill-posed. Formulated in this way, the question of blackness identical with a social death, and the assumption of the impossibility of building a movement from absolute nothing in order to subvert its overdetermination, cannot have an answer. Yet, this is exactly what the Pessimist requires for their analysis. The Pessimist assumes that “nothing” is to identify or denote a certain group or individual, making that group’s existence, en masse, identical with a single individual. The question, formed as an assertion by the Pessimist, induces a misreading of blackness within our current state of affairs. A question that could have an answer is: “How is the term “nothing” being used?” Therefore, I will assume the Afro-Pessimist position to show its internal contradictions. “Nothing,” as it is used in posing the Pessimist’s hypothesis, highlights a useful paradox as it is now possible to equate nothing to multiplicity, to movement. A reorientation to how “nothing” is used allows for blackness to be conceived as a void that is not empty.

A Wittgensteinian paradigm has been tacitly assumed throughout this project. There is no “private” language so there is no private vocabulary with which to form expressions. However, there must be an account made for the formation of the expression. My assertion against the Afro-Pessimist premise
is: there being no private language entails no private market or social organization to society. No private language is based on the ubiquity of an inner creative capacity of thought as definitive of language, rather than an assumed primacy of communicable expression. In the racialized society that is the U.S., and the various extensions of that project, the notion of market and exchange is inextricably tied to blackness defined as an object or term “Black.” That term’s meaning is derived from some other object considered denotative of that individual and is subject to the propositions of governmentality. An Identitarian and, therefore, proprietary notion with concerns to stalling changes within states of affairs, overdetermines the subjectivity of individuals within that state. A contradiction is derived from this formulation for the name of an individual transposed as an object of “commerce” into another system of value outside of its own form of life is exposed.

My approach to reading how states of affairs are expressed takes the syntax of their construction to illustrate how terms or individuals compose that environment. There is a difference between syntax, generative structure, and the rules qua parameters that enforce definitions and maintain rigidity of a system of categorization. Rigidity of structure is maintained by fixing the possible roles, and their functions, that go on to express our state of affairs in order to communicate an individual’s value. Linguistically, the superficial appearance of a sentence does not directly correlate with what it expresses. The logical form and syntactic structure of a thought or proposition may or may not—dependent upon context—have an externalized phonetic structure or surface representation. There are many ways of saying the same thing, one can create a thought yet remain silent, and there are things we can think but not say. Socially, one definition or the name attributed to an individual does not exhaust what that individual actually is, or the potential expressions that individual can form. Conservation of one’s stance by virtue of an ideology of ownership and Identity creates a nonrestrictive or additive modification to these configurations. These have no justification save from the one that these stipulations come from. Mapping this, we see the transposition of individuals’ roles into a state of affairs that seeks to fix their function. By a defined operation the goal is to defend the structure of attainable positions within that state in such a way that is profitable and sustains that state’s internal structure. In turn, this makes individuals newly introduced to this structure legible to strategies incorporating cultural expression to extract value. In a racialized society, a White reference frame’s goal is to substantiate a value system extended over individuals across different contexts, proposing its form of life as dominant and determining what forms of expression are “correct” therein.

**The State of Affairs and the possibility for Rearticulation**

Through the mechanism of articulation, it is possible to imagine the expression of blackness both from within blackness itself and from an external stance. The function of expression takes blackness as an object of propositions representing Black identity. Here, I will look at two examples of
blackness’ articulation and their implications. First, blackness takes itself as an object. This inevitably leads to an analysis of the initial articulation of blackness and its subsequent rearticulation within its own frame of reference. Second, I formalize the overdetermination of blackness as the object of a proposition external to its own reference frame’s form of life. The former is seen as indicative of the internal merge of elements, the encounter of objects internal to a lexicon within a form of life, utilized for the expression of blackness itself. The latter is an illustration of the merge between the former and elements external to blackness’ frame of reference. This expresses Black identity within an overdetermined frame. As a whole, the individual of the former set of propositions is taken into the articulations of another frame’s mode of expression. This process provides the formal definition of second order articulation, from here on termed rearticulation viz. a process called pied-piping.

The attempt to articulate blackness from within itself, although more recent than the period to be explored in the attempt to overdetermine its expressions, can be illustrated by the event of Jesse Jackson’s pronouncement that blackness should be identified “African-American.” I analyze this more recent example first, for it is imperative that one grasps an internal merge of objects, immanent within the lexicon available within the finite experience and environment constituting a form of life, so to understand how external articulations take in individuals whole. External merge does not have access to an expression’s internal logic or construction. Overall, merge illustrates the capacity to create an almost infinite range of expressions with finite means. Once this concept is in hand, it is possible to grasp the idea of rearticulation captured by the act of overdetermining individual expressions. The difference shows the points at which this act can be subverted. Through this method and sequence of analysis, internal and external merges are understood as individual processes that are not mutually exclusive.

In 1988, the Democratic National Convention was held in Atlanta, Georgia. Jesse Jackson, a prominent Black Civil Rights leader, was running for president. His presence in the presidential race was evidence of a wish to participate, in other words, to fit into the governmental structure as a public official. Shortly after the convention, Jackson calls for Blacks in the U.S. to be identified as “African-American” during that meeting in Chicago. The importance of this movement was to utilize a cultural endowment from one context for use in another within the lexicon of an Afro-centric frame of reference containing a sovereign concept of the “African” diaspora. This moment sanctions a new role for Black intellectuals as there were seventy-five Black scholars involved. Ethnicity was to be understood as cultural endowment. The endowment was a repertoire of signifying practices, indicative of a mode of expression and way of being in the world, of being “African”-American as Black identified. Ethnicity was to be evoked by the use of the hyphen as a functor in the articulation of blackness within a U.S. context. It was to be understood that this evocation of a cultural endowment was required from a context outside of Black America, due to the assumption that Black culture was
minimally significant, even nonexistent, within the U.S.’s constitution and system of values. The articulation of blackness at this moment will be understood viz. our articulatory mechanism as an encounter between this hyphenated identity and blackness itself.

Within our articulatory mechanism, I take the context, (W)orld, to be the U.S.; the two individuals within the encounter are (N)amed “American” and “African”-American; those individuals (R)elation within that state of affairs are set within the propositions of a White context and Black context respectively. The cross product of the encounter between these two individual contexts represented by the triplet <W, N, R>, and indicative of a merge internal to the U.S. articulating Black identity within the lexicon of that U.S. state of affairs, expresses the overdetermination of a name by way of their newly articulated relationship within that state of affairs. This yields interesting results. What is known as “American” overdetermines blackness’ relation within this state of affairs. The relation White identity obtains within this state of affairs overdetermines the role expressed through the use of the label “African”-American.302

There are three implications derived from the result formulated above. The first is that blackness is overdetermined in an American system of value, whose operation expresses a White reference frame. The function of that name takes as its object the role of Black identity and its function expresses a position that furthers the extension of “White”-ness’ reference frame. In turn, Black identity’s relation to that state is defined within a reference frame that assumes White as identical, interchangeable, with “American.” Overdetermination is expressed by setting the function of the role or defining Black identity’s value within that state of affairs. Secondly, White’s overdetermination of the term “African”-American’s use belongs to and is determined through a frame of reference that is outside of blackness but still within the same state of affairs constituted by the roles in which those individuals are to ascribe. Attaining those roles entails one’s subordination to the nominal assumption that, “American”=White.303 The context and, therefore, the form of life of this state is White, hence White’s being identical, interchangeable, with American.

By formalizing the articulation of this encounter, it is easy to show the paradox in Jesse Jackson’s program. His being the hope to define a culture for Blacks under the assumption that there was none there significant enough to subvert blackness’ overdetermination in a “White” America. If ethnicity is conceived as a cultural endowment which, in turn, is a repertoire of signifying practices, the importation of an endowment from a context outside of this state of affairs and utilized within it, works along the same logic as what attempts to overdetermine blackness within the U.S. The assertion of “African-American” is equivalent to the Afro-pessimist position that blackness is equal to cultural death. That Black identity is in need of operationalizing a cultural endowment from outside of a U.S. context for use within it so as to be valid on its own. However, through Jackson’s operationalization
of the hyphen, importing an “African” endowment for use within an American context, we easily see that Black identity is a function with no object, an open sentence. Its use indicates that someone is utilizing that function to express themselves. On this account, blackness cannot be empty. This entails that the identity is not blackness itself but used by it to express a self in the world. Thus, blackness’ use of the vocabulary of the system which sought its own subordination mistakenly enacts a strategy of incorporation through dispossession in the name of that which overdetermines its own modes of expression. Nevertheless, there remained a cultural endowment that is blackness within the U.S., most evident in music and to be discussed in further detail below.

With articulation internal to context formalized, it is now possible to illustrate an external merge of a previously articulated individual’s encounter with another state of affairs. Recall from the Electric Church, the 1960s as a historical period began shortly after World War II and ends during the management of a world financial crisis in 1977. The encounter between a structural reconfiguration of the U.S. and the ideological, i.e. cultural modes of expressing alternative forms of life have had lasting effects on the social and political landscape of today.

The mechanism inherent to this encounter posits a cross product between Subculture and Youth culture. Subculture was to be identified with the burgeoning second wave of feminist movements; the Hippies and dropping out of mainstream society; the Beat poets; and Civil Rights movements. The relation these individual movements would hold within the Subcultural state of affairs would be structural. They would propose an alternative form of life up and against the traditional value systems in the U.S. Youth culture would be identified with Rockabillies; the New Left which was to be a reformulation of the ideological dogmatism of previous iterations of that movement; a cultural reassessment of sex and sexuality; and others. The relation that these individuals would obtain within Youth’s state of affairs would be ideological.

Articulated from this encounter was what came to be known as Counter-Culture. Individuals identified within the Subcultural state of affairs would come to overdetermine the ideological relation of Youth. A structural relation would come to overdetermine the movements of individuals participating in music and culture, ideologies around sex and sexuality, the New Left, etc. Subcultural state of affairs would overdetermine an ideological relation within this newly articulated state of affairs, while Youth culture’s state of affairs organized along structural lines. In all, the Subcultural state of affairs would overdetermine what constituted the Youth culture of that time. The Feminists, Hippies, Beats, and Civil Rights movements would overdetermine the expressions of Youth culture. The configuration of these sets of conditions articulated the Counter-Cultural movement of the late 60s, in and through the 70s and 80s.
The importance the concept of rearticulation has to blackness is that through reports and changes with regard to the governance of populations, blackness becomes equated with Youth and Counter-Culture. Blackness became the culprit for managing what the Huntington Report called a “crisis in democracy.” This was concluded from his reiteration of “the blacks” participation in what he diagnosed as an “excess of democracy.” Increased democratic participation, either through suffrage or the increased cultural significance of expressed opposition to overdetermination, was directly correlated to decreased governmental authority. From a formal analysis of this particular articulation—the encounter of Subculture and Youth—it is possible to draw conclusions as to what occurred during this period. The overdetermination of the cultural expression of Youth by Subculture engenders a Counter-Cultural expression up and against dominant value systems. The Subcultural utilization of an ideology overdetermines how social movements express themselves during this period. Finally, the Structural overdetermination of Youth culture identifies Youth culture with the crisis that the authorities of democracy faced in the 1960s. Youth’s identification with blackness and blackness’ rearticulation expressed by utilizing cultural objects external to its own form of life, black subjectivity becomes the mode of expressing Counter-Culture. When one expression or individual is brought up for use in another context or proposition, this movement amounts to the former being defined within the context of another state of affairs. This, by definition, is the construction of a frame of reference. The transposition of blackness out from one state of affairs in and through another will be analyzed through the process of rearticulation which is syntactically called pied-piping.

To illustrate this concept, first take the articulation of blackness from within itself: blackness articulated as “African-American” within a U.S. state of affairs. With blackness’ mode of expression made identical to Youth by the Huntington report, and statistically codified through a social-anthropological study by Daniel Moynihan entitled “The Negro Family,” the term “African-American” is piped through the mechanism of articulation and identified within the structural overdetermination of Counter-Culture up through and against a U.S. value system.

Formally, when rearticulation occurs the individual articulated from the initial encounter is taken up as a whole into a secondary encounter. As such, it is identified under another name. Taken up as a whole is conceived as the overdetermination of an individual—the whole being composed of a particular point of view, relation, and its function within that form of life—by a function external to the one that articulated that individual in that prior encounter. The inner logic and structure of that individual comes under the name or role imposed by that external function indicating the extension of overdetermination within the scope of that secondary encounter. The new role applied to that name and its function within that secondary context expresses the concept of another form of life. However, the whole articulated through this mechanism is composed of many elements which, if one were added or taken away, that individual would become some one/thing other than it was. Blackness,
equated with Youth and Counter-Culture, is taken up into another encounter within the structural value system of the U.S. Only its identity is rearticulated. That identity is composed of a name and that names relation or function within a particular form of life. That name is then made an object within the operations of another, external and therefore secondary, form of life distinct but not mutually exclusive to that indicated by the primary encounter. Now that Counter-Culture is labeled Black, Black identity becomes a function of Counter-Culture. That object encompasses what individuals within that Counter-Culture were known as originally as well as the state of affairs that fixed that identification in the first place. Therefore, the entity being defined in the rearticulation of an individual is ambiguous as its constituents are taken as separate from what that entity is assumed to be in that second encounter.

Linguistically, this concept is called an island. What is referenced in the resulting context—the complete set of all the constituents which have become the object of the function within that secondary context expressing the newly articulate individual therein—does not appear in that secondary context’s expressions, only that individuals name. How expressions appear are context dependent. To the question “what is Black?” one could reply a color, a people, etc. This ambiguity amounts to asking what is this? or that? The begging of these questions motivates the construction of a frame of reference. The term being used to refer to an entity is thought of as being empty or stranded without reference to the features constituting the individual to which that expression supposedly refers. The constituents of what is being referred to have not moved into this state of affairs, only its name.309 “Black” or “African-American” is used to represent all of blackness but does not refer to any one individual. The term qua label is taken to be the individual. The term African-American is made to refer to blackness by choosing an individual which is a part of but nonetheless apart from blackness as soon as it is named. One individual identity does not exhaust what blackness, as a capacity expressing subjectivity, is, but can be used to define what blackness is to represent within a specific value system or reference frame a particular Identity. This ambiguity is shown when blackness is referred to by a specific term and the what, which, where, etc. phrases that are raised in order to fix its ambiguity.

Issues of ambiguity show the problem with Identity Politics as brought up by Jesse Jackson and seventy-five other activists in that 1988 conference. By creating the identity “African-American” problems ensued.310 With this assertion, blackness under any label can be taken up and used within a frame of reference and to a specified end or politic that is either beneficial to blackness or works against it. The assertion of that label illustrates an acceptance of a disavowal of blackness’ subjectivity by what is considered dominant culture. In the U.S., dominant culture was an assumed White reference frame which stated that Race does not exist, however, granted Whites an ethnic and, therefore, cultural inheritance signified by a hyphenated identity. This was/is not the case for Blacks.
The conclusion that Blacks have to be given a cultural endowment is here shown to be contradictory. However, as this strict identification, indicative of one’s significance in the state, was challenged, what was considered the dominant system of value within the U.S. felt the need to defend itself through the control of populations. Its defense was made through the use and access of legal means as opposed to the mere creation of law through a White supremacist ideology. Instead of fixing an irrational structure, contradictions were identified and placed within strict parameters so that secondary mechanism were put in place and enforced in order to maintain the status quo.

There are three implications to what has been referred to as second order articulation. Now conceived as the rearticulation of blackness, we find through these two examples: i) the articulation of blackness uses the parameters of the state of affairs to express itself even if, and despite of, its being overdetermined when taken up for use to produce value within the lexicon of another context; ii) the use of the term “African-American” is already overdetermined when imported for use within another state of affairs’ frame of reference. This is due to that term being used to identify a group of people using the terms of that frame, whose rearticulation overdetermines it in that secondary state; iii) the hyphenation of Identity attempts to import the mistaken identity of “Africa,” considered as a country, into an assumed reference frame, a U.S. or “American” base, that then becomes proof of furthering a colonial project. Logically, this leads to a contradiction, for Africa is not a nation, but a continent of many countries, each composed of various ethnicities, leading to ambiguity in the denotation of the term “‘African’-American.” However, the rearticulation of blackness, and the use of its modes of expression within the reference frame of another, shows that “White”-ness requires blackness in order to substantiate its state of affairs. Without it, “White”-ness remains vacuous, a function without an object. This need highlights the motivation of White overdetermination by virtue of incorporating through dispossessing the expressions of one context for use in its reference frame so to legitimize the ethnicity or cultural endowment they have given themselves by the terms of the frame it constructed.

Evidence of this is found in the incorporation of the term “African-American” in the 1990 Census. It is also found in the propensity for White individuals within the U.S. context to disavow the existence of racial categorization while hyphenating their identity so to import cultural repertoires for use within the U.S. to enforce their categorical difference. In this way, White is made identical to American with a qualifier prefixed to that base, usually in the form of another country or nationality, so as to assert a cultural lineage that reinforces an origin. This specificity is denied to those of “Africa.” Through the formulation of White=American, “African”-American not only illustrates the overdetermination of “Africa” within a reference frame assumed as American, but also becomes counterintuitive. The logical form of that identity maker, “African,” can be formalized as stating “African”-White, due to the definitions imposed by the reference frame itself. However, because of these ambiguities in reference, blackness retains the capacity to rearticulate states of affairs as the assumption of no one
culture residing within blackness, save for its being labeled a certain way, only reinforces the fact that nominalization cannot exhaust all that is blackness. “Black” or “African-American” as terms, symbols, etc. can be overdetermined, but blackness, that from which they are articulated, cannot. For if it was, the determination would be self-defeating as they would be empty predicates, no object would obtain that definition, and yet the subject, blackness, can obtain multiple predicates regardless of whatever one it does dependent upon the context in which it appears.

Through this mechanism, our analysis claims that White assertions of strict dominance over others viz. the imposition of a mainstream reference frame are vacuous. In lieu of the determination that blackness suffers a cultural death and is Nothing, blackness is determined as no one thing. Due to the requirement of White frames of reference to incorporate Black modes of expression to define blackness and substantiate its form of life, blackness retains the capacity to change the surface organization to states of affairs despite categorization.

**Syntax to Structural Overdetermination**

A syntactic analysis of the surface organization to the expression of a society is important to analyzing its form of life. To each state of affairs’ organization there is a grammar to how it expresses the relations between the individuals which participate in and, thereby, actively construct that state. What is known under a label or formal expression in one state of affairs can be known under a different name or expressed differently in another. This can be the case, even if both obtain or speak of the same object. Contingent to context, the use of a single term can refer or be used to categorize different individuals. What is “Black,” “African-American,” etc. cannot be discerned outside of the frame of reference that defines how it is to be used in that state affairs; these terms could be different ways of speaking of the same individuals, but may not qualify for all the individuals of a particular category within that frame and yet a categorized differently in others. Names, identities, are functions expressing a role within the grammar of the state.

The importance of syntax is that overdetermination can occur under the auspices of different names or expressions, accomplishing the same structural ends, and articulate the same power dynamic under a superficially different regime or code. On the surface, what is expressed can be seen as different when in actuality, the function of that expression obtains the same object or ends. This amounts to being caught in a relativistic web of semantics which is the crux of political expediency: fixing the frame of reference for individuals across contexts that requires experts to navigate the network imposed. Across contexts, the same terms can have an interminable amount of definitions and meanings for each situation. A superficial analysis allows individuals to use terms as tools towards their own subordination. The result is that mere surface level critiques, challenging only how contexts appear,
halt structural change. The importance of this section is not particularly to discern between frames of reference, but to understand how one is formed. In this way, it is possible to ascertain how the reference frame itself is being utilized and by whom; which is not merely to know the categories within it.

The emphasis here is on the modes in which these individuals are expressed. For the expression produced by such mode to have a sense, it must reside within a frame of reference. As two interpretations can obtain the same object, the value of that object can only be represented within a proposition. An example of this is the mistranslation of “mash” in the Bad Brains’ proposition “mash it up” during a performance in 1980s Washington D.C. To “mash” soon became to “mosh” as in “mosh pit,” a circular dance during punk performances. An expression out of Black American, particularly Jamaican, origin was put to a different use within another reference frame. This movement of an expression, formed in the context of one form of life, and taken up for use in another is what was termed pied-piping. Piping requires a discussion of how the reference frames that fix the identity of individuals are constructed. In such an account, we attend to the question of how reference frames come to force a dominant role over individuals, as well as how these frames are passed down from one context to another? Both are of great importance to Articulation theory. These are questions regarding second order articulation. Second order entails the rearticulation of an individual produced within the frame of another encounter. It remains to be shown how what is expressed out of rearticulation does not contain the individual referenced but, nonetheless, speaks of that individual to fix its position or role within another state of affairs’ reference frame or value system. This process will be handled under the concept of cultural endowments and how these lineages affect the social organization in states of affairs.

The formation of a cultural endowment occurs through the rearticulation process. Take “A Black individual” or “Victor is Black.” Both have identity implications. The former is existential. In terms of an individual’s expressive capacity as derived from the syntactic structure of that individual’s expression, the form of these expressions evince the base structure to what could possibly be expressed within a reference frame by stating what “is” in that frame. To see how reference frames are formed we must look at the flow of individuals as their being piped through contexts and what that entails. This must be considered despite their being overdetermined by their definition within the reference frame of a particular context. This flow of what “is,” was termed the Gerund in chapter one. The Gerund can also be considered under the notion of the “changing same.” The same term or expression can produce an exponential range of expression through finite means, appropriate to context but not caused by it. The Gerund form cannot have any determiners or descriptions injected within their internal structure. Consider improvisation and difference generated through the repetition of a chord whose intonation may change dependent on the context in which its played.
Analyzed syntactically, this property has implications regarding articulation of Punk musical expression. If one considers Punk’s blues base, this form is embedded in Punk’s method of constructing its expression and a logical form which, whether it be improvisation or distortion, cannot be argued away.

The Gerundive formation to frames of reference shows how blackness travels through articulations to express a manifold of individuals. Despite blackness itself being written out of the dominant reference frame, it is continually cited by alternatives. What is piped through contexts is based on the lexical hypothesis which, for our purposes, works through our formalization of reference frames. After certain individuals are articulated, how they appear and what they express by how those individuals are categorized—categories being contingent to frame and apart from the object itself, as indicated by their logical form—are marked within the lexicon of the frame in which they are introduced. Once articulated, individuals are no longer subject to the transformations of their previous frame. However, their names are taken in as an identified whole to be used in the expressions of that secondary context. In this way, the units required for semantic interpretation remain intact. Thus, if one recognizes the inner logic that these individuals obtain within an expression, and the manner they are inserted into a proposition as their mode of being in the world, then regardless of the origin of those individuals, another subject can understand how these individuals are being used to express an aspect of that state of affairs. One does not require knowledge of a term's definition in order to use it in a way that expresses a thought understood by another individual within the same form of life. When one refers to a term, one uses its name, not always its definition. To conflate a categorical description or definition with an individual, even if that category only has one member, and even if that member is Null, leads to ambiguity in regards to what is being “referred” to through the use of that label. A description, by definition, does not include the name or term it defines.

Rearticulation occurs in the encounter between individuals held within different state of affairs. The movement of these resultant articulations become subject to the grammatical propositions of an external context. A frame of reference creates a grammar external to the inner logic of the subject that dictates whether definitions of the function expressing that subject’s assigned role are valid or not. Whether or not they benefit the status quo by virtue of the Identity/naming function being significant or not within that particular state. If valid, that individual is a member of that state of affairs. If invalid, and therefore insignificant, the expression of that individual is paraphrased out of the ontological commitments within that state. For W.V.O. Quine, if an individual is quantifiable within that frame of reference—a statement can be formed, or we can count exactly however many of that particular type of individual there are—then that individual is significant to and within that state of affairs. This entails that that individual obtains the identity parameters that define that context. If not, the individual’s expressions are paraphrased out and relegated to nothing.
Pied-piping illustrates a continuity of a subjects’ inner structure with regard to the coherence of its expressions by virtue of an articulatory mechanism, despite a change in the subject’s superficial aspects. However, what constitutes an individual is not brought into the subsequent level of articulation. Only the name used to refer to those constituents are taken up in that secondary encounter. Ambiguity in reference inevitably occurs. This ambiguity motivates the formation of a frame of reference in order to delimit the range of constituents to which that individual refers. Syntactically, “Wh-” phrases such as “What . . .,” and its derivatives “When . . .,” etc. are raised in the subsequent context. There is a direct relationship between the repetitive articulation of an individual and increases in referential ambiguity as that individual participates in more contexts. With each rearticulation, the reference frame attempts to narrow each identifier/terms’ scope. Inevitably, this harbors the adverse effect of an increased need for definitions. Lengthier, with the hope of being more precise, definition of definitions places that individuals’ name farther away from the primary description of the elements that required that initial “naming.” As a result, referential ambiguity increases for the definitional framework overall.

Take the paraphrasing away of an individual’s expression from the scope of a given context. The function of that individual’s role in that state is labeled “Nothing.” This label is analogous to that of silence or noise. Silences are definitive of expressions that do not fit into the grammar of a state of affairs. However, silences indicate the inner and implicit structure of phrases with concerns to music. They are the evidence of elements that were once separate being put together by a subject in order to express a thought. One of the most studied aspects of Black musical expression is syncopation. Syncopation is the pattern of silences indicative of a structure, the logical form and syntax of construction, forming a sonic thought during the production of what is considered a song. The derived pattern is used to understand the mode of its expression in relation to the culture in which the thought was produced. Culture, then, is a repertoire of signifying practices. Syncopation’s function expresses the concept of and can be utilized to formalize many aspects of a song outside of mere stipulation. One such concept is rhythm. Through pied-piping, conceived as an expression produced in one context that is used in another, it is possible to show that rearticulation expresses an individual that is not represented but, nevertheless, present in the state of affairs under consideration. Silences, as the spaces paraphrased out of the surface structure of the expression, but required for that structure to hold, illustrate the capacity to challenge predeterminations of value. It does so by showing the contradiction in the imposition of an Identititarian function that presupposes the value of an expression, while remaining external to the process articulating those expressions. It is now possible to trace the formation of expressions outside of external grammatical control. Syncopated silences indicate the productive relation between sonic elements in music. Syncopation serves a function that constructs reality, as silence is an object that is a part of the experience of the phrase. However, syncopation
itself is not present, an actual thing, in the superficial expression of that world, for syncopation is experienced as the function constructing that object of thought. Nevertheless, syncopated expressions harbor material effects. This notion is handled syntactically under the concept of the Empty Category Principle: the use of an empty signifier in the formation of expressions.315

The direct correlation between the creation of a frame of reference through pied-piping and increased ambiguity rests with the linguistic concept of an island. Taking up one expression for use in another context superficially disconnects what the individual is known as in that encounter from the constituents of the context in which it originated. One can understand a family resemblance, but not necessarily know the concrete relation that individual has to others within that family. This entails a discontinuity which ultimately results in an attempt to translate an individual’s form of life into the grammar of another context. That individual is overdetermined by a vocabulary not its own. What is expressed can only use the language of the state of affairs to which it was introduced. For example, when a specifier such as “it,” “that,” or “there” is used in reference towards another sentence, unless that sentence is within the same passage, it is rather difficult to link “that” to the proper name to which it refers. If “that” refers to a sentence of another context, then its reference is inductively imposed, subject to the lexicon of that secondary reference frame. The stranding between a specifier and its reference represents an island. Thus, islands are transposed from one frame to the next with each encounter, becoming a part of the constituents underlying the deep structure within each context articulated.

The connection frames of reference have with regards to racial categorization and blackness is that overdetermination is the attempt to fix a reference frame over multiple contexts.316 Thus, a frame from one context that overdetermines the individuals of another contains empty categories or islands. These are the unnamed constituents in the state of affairs which make the articulation of that context, and its reference frame, possible. If blackness has been paraphrased to Not, has been determined outside of the reality represented by that reference frame, then the movement of blackness from one state of affairs for use in another makes the point at which it is overdetermined, the horizon of possibility for the articulations of those latter states. Generally known as appropriation, herein lies a formal definition of incorporation through dispossession. Taking the case of a White cultural endowment, the frame of reference for White individuals is shown to be empty, save for what it incorporates from other states of affairs. The engineering of a frame of reference which overdetermines that of blackness, evidences that frame’s need to substantiate itself through the act of incorporation through dispossession. By translating an individuals’ cultural products viz. a name function from a context not that individual’s own, that frame extracts value for its own benefit.317

Conversely, pied-piping also shows how to illustrate a cultural endowment across frames of reference.
Frames of reference can be inherited as either a privilege or a burden. Blackness has the capacity to rearticulate itself because it is not grammatically fixed within frames. Thus, as an operation and not an object of expression, it creates a continuity of signifying practices that can be piped from one encounter through to another. Modes of expression that are not translated into another context allow for blackness, even if overdetermined, to retain a sense and inner logic of its own. This capacity is outside of the imposition of a grammar from a state of affairs’ reference frame external to the form of life its operation entails. Only the products of this capacity are identified. Expressions that are syntactically correct but do not have a semantic interpretation, are linguistically referred to as garden path expressions. These “path” sentences are syntactically valid, but semantically ambiguous or non-referential. As “paths” we can model what the pied-pipping of the subject, rather than an identity of that subject, across contexts actually looks like. Paths are expressions we can think but cannot necessarily say. Therefore, these paths serve as evidence of a subject’s mode of creating thought. The modality of expression qua subjectivity is representative of a language faculty that resides outside of communicability and translation. The use of these forms of expression outside of their original sense will be further detailed in following sections and characterized as catachrestic. These events precipitate from the translation of individuals between contexts.

Translation is always a “mistranslation.” The lexicon of separate reference frames are different. Transposition has been referred to as a better term to account for the movement of individuals and their expressions across contexts and various states. It will be illustrated through rearticulation by pied-piping. The context from which expressions are formed propose the relations and positions of individuals as a function of their names. Transposition moves an individual across contexts, which entails the movement of a name into another context which is initially considered nonsense until strictly defined—recall our example of garden path sentences. This, however, does not deny the formal generation of that name in the context from which it came. The first state of affairs houses the syntactic and generative principles of that individual’s formation without recourse to extra-semantic material. However, the subsequent state can only hope to obtain a description, as the categorical function of Identity, over that object which needs verification from a context outside of that expression. Otherwise, its assertion is vacuous. In speaking about that individual, that expression does not harbor the individual itself, only its name. The assertions of the imposed frame of reference is shown to be vacuous as a name of a name obtains no one individual. However, the supposed void it speaks of, the other context, as a result cannot be empty. One frame of reference cannot be held absolute, a universal assumption or organizational principle, over all others. The islands created through this process, the syncopated silences, are the expression of a state of affairs within another state of affairs. This will be termed a Future Perfect which results from catachresis and will be explored in more detail below with regard to blackness and Punk.
Syntax and the Subversion of Overdetermination

This leads us to an illustration concerning the subversion of overdetermination. On the semantic level, no equivalences exist between individuals and what they are named as far as one’s knowledge in regards to their state of affairs. What an individual is, is different from how they are defined and/or categorized. Individuals can express things outside the domain of a definition. Identity can only be derived from a syntactic level; understood by way of that names method construction of and within context. Taking the semantic level as primary, names only define other names, identities other things already identified. A syntactic analysis quells an interminable relativism to states of affairs. These relations, formal modalities, and their logics secure the existence of real objects for their names harbor consequences to states of affairs inhabited. However, this leaves room for us to conceive that whatever actual objects that may exist being able to be apart from and yet a part of multiple frames of reference. This, in my view, maintains that there are multiple modes of expression, multiple realities as reference frames, obtainable from the finite objects that actually exist. Without this provision, overdetermination would be unanalyzable as all there is should be what there is. Identity is only obtainable within frames of reference, and since there would only be one reference frame in which White is somehow greater than Black, we would have to settle for the state of affairs as it is. No relation could be described in regard to subordination or dominance as no statement or negotiation of an asymmetry between positions could be made. A syntax allows for overdetermination to be demystified because the identity obtained would be shown to be constructed as well as not the only way that things can be.

As these names, more precisely these positions and their role/function within a frame of reference, are contested spaces, an Identity politic runs into the same issues as the semantic dogma. This is precisely because objects can have multiple names contingent to their reference frame. A syntactic analysis with concerns to pied-piping shows how individuals from one context are transposed within the reference frame of another. Politics comes from efforts of translating individuals through specific vocabularies which attempt to define individual’s significance or value within states of affairs. The concept of paraphrasing repetitions that occur in the deep structure and not in the surfacing expression, shows how aspects of propositions, once translated from one context into another, are deleted for the sake of communicability within that frame. If modes of cultural expression are the expression of a people, these deletions are connected to the relegation of a frame’s ontological commitments towards a people to invalidity.

Identity politics seeks for a plurality that is inscribed within a singular and particular nominal position. As relations of overdetermination are represented through reference frames with one function or role becoming the object of another, an individual’s expressions are either subject of or subject to the propositions within that new frame. This strategy harbors an underlying assumption that
individuals are caused by or mirrors of their environment. According to modern linguistics and
cognitive theory this cannot be the case. Our analysis is about subjectivity after all. It is the verb-like
constructions of reference frames that allow for individuals to discern between as well as construct
them in the first place. Construction and discernment are not had by the imposition of a name or the
repetitive insistence on identification. There is a Descriptionist empiricism which motivates the
referential and communicability assumption of an innate semanticism to expressions. Inevitably, if
semantics are innate, we are led to a dualism that denies the action of subjectivity for the sake of
identity. The Identitarian position and its descriptivist outlook cannot answer the poverty of stimulus
problem: although the environment experienced contains a finite set of elements that can be used to
form expressions, why and how are novel expressions formed, one’s that have not been experienced
before? Through syntactic analysis we show what accounts for the innate creative capacity which
makes infinite use from these finite means. There is much evidence that it is what the individuals are
doing within states of affairs, verbal phrases, that construct reference frames. Explored above through
the process of rearticulation, what individuals do form a continuity with regards to cultural
expression. Verbal construction of frames accounts for the process that hopes to secure the function of
those expressions. A referentialist and superficial semantic dogma can only account for a static state
of affairs and assumes that individuals are only significant within that frame of reference as far as they
can be defined. It is the movement of individuals as they are articulated in and through frames of
reference that determines the frame itself. If the opposite were the case, the superficial organization of
a state, its surface structure, would determine meaning outside of creative capacity. Movements are
movement, and not another thing.

Overdetermination through Governmentality

With the case being made for a syntactic reading of states of affairs, I use this method to analyze the
articulation of Black subjectivity through two lenses: Governmentality and cultural expression. My
analysis will culminate in a discussion of Black modes of expression through a punk ethos. It is
through syntax that it is possible to locate the points at which the overdetermination of Black
subjectivity occurs, either through its function or its operation becoming the object of a function of
alternative roles expressing governmentality. Just as well, I will illustrate how overdetermination is
subverted within the process of articulation itself.

There was an initial description of the formation of governmentality as a historical object in Chapter
Two, made through the triangulation of the Powell, Moynihan, and Huntington Reports written as
guides to the expression of government in the late 1960s through the 1970s. Here, the task is to
illustrate how governmentality, the function of government’s “function,” operates through the
imposition of a frame of reference and the forcing of expressions so to validate or invalidate an
identified position within the social political matrix determined. The assumption here will take a
stance held by Wittgenstein that there is no such thing as a private language. We will take it to be the
case that there is no metaphysical "thing" that, extra-mentally, is "language," for language is a
capacity of subjectivity. If ownership over the thing which is called "language" extends to only one
mind, then its use would be applicable nowhere. If that thing was owned by all, then its function
would be useless as it would uniquely apply nor determine to no thing/where. We can however
uniquely determine (pre)functions qua objects of thought. Therefore, the notion of a "private" thing
that is identical to language is either false or vacuously true. Language as a capacity entails someone's
putting to use an operation whose function indexes their assertions to the appropriate context as that
operation constructs the contexts in which they inhabit. As such, that context is shared by virtue of the
concepts acquired which go on to become input for the ordinal construction of subsequent contexts by
virtue of the functional content of those assertions. Concepts are expressed as a function of an
operation, the output of this capacity. With context's being, in this sense, "co-constructed," all that
participate in the context share a similar capacity whose outputs, the concepts expressed, only become
"meaningful" within the contexts inhabited because those members actively participate in that
context's construction. In this way, we can propose an answer to the following questions. How does
one know that their actions express a concept unless that function has been acquired which, if utilized,
acknowledges a capacity that put that concept to use? Is it not that the function acquired by such a
capacity is the content of that concept's assertion for which that capacity, evidenced by that assertion
as a function of, indexed to, that context, is held prior to acquisition? Subjectivity, then, is a capacity
in this sense. An identity assertion's content, therefore, is functional. Subjectivity precedes identity. An
identifier's use constructs the contexts in which that identity applies. This being the sole property of
one individual leads to trivial or absurdist outcomes. Privacy is empty until applied, much like the
zero of any function. This, then, implies that some one/capacity applies concepts. From this assertion,
I take the object we experience as Language as a prefigured reference frame and the language faculty
as a capacity utilizing a repertoire by way of a mode of expression as public tools for the expression
of private life. As there is no private frame of reference, there is no private formulation to
governmentality. Governmentality then is the public use of finite means to enact a multitude of
strategies to attenuate a form of life, sanctioning the application of a predefined system of values.

The function of governmentality detailed through the strategies put forth by Justice Powell, P.
Moynihan, and S. Huntington work to transpose the expressions of individuals from one context for
use in another. This translation works through an appositive which is or is not restrictive. If non-
restrictive, transpositions occur in which the description affixed to that individual is successful; if
restrictive, that individual is presented under a void categorization within that frame of reference. The
simplest way to conceive of this process is through the U.S. Census. The function of the Census
is composed of a naming or identity operation generating a frame of reference the defines the state of
affairs of the individuals of its domain and in which it resides. In a legal framework, an affirmative transposition within that frame of reference registers that individual within that system of value. In this case, registration amounts to a transfer of nominal property. The name becomes legal means for the expression of governmentality. Clearly seen in the distinction between legal and lawful—license for the use of the law as means to produce civic expressions, opposed to mere definitions of principles one can or cannot transgress—the function of governmentality moves towards the facilitation of norms, not rules; the use of legal means to make individuals subject of the propositions of that state of affairs is distinct from the ability to form those propositions. It is because these systems have few rules that they are able to adapt to and manage what Samuel Huntington called the “crisis of democracy.” Subsequently, Justice Powell’s Memorandum advised to cultivate and incorporate the tactics employed by cultural critics of authority into the governance of those very people through the use of those now dispossessed tactics.

Governance’s change to the use of legal means to extract value through incorporation as opposed to governing via the production of law throws materiality into question. Laws have consequence and, thus, are real due to their effects. One does not see a “physical” law in the world, only what its use produces. The use of legal means is the extension of a function through naming the effect within a state’s governance of its affairs. The conflation of law with the use of legal means to access and produce value is key to governing populations. This ambiguity forces governance to professionalize how laws are read. Knowledge of what constitutes an individual named within a frame of reference is not required to use that name. This poses an inherent contradiction to governmentality which will be described in more detail below.

Governmentality works by encapsulating ambiguity. Confusion over the interpretation and use of legal means is how the social organization of society, its grammar, asserts a power relation. As well as stipulating how to express one’s self, as well as when and where “appropriate,” governmentality places correctness conditions on those modes of expression. In this way, parameters over vocabularies make individuals the subject of governmental propositions. The name that an individual is assigned within a frame of reference becomes interchangeable with that individual. Category name is confused with the individuals constituting that category. This is in line with the Descriptionist’s dilemma discussed above. The name of a term is substituted for that individual across contexts through the imposed reference frame over those individuals’ form of life. This, however, does not always hold true. The ability to discriminate or place an individual within a body of knowledge that overdetermines all others does not bear on the existence of individuals or their potential to fit into other frames of reference. Nor does it bar the capacity for that individual to form propositions not determined but appropriate to that state of affairs.

To understand how governmentality attempts to limit this capacity, let these tentative distinctions
between Race, Ethnicity, and Nationality be taken into account. I have been treating Race as a social and political construct that is institutionalized through a frame of reference. As an institution, Race has material a/effects. Racial categorization delimits the identity of an individual within a frame not its own. Ethnicity, then, as modes of expression are a people, becomes a cultural endowment that is transposed across frames of reference. Within ethnicity, individuals carry a family resemblance whose continuity is conceived through the movement of individuals across encounters. Through the construction of states of affairs, a repertoire of signifying practices is represented by the expressions present within a frame of reference. Therefore, ethnicity is an identity founded on affiliation, not negation. Its based on a cultural, social, and at times but not necessarily racial familial resemblance. Nationality is a politically localized affiliation to a reference frame which is represented through the function in which individuals ascribe to a given role one’s position acquires in the surface organization of society. These three concepts are individual but not mutually exclusive. They are nested and can be represented as: \([\text{nation} \ [\text{race} \ [\text{ethnicity} \ [\text{individual}]]]]\). Each nested function is contextualized, identified, within the scope of the bracket preceding it. We know that this structure is the case because nation defined by race or ethnicity leads to vicious contradictions; for example, fascism. We see that what an individual is represented, identified, as is dependent upon the layer in which it appears. However, with that same individual present in each layer, individuals are both a part of and apart from a state of affairs expressed in this way. Within this, it is important to note that Race is how one lives in that societal structure; Gender, how race is lived.

Blackness is not a matter of nationality or phenotype, but the product of an heir-loomed text of signifying practices which rewrites itself with each iteration. This is the core concern to the rearticulation model illustrated through pied-piping. The individual articulated and whose identity was engendered in one context is taken up for use in another. This can occur in a way which sets that identity in a relation of dominance over another; or subordinates that identity to the goals of another person, institution, or system of value. Identification through a naming function is represented by the Census. The quantification of blackness for use in another frame of reference or system of value as “Black,” then, is translated for political use as “African-American.” This represents the conflation of all three aspects—Nation, Ethnicity, and Race—regardless of context. Conflation of concepts reveals a mechanism of control. Universal quantifiers are only indicative of a frame of reference, not the individuals therein. Frames of reference are constructed through forcing explanations for the sake of translating newly introduced individuals into another value system. As three identifiers, different but not mutually exclusive, the function of governmentality is clear when considered in this way. The assumed supremacy of a White reference frame is derived from this constellation of definitions, their functions, and the production of constraints that attempt to render fixed what is variable. Through a proprietary stance, the imposition of these positions qua roles within the surface organization of society are aspects of the individual identified but are not that individual in total.
These functions remain open or incomplete in order to be an exportable system. If the positions they described are constantly filled, the system would be useless save for those individuals which become their objects. Inevitably, they are not of this reference frame, unknown to the one whose frame it is. Governmentality as a function of legal means, opposed to producing laws, in order to extract value from one context for use in another works through the following three aspects: incorporation through dispossession; the transposition of individuals for use in another context; and the management of the crises generated by that dispossession in order to create an infrastructure for the piping of value across contexts. The assertion that it is impossible to make a “movement out of absolutely nothing” made identical with blackness through an identity function, therefore, is incorrect.

Identification through the Census creates populations for the function of government by individuating groups from the populace. Race, a social and political construct with material effects, works to enforce a singular frame of reference over others in this way. Identity politics is brought into a White reference frame which remains abstract to define who is part, i.e. member, of that state of affairs. A universal quantification attributed to an individual only asserts the frame of reference that categorizes, organizes, that population. Categorizations other than “White,” are substantiated by individuals outside the reference frame itself; and, yet, in doing so, validate the claims of that frame. In turn, individuals’ modes of expression utilize the lexicon of the frame in order to express themselves. In this way, social movements, as well as individuated others, consume themselves. Therefore, the language that was used to express one’s self is overdetermined. Consequentially, “White”-ness can remain abstract and incorporate the expressions of the segments of the population identified within that state of affairs. “White”-ness is represented in the state but not present or subject to the propositions of its reference frame. However, this mode of production has the dual effect that White frames of reference can only define themselves through incorporation through dispossession, necessitating a strict dominance over the modes of expression of individuals not-White. As White is only a frame of reference and not an individual, its expressions are vacuous unless substantiated through what is external to it. Therefore, “White”-ness is immaterial, yet objective.

This process is how hegemony is stipulated, the dominant class imposes a frame of reference in order to cement the possible articulations of its subclasses. Hegemony becomes essential to dominant frames as they are constantly thrown into question by their need to incorporate what is outside of their purview to substantiate themselves. The individuals of this subclass are transposed into a state of affairs in which the reference frame of that state remains ambiguous. Due to this process it is possible to incorrectly use what would, in its own frame of reference, constitute that individual. In turn, an alternative sense or value in the frame that overdetermined those modalities is created. Incorrect use and, yet, making/retaining a sense is a considered a catachrestic event.
**Hegemony as Paraphrasing Ontological Commitments**

The imposition of a frame of reference is the creation of a mainstream or dominant culture. From here on, this is analyzed under the term hegemony. In illustrating the syntax to the construction of a frame of reference via governmentality, I intended to show that it is at the interface between the creative capacity of the subject and the external grammar of the state to which it is introduced, that the subject’s expressions are paraphrased. Paraphrasing dictates who and who is not a member of that state’s system of value. The elements used to compose an expression within a state of affairs are merged before “non-lexical” surface categorizations and their transformations commence.340 These categories are non-lexical because they are not of the lexicon or vocabulary with which the subject expresses its self. They represent the imposition of a reference frame in order to index or categorize what has been expressed and identified. Although the syntax indicated by the merging of elements and the relationships that the individuals expressed obtain with each other, represents the horizon of possibility for semantic interpretation. A theory regarding the act of categorization qua identification must consider the reference frame’s in which these categories are used. It is within these frames that lexical items and the individuals expressed by/with them are interpreted. Thus, significance comes from these final transformations to the surface organization of society. The positions these expressions obtain against each other are taken as those individuals’ identity within that context.341

Hegemony is universally imposed across the categories with which society is organized. Defining individuals through the identity function of the Census became a way to divide or break up solidarity within the overall population under the ruse of naming “minorities” in juxtaposition to a “majority.” That process retains the means of producing those categorizations. Strategic use of the Census inevitably protects the actual minority’s control. Ownership over the means of categorization is represented by the system of categorization itself and dictated by what is considered the “majority” by name alone. The majority does not have to define itself. This explains how a “mainstream” or consensus of reference frame can be seen as a “majority” opinion yet only be held or manufactured by the industry of a few. Minority control need only substantiate that frame of reference through the use of definitions for others. “White”-ness as immaterial, yet objective, becomes a function that is represented but not present in the state of affairs which it governs indirectly.

Hegemony is a proprietary stance over how individuals are transposed into these non-lexical concepts. The categories are not part of the language. Hegemony sets the parameters in which these “categories” are expressed. This is seen in the trend by governmentality that enacts incorporation through dispossession by defunding public goods so as to change the desire for them. As those goods no longer function because they have been defunded, hegemony finds the motivation to privatize them. In this way, modes of expression in contradistinction to regimes over expression are able to
incorporate the products of individuals and sell them back to those who produced it in the first place. This was the crux of the governmental advice given in Powell’s Memorandum. The danger with an Identitarian politic is that it disguises a proprietary stance that mimics the very logics of control it tries to subvert. For governmentality, and those who possess the means to categorize, the goal is to utilize ethnic and national endowments from one context for use in another—public goods for private profit. However, this Identitarian position fails on many grounds and does not actually import what it cites. Despite its failures, its use does harbor consequences. Governmentality is not a plane or grid but is expressed in the sphere of influence its function constructs. In such a sphere, the question becomes: how far to the “Left” or the “Right” must one go before those positions become the same, although functioning under different names?

Frames of reference are discerned through what individuals are doing, their verbal forms. Modes of expression as a mechanism of creating thought, thus the creative capacity of the subject, are indicative of one’s being in the world. Overdetermination harbors Ontological implications as there is a correlation between what and where individuals are categorized within a frame of reference. The paraphrasing of certain individuals out of a reference frame amounts to stipulating their non-existence. Distinctness becomes the vehicle for deletion as opposed to selection. As reference frames are created, the subject’s movement from one frame to another creates a sense of expressive continuity. This continuity, prior articulations, the most recent frame entered does not have access. With each rearticulation, the elements that compose that individual repeat. For the sake of “translating” one’s expression into the vocabulary of the state—harboring the effect of transposing their role into an alternative domain whose function is stipulated by non-lexical categorization—repetitions are deleted on the surface structure organizing that state of affairs. The subject qua its capacity for expression is replaced by a name communicable within that context. Thus, there can only be one name for all the individuals of a category in order to create a 1:1 mapping of individual to definition within that system of categorization. This strictly delimits what resides within the body of knowledge that is to represent the Ontology of that state of affairs as reported by that frame of reference. The subject is only known insofar as it can be identified within that reference frame. The deletion of the various objects and events composing the endowment that individual’s expression implies, for the sake of one name, amounts to the paraphrasing of the ontological commitment that frame has to the continuity of those subjects. It amounts to the fixing of distinct features identifying an individual so that a name makes sense within the grammar of that state. If the superficial form of an individual—how that subject and its expressions appear; is identified—does not fit into categories of that reference frame, it does not have a use. The only expressions as a function of “use”/role acceptable are those maintaining the system of categorization within that state. As a result, it is deleted from what constitutes what is known about that state of affairs.
In sum, paraphrasing occurs when an individual’s role, transposed into another’s reference frame, is forced to “move” and agree with the current context. In other words, the individual must explain itself to the dominant frame to determine its value within that state of affairs. The dominant frame places validity parameters on that individual’s expression. What is most interesting is that through the rearticulation model, it is possible to locate if, and later how, hegemony’s presence is imposed and understood as the “mainstream.”

Linguistically, the movement of an individual, what that individual is doing, is the Gerund. It is this term which will make sense of what constitutes subjectivity: a changing same; the flow of “is.” This flow of “is” is represented through the suffix “-ing.” Its connection to subjectivity can be conceptualized through the Gerundive Nominal which takes a noun and adds the “-ing” suffix to make a verbal construction of what is to be the subject of that proposition. The Gerundive Nominal is how we conceive of the function or putting to use of a name. By doing so, we illustrate how to rearticulate the role that name attempts to determine. This is important as Black identity can be utilized by blackness to express different ways of being ”Black” within the world. All of which are not exhausted by the strict adherence to the nominal ”Black.” The Gerundive of that title, what the label ”Black” is doing, is what constitutes ”Black”-ing, what being Black could mean. Through this activity, we show how to put overdetermined positions within society to alternative uses. Rearticulating the presupposed function of a role is indicative of a form of life outside of a relation set by dominance. This tactic, putting objects indicative of particular forms of life to different uses, is the practice in which punk expresses itself.

Zora Neale Hurston’s “Characteristics of Negro Expression” brings this point closer to black subjectivity. Hurston makes rearticulation the focal point of her analysis of Negro expression. Modes of expression are modes of being in the world. “[W]ords are action words,” and “the use of verbal nouns,” is what is conceived as indicative of black subjectivity. States of affairs that set identity and validity conditions for the articulation of individuals transpose that individual into a system of categorization not its own. However, rearticulation does not entail the imposition of one reference frame over another as it can be shown that two frames can obtain the same object. A state of affairs that utilizes the name and role of one individual, from within the context of an encounter, can be overdetermined or known under a different name within another state of affairs. Two different realities or sets of consequences can be had in the same world. One example of how this manifests itself is in the concept of intersectionality with regard to the analysis of the mutually lived and co-constitutive concepts of Race, Gender, and Class. Within intersectional frameworks, an individual belongs to multiple categories.

The conflation between Nation, Race, Gender, and Ethnicity illustrates the imposition of regimes of
control through reference frames. For Race is how Class, the stratified organization of society, is lived. Gender is how Race is lived.\textsuperscript{347} The consequence reached by reorienting articulation out from Identity and towards subjectivity allows for the subject to retain the capacity to subvert coercive and forced categorization within systems external to its form of life. The attempt to organize the surface categorizations within social construction of state of affairs, overdetermination is incomplete. The subject can construct a frame of reference within a state of affairs that is outside of a hegemonic or mainstream frame of reference. This will be analyzed through the concept of a Future Perfect: a form of life with its own frame of reference either alongside or against the dominant frame within the same state of affairs.

This “Future Perfect” form of life is not represented within the current state’s dominant frame. Nonetheless, it presents an alternate form of life within that very same state. Future Perfects arise at the very point at which identification and, therefore, overdetermination occurs. Just merely residing under a name, even if arbitrarily, is still fixing an object to a referent within a specified frame of reference. There is no clear distinction between the fixing of a name and predication, for any individual can be given the same name. Conversely, any individual can obtain multiple names. The difference being the name of a class of individuals as opposed to a predicate rigidly fixed to an individual within a frame of reference at the onset of a mainstream form of life. The ability to create another form of life within a state of affairs is possible through the increasing ambiguity of references with each rearticulation of the same individual. The direct correlation between a stricter frame of reference and increasing ambiguity, to what constitutes the individual obtaining a name and to what that name refers, is what I call a violence to grammar.\textsuperscript{348}

**Black Musical Expression and PUNK! The Future Perfect**

Taking modes of expression as ways of being in the world, a Future Perfect is an alternative frame of reference within a state of affairs. One that is up and against a frame stipulated as dominant. Linguistically, the Future Perfect is a form of speech which indicates an action completed in the future that is lived, vicariously, at present. The vicarious aspect to the articulation of a Future Perfect is key. This proposition may not reside in the actual world, but is a reality which has consequences for those that participate in that form of life. Vicariousness is found in the capacity of an individual to obtain two or more functions, within separate frames, simultaneously. As Future Perfects are completed in the “future”—because defined within this current frame—but lived at present, the individual which obtains a “Future Perfect” is the object of the functions of this current frame, as well as one outside of the domain of that current state of affairs. Simultaneity, then, means within the same context. In this way, we can conceive of the capacity to change the current context from within that very same context. Occupying two functions or more expresses the Future Perfect mode of being in the world. It
is in this modality that individuals work toward the actualization of that as yet to be context. As yet to be, the Future Perfect cannot be institutionalized under a static particular arrangement of individuals’ functions or roles.

Black identity during the 1960s and currently has been caught at the interface between its articulation as “African-American,” representing the sublimation of a double consciousness—seeing one’s self as “Black” and being black in the U.S.—and that identity’s translation into a U.S. value system. Tension around double consciousness comes to the fore with blackness’ increased participation within the political project of the U.S. The result is its incorporation into the dominant frame by dispossessing it of what it articulates. The dominant required that incorporation of non-determinacy so to quell blackness’ identification with Counter-Culture. Black autonomy was deemed dangerous to American sovereignty. It posed an internal contradiction within the U.S. reference frame. If blackness was able to determine its own mode of expression, the process translating those expressions from one context for use in another to create value for/within the U.S. system would render a White “American” reference frame untenable. The practice of overdetermination was to ensure dependence upon and to substantiate the U.S. system of value(s). Maintenance of this system was accomplished through the extraction of the means to produce value from blackness so as to actively construct the U.S. Although the articulation of blackness through social and cultural movements as labeled “Black” up through to “African-American,” these labels did not exhaust all the possible articulations of blackness within the frame of reference of that state of affairs.

The illustration of the construction of frames of reference by way of the mechanism of articulation and pied-piping brings about the need to show how alternative forms of life within state of affairs, alternative frames, are built. Linguistically this is called an appositive, the modification of the subject by virtue of another frame of reference. Appositives have two aspects. The restrictive entails a clarification of the subject and the subversion of overdetermination. The additive, or non-restrictive, represents the tool of overdetermination. This tool forces explanations to be translated into the dominant vocabulary of the frame so to validate or invalidate the introduction of that individual from one frame of reference for use in another. In the non-restrictive case, definitions are what that individual is taken as being in and of itself. This is despite what that individual actually is. It is supposed that subject can no longer be the object of its own propositions when overdetermined.

Take the expression of blackness through a cultural endowment whose mode of creating thought is sonically. What seems as utter noise, or complete silence, in relation to a mainstream form of life and the dominant vocabulary making sense of musical production, is not devoid of meaning. Because it has a form at all, that song has an inner logic indicative of the mechanism with which it was constructed. If the marker of blackness’ creative capacity is the ability to subvert regimes of control,
to rearticulate grammar itself as evidenced through improvisation against musical notation, then the most apt example of a sonic capacity to subvert regimes of overdetermination is punk. As blackness has been made identical with “Not,” the only actions against strict dominance, to act up at all, occur out of blackness. As blackness resides in the ambiguities that are paraphrased from a White reference frame, the universal or global quantifier of blackness as categorically Not evinces its capacity to construct its own reference frame. In concert with overdetermination, whenever there is a breach in grammar, when individuals are not identified for the beneficial use to further substantiate the imposition of a reference frame, that state enacts a polici(y)ing of those affairs. Policing of the parameters in which individuals becomes significant with that state works to narrow the possible references or definitions of the terms qua individuals composing that context. It is in this way that hegemony, the mainstream, is brought about over the domain of cultural expression. The imposition of a name is negotiated with each occasion of its appearance within a state of affairs. Thus, governmentality harbors a paradox. With increases in ambiguities, the state institutes a subsequent renaming of individuals which also incorporates a hole in the grammar of that state. Applying a name to non-determinacy does not define but locates this hole which only reaffirms non-determinacy. It is in this way that overdetermination sows the seeds of its own subversion.

We see the possibility to rearticulate states of affairs through what Zora Neale Hurston called the “double descriptive.” With each rearticulation of an individual, and the attempt to narrow the frame of reference, the possible expressions produced as a function of that individual’s subjectivity grows in comparison to those captured within the parameters acceptable within that frame. For Hurston, the marker of black modes of expression is this capacity to re-double already articulate expressions. A single “expression” becomes an object of multiple functions or uses. To see the connection to punk, one need only listen to the double-peddle bass drumming in its Hardcore form. This style of play is emblematic of many bands such as the Bad Brains. Blackness’ mode of expression, then, is rearticulation. Black modes of expression actively use predefined terms to create alternative frames of reference within states of affairs. This marks the signifier of blackness itself as the capacity to do violence to grammar. Being subject to the propositions of a state of affairs which seeks to overdetermine its modes of expression, blackness’ propositions utilize the ambiguities generated by that very act of narrowing the scope of reference. Blackness utilizes these inconsistencies from within the frame blackness’ expressions supposedly substantiates. As the frame narrows, the negated uses of a term grows outside of the scope of the dominant frame; ultimately, this leads to the widening of blackness and its lexicon as blackness is Not, outside the scope, of that frame. As these expressions are not a part of the dominant frame of reference, it can be said that they are not-not part of that state of affairs. They are of a different form of life, a different world, a part and yet apart from this one. The reverse of a reverse, “not not Black,” is not affirmation of the reference frame, but of affirmation of an affinity to a way of being in the world. A self-referential, according to Wittgenstein, represents
blackness’ ability to cite a cultural endowment unknown to the dominant reference frame. It is the negated alternative uses or functions assigned to that particular identity as Not, and the re-use of that identity imposed on blackness’ modes of expression, that indicates blackness’ capacity to express its own form of life. To be able to use the ever expanding lexicon of negated and cast away materials from the dominant frame, marks the ability to speak or create from “nothing,” to express a Future Perfect state of affairs.

Blackness is self-referential because it is not a thing in the physical world, but is a mode of expression. As self-referential, blackness, through its use of the materials present within context, is expressed by this capacity becoming the subject of its own propositions; infinite use of finite means. This is the case because blackness cites an identity, externally projected unto it or constructed from within itself, which can be utilized from a repertoire of prior articulations. Thus, self-referentiality is generatively recursive in the sense that the capacity becomes the referent. Issues regarding denotation are resolved for blackness’ referent is conceived by virtue of its method of construction, not by its being interchangeable with some other thing. Referent as capacity, in turn, is indicative of the subject utilizing it. The identity or image produced, either imposed or projected, is the vehicle by which this process occurs. Blackness’ capacity, as a function (repertoire of practices) that indicates a relation between inputs (a cultural endowment) and output (context-dependent identifier), reveals a process in which those outputs become inputs for future articulations. If the outputs identified obtain a functional description within the contexts in which they are projected, they then become part of the repertoire from which that subject pulls in order to articulate a self in other contexts. The same subject can have multiple context-dependent identities; the same identifier can be utilized by many subjects.

Subjectivity is expressed by virtue of this operation, whose function is understood as a capacity indicative of a method of constructing a self, appropriate to context, not random, and not necessarily caused by that context. The question is not about what is Black, which gets us into Russell’s paradox, but how are the signs assumed to denote the identity of Black individuals being put to use on or by blackness. This is a question that is testable and presents evidence of blackness’ subjectivity, for we can show the "how," and provide an account for this mode of expression. Questions and attempts at defining a correlation between identity, prevalence or significance, and context, either presupposes or ignores the activity of the subject and, ultimately, leads to contradictions or an interminable ambiguity. As blackness is no one thing, and if made to fit within finite categorization, each product of this capacity, seen as discrete and separate, plausibly gains blackness access to another category, making identification indeterminate, if not impossible.

**Syncopation and alternative forms of life**

The articulation of Not has been discussed as the use of islands or silences in the formation of
expressions. The syntax of these islands construct a Future Perfect by way of syncopation. This concept will serve as our analytic to the formation of these alternative forms of life. Syncopation is the syntax or construction of a musical proposition from the off-beat or silences inherent to the phrase. It is because of these silences that we can conceive of a structure to the phrase produced. Therefore, we understand that there is some one doing the construction. The notion of sound is not to be confused with a lexicon of phonological elements but is to be considered the use of a lexical item we call a “sound.” These sonic objects become the arguments of the function constructing and expressing thought.

According to Frantz Fanon’s chapter, “The Black Man and Language” in Black Skin, White Masks, “translation” forces one to become Other. Fanon emphasizes an explicit link between modes of expression and subjectivity. In opposition to subjectivity, there was a presupposition that only the name, one’s identity, existed when relations of dominance over subordinates are enforced within reference frames. Overdetermination works through the transposition of identified expression of subjectivity to positions beneficial to that system of value. We will consider how the sound world transports an individual through the articulation of what is expressed. Those expressions’ overdetermination, their transposition into a genre or external categorization, leads to a break in subjective continuity. The tension between articulation and rearticulation inevitably leads to these breaks, constituting the syntax to syncopation and its capacity to posit a reality outside of the dominant frame imposed. That which was not of one reference frame was illustrated as the horizon of possibility for all subsequent articulations within a state. The “Not” becomes a part of articulations while remaining apart from any one of the expressions of particular frame of reference.

A Future Perfect is considered an organic whole. Each element in a group does not necessarily have to have a value or definition, nor does the value of the group in total depend on the sum of all the values of its elements. However, the value of that whole is undoubtedly changed if one element is removed, for then it would not be that group at all. A Future Perfect is understood by virtue of the arrangement of the terms which express it. Not one feature makes for the expression of that Future Perfect state of affairs. Take away one feature and the result is a different expression. An expression can also be defined with another expression. This is why definitions are contingent to contexts. The structure of a Future Perfect is theorized through the spaces between features, the gaps which are indicative of a relation represented by the structure of that expression. That structure is not present in a sole constituent of or the phrase that surfaces. Syncopation actively structures expressions and is evidence of a subject’s putting features, objects, sounds to use.

For example, “Holiday in the Sun” by the Sex Pistols exhibits the capacity to rearticulate impositions of order. By taking a 4:4 time pattern and redoubling it, to use Hurston’s phrase, the Pistols accentuate
the second beat. This is also seen in the Stooges adoption of a blues core in their musical expression. This is noted by Evan Rapport in “Hearing Punk as Blues.” The song “No Fun” by the Stooges was subsequently covered by the Teen Idles. Despite the added distortion, the blues core in “No Fun” remained intact across its articulations. The movement from [1 2 1 2] to [1 “drop” 2 2 2] was the rearticulation of a blues core into the kernel of expressions indicative of Punk music. When sped up, the recursive application of this core yields a distinctive signature,

< . . . 1 1 2 “drop” 1 1 2 “drop” . . . >

heard by the merge of two blues units creating a string in which the third constituent of that string is emphasized. We see this by the ‘drop’s punctuation of the constituent preceding it. This makes for that constituent to be heard as distinct from others. Syntactically, the pattern generated by the alternating 3rd then 4th sound being redoubled or emphasized throughout the duration of the song becomes a key feature of a Punk sound.

With rearticulation illustrated as pied-piping, this emphasis heard in song, analyzed in the composition of socio-cultural states of affairs above, has been demonstrated as the transposition of one subject into the frame of reference of another. Here, this becomes the blues core transposed into a punk form of life. Rearticulation, then, is the precondition for a “subject to subject” relation to occur. This subject to subject relation is outside of mere identification understood as one’s submission to a genre in which the names of one set of constituents are related, one to one, with names of the subsequent context. As “functions” to/of other functions, this one to one mapping is conducted with the hope of gaining recognition within that secondary system of reference. The resulting functional compositions of these roles within the mainstream are used to denote an expression but are known without recourse to their construction.356 Transposition without recourse to brute translation is how a Future Perfect is formed. By forgoing translation, the state of affairs articulated, even if utilizing the materials both of and outside of that context, remain outside the scope of a dominant frame of reference. The affinity created between the inner logic of these subjects in this rearticulated relation may be present within the state of affairs, but not superficially legible within the genres imposed on these forms of life.357

The off beats in the sounding of the Future Perfect, the redoubled first note followed by a silence or distortion carrying that note until the next is played, is governed by the propositions of that state of affairs. This means that propositions are able to form expressions from the use of elements that are not of the frame of reference in which they are formed. These elements act more like “verbal nouns,” to borrow from Hurston once more, that linguistically adhere to the capacity to articulate a subject through syncopation. Expressions of subjectivity in this way use what is considered the “Not” itself. A
reference to Not, “Not” meaning outside of the reference frame, does not bar the use of a term to form expressions. Syncopation becomes an analytic of blackness’ modes of expression outside of categorizations based on reference to feature or phenotype. Through what Noam Chomsky would term the Empty Category Principle, blackness stipulated as Not is taken up within the articulation of Punk. Black identity is a name without reference within that particular frame imposed on that musical genre. This does not mean that blackness is not embedded in the form. This empty signifier, when used to form expressions, inevitably leads to the expression of nonsense propositions in the dominant reference frame. The use of “nonsense syllables” yields a violence to the grammar structuring that frame. The dominant reference frame’s imposition is revealed to consist of a lexicon external to the one composing the form of life overdetermined within that state of affairs.

Silence and, therefore, syncopation have the capacity to create meaningful expressions, not random but not caused by the environment; expressions syntactically sound, yet unable to be translated into the propositions with which the mainstream is expressed. The syntax to syncopation highlights the relations between elements within a state of affairs. As this arrangement of elements does not have an identity within that frame, for how does one name silence but by/as “Nothing,” the arrangement achieved by virtue of syncopation offers an expression indicative of an alternative frame of reference. The alternative is unknown to the dominant grammar of that state. If the mode of expression is the expression of a people, and language is a form of life, the Future Perfect formed in this way is another livelihood, a complete frame of reference which individuals can obtain. The alternative offers another form of life with the capacity to do violence to the dominant grammar of that state of affairs. This capacity of the black, as well as punk, subject is tacitly expressed by their very being outside and, therefore, questioning the assumed system of categorization governing that state.

Rearticulation maps the flow of what the “is” during the formation of expressions is doing. What the function of “is” indicates is the creative capacity of the subject. Blackness, as apart from this frame of reference and yet a part of its expression, for it is the material with which that frame substantiates its being, has the capacity to form a movement out of that which is considered Not within that frame. This movement is revealed through the tactical use of syncopation. For the blues through to punk, the occurrence of this affinity is marked either by affirmation of place or by obtaining a relation within that place. This is expresses as a function of the operation of a role set to other means. That affinity is not necessarily owing to its name as such, but the way in which it is expressed. The hallmark of this affinity is the mosh pit. The pit actively announces the arrival of the Future Perfect. Individuals obtain this Future Perfect relation by actively creating a value system in the moment of its occurrence; articulating a way of being in the world outside of the regimentation of the mainstream. The mosh pit expresses the ethos to that alternative state of affairs.
The Politic of Affinity and The Changing Same of the Mosh Pit

In his 1979 poem “Black Art,” Baraka states “We want a black poem. And a/ Black World/ Let the world be a Black poem” which is created “Silently/ or LOUD.” The syntax of musical expression brings this analytic to the mosh pit as the signifier of an affinity, an understanding, within an alternative reference frame constructed Future Perfectly. If musical expression is the expression of a people, the emblem of that affinity is obtained in punk performances through the mosh pit. Etymologically finding its roots from a mistranslation of the Bad Brains shouting, “mash it up,” the mosh pit is the generation of a punk scene and form of life in the moment of its expression despite the state of affairs. The articulation of modes of expression out of finite elements mirrored the concern to build worlds in the social and political climate of the time. The destruction that was present in the decaying urban centers of New York, Philadelphia, Detroit, London and the global economic fallout of 1976-77, made it internally necessary for the capacity to create modes of expression appropriate to those contexts but not caused by them. These alternative modes of expressing a form of life were to be utilized in order to articulate the possibility of another system of value within that state of affairs. This capacity was found in the use of finite means to form expressions not yet represented in that reference frame. Expressions that came out of No-place, “Nothing.” Articulations out of this set of conditions yielded a Counter-Culture which was made equivalent to the expression of black subjectivity—Powell, Huntington, Moynihan. Although this movement came to be identified as Counter-Culture, in the moment of its articulation it would become a network of free associations, a composite function whose operations were indicative of a form of life outside of the domain of the operations of dominance. This is how I will formulate what is called a scene. Superficially, during a performance the scene appears different and may be miscategorized. However, despite misidentification, it retains the capacity to be understood or entered into relation with because the structural relations that actively construct its appearance, its inner logic and the mechanism of its formation or syntax, remain intact.

Counter-Culture sought to undo the process of overdetermination. To accomplish this Counter-Culture asked, “what is the smallest unit with the capacity for doing violence towards mechanisms of control?” Counter-Culture determined that it must creatively search for holes in the legal matrix, the surface organization of society, so to input propositions that highlight the internal contradictions in the state’s functions. This became the legitimacy test for what individuals are doing, the Gerund, so as to change their role and articulate alternative reference frames. To accomplish this task, Counter-Culture, through the creation of multiplicity in order to do away with becoming subsumed in a singular categorization, formed networks or alternative forms of life within states of affairs. These alternative frames, networks, could be handed down to those who actively participated in the construction of that cultural endowment. In this way, multiple operations, modes of expression, obtained the same object. From any set of elements, an exponential number of arrangements can be
obtained. The simultaneity of different modes of expression, as a function articulating an alternative state of affairs, cannot be controlled when identity is based on one to one correspondence between individual and category. Multiple frames of reference, lived in vicariously, in other words simultaneously, subvert attempts at control. Recall that mechanisms of control seek to render a multiplicity under a singular expression so as to extract value. Baraka formalizes the Future Perfect in his 1965 poem “Black Art” by calling for Black peoples from everywhere to come together for what he called a “collective improvisation.” This is finally made sense of here in the rubric of the mosh pit. The seeming chaos within this swirling dance contains an inner logic and syntax articulating a punk ethos. The expression of a people formed in this way brings together a form of life unknown to the dominant frame, but containing a sense that cannot be overdetermined by the state of affairs an individual inhabits. This is so even if its performance is relegated to specific venues or banned overall—see Bad Brains, “Banned in D.C.”

The performance of a Counter-Cultural mode of expression is understood under two aspects, the circle and syncopation: the circular as citation; and syncopation as generative. The mosh pit is a circular dance. It bears a family resemblance across contexts although the song, venue, or the individuals present may differ. This family resemblance is held together through the deep structure of syncopation, a logical form and a syntactic structure as evidence of the subject putting together sonic elements to articulate a thought qua mode of being. The mark of the subject is the spacing between these elements. The silences or cracks in voice, the space between a note and distortion, what was once considered just a noise that spans that gap until the next note is struck, represents what does not appear in the song. What was once labeled “Nothing” represents potential as it is no one thing but a capacity. This capacity presents to us that which is putting those sounds to work. There is an affinity between the inner sense or deep structure of the mosh pit and the syncopation within a song. These concepts maintain a set of relations whose function is the generation of the scene in the very moment of its articulation. Syncopation accentuates the off-beat. The mosh pit fills in the gaps left by syncopation with the stomp of feet. Speed is linked to rearticulation. One, one, two; One, one, two; the pace at which the pit spins. This call and response is an exercise in self-narration, the articulation of a self outside of being identified. Creating expressions that are nonexistent within the vocabulary of a system of value that seeks to overdetermine and hopefully paraphrase away this mode of expression, inter-subjectivity, a collective improvisation, is obtained.

The mosh pit has a logic or inner structure that is not accessible to the dominant reference frame save for reference to it as a whole under a name external to the form of life within the pit. The act of identifying what is being articulated in that moment is futile. The pit looks, appears, and according to the Descriptionist, “is” different every time. However, the pit’s center, its deep structure, holds. Attempts to translate this form of life into another frame of reference so to extract cultural import
takes in an object that does not endure. The pit only arises within because it is the creation of this particular context. The pit obtains only in its momentary performance. As it is an undefinable object, it can only be described. Its occurrence reported. The pits being labeled “Punk” in and of itself, therefore, carries no reference. Linguistically, that name functions under the empty category principle, understood under the linguistic concept of an island above. Although the name, Punk, can be used within the dominant frame of reference indicating the mainstream, it has no referent save for a particular use in and only in that frame. However, Punk, the categorical name applied to this articulation of a particular attitude, does not contain the ethos or form of life that is punk. As a result, it fails to overdetermine the collective improvisation that is the expression of a punk form of life.

Moshing’s cultural endowment comes from a Black mode of expression called the “ring shout,” a collective improvisation carried by African slaves and put to use in the American colonies. The individuals who participated in it through dance and song were privy to a syntax, an inner sense, which actively constructed the ring’s state of affairs. If part of that form of life, subject continuity generated as a function of understanding was obtained sonically. The experience of the ring by an onlooker engenders ambiguity. For the terms superficially do not make sense: they were put to use in ways that did not cohere in the orthodoxy of praise; the cries were not the laments of slaves; these expressions were joyous, profane, and, ultimately, mistranslated. The ring’s mode of expression did not fit into the categories of a “White”-American reference frame. The onlookers, their supposed masters, could not understand what was going on because they did not participate in the active articulation of that form of life. Although they knew of, could “see,” these circles formation, they determined them as devoid of meaning, as absolutely nothing.

Utilizing call and response, whose familial resemblance is also found in the blues where the “blueing” of notes utilizes the aberrant quality of a sound, this mode of expression was unable to be translated into a musical notation or captured within religious categorization. This aspect of black expression continues through to punk. The blueing of notes is inextricably tied to the expression of freedom in the language of blackness itself. It is the modality of sound that generates difference in repetition: contextually contingent but necessarily exhibits the creative capacity of black modes of expression. Just as well, it embodies the possibility of creating different relations within a state of affairs. In the spinning of the pit during a performance, we actively see the putting to use of sonic elements to undo systemic categorization while simultaneously creating an another frame of reference within the state of affairs in which it is embedded. That reference frame, that alternative form of life, is occupied, lived in, immediately as it is created. Therefore, it is my contention that punk’s ethos is a form of life that does not seek to endure but seeks to rearticulate the conditions in which it is formed; and purposefully so. Removing the wish to construct an eternal object representative of a movement and the desire to be significant in a reference frame not one’s own, also removes the possibility of control.
By doing so, this ritual can be evoked again when that reference frame is recreated due to the affinity obtained by the individuals who understand that form of life because they actively construct it. In this way, punk cannot be overdetermined for the precise reason that it does not endure. Punk and blackness, are capacities, not things in the world.

The stage posits aesthesis as first philosophy to punk and, therefore, black subjectivity. In the act of “reading” one’s role in society and “writing” out one’s form of life, it is possible to generate an ethos through the deep structure of Counter-Culture. Aesthesis captures the ethos or mode of being in that scene, the relations obtained between individuals as well as within the surface organization of society. Aesthesis also captures poiesis, the creative capacity of that individual. The active negotiation of these relations and capacities is seen in the utilization of translations and mistranslations in punk, as has been shown here via the mosh pit.

The construction of a Future Perfect frame of reference up and against a dominant frame within the same state of affairs is possible only through a reorientation away from identity. Identity, here conceived as passive nominalization, we move to a radical form of listening. Listening becomes putting “Nothing” to use in a way that alters the possibilities to say some-thing which, in this newly oriented context, necessitates the changing of the relationships obtained between every-thing within that form of life. The consequence of rearticulation itself is that although the mosh pit actively undoes overdetermination, its encounter with another state of affairs rearticulates that state. Although pits may look different, there remains a continuity of the subject they indicate due to its being incorporated for use from one state of affairs into another. The scene created, and the affinities forged, in and by mosh pits become the smallest unit of resistance with greatest a/effect. Using the scene itself to create a subjective continuity, the family resemblance born by each rearticulation creates a syndicalist model that is decentralized. There is not one individual that is the mosh pit, there is not one individual that is the scene. The pit as a public tool for the expression of private life allows for that private life to become collective.

*  

It is through Articulation theory that one attends to how a movement obtains continuity of subjectivity outside of overdetermination. Continuity of subject is obtained in the use or functions of expression, not by what is said. Zora Neale Hurston formalized four key aspects in “Characteristics of Negro Expression” indicative of this creative capacity within black subjectivity: Angularity, Asymmetry, Mimesis (Imitation), and Absence.

Angularity in expression is found in the tendency to change nouns to verbs. Terms become vectors
which maintain their internal sense but set different relations within the state of affairs they inhabit. The same term can generate new meanings, contingent to context, yet maintain its syntactic integrity. Angularity yields speed. Speed is generated through the use of kernel expressions in repetition. Punk rearticulated the blues by utilizing core expressions to generate different forms through the repetition and the speed with which those kernel expressions were played. This effectively set novel relations for individuals obtaining these sets of conditions, thus forming a different form of life. The blues played fast allowed for what David Laing called the “one chord wonders” of punk. Speed and black expression have been tied to the articulation of a modern subject by changing the reference frame itself. Black musical expression generates a syncopated pattern in which time and the overdetermination of the terms themselves break down because of the speed generated through the repetition of the core elements of the blues. This in turn generates different forms of expression even though they utilize the same objects. Syncopation’s accent of the off-beat, of the breakdown itself, highlights the putting to use of these elements, not the elements themselves. Repetition of the same term is tautologous. The operation of repetition says no one thing save for its being used to construct an alternative frame of reference by resetting the form of its propositions. The utilization of no thing engenders the possibility for these expressions to be built in the first place. Expressions are built off of the kernel structures within a blues lexicon. This tautologous core signifies nothing about the reference frames to which it is introduced, yet asserts a self that can and is actively forming and framing the expressions that will be experienced therein. The same term can be put to use in exponential ways in accordance with context. Therefore, black expression is inextricably tied to the expression of a modern subject.

Blackness, as an undefinable object that, nonetheless, exists, shows how something that expresses nothing within a state of affairs can be used to make a statement about a particular circumstance. As blackness does not say anything in and of itself, it escapes the downward overdetermination of that reference frame precisely because of the indeterminacy generated through its use various aspects within that context to speak of that context. Black expression cannot be readily identified as each articulation is different and yet represents the activity of the same individual. W.T. Lhamon links black expression to the origin of a 1950s cultural revolution. The emergence of Black identities represents a self-critical act within the national culture articulated through blackness’ deliberate speed in rearticulating a U.S. system of cultural value. Lhamon locates this capacity in the riffs of Chuck Berry and the speed of his play. He ties this to the articulation of Modernity itself, subverting the practice of White covers of Black music with the intent of paraphrasing blackness out from the only musical forms that were truly of the U.S. For Wittgenstein, the advent of Modernity is in showing how Nothing forms expressions.

Asymmetry, for Hurston, leads to “abrupt and unexpected changes.” The aberrant vector of blue notes
maintains an inner syntax and logic while changing semantic value as it crosses contexts. This is due to the rearticulation of its relation within a sonic landscape and/or a social state of affairs. Asymmetry is the mechanism with which the aberrant quality of notes is used to make the same note form different expressions, articulate different values. Asymmetry proposes that black expression is movement itself, undefinable, and, from an external framework, can only to be described. However, that definition is unable to capture the totality of expressions that can be formed by that same subject. Hurston states that, “presence of rhythm and lack of symmetry are paradoxical, but there they are.” There is the subject. Though the subject of blackness is movement, blackness’ expression is “such that each unit has a rhythm of its own, but when the whole is assembled it is lacking in symmetry. But easily workable to a Negro who is accustomed to the break in going from one part to another, so that he adjusts himself to the new tempo,” the setting of relations within states of affairs as opposed to identified positions available within that state.

This brings our analysis round to Absence. This aspect is the stressing of the off-beat during the expression of a musical proposition. It is through the culmination of these three aspects above that syncopation becomes an analytic for black modes of expression as a way of creating thought, thus subjectivity. For Hurston, “Discord is more natural than accord.” Distortion and noise, the objects within a punk lexicon which remain outside the domain of predetermined notions of Music, are more natural than what is denoted by musical notation. It is the use of the parameters and impositions of grammar over black expression against themselves that highlights what Hurston focuses on as the creative capacity of blackness. A capacity in which blackness is revealed as a “fighting machine.” In it, blackness harbors the ability to do violence to the impositions of a dominant frame of reference. This capacity enables it to play and create an alternative form of life. Stressing the putting together of elements focuses analysis of black subjectivity qua expression on the breaks in what stands already articulated and neatly organized within the surface structure of society. The breaks show the work of the subject by how it is articulating what is represented on the surface. The work of sound being put to use is the marker of subjectivity. The subject is revealed viz. the silences as that which rests between and what fastens those elements together in different ways. The change in the syntax of these silences generates speed and movement. Hurston puts into conversation the generative aspect of this process under the term, “love-making.” Lovemaking is the ability to rearticulate frameworks that seek to overdetermine the subject revealing the capacity to utilize discord to form expressions and birth forms of life outside of domination. Syncopation allows for affinities to be had through this process. The semantic interface between the syntax or inner structure of the performer and the mosh pit, linked together in the off-beats within the scene of musical expression, form both aspects of performance. The expression of this alternative frame of reference is held together by their simultaneously fashioning a collective thought from the finite elements available in the scene of that performance. If both were hermetically sealed assertions, there would be no room for understanding. One could
only work towards the transposition of one individual into the language of the other. This would inevitably miss the point.

The Mimetic process harbors the capacity to check the legitimacy of constructions by searching for the precise point of the imposition of a dominant frame. These points can be exploited by the smallest unit of resistance so that the system of value which seeks to overdetermine the expression of this performance is confounded. The parameters of the system itself are put to use at the level of its construction to rearticulate the function transposing what is expressed into a system of value outside of the context of its articulation. Illustrating the syntax to the encounter between individuals within a state of affairs allows for the pinpointing of where overdetermination occurs. In that off-beat, the opportunity to change the direction of the subject so as to subvert strict identification is made possible.371 The aleatory movement of notes in the act of improvisation was analyzed under the aberrant quality generated by the blueing of notes above. Through the articulation mechanism, it is in the very act of naming itself that we found ambiguity increases. Therein lies the possibility to rearticulate states of affairs in that off-beat. With each rearticulation, the set of possible expressions increases along with the world comprising the unknown territories of blackness; territories unmapped by the grammar of the mainstream. The power to overdetermine the subject for the sake of that dominant reference frame decreases because the strictness of identification and definition required in order for it to work increases.372

* *

Black expression is found in the off-beat. Therefore, through an analysis of syncopation, blackness’ mode of expression, its very being, is rearticulation. The capacity to do violence to strict overdetermination is not lost even if overdetermined. A single blues chord, through repetition and speed, articulates a punk ethos that seeks to destroy mainstream ideals of Musicality. Systems of control cannot deal with the repetition of many all at once. Hence why it paraphrases simultaneity and multitude: the multitude is traded for one individual to represent that group; simultaneity, is traded for the sake of identification towards the extraction of value. This is for the sole purpose of putting one thing to use for one purpose, not allowing for one thing to be multiply useful. It is through this concept that syndicalism becomes the politic of blackness and punk.

**Syndicalism**

The Mosh Pit illustrates the subversion of overdetermination. From this, we derive a politic outside of
Identitarianism and despite the Pessimist. A mistranslation of “mash it up” from Bad Brains performances engenders the incorrect semantic interpretation of that term and, yet, its use still retains a syntactic structure which allows it to maintain a sense making capacity. This is possible even if the identity of the pit, of blackness, does not refer to that capacity at all and is mistakenly used to label the scenes in which the pit appears. The circular dance shows the active rearticulation of a state of affairs. Just as well, this is also done while offering a frame of reference in which individuals use the dominant frame itself to create expressions not caused by that state of affairs but appropriate to it. This is accomplished by the active reorganization of the arrangement of terms within that frame so as to articulate a different set of values attributed to its individuals.

Due to this rearticulative capacity, the pit on the surface looks different in each occasion of its enunciation. However, the deep structure, its logical form found in the syntax producing what is the scene in which it is coming together, remains the same. The mode of its expression evinces a signifying practice that is a public tool to understand the syntactic structure of the form of life which the mosh pit generates despite mistranslation. The pit, as an exemplar of the mechanism of articulation at work within a performance, shows how a repertoire of expressions can, on the surface, seem chaotic, but is not devoid of a sense making capacity. From this it is possible to propose a politic of rearticulation. It is in these scenes that a tactic against overdetermination via the subversion of one’s transposition into overdetermined systems of categorization are worked out.

The movement, here a dance, of individuals indicative of a mode of expression and, therefore, their way of being, was discussed under the concept of the Gerund. With the construction of a reference frame through the notion of pied-piping, it is now possible to discuss in greater detail how Gerunds are indicative of a “changing same.” Syntactically, this notion was handled through what is termed a Gerundive Nominal. It is through this concept that the syndicalist ethos to punk can be used to evaluate the legitimacy conditions of institutions. If a Gerundive expression can stand on its own, it is evidence of the subject. If an expression can only be represented within a proposition, that proposition only having a sense within a frame of reference, it can and must be rearticulated.

The mosh pit encodes the expression, output, of a form of life and only decodes it based on the performance and context. The pit reencodes the work done so that it can be understood only in the form of life in which those individuals who have participated in its construction. It function proves the incompleteness of the systems in which it has been transposed, overdetermined. By being translated into a system of categorization external to the form of life that produced it, the internal contradictions in the overall system can be proved, while its propositions remain consistent in the performative context in which it is expressed. Like “this statement is false”, the pit is evidence of Zora Hurston’s notion of dialect and dance in “The Characteristics of Negro Expression,” coming together to
articulate a form of life at once a part of the dominant mainstream frame, and yet not as it is not wholly legible to that frame. Thus, the pit harbors, in its incorporation by the mainstream, the capacity to rearticulate that reference frame, and does so by eliciting that frame work’s internal contradictions. Kurt Gödel showed that from within any system, one can prove inconsistencies. The form of life qua expression the pit proposes is true in that it is inconsistent with the frame in which it is enacted, as it cannot be readily translated into its system of values. However, the pit’s assertion is valid by because it has been articulated with the terms of that very same system. In turn, the pit reveals the inconsistencies of systemic overdetermination as incomplete. This is done without the pit itself—without the inner logic to its mode of constructing/expressing the form of life it is, as shown through the generative syntax of the blues core embedded in punk—becoming inconsistent, self-defeating, or contradictory.

The mosh pit generated by the subversion of the process of overdetermination, creates a syntactically sound expression that has no definition within a dominant state of affairs. The politics forged by it were mistranslated. Its sense making capacity was given a function that was not of the form of life in which it was created. The creative capacity to modes of expression as indicative of subjective continuity is found in recent linguistic analysis to utilize the parameters or impositions of reference frames themselves. The frame becomes the object with which to form expressions from this Counter-Cultural perspective. This is captured by how the mind treats expressions that are syntactically correct within a reference frame, but do not have any semantic content, a function or sense, within that frame. These are otherwise known as garden path sentence or island phrases. Garden paths are phrases that can be thought but not expressed, indicating their transposition from an outside context for use in this one. Therefore, the sense or function of the expression is used “incorrectly.”

An example of this is a punk ethos’ utilization of a syndicalist framework and its mistranslation as “nihilistic.” The imposition of this mistranslation was derived from an incorporation of lyrics from the Sex Pistols 1976 song “God Save the Queen” into the mainstream. Made the object of the mainstream’s propositions denoting Punk as a genre, the song was considered evidence of punk supposedly articulating “No-Future.” Within the terminology of our analytic, Punk, as genre, was transposed into the category of Nihilism. The incorporation of punk signifying practices into a dominant reference frame to extract value in maintenance of the state of affairs, was done in order to decrease solidarity within alternative forms of life. The hope was to enclose that ethos within the strict sense of the dominant value system. As the no future espoused by punk was a mistranslation, the addition of the definition to what a punk ethos entails might extend over that identified individual, but does not alter the internal relation between the constituents whose form of life expresses punk. Punk, as ethos, is an apparatus that takes in assumptions and critiques them by the very necessity within frames of reference to have to define the constituents of a state of affairs; it being necessary within
that frame to name and fix the relations obtainable by those individuals, to system and each other, within the surface organization of that state. What the Pistols were indeed saying in their lyrics, “No future for you/ No future for you” was that there was no future for, “. . . the Queen/ The fascist regime/ for being told what you want/ . . . what you need.” There was to be No-Future for the mainstream, for a Historical determinism, for an institutionalized dominant frame of reference that disavows its presence, but is represented in the apparatus of control it imposes over the population for/by the “Queen.” The Pistols end the song by stating that they were the, “flowers/ in the dustbin,” for those that were relegated to Not, “We’re the future/ You’re the future.” This encapsulates the punk ethos, regimes of control writing themselves out of existence. When punk was saying “No-Future,” it was articulating the end of a relation of dominance, a form of life outside of that reference frame lived now, the Future Perfect.

What resulted was a cultural endowment forming a subjective continuity that is best understood from the example set by the Situationist International. It is from the Situationists that Malcom McLaren, manager of the Sex Pistols and owner of the London shop SEX at the heart of the U.K. Punk scene, took so much inspiration. A subjective continuity can be found in blackness as well for Amiri Baraka/LeRoi Jones’ poem, “Black Dada Nihilismus,” recorded in 1967, labeled the injunction it levied against White overdetermination of Black subjectivity a “situation.” (Figure 12) A direct link can be made between the mistranslation of a punk No-Future as Nihilism, and the capacity for blackness to create outside of regimes of control. Emblematic of this was their being mistranslated as a “nihilismus,” whose function was a “cultural death.” When Baraka states, “Hermes the / blacker art. Thievery (ahh, they return / those secret gold killers. . .,” Baraka’s evokes the Situationist tactic of “détournement.” The cultural endowment through Baraka and through that situation to punk can be found in his rallying cry, “Black scream/ and chant, scream,/ and dull, un/ earthly hollering. Dada, bilious/ what ugliness, learned/ in the dome, colored holy/ shit (i call them sinned/ or lost burned masters. . .” The No-Future for White overdetermination and the profane act of living outside of a dominant frame of reference, the inner logic and syntactic structure to that subject survived in and through punk.

Formed in 1957 as an association of intellectuals, political theorists, artists, and revolutionaries, the Situationists articulated an organization based on a DIY ethos. This ethos was a network of mutual, non-coercive, relationships and affinities of expression. These affinities were an attempt to posit a politic outside of mere spectacle. Situationist practice was against “spontaneity” for its own sake. Their tactics were indicative of a capacity to generate expressions that were not random but appropriate to the cause of expressing an alternate form of life up and against a dominant reference frame. The goal was to point out the internal contradictions of the mainstream and utilize the vocabulary with which it was expressed in order to articulate something unheard of which would then
encourage the dominant frame of reference to incorporate the means of its own dissolution. The
Situationists developed a tactic termed détournement: the use of symbols and practices against their
sanctioned definition so as to rearticulate their significance within the state of affairs. Essentially,
these were acts of profanation.

Punk was articulated out of the encounter between U.S. racial upheaval and a New Left political
movement in Paris that yielded a Counter-Cultural expression that was equated with blackness in the
U.S. What emerged was a mode of expression tied to Punk. Many Punk bands would adopt
Situationist strategies—the Feederz, Dillinger, Panthers, and Gunk to name a few (Figure 11)—to
combat forced explanations regarding their musical expression to the mainstream. Forced explanation
was equated with coercion to produce music for a value system not their own. Coercion was effected
by their translation/transposition into a genre and their identification, viz. definitions of and strict
limitations placed upon their modes of expression, within mainstream culture. Efforts to control the
movement were seen in the move from Lo-fidelity live recording to Hi-fidelity studio recording. This
effort was concered with how to control what was to be included in the category of Punk as defined
by the Music industry. Hi-fi recordings represent the erasure of mistakes which led to an affectual
change in perception as the person listening could no longer feel like they were participating in the
performance. Identifying what this musical expression was and is, inevitably lead(s) to the erasure of
markers of subjectivity. Subjectivity represented by an inner logic and the syntactic mechanism to
form musical expressions. However, what was eschewed from the dominant frame, that which could
not be readily translated, provided the referent for punk itself. The labels attributed to these
expressions denoted empty categories although used within the propositions of the market. The
evidence of the punk subject remained in the syncopation and speed with which the music was
expressed. It was also revealed by the subject not being able to be wholly recorded into a value system
outside of its own.

The strategy adopted to combat overdetermination represents a tendency of thought, in this form of
life, that creates and rearticulates conditions of legitimacy. It actively questions the imposition of
institutions within social structures. The illustration of the construction of reference frames by way of
the theory of articulation brought about an understanding of the imposition of a reference frame.
Frames of reference are revealed as a constellation of terms, predetermined roles, and their assigned
functions used to parse the significance of individuals products of expression within a system of
value. As these expressions are introduced from one frame for use in the frame imposed, the trouble in
categorizing these expressions led to them being deemed dangerous to the organizational structure
overall. The checks that this tendency conducts are, through an appositive analysis, determines if an
imposition is mutually beneficial. If not, it is to be removed.

A restrictive appositive analysis seeks clarity. It holds legitimacy conditions for how the identity of
individuals are used as constitutive of their significance within society, despite how they are defined. This is accomplished through what is termed a contrapositive: one takes the device with which states of affairs are organized into various classes of individuals—whether racially, gendered, by sexuality, etc.—and by negating the categorization produced, and negating the antecedent or the sufficient inputs of that device, reveal whether or not this dividing mechanism can be legitimately asserted. “If Black, then overdetermined” becomes “If not overdetermined, then not Black.” In this way, we find the limit of the assertion of Black overdetermination is what is not-overdetermined, which means that overdetermination is a stipulation external to Black life. Therefore, overdetermination is not necessary to Black life, only to the one committed to its assertion. Contrapositives disclose assertability conditions of identity viz. categorical statements. Contrapositives are the praxis of Counter-Culture which do not seek to circumscribe a political position, but treats expressions of dominance as propositions. In turn, this shows the internal contradictions in the enactment of overdetermination so as to reveal the state sanctioned construction of mainstream frames of reference. This practice involves the move away from predefined political positions, and how they define themselves, to the use individual expression’s obtain and how the function of those terms can go on to create different meanings. In so doing, contrapositives take advantage of the internal contradictions to systems setting the function of roles within society to obtain the same truth values or aims.

Therefore, actions may look different superficially, but once enacted maintain the same injunction. If what the subject is doing, considered its verbal construction, is deleted due to external grammatical rules—which is a determination of their significance, W.V.O. Quine would argue as their existence—is paraphrased out of the reference frame. Thus, language as a mode of generating thought, not primarily communication, actively creates frames of reference in which a term's use is indicative of the capacity to generate significant meaningful expressions at all. This is an important artifact of the Situationist endowment in punk. The subversion of overdetermination achieved through détournement was not spontaneous, not mere probability, or luck. The subject articulated a proposition which forced the rearticulation of a state. That expression and form had not yet been experienced by the dominant frame or mainstream prior to that moment. The use of symbols against their sanctioned meanings for novel uses not caused but appropriate in context was deliberate. The Anarchist symbol might denote nothing to those whose frame of reference did not include it, but its use created a movement. Within this act is how I have analyzed syncopation as the articulation or expression of Nothing in such a way that it harbors the ability to rearticulate frames of reference themselves. It contains the ability to take advantage of the ambiguity in frames of reference and entails the purposeful use of the internal logic of the individual articulated, which may be incorrect in how it is defined, but possesses a sense within its own form of life.

Taking Race, Nation, and Ethnicity as individual terms that are not mutually exclusive, it is possible
to map tactics that were taken up in response to overdetermination. It becomes clearer how the Beat poet LeRoi Jones in the Village, as a progenitor of Baraka the punk, differs from Baraka’s Black Nationalism. The difference runs parallel to a politic of affinity, rearticulation as a tendency of thought, as distinct to the dictatorship of the proletariat. To define Anarchism as an object whose reference is nihilistic leads to what Baraka calls “Dante’s Hell” or what Wittgenstein describes as a cage in his lecture on Ethics in 1929. Rearticulation as a tactic is an undefinable object but exists as a way of thought. Rearticulation represents a creative capacity to change states of affairs. Its meaning is in how it is used. With this in mind, no longer does the Left/Right binary as a plane of politics hold. The social, as a form of life in states of affairs, is more a sphere of relations. It is possible to see that the question is not how far Left or Right, or even moderate or progressive, one is, for if they go far enough either way, the politic begins to resemble the other as each position must be defended by any means. Movement cast in this light begin to imitate what they are against just under different labels, these positions become the same point on the sphere.

Punk as ethos and understood through blackness, renegotiates matrices of overdetermination. In fighting a doctrine that is dogma, the function of the role as the function of an Ideology to which individuals ascribe, of the Left or the Right, results in fixed positions. These positions become the cultivation of a concrete stance or form to expressions that ultimately renders movements static. The mode presented above is a generative way of reading states of affairs as it reveals the tendency of the “Left”—that dangerously ends up close to the conservative so as to hedge its identified position for the sake of the apparent gains it has made—against a tendency on the “Right”—which veers towards a neoliberalism that circumscribes the term “freedom” as only of use within a single reference frame imposed across contexts.

An analysis of this way of being in the world inhabited and created by黑ness through punk is that of mutual aid. A punk ethos is an affirmation of transgression. The individual is not autonomous, but a set of relations based on an affinity of uses within a form of life. This relation is captured in the study of syncopation as the mark of the subject’s creative capacity. Its capacity to enter into and renegotiate the relations between a finite set of elements to produce new expressions.

The goal of this reorientation away from Identity towards the activity of the subject is a move from a politics of position—intending to occupy and defend one’s role within the state of affairs—towards one of aesthesis—the handling of the relation that an individual has within a state of affairs simultaneous with its capacity to renegotiate that position. This distinction is made between Identity as a form of translation and subjectivity as a way of being in the world. The former is at odds with one’s capacity striving for personal identification in order to become significant in an/other’s reference frame. The subject, blackness as an entity, is integrated into one’s own active creation of a
frame of reference, the mode of expression that affirms the inner creative capacity of black subjectivity, appropriate to the state of affairs at large, but not caused by it.385

Our analysis comes to this. It is conceivable to positively assert that it is possible to build a movement from Nothing. A non-coercive network of affinities has the same inner logic, produced by the same finite capacity, but expresses different operations towards the same object of thought. It represents different ways of being in the world that go on to express a collective subject(ivity); different operations considered under the same function, maintaining a relationship between subject and world, and coming together to express a Future Perfect form of life. It is possible to conceive of the concept of an alternative world expressed as a “function” of many other functions. Though we may know those functions as different roles, they can obtain a “world” building operation for the reason that it is less likely that we could know the totality of those roles articulated by the active construction of that form of life a priori.

There are multiple ways to express the same subject. If these modes of expression are held in a multivocal relation, overdetermination by a function held universally over all individuals across domains can be subverted. Its syntactic structure is where all these functions are equivalent, not identical, and leads to a circle of affinity. As these are different functions of the same object, equivalent yet not identical or interchangeable with one another, a movement is, nonetheless, always singular plural. It is a definite function of an undefinable object expressing the subjectivity of a people, a movement. Identity and its politics being innately ambiguous, a function with a non-determinate object, yet publicly determinate within a frame of reference, shows that there are relations and networks to be had outside of having to submit to a singular regime of categorization. This is a relation of affinity rather than coercion. As a dominant reference frame is constituted by a web of predicative roles to which individuals become objects or subjected to, the formulation we arrive at attacks the reason and method of overdetermination. If a frame’s significance within that world is predetermined, as identities are introduced from one reference frame for use in another, we can show that it is possible to rearticulate those conditions. This tactic takes the inconsistencies of regimes of control and, by those frames focus identity rather than subjectivity, renders acts that tend to terrorize, subjugate, or dominate others, insignificant for they are not essential to the subject. The function of identity fixed, its referents ambiguous, an identity may be imposed with no subject there to obtain. More importantly, the subject may produce an identity in one context that is in contradiction to the role determined in this one. Because the frame may not be able to decide, by its own rules, whether or not the subject identified maintains the status quo therein, we can suppose that by renaming and translating that ambiguous referent into its domain, inconsistencies begin to grow unbeknownst to the dominant frame. The name of a name does not necessarily define or enclose the totality of the subject it supposedly determines. This is for the simple reason that a subject is not a thing but a capacity. As
the same subject can have multiple identities, the act of overdetermination takes in the means with which it may be overturned. The conditions reformulated, and an alternative form of life proposed, these acts of overdetermination cannot reproduce themselves when they internalize their own inconsistencies, even if they are wearing different clothes. The domain in which their functions run returns objects that are in contradiction to their maintenance.386

The concept of Overdetermination as a result of our study is defined as follows. An individual within our state of affairs has three aspects: its World—context or point of view within a state of affairs; its Name; and the Relation that name obtains within that world. If there is an encounter between two individuals A and B such that [A x B] produces C, then the concept of overdetermination is expressed in the cross multiplication of these two individuals within our articulatory mechanism. This represents an encounter in which various aspects such as ‘Name(World)’ are created—the function of a name over the affairs/operations within another’s world—in C. The function of how one Names the constituents of its World, and so determines the operations held significant or the affairs of the other’s World view, represents the overdetermination of an other which may obtain in C. We have shown that the “function” of a function is not circular but expresses the concept of overdetermination: one function redefining or “determining” the operation of the other in this freshly articulated state of affairs. Effectively, through formalizing this process as distinct within context but not mutually exclusive from others processes of overdetermination, through articulation we map an individual’s movement from one context for use in another. We model that individual’s operation, its form of life, being determined within another’s context.

Outside of the relation obtained, we can assert that the syntactic structure of control viz. overdetermination is that of different subjects, rigidly defined or identified, becoming objects of the same function. To attack the act of overdetermination, its mechanism is shown ineffective by revealing the inconsistencies with regard to identity. For it is the structure of overdetermination that has been shown to allow for these acts to remain recursive, to repeat themselves. As affinity works along lines of non-coercion, the legitimacy checks to systems of control through the contra-”positive” assures us that affinities do not work along lines of negation but rearticulation. Affinities utilize what is Not as an operation that makes hegemony write itself out of existence. Nothing, as a predicate whose function must obtain some thing for it to say anything at all, is not definitive of the subject, only the objects it obtains within an overdetermined system of categorization. The difference in the former from the latter is that in the latter we have one function to characterize a multitude. Of this, we should be wary. The former consists of multiple forms of life, multiple functions, coming together to express a particular subject.387
It can be stated that a universal stipulation, "one" over "no one thing," harbors a non-determinate, i.e. infinite, result. Thus, overdetermination houses within its very stipulation an internal contradiction. It affirms the existence of every thing it negates for the sake of that one, dominant, and definitive parameter set over a non-determinable population. A finite measure cannot capture infinite possibility. The mechanism of articulation developed in this study allows us to construe a remark about the recursive creative expressive capacity of individuals in context, as one about the method of articulation itself. These articulations are appropriate to context, not random, and not necessarily a mirror of that context. In this way, the paradox of infinite possibility captured within the terminology of finite experience does not arise.

The act of rearticulation subverts overdetermination by overcoming the sanctioned use of a term utilized in the process of articulating a self. The importance of our qualification of "Black"-ness as distinct from "Black" identity within racial categorization, illustrates the use of a label to express something not of that category. Namely, what is expressed is the subject that holds the relation between various identities—Black, African-American, Negro, etc.—generated by the function of those terms. In this way, blackness comes before or is outside of what is “Black” to and for others; subjectivity comes before identification. Blackness’s ways of being in the world are unable to be determined external to those whose use of the terms of its identity obtain a particular form of life.

A strategy to strictly dominate possible ways of blackness’ being in the world works through an Identity function that extracts leaders as individual founders. The purpose of this extraction is in order to cut representatives off from that movement, using that individual to refer or stand in for a multitude. Asserting a “Founder of a Movement” insists ownership over a position within the surface organization of society. Those translated into the dominant frame are those whose critiques can be incorporated so as to produce value for or substantiate that frame. The incorporation of individuals from one context for use in another incorporates the subjugated in the act of their own subordination. From the point of view of Counter-Culture, this was termed “selling-out”; from that of the mainstream it was to “drop-out” from that system of value and reference frame. In effect, these monikers become two functions over different objects made to be interchangeable with each other. The inner logic of subjectivity has illustrated the fallacy in this formulation. This is done by the dominant frame so that that individual can be made to refer to absolutely nothing, thus rendering a movement static, controlled. The trend of creating thought that is blackness as detailed here is a non-coercive rearrangement of relations within states of affairs. This motivates Amiri Baraka’s analysis of the expression of a people through music in his essay “The Black Aesthetic.” In it, Baraka undoes the virtuosity sought after by the respectable holding sacred singular modes of Black expression to be considered significant within a U.S. system of value(s).
We can also show how cultural endowments may intersect in such a way that issues of propriety, claim, and dispossession do not arise. There is no one true endowment over which individuals or nations may lay claim. Alternative endowments can be generated in the process illustrated by our articulatory mechanism. The question is not "what" or "from where" but "how" the matter within or the lexicon of these endowments is used during the expression of a people. This secures the need for a general theory of Articulation and its usefulness in socio-cultural and political studies. The intersection of endowments, inspiration, and the movement of the various materials of expression across contexts is represented in the cross-pollination between the different cultural lines embedded in the same form of life. These lines are possibly obtained, but not necessarily so, in different spatial-temporal locations. Blackness is not in or of one distinct place. Incorporation through dispossession as appropriation occurs when one form of life attempts to dominate, or utilize for its own purposes, another.

Just as syncopation is an analytic of subjectivity despite forced categorization, the rearticulation of states of affairs is not merely about noticing the notes expressed, but acknowledging the subject of those propositions. Each time blackness or punk was subject to the function of a reference frame external to its form of life—becoming the object of commercial, political, or social overdetermination by a lexicon or vocabulary not its own—its tendency was to rearticulate itself. From blues to rock, rock to punk, punk to hardcore, this occurs on and on. This process proves that Nothing can form a movement viz. the structure of a song, the pregnant pauses between beats and riffs. The subject is revealed as what is putting those notes together by virtue of the silences holding each utterance intact and the noise or distortion that reigns continuous over the performance as a whole. It is with this methodology of applying the mechanism of articulation through the historical frame of the Electric Church, the textual evidence of the Singing Book, and the analysis of the particular cases articulated from this set of conditions, it is now possible to show how a movement is made out of Nothing. As Richard Wright states in White Man, Listen!, blackness as, “The Known Unknown,” is the modality of expressing Modernity itself. Blackness is the non-non-Western subject. In line with the ethos of a punk mentality expressed through blackness, the fight to fit in is a fight against self.

Conclusion

Formalizing Articulation revealed the set of conditions in which relations of subordination and dominance emerge rather than recording statistical evidence of its effects. This allowed us to attend to the structures reproducing sets of relations to maintain the status quo. Although, from context to context the appearance of the states a system produces change, we can theorize where the internal contradictions in that system’s mode of expression occur and how a collective improvisation rearticulates those conditions Future Perfectly. The articulatory syntax developed can represent
contradictions without its propositions becoming contradictory. This effort showed that faculties expressing states of affairs are derived from the capacity to form expressions, in turn, structuring reality. Challenges to dominant structures are no longer arbitrary, nor random. Thus, it becomes rational to challenge, change, or discard the attitudes maintaining the dominance of these irrational institutions.

Acknowledging blackness’ expressive faculty—its inner logic—in a way that cannot be disregarded, required formalizing our methodology. Articulation theory provides a mechanism which accounts for the formation of conditions in which the modalities of individuals are their mode of expression. Our work avoids retroactively attributing analyses definitive of those individuals without accounting for context formation. If there are an indeterminate amount of solutions to the same problem, analyses may be discounted as arbitrary. However, a single structure can produce different outcomes. Rather than producing an all-encompassing determination, our method of constructing analysis was shown alongside its results.

Our mechanism illustrated the validity to conceiving blackness, also punkness, as a "collective improvisation." For Jones/Baraka, this concept represents the "as yet" to come. Conceptually, the as yet was conceived by studying improvisation in music or social movements and developed here under "null." The Future Perfect is a Counter-Cultural operation: living the “as yet,” an alternative form of life, in the present. Our articulatory mechanism allowed for the representation of the present context as well as alternatives produced by the encounter of individuals within the same state of affairs. This was done without having to negate one for the other—see Appendix I. Blackness is both a part of the current form of life’s structure vis-à-vis its identity, yet it itself, its subjectivity, remains apart. For it expresses, articulates, that self from the “as yet,” a non-empty null. Formally, null is not a “part” of this set of conditions, context, state description, etc. but is of another for it is no one thing. The null must also be a part of that former set, for it becomes what is not a “part” of those alternative contexts as well. Adding zero to any set leaves identity unchanged, therefore, all sets are connected for they have zero as a member which affirms zero’s existence, i.e. the null. Therefore, the null unifies all sets—no set can be a member of itself, the set of all non-members is null. In sum, the null is insignificant in one, yet part of all possible articulations; embedded, yet appearing different, in each articulation from that core. As such it is the foundation from which all other contexts are constructed—see ZFC axioms, Cantorian set theory, and von Neumann’s set-theoretical construction of ordinals.

Our articulatory mechanism also illustrated black subjectivity outside of presupposed classifications of what counts as valid expressions of Black identity. Despite the various forms of blackness produced, the generative core to its mode of expression was shown valid and consistent. Articulations
of blackness cannot be discounted as random, reactive, or nothing dependent upon or if uncategorized in its emergent context. The articulatory syntax formalized within blackness ensured a cultural endowment that cannot be denied and is continuous despite its apparent differences across contexts. Socio-political significance is not identical with cultural existence, but cultural endowments generate the force behind socio-political expression. Blackness is no one thing. Its structural determination as “nothing,” akin to a “nihilistic” punk, is not total. This, in turn, reveals what is only named “nothing” as the presently submerged “as yet.” The forms of life expressing blackness and punkness are Counter-Cultural, illustrated by a “counter”-ing operation that improvises off of what is available and expresses what is yet to be. This is a collective act. Therefore, blackness’ very being cannot be void.

Blackness, then, is a form of life. Its center is everywhere, its circumference is nowhere.
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APPENDIX I: Formal Diagram of the Mechanism of Articulation

A formal and general mechanism for the process of Articulation is required to account for the emergence of relations of dominance and subordination. In this way, our account does not readily blame individuals for these distinctions, but reveals how they are imposed by the structures and systems responsible for overdetermining theirs, as well as others’, functions or roles within the categorical organization of a state of affairs. Our articulation mechanism is developed through a multiplication of vectors. It is my contention that movements are movements and not another thing. A movement, just as a vector, has magnitude and direction. Movements are vectors that move through a social space. Therefore, we can map their impact within states without predetermining their value. Thus, by developing our theory in this way, we grant movements a reality even if deemed insignificant by retroactive descriptions of that state of affairs. The goal is to see how a movement shapes social space rather than a social space determining a movement as a singular point within a predetermined geometry. As such, individuals and their movements can be considered under the algebra of a tensor, a function of a coordinate, role, position, neighborhood, or body within the legislation of this social space.

Our only axiom is how we conceive of the function of the term “Not.” Not is conceived as indicative of the operation of the Null which, in set theory, comprises the set of every possible element used to articulate what is significant within a particular state of affairs. The Null, being the set of every thing, is at once a part of any thing that can be conceived or formalized as well as remains apart from each one thing that has been stipulated as an individual within that state of affairs. The Null, then, is no one thing. We have and will refer to Null as a repertoire of signifying practices with which subjects express various identities. In this way, the Null represents a cultural endowment. As the Null is no one thing but the set of everything, it is expressed by the function or way in which “Not” is utilized to distinguish between different individuals.

The mechanism pursued below illustrates both the creation of a state of affairs or set of conditions as well as the interaction between different individuals within the context in which their encounter occurs. In so doing, we illustrate the tension between structural or systemic subordination and individual agency. This demonstration functions as the expression of the concept of overdetermination itself.

Historically, linguistic study determined that the only true verb form are variations of “to be.” This illustrates a close link between modality and language. Linguistically, possibility and existence are linked in such a way that one can form the phrase, “. . . may, not . . .” but cannot form the phrase, “. . . not, may . . .” This is evidence that modality, existence, and possibility precede the application of the descriptor representing the operation of negation. It is also indicative of the structure of our world and the way in which we articulate a form of life. An object must be conceived within a conceptual scheme by what it is doing.

Phrases are known in frames of reference. The individuals they mark are understood as being there before a label is affixed to them. The transformation that seems irreducible to other forms in the setting forth of variations of “to be” is captured in the suffix “-ing”. The function of object(s) expressing an individual, the ‘object’ and the function under which it operates viz. “-ing”, will be termed the Gerund.

Let the Gerund be defined as what ‘is’, is doing within a state of affairs represented under the “-ing” form. Linguistically, Gerunds function as noun-verbs. They are the subject of propositions and what sets the structure of a proposition. Etymologically, Gerund is derived from gerundus meaning “which is to be.” Thus, the modality of that which is expressed in a proposition is captured in the Gerund form. In generative views of syntax, the modality of a proposition is determined in the first and last
step of its recursive functions. What an entity is in the world pivots around the Gerunds buried in the prose of our expressions. They underlie the surface structure of the propositions produced.

By coming to understand the Gerund in this capacity, the existence of the individual is between the self it forms in the world and its relation to the Other. The “self” that the Gerund forms, the name it asserts, becomes that Gerund’s identity. Becoming the subject of a proposition is how that Gerund is identified. It becomes the “subject” of propositions, a network of propositions a frame of reference in which that identity has a sense, use, so as to organize a state of affairs. The naming of this individual constantly rearranges the relations attainable within states of affairs as names are captured within the grammar of that world. In so doing, Gerunds create the potential for meaningful expression simultaneously with being the subject of valuations taken up by the grammars of the worlds they inhabit. In sum: meaning is made and values are taken.

An individual—either a single entity, an institution, or a group of individuals—is made of three aspects: a world; name; and relation. Our scheme for language structure as indicative of social structure can be applied to the Gerund in the following way. Set within a lexicon, the subject is composed by a generative syntax. With a slight modification from Chomsky’s *Lectures on Government and Binding*:

```
Syntax
  | Syntactic-Structure
  / \ Phonetic Form Logical Form
the individual becomes,
  
  Subject
  | Relation
  / \ Name World
```

The lexicon of elements from which to articulate one’s world is composed of a finite set—social vocabulary—of materials—whether sonic, visual, etc.—representing different arrangements of multiple or various objects experienced by self or others indicating that world. The lexicon represents the actual world. Syntax is connected to subjectivity as it is the way in which the subject utilizes these elements to form expressions. The function of which these elements—which do not have meanings in and of themselves, but produce meaning nonetheless—is the syntax by which and that is indicative of subjectivity. Relation, then, becomes the syntactic-structure.

The (W)orld is the context in which this individual is participating. The context reveals the point of view of our study, the label attributed to the set of conditions we are analyzing. A world, then, is one reality or arrangement of elements articulating an individual’s form of life out of others. The formation of a particular world harbors material consequences to how that individual is identified by others.

The (N)ame is how that individual is identified within those sets of conditions. Names in accordance with identity theory are epistemologically necessary but ontologically contingent. This means that a single individual can be identified in multiple ways depending on the context in which it appears or is described; and, yet, it remains that same individual. However, within (W)orld, that identity remains fixed.

Finally, the (R)elation aspect of this individual maintains how an identity or name is used within a given (W)orld or context.
These three aspects are distinct but not mutually exclusive. Without the relation or function an identity or name obtains within a given world or context, we cannot conceive of the object or individual whose affairs or operation expresses the subject of the propositions articulating our state of affairs. The combination of these three aspects represents the Gerund or the subject outside of one frame of reference's identification or rigid definition of the individual qua entity being analyzed. In this way, we show the activity of the subject, its inner logic and continuity, despite its being identified in multiple ways or being labeled/named as nonexistent. “Nonexistent” only means that the individual is unknown to one reference frame, which does not preclude its being significant within its own or another. By demonstrating the encounter between individuals producing alternative contexts, we also show how a frame of reference or body of knowledge indicating a form of life, the functional affairs of the individuals therein, is constructed.

The concept of nested worlds in which a single subject can be identified in multiple ways, within varying frames of reference or “worlds” indicative of particular points of view, and yet retain subjective continuity, can be considered in accordance with X-bar theory in modern linguistics. X-bar theory considers the inner logic and structure of phrases in accordance with projection rules. Subcategories or types are carried or “projected” structurally during the formation of phrases. Types are not rewritten after phrases are formed or predetermined prior to their function or role. The type of phrase is determined by an item’s function, indicated by its position within the structure of the thought produced. Worlds can branch into other worlds just like complements link to others in the X-bar diagram.

X-bar theory is based off of a verb taking an object of which that couplet then becomes the subject of a phrase. An X-phrase (XP) is such that ‘X-’ can represent a Sentence (S) or Inflected Phrase (IP), a Verb Phrase (VP), Noun (NP), Preposition (PP), etc. X-bar structure is formalized in the following way:

```
XP or Phrase
    / \ Specifier X-bar
        / \ X Complement
```

Complement can take another Phrase, such that:

```
Phrase
    |XP
    / \ Spec X-bar
        / \ X YP
            / \ Spec Y-bar
                / \ Y Comp
```
In our model, a subject is expressed via a Relation between Name and World:

```
    Subject
     |
    Relation
     /
    Name  World
```

Worlds, like complements, can accept:

```
    Relation
    /
    Name  World
```

Thus,

```
    Subject
     /
    Name World
     /
    Name  World
     
    . . .
```

in such a way that we can follow the articulation of different identities—the way in which a subject appears within various worlds, frames of reference, points of view, or contexts—up to a subject. What appears or what we have experience of in various “worlds” are identified in one particular context. The totality of worlds or every-thing, which is to say no one world or no-thing, serves as the foundation for all possible identities or names and, therefore, represents the Null, i.e. $\emptyset$. The Null is the set of everything which is an equivalent proposition to “nothing” as no one thing is yet significant within any particular state of affairs. The subject is at once present in each world but only represented certain individual ones which are unified by this Null set. This movement from one context to another, one set of conditions or world to another, maps what is termed the line or vector of the Gerund which, as the subject before it is identified, is at once named in multiple ways yet remains continuous outside of categorial identity. The subject qua Gerund maintains its inner logic and generative creative capacity to articulate various ways of being in the world and, therefore, alternative forms of life as a result of the capacity to make infinite use of a societal lexicon’s finite means.

The subject has various identities whose meanings are dependent upon the function of a name within a frame of reference or world. The finite set of names provide the material with which out of one world a subject’s syntactic structure as generative mechanism can create or articulate others. A finite lexicon cannot outstrip or describe the infinite ways in which it can be put to use. Therefore, the various worlds a subject is a part of, by virtue its identity and, yet, remains apart from, can be shown as the tree diagram above or nested:

```
[Subject [World [Identity [Subject [. . .]]]]]
```

which is the same as

```
[Null [World [Name [Null [. . .]]]]]
```
The Null set, as the set of all possible elements and therefore of no one specific element or world, through the process of articulation, can be utilized to construct multiple arrangements constituting different states of affairs or world descriptions in accordance with modern set theory and modal logics. One actual world can have multiple realities—points of view indicative of a particular frame of reference—of consequence to the various individuals in which those realities represent their form of life.

Essentially, A subject in and of itself does not appear in worlds for it is Null but is a part of each one by virtue of a name or identity. Therefore, each world has a naming function and grammar or the way in which names are used to organize them. Grammar represents how that world or society is superficially organized with respect to the roles that names as functions impose on individuals whether racially, gendered, etc. In this way, we have an easy way to map how worlds are founded from the material or lexicon of various finite world-descriptions and, therefore, are nested within others; all of which find their basis in the Null set, the subject as the totality of all possible worlds which itself is both a part of and apart from.

Subjects can connect to other subjects outside of name and identity, what is here being referred to as specifiers, by the same X-bar schema. “Names” do not have to be in specifier position, for any term or phrase can serve a nominal function, but not all phrases, once considered under the category of “Name,” specify a particular object other than themselves. “Victor,” dependent upon its function, can be a unique individual, merely a name/label, or describe the outcome of a conflict. Objects or terms once categorized or used as “names” can obtain other names if that same term is now in a complementary position or the head of a phrase. A specifying, i.e. identity, phrase can be composite, which is to say, not a singular term. A named world or the set of names within the scope command of a particular world depends on those terms’, phrases’, function within a particular structure. X-bar allows us to distinguish between some term that functions in a specifying capacity retroactively categorized as a “name,” as distinct from a term that does not obtain a specifying role by its position within the formation of that structure. Thus, a name or subject can take a complement dependent upon its role in the formation of an expression. This ambiguity in deciding the appropriate label of a phrase’s constituents—specifier, complement, the type of term or X—as indicative of a certain type within a predetermined system of categories can be handled by our schema. For, the X-bar diagram’s inverse is valid as well—see above. A specifier preceding an X-bar as well as an X-bar preceding a specifier are both valid, but not identical or interchangeable as structural shape harbors certain consequences for semantic interpretation. Sound semantic interpretations are generated as a function of a structure provided by virtue of a generative syntax; semantics are derived by how that structure is utilized to express the thought.

According to X-bar theory, specifiers and complements are optional, therefore, we do away with the need and troubles generated by having to rely on predetermined phrase types. Only the head, X, is obligatory as it can form a phrase by itself if it is a noun, verb, adjective, or preposition. Types are expressed by how phrases function in the articulation of a thought’s surface structure; not in how that emergent object fits into categories external to this process. A name does not necessarily obtain a subject. A name can obtain Null, what is nominally “Nothing.” Recognizing this aspect of our method, we can map various organizations of subjects as well as the inner logic and structure of their interrelated worlds and identities.

According to the principles of X-bar theory, an X-Phrase or XP is constructed in the following way:

\[ X-bar \rightarrow X, YP/comp \]
\[ XP \text{ or what is derived from an } X-bar \rightarrow \text{spec, X-bar} \]

According to these principles, a sentence, here, a state of affairs S, is expressed by the relation obtained between an XP and YP, each of which project only be an X or Y. This is demonstrated by the following rewrite parameters whose constituents are unordered:
$S \rightarrow XP, YP, (aux)$

where $S$ is expressed *viz.* the relation—represented as an auxiliary modal—between $XP$ and $YP$. In accordance with this overarching structure, we have by phrase structure rules:

$S \rightarrow NP, VP, (aux)$

$NP \rightarrow$ spec, $N$

$VP \rightarrow V, NP/comp$

where an $XP$ or $YP$, etc. can be considered an $NP$ or $VP$, etc. and an $X$, $Y$, etc. can be just an $N$ or $V$, etc. The Gerund is conceived by the movement of an individual from X to X-bar to XP, its encounter with various specifiers and/or complements whose function or how they utilize the Gerund to express an individual within states of affairs is done in a way that is appropriate to worlds but not caused by them.

A state of affairs, which consists of the Relation expressing the individual subjects therein—what comes before an individual is identified or named—and what those subject’s various identities are doing in the formation of worlds can be described by these principles:

$S/Rel \rightarrow rel/subject, world, name$

$Name \rightarrow rel/subject, name$

$World \rightarrow name, world$

This allows for our structure’s demonstrative capacity to be expanded in accordance with a traditional X-bar scheme in the following way:

```
Named subject
/ \   \
Name  World
/ \   \
R/Subject  Name
```

For our purposes, and to show continuity, this diagram can be rewritten:

```
Named subject
/ \   \
Name  World
/ \   \
Name  R/Subject
```

from which we can derive, showing that every name is indicative of a subject, the following:

```
Subject
/ \   \
R/Subject  World
/ \   \
R/Subject  Name
```

which better displays a continuity of subjectivity, forming the basis for what we will term a cultural endowment. It also shows that a subject can obtain multiple names dependent upon the world in which it appears and yet remain that same subject. Therefore, the principles of our subject diagrams in accordance with X-bar theory are: i) a single name of an individual projects into or is utilized in its respective world along the lines of our diagram; ii) multiple names may project the same subject into
the worlds in which those names fulfill an identity function—names being world contingent, a single subject may have multiple names dependent upon the context in which those names are used; and iii) multiple subjects may project into the same name in the same world.

These structures can only obtain a use or role within a given lexicon or repertoire of signifying practices. The collection of all possible formations expresses the concept of an articulatory mechanism as something that is implicit in the expression of each “world,” but dynamic, can produce appropriate articulations to context. These various forms use, outside of a predetermined system of categorization or reference frame, is indicative of the operation of “Nothing” as any one of these structures, as the set of no one form in particular, obtains Null. This ensures that no world, including blackness, is empty for the set of no thing is the set of every thing.

With regard to our study overdetermination, the syntax to the expression of this concept can be easily mapped. A term or aspect in specifier position is equivalent to the identity or naming function of our articulation mechanism. As complements in the X-bar structure can take other phrases, we have the following structure:

```
XP
/ \  
spec X-bar
/ \  
  X YP
/ \  
spec Y-bar
```

From this structure, overdetermination is obtained by virtue of a function determining the operation of another. This is done by a specifier qua identifying phrase that sets the function or role of another specifier within the process of articulating that other individual. Hence, specifying the role or operations of another’s specific form of life predetermines that individual’s role from a phrase or context outside the inner logic of that individual within the same state of affairs, here an XP. This, then, expresses overdetermination within the schema outlined above. The “function” of a function, i.e. the composite function, spec(spec(Y)), in our X-bar model, expresses the concept of overdetermination. Our articulatory mechanism outlines this process in a simpler way by formalizing the language function of merge by considering the encounter of the vectors of individuals or movements.

In sum, a state of affairs represents the collection of various Worlds or contexts, each one real for they are consequential to how one's life is experienced and defined. A state of affairs as “world” maps over different and particular arrangements of descriptions of the actual world. The Gerund formulation is the basis of our theory for subjectivity outside of strict identification with something other than it is. We are also able to illustrate the structural formation to the expression of overdetermination, the formation of movements, and the possibility to rearticulate state of affairs providing an alternative frame of reference and form of life outside of the imposition of a dominant societal order.

For this reason, Gerunds will be formalized under vector notation. The Gerund definition above can be shorted to the vector $\vec{X}$ where, $\vec{X}$ is equivalent to:

$$< W, N_x, \delta RW >$$

Travel along these lines do not change the internal sense of the Gerund but only the set of relations in which it is involved. This accounts for the fact that names may change but the object to which they refer remains the same. The name is cast over an instance of this line. This marked interval is dependent upon our position in/to the context under consideration. For it is over these unions between the interpretants of Gerunds that a “culture” can be theorized. Hence, the behavior of these Gerunds
reveals not only our ontological commitments, but also what these relations are doing in a form of life.

After its initial introduction to a form of life, a name is moved farther and farther away from the empirical description to which it was originally fixed. As the individual’s name refers less and less to the features merged to create it from the Null, but more so referring to that label’s movement or use within the syntactic structure of a state of affairs, those features no longer referenced or used in connecting name to object become the fragments taken up by other Gerunds. This process is called entropy. Movement between contexts always leaves traces that can be taken up by others.

Encounter

Now, I aim to propose a way to map the encounter of Gerunds which come to articulate a reference frame and form of life. The forging of affinities defines the points which contour one’s context within a state of affairs. These affinities have a material implication or consequence. This consequence defines the reality of an individual’s existence.

Material implication is formally represented: \[ \overline{A \times \overline{B}} \]. Let \( \overline{A \times \overline{B}} \) represent the encounter between possible worlds illustrated above. The encounter operation within a social lexicon in this instance is analogous to the operation merge in the linguistic sphere. This is what is inferred as causality. The inference of causality was misinterpreted as an object in the world. That is, in order to know what something is, one must know what specific events came together, which are then read as its “cause.” However, this is not the case. What should be read from the encounter is that by virtue of \( \overline{A} \) and \( \overline{B} \)’s occurrence, there was something, namely, the set of conditions “S” from which \( \overline{A} \) and \( \overline{B} \) emerged. \( \overline{A} \) and \( \overline{B} \) are revealed as the inner description of the set of conditions which become an “object” of a contextual description, here \( S \), the function of which express their significance or meaning within and only within particular states of affairs. Formally, we have a context within a state \( S \), such that \( \overline{A} \) and \( \overline{B} \), where \( \overline{A} \) has a relation to \( S \) and \( \overline{B} \) has a relation to \( S \), such that the construct of that state of affairs is composed by the activity of \( \overline{A \times B} \). What is inferred is that if \( \overline{A} \) and \( \overline{B} \), this entails that there is an \( S \) that is expressed by the operation of \( \overline{A} \) and \( \overline{B} \) which were once Null, i.e. not-\( S \), but represent the set of conditions in which a context \( S \) emerges. In other words, \( \overline{A} \) and \( \overline{B} \) represents the set of conditions that articulate \( S \). If \( \overline{A} \) and \( \overline{B} \) are the set of conditions, then \( S \) is materially implied by them; although their presence is disavowed in “this” context in order for \( S \) to be represented from then on as a significant description of the world. Causality is, therefore, a matter of narrative. Since the Null is the set of all possible individuals, one is hard pressed, save by stipulation, to denote exactly which arrangement of possibilities one can attribute to the emergence of \( S \). Below we shall show how this process then expresses a new context within the state itself which generates or introduces the possibility of other individuals. In this way, \( \overline{A} \) and \( \overline{B} \) represent the state of affairs; their operation expresses the particular context \( S \), which functions as a description of the reality experienced by the constituents of \( \overline{A} \) and \( \overline{B} \) which is an aspect of the actual world.

Propositions are set by virtue of verb transformations. These verb transformations extend in all directions from what that individual is. The intersection between worlds occurs in the encounter of these verb phrases extending into other worlds. This extension coincides with coming to know the propositions of another’s world. Through materiality, we are able to see that the disavowed still exists, and what is, is despite of stipulation.

Brought to the fore is a question of modality. A Gerund is asserted within a proposition by virtue of the encounter. The force of the assertion is contingent to the ways or modalities in which an individual is in the world. Modalities can be represented by “if . . . then . . .” or “. . . if and only if . . .” statements in place of hypothetical propositions. The movement from the set of all possible modes of being in the world, to the reality of being in the world, is consequential to the states of affairs in which the encounter occurs. The grammar of these states of affairs parse potentialities and are contingent to the functions extending over them. It is in this way that what are seen as “new” terms are introduced
across contexts and how a stipulation to Null or “Nothing” occurs. Material relations are represented as \((\exists A, B)(\forall S)\) to be read as “there exists some \(A\) and \(B\), for all of \(S\) . . .” Through this, we can modally represent the existence of both “not-\(A\) and not-\(B\)” as Null or \(S\) as the aggregate pairing of features of \(A\) and \(B\) composing the state of affairs in which \(S\) emerges.

**Articulation and Transformation**

With the concept of the encounter in hand, we are now able to conceive of the encounter as a generative mechanism. Specifically, we are able to see what happens between individuals and the arrangements of objects that provide the conditions for the process of articulation. Our section on the encounter attempted to account for what I tentatively call a “vertical,” more precisely an “outward,” movement between these levels: the formation of objects by the grouping of certain features through the merge process which then become the object of a proposition expressing the state of affairs under consideration. However, this overall description is inadequate as it only can hold for the movement of one individual becoming the object of a proposition. Within a state of affairs there is nothing barring the assumption of a multiplicity of objects that are already articulate or the even greater number that await the process of articulation. Our conceptual scheme must be able to account for the movement of a multiplicity of individuals, an object and its function, in their becoming significant in one or many encounters.

In our scheme, any one feature does not fix the identity of any element which resides in the Null as naming functions come after transformations which keep them appropriate as well as contingent to the context in which they arise. The encounter more so resembles the following:

Here, then, is a mechanism that accounts for the method of generation within contexts while remaining appropriate across contexts. For illustrative purposes the encounter has occurred in world \(W_0\) or Null. The encounter here represents the articulation of a Gerund ‘\(C\)’, where \(\tilde{C}\) is the Gerund produced from the encounter of \(\tilde{A}\) and \(\tilde{B}\). The Gerund resulting from this encounter creates another possible world \([C]\) which will be represented here as \(W_1\). In order to draw this encounter with the understanding that each Gerund is represented according to \(<W, Na, aRW>\), the cross product of this encounter is represented within a matrix notation for elements of multiple vectors as follows:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
\tilde{A} \times \tilde{B} & \Rightarrow & \tilde{C} \\
W & Na & aRW \\
W & Nb & bRW \\
\end{array}
\]

This represents the grammar of \(W_0\). The cross product of these vectors generates the Gerund \(C\), such that \(\tilde{C}\) is equivalent to:
Gerund C can be expanded into the triplet for the newly created context or possible world \( W_1 \):

\[ < W: [Na(bRW) \rightarrow aRW(Nb)], N: [W(bRW) \rightarrow aRW(W)], R: [W(Nb) \rightarrow Na(W)] > \]

The formal representation of the encounter conceives of this transformation as a mechanism which can continually generate Gerunds appropriate to a given context but not caused by those contexts. Their “cause” is by virtue of the encounter itself which does not owe its being to a specific point in space or time, but to a set of conditions \( \{ A \times B \} \) representing the state of affairs \( W_0 \). As causality is inferred from a rather weak capacity to identify origins, this apparatus forgoes the dictionary and simplifies the process of articulation by taking each individual as a whole, simultaneous with its movement through an encounter. This function is recursive within contexts as it extends over a possible world by virtue of the grammar to which it belongs. Our mechanism is a part of every world as each possible state of affairs within the Null has a grammar indicative of the conditions in which it emerged. As each part of the Gerund produced are represented as the difference between the objects that come together, we see how the mechanism generates difference itself, easing tensions around essentialism. Contexts come together, as well as individuals, through difference. The Gerund produced is found in between these couplets, e.g. \( Na(bRW) \) and \( aRW(Nb) \). We also see that aspects of individuals are held within relations of dominance and subordination—\( Na \) captures \( bRW \) and \( aRW \) makes \( Nb \) its object—effectively displaying the expression of a relation of overdetermination. This can only be represented if the individual becomes the object of the propositions of one or another’s context by virtue of a name. In the Gerund C produced, the name would be ‘\( Nc \)’ however “\( C \)” would maintain the inner logical structure, \( <W, Nc, cRW> \). Each aspect is the result of the previous encounter. For example, ‘\( W \)’ in C is derived from \( [Na(bRW) \rightarrow aRW(Nb)] \).

It is now effectively possible to trace the subject or what constitutes an individual outside of the parameters of Identity theory: an object’s identification, name, considered as that object in and of itself. Identity functions reduce the triplet above to the object ‘\( C \)’ identical with the Gerund C, instead of just one of its aspects, which is \( Nc \). We show the error in this assumption as C in its entirety cannot be interchangeable with just one of its parts. The illustration above represents the mechanism in which worlds are articulated. Let this “core,” the elements that make up the newly formed triplet, be the set of individuals necessary to surface articulations. It is derived from a kernel composed of the simplest strings of objects from the Null, so that grammars generate a corpus of Gerunds taken up in the articulation of other possible worlds from what is actually the case. Therefore, any articulation must be a part of the kernel or derived from a rearrangement of the elements composing that kernel. The Null as the sum total of all possible elements from which individuals are articulated is both a part of every articulation and apart from each individual as the only entity in and of itself that can stand alone.

What is generated in \( W_1 \) obtains a reflexive relationship with \( W_0 \). This ensures that surface articulations can be derived from the Null as well as other possible arrangements within those worlds. For the reality of an articulate world to hold, other possible arrangements or realities must be nested within the actual world. Otherwise, the reality of the propositions of one state of affairs do not harbor consequence to those individuals whom inhabit that world. However, individuals do not have a symmetric access to the worlds from which they are produced, one cannot rearrange the conditions which birthed them for then they would be other than they are. This ensures contextual depends without giving into arbitrariness of generation or endless relativism.

Once articulate, for C to be identified it becomes the object of a proposition within the state of affairs it is now a part. ‘\( C \)’ can become the object of the function \( Nc \), its own propositions, or the object of another function indicative of worlds A, B, D, etc. The production of C not only generates that individual but the context of that individual. By creating this context, C becomes the matter for other encounters. It is safe to conclude that C’s existence as ‘\( C \)’ or \( Nc \) to stay within Gerund notation, its becoming an individual within another state of affairs, is only in the event of its generation. It was produced in the Null only to become Null again by virtue of its implication in another encounter.
generating other individual(s). In this way the Null is replenished. Articulation looks more like a wave than a straight line: rising only to crash back onto another plane. The encounter generative of this Gerund is disavowed through the naming function which merges it with other elements in order to form the proposition expressing another state of affairs. This then forecloses the opportunity for other Gerunds to be significant under that same name. Formulating the articulatory process in this way has a twofold purpose: the first is the generation of difference within the set of propositions of a given world; second, that this object can only be known within a given context by that name, although it may come to be known by some other context under a different label. As causality is here conceived as a set of conditions which a Gerund obtains, the foreclosure of modalities within a state of affairs also engenders further encounters between Gerunds. Thus, every act of naming over what is articulate is simultaneously the path to further articulations. As a territory is mapped by the names which are produced by this grammar, the contours of a possible world made more rigid viz. the formation of a reference frame by virtue of naming recently introduced individuals within the context, the construction of these borders simultaneously produce the conditions for individuals to become significant outside of the purview of this map. In other words, the territory expands as well as the landscape.

Our conclusion to formulating the articulatory mechanism brings up an important point: every articulation is composed of that which it is Not, the Null, which comprises the set of all possible elements with which to articulate an individual and remains apart from any one individual as it is the basis from which that entity can be seen a distinct from others. Before the extension of names over individuals, everything can either obtain the set of conditions within that world or not. Articulation in this way does not predefine terms in order to denote their significance to states of affairs or exclude others. Our mechanism is the function with which individuals become significant within a reference frame. The arrangement of elements from the lexical kernel within Null creates an immense diversity of ways of being in the world. Therefore, the Null represents possibility itself; it is actual and not yet real and, thus, is apart from that which is articulate; and, yet, is a part of all articulations, making it necessary to the formation of every object of consideration within a state of affairs.

**Reading Articulation and the Encounter**

Now to illustrate the method our mechanism makes possible. Reading the cross product of the encounter is the ability to understand what happens the moment it occurs. The derivation of the mechanism within the encounter above comes to the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Na(bRW)</th>
<th>aRW(Nb)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W(bRW)</td>
<td>aRW(W)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W(Nb)</td>
<td>Na(W)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this matrix, we are able to determine what occurs in the encounter between A and B without predetermined notions of their value.

A Descriptionist account of the encounter has little to do with its method of generation, but does show how prescribed or defined notions as to what is the case, regardless of the reality of states of affairs, take hold. This is what Stuart Hall called overdetermination. Let overdetermination represent the structure within a state of affairs which binds what is rendered articulate to certain propositions in a way that delimits how that Gerund is interpreted. Formed in this way, overdetermination is expressed when a function or one’s affairs/operation becomes the object of another’s function. The composite function sets the operation of the name for b in bRW to the function of another W external to B, represented W(bRW).

Overdetermination occurs due to a leverage within the semiotic field that structures symbolic relations in a way that predetermines their value. Once rendered articulate, this mechanism merges objects that become the terms that form assemblages which are to represent what is significant within that state. Our mechanism shows this without predetermining the value of each term in the following way: if
Na(bRW) is one term from the context of A, the naming function of A over-determines the relation that B has in the world it was previously a part. Thus, A over-determines B’s form of life by setting B’s affairs in a way that substantiates A’s frame of reference in this newly articulated context.

There are two contexts that extend over the Gerund in this example. From the context of A, it is possible to summarize its view as the process of over-determining or capturing some other function. aRW captures the naming function Nb as well as dominates the worldview. This is formally represented, aRW(Nb). Nb becomes an object of the function aRw in which A’s relationship within the state of affairs sets the role for what B is known as within that same state, thus creating this “worldview.” The naming function Na sets B’s relation in that world view which is illustrated by Na(bRW). Finally, the world view of A over-determines the state of affairs of B, seen by W(bRW).

The context of B is read in a similar way but tells the story from its point of view, reversing the relations of over-determination.

The first possible conclusion to derive from this formalization of our mechanism is that the Gerund articulated does not necessarily belong to one context or the other. My first conclusion is this: the existence of the Gerund is found between contexts. The fixing of that Gerund to a specific context, whether it be of another or it being the subject of its own proposition, is by virtue of a naming function stipulated by the process of over-determination.

The second conclusion is that as the generation of that particular Gerund is necessary, what it comes to be known as is contingent to the context in which it becomes a part. Although the Gerund can become significant within a state of affairs in one way, it could always be otherwise. The different contexts which meet at this encounter read what comes of it in different ways, understood as two functions which arrive at the same solution or form of life in different ways. The continuity of this set of relations holds across contexts; the concatenation of elements shown by the expansion of our encounter formula elucidates the same object obtaining different functions across different frames of reference. The result of the encounter, the articulation of an individual’s movement from one context to the next, generates both the limits of a world, N(W), as well as that world’s notion of the relation that individual obtains in that world in juxtaposition, and in time, with others, R(W).

What is next is not really a conclusion, but a consequence. By conceiving the mechanism of articulation in this way, there is an effect on the structure of worlds. The Null permeates every articulation because those elements, once part of Null, now become a part of some individual generated from that set which, nonetheless, comes to be a part of another arrangement of elements expressing or used to articulate other individuals within that same state of affairs. That subsequent arrangement from one context becomes a set of possibilities for another. Hierarchies are instituted only by stipulation. What “is,” comes from that which is Not that individual, the Null, and once articulate in one context, becomes that which is Not again for another. The state of affairs could always be otherwise, these other realities still bear consequences to what is actually the case.

The concept of entropy can be formalized and occurs from this process as well. The line generated from this encounter is not “straight up” through the grammar but more in the shape of an arc. This entails that there is a decay back to the Null, the velocity of which is determined by the angle or conditions that set up the encounter. No matter how long the string of elements—Na(bRW), etc.—that comprises an individual, an individual enters into subsequent encounters under one name which is indicative of one function or role within the context to which it was introduced. The elements, at once a part of that individual but, because under the function of a singular label, are not represented in the object that is the named subject of the propositions of this next encounter. For example, if you meet a person you do not “meet” the entirety of the spatio-temporal events and features of their being, you meet a current representation, name, or image of that individual. Those other elements remain apart from the encounter, a part of the Null. As one follows this arc, the decline in the force behind the use of an individual’s name or label after its initial introduction to this context or newly articulated state of affairs renders this Gerund back to Null. This makes up the material with which to articulate different entities within that state of affairs. It thus becomes the matter for another encounter. Once
the “new” Gerund is articulate, as the direction of it cannot be predetermined, only so a posteriori from the subsequent encounters it generates, the other possible outcomes of this encounter comprise the fragments swept up into the expression of other Gerunds. With the generation of a Gerund comes a new context within that state of affairs, another reality mapped by the frame of reference. As this renders the possibility for the articulation of another possible world, nested within all that is the case, the reflexive relation of worlds applies to Gerunds as well. In this way, the foundation of other arrangements in states of affairs maintains their reality although they may not be the case in the current context. Although this possible world has its own grammar and language, as a result of the overdetermination of N over W, it does not preclude it from forming descriptions of or functions for the same objects participating in other worlds. However, the meaning or internal sense of an individual can only be represented within the propositions of its world. Translation inevitably leads to mistranslation, although, these may appear to be useful in future transformations. Within those misreadings lie the possibility to rearrange states of affairs.

Finally, the difference between value and meaning can be made explicit. Meanings are made through the internal sense that is now part of the encounter, the inner logic (LF) of the elements that became the object of a name function (PF) which is expressed via the mapping of a context appropriate representation over the combination of that inner logic of the mechanism expressing that individual (S-structure). The meanings created within one state of affairs do not directly translate to another. Values are taken of these articulations in contexts external to their own. Evaluations of what is produced through this mechanism are quantified through grammars, the verbal “language” or rigid collection of names within context that attempts to describe individuals whose context is unknown to that grammar. These descriptions are made with a language not of the individuals they wish to codify. Therefore, valuations are outside of the actual assemblages constitutive of Gerunds and are a set of propositions which constitute an agreement over an explanatory theory of what is in the world. The inner logic and method of expressing a subject becomes the object of a function within the surface organization of the state of affairs (PF). Meanings are made (LF + S-structure), Values are taken (PF).

**Individuals now Articulate**

The Gerund, the object whose encounter with others through the function of our mechanism and the object of the expression of the articulatory function, is the individual before it is labeled or identified. Identity is formed when a Gerund becomes a part of a reference frame. Now articulate, we can see the difference between how that individual is identified in that frame, and the subject which lies outside of frame, identified differently in others. Thus, identity and subjectivity are two aspects of the same individual. It has been tentatively laid out as the copula of a name function and the object of that function, N(x), which expresses the individual called N. It is now possible to describe what individuals are. The illustration of articulation allows for detail in the method of generation for any individual without circumscribing, a priori, what that individual means across contexts. By doing so, it is possible to remain dynamic to contexts with regard to what is rendered articulate; to see how meaning making and becoming meaningful or significant occurs within states of affairs; and to account for the difference between contexts and what is generated in their modes of becoming significant, their signifying practices. In other words, the concept of the individual is captured in the function of the operation or role placed over an entity by virtue of the process of overdetermination; the name as a function of that object now articulate. This was shown to have consequences to states of affairs and is what makes our reality. For example, an institution is an individual, although comprised of other objects. Not all objects are individuals. The individual is what we come to know as a particular thing within a state of affairs.

What determines the reference itself was attributed to an internal transformation within states of affairs. Reference does not occur by another thing but in the function of the name attributed to an object constituting an individual’s membership within our reference frame and its form of life. The creation of this matrix of objects has the epistemological effect of setting a spatiotemporal framework which can be utilized in the construction of reality.
The use of a definite description presupposes the existence of an object which does not necessarily mean that there is an ‘object’ or thing in the world, for a name is strictly a function and not the object in and of itself. This concept was discussed by philosophers and linguists linking the use of language to the Ontology of a state of affairs. Individuals are designated as an interval within space and time, the coming together of objects, a coming to matter. As individuals are the form of a specific constellation of objects named out of the Null, they must then be conceived as “singular plural.”

Being singular plural can now be illustrated through the mechanism outlined above as each individual that undergoes the process of articulation, regardless of the value attributed to them, are nonetheless an entity braided together from what was in the encounter. A singular entity, the plurality of objects as well as the plurality of names of the same object, binds a set of relations that are to be read as a singular plurality.

It is not necessary to know the constitutive parts of an individual; it is sufficient to conceive of it as a whole represented in the function of its being named. As names are functions, their meaning only had by their use in a reference frame, it is possible to understand the use of a name without knowing its object. For example, when you are initially introduced to another person, it is not necessary for you to know the history and any other background information in order to identify that individual as a person in the world at this time, surrounded by this environment. We understand that this is a person and this individual becomes known to us although their origin and the process of their having arrived here at this place and time is unknown. One can conceive of that individual without recourse to external facts belonging to a context not their own or the set of events and features that make up that individual. The set of conditions and the relation that individual has within those conditions are sufficient to be able to know this entity along with the understanding that this knowledge does not exhaust all the other possibilities for this individual to be otherwise.

As individuals are within a process of formation, the reality of an individual’s existence is the event of its articulation. The actual question of Being is not what “is” in the world but how one comes to be articulate within a state of affairs. This brings my inquiry to a crucial point: the ability to identify the points that demarcate a state of affairs are not outside of a given context. The ability to identify these individuals is not transcendent to states of affairs. They are only possible within contexts, within a frame of reference. Outside of these parameters, any denotation of an individual becomes vacuous as there is no relation which holds a set of conditions within which meaningful stipulations are made. No one is exempt from this rule. If one holds or purports themselves apart from a given context, they are still the subject of the proposition of another context all the same.
APPENDIX II: Articulation Mechanism Proof

**Condition 1:** The historical conjuncture marked by the authorship of the Powell, Huntington, and Moynihan reports generate a structural apparatus through which a contemporary concept of governmental intervention is founded. This framework is then exported into the social and cultural states of affairs during the 1960s period. The function of this structural apparatus expresses the concept of governmentality.

**Condition 2:** Youth encounter with subculture produces cultural ideology. To test: The intersection of Ideology produced by condition 2 and articulated through the structural apparatus produced by condition 1, such that the ideology and structure of that state are not equivalent, account for the conditions in which a Counter-Culture is formed. We have:

\[ \text{Ideology(Youth} \times \text{Subculture)} \cap \text{Structure(Powell} \times \text{Huntington} \times \text{Moynihan)} \implies \text{Counter-culture (Punk)} \]

where ‘Ideology’ represents an innate creative capacity which is generative, non-descriptive, and context-free. (Hall, 1990)

‘Structure’ represents a surface grammar. Grammar, then, is the surface organizational component to society that sorts or paraphrases, through an identification function, the expressions from the ideological level. “Structure” is context dependent. Its function, through the operation of the constituents of that society, expresses, communicates, a value system.

Counter-Culture is generated through an Ideological encounter articulated through the Structural component which is identified, in this context, as Punk. The articulatory operation is recursive and enumerable across contexts. Thus, its products may be identified under a different name, representing a different role within each context, yet each identity is a function of the same subject.

Individuals are defined as having three aspects, the triplet of terms being: <World, Name, Relation of name in World>

A: <World, Name(a), Relation of (a) to World>,

B: <W, Nb, bRW>

The formula \([A \times B]\), represents what happens in the encounter between these individuals. It does not merely describe their antecedent conditions or consequence. The result:

\[ A \times B \implies C: <Wc, Nc, cRW > \]

The individual created by the encounter is C, which in turn has three aspects dependent upon the newly created context resulting from \([A \times B]\). The calculation is derived as follows:
Overdetermination sets the definition of a term within a frame of reference or context. The cross-multiplication of A and B, when considered as vectors or movements, models how and where overdetermination occurs. Na(bRW) is to be read: the naming function in World A overdetermines the Relation that individual b has in its World. The encounter renames that individual in the World articulated from the encounter between A and B. It is now possible to represent the same subject known under different names across contexts. C, as articulated from A and B, is known in that resultant state of affairs by a name function C. That name is, therefore, "state sanctioned or grammatical. However, what is, [aRW(Nb) - bRW(Na)] + [aRW(W) - W(bRW)] + [Na(W) - (W)Nb], the elements of A and B braided together, can be used in the wrong way to make sense in that state of affairs. From chapter one, this is termed cataphresis.

The encounter generates a Counterculture C, such that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W x Na x b x a</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights)</td>
<td>(Youth culture)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let’s take our example from the Electric Church, Ideology - Youth x Subculture:

**A x B = C**

A: World
Na: Subculture (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights) (Youth culture)
B: Youth culture
Na(bRW): Hippies/Beats/Second wave Feminism/Civil Rights
aRW(Nb): Structure (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights) (Youth culture)
W(bRW): Subculture (Youth culture)
aRW(W): Structure (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights) (Youth culture)
Na(W): Subculture (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights) (Youth culture)

Yields Counterculture C, such that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W x Na x b x a</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights)</td>
<td>(Youth culture)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The encounter of A and B is viewed from two contexts. For example, in line ‘NaRW – aRW(Nb)’,

- In one context, we can account for A setting the relation of what b is known as from its own context.
- In another context, we can account for B setting the relation of what b is known as from its own context.

It is now possible to represent the same subject known under different names across contexts. C, as articulated from A and B, is known in that resultant state of affairs. From chapter one, this is termed cataphresis, which is formally represented here. The potential to subvert overdetermination lies in this aspect of the articulatory mechanism.

**Ideological encounter and articulated result**

The encounter of A and B is viewed from two contexts. For example, in line ‘NaRW – aRW(Nb)’, aRW(Nb): Structure (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights) (Youth culture), Na(bRW): Hippies/Beats/Second wave Feminism/Civil Rights, aRW(W): Structure (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights) (Youth culture), Na(W): Subculture (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights) (Youth culture), W(bRW): Subculture (Ideological), aRW(Nb): Structure (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights) (Youth culture), Na(bRW): Hippies/Beats/Second wave Feminism/Civil Rights. The encounter generates a Counterculture C, such that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W x Na x b x a</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights)</td>
<td>(Youth culture)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The encounter of A and B is viewed from two contexts. For example, in line ‘NaRW – aRW(Nb)’, aRW(Nb): Structure (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights) (Youth culture), Na(bRW): Hippies/Beats/Second wave Feminism/Civil Rights, aRW(W): Structure (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights) (Youth culture), Na(W): Subculture (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights) (Youth culture), W(bRW): Subculture (Ideological), aRW(Nb): Structure (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights) (Youth culture), Na(bRW): Hippies/Beats/Second wave Feminism/Civil Rights. The encounter generates a Counterculture C, such that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W x Na x b x a</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure (Rockabilly/Sexuality/Commodity/Civil Rights)</td>
<td>(Youth culture)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ideology articulates through Social Structure generating Counter-Culture

The product of the Ideological encounter is articulated or expressed through the Structural organization of society (surface grammar). This is represented by the encounter [Structure x Ideology]. However, ‘Structure’ is to be represented using our terms from the antecedent context in the following way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(W)orld</th>
<th>(N)ame</th>
<th>(R)elation to (W)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A: U.S.</td>
<td>Hippies / the Beats / Second wave Feminism / Civil Rights Movement and Organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B: France</td>
<td>Rockabilly / Sexual Revolution / the New Left</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A x B ⇒ C
Na(bRW): Hippies/Beats/Feminists/Civil Rights (Youth Culture)
aRW(Nb): Subculture (Rockabilly/Sexual Revolution/New Left)
W(bRW): U.S. (Youth culture)
aRW(W): Subculture (France)
W(Nb): U.S. (Rockabilly/Sexual Revolution/New Left)
Na(W): Hippies/Beats/Feminists/Civil Rights (France)

Ideology articulated through structural conditions, [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan], such that:

Wc: [Powell Memorandum x Huntington Report x Moynihan Reports] expressive of Governmentality.
Nc: Punk
cRW: Counter-culture

The naming function, in its attempt to overdetermine an individual’s relation to the world it inhabits, comes to a contradiction within its recursive operation. Violence in the act of naming can be turned against itself. Contradiction becomes apparent in Na(bRW) and aRW(Nb). These relationships are nonsensical if reversed and, yet, are possible to illustrate in the inner logic and syntactic structure of our mechanism.

Conclusions:

[Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] sets the grammar to state of affairs structurally and is how dominance expresses itself. This formulation sets the overall function of the operation of the “functions” or roles in society, expressing the concept of Governmentality. Governmentality represents the syntax or method of constructing a dominant reference frame within the state of affairs. In so doing, this grammar sets the positions or roles within the surface organization of society in which [Youth x Subculture]’s individual expressions are able to fill in order to become legible within that structure. The fulfilled positions and their function go on to express the state of affairs constituting the articulated context. In being externally fixed, [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] cannot account for the creative capacity of [Youth x Subculture] which make infinite expressions or combinations with finite means. Culture, here, is a repertoire of signifying practices that puts elements in this environment to use so to express propositions not yet a part of that environment. From this formulation, blackness is considered a cultural affinity that exhausts national and ethnic limitation.
Names within that frame of reference sets how these terms are to be used to sustain the structure of that state of affairs. Thus, the name is a function whose object is the individual it expresses. These names are epistemologically necessary but ontologically contingent. A name’s meaning is only obtained by virtue of its use or “function”/operation, within that frame of reference. [Structural x Ideological] cannot know what [Youth x Subculture] is called before its introduction to its state of affairs. However, after the name of an individual from the [Youth x Subculture] level becomes known, that name becomes necessary for the ontology of indicative of its significance within and only within the structural propositions of that state of affairs. These could be opposite of that previously within [Youth x Subculture]. The relation individuals have within [Youth x Subculture] hold beyond and underneath structural overdetermination despite their roles being defined through the naming function.

Origins are “ontologically,” i.e. existentially, necessary. Therefore, the concept of origin is epistemologically contingent. What “is,” exists outside of its name. The relation it has in the world is always changing. The set of relations for each individual still holds as each individual has an ethos or form of life as expressed through language. This entails that one individual can be known by one name in one context and by a different one in another. A function can obtain multiple objects, which is indicative of control; or one object can obtain multiple functions, which harbors the possibility of subverting overdetermination or obtaining a network of affinity across contexts, outside of Identity.

Identity functions and their positions do not consist of that individual. That name does not have a reflexive, transitive and symmetric relation across contexts as necessary to its very being. Identity, therefore, dispossesses one of a feature of its individuality by choosing an element of that individual and making it the subject or object of the propositions of the newly articulate World. That name does not exhaust all the features that make up that individual but, only highlights a specific group out of all those possible as sufficient for identification. This, therefore, holds the possibility to articulate worlds and change states of affairs. For punk is not “Punk,” but the coming together of the elements obtaining different functions related by or expressive of the same subject, exceeding what is articulated through the structural level. The concatenation of elements whose relations are not present but are represented by name, nonetheless, are what is needed to understand what it is, buried in its pronouncement as a set of relations, a form of life, within that state of affairs.

Blackness as an interminable field of possible modes of expression and as what is most “American” about the U.S., flows through the whole matrix. Most “American” as what defines American must be formulated by what is not represented by the name: a definition cannot contain the term identified; blackness defined as Not of the reference frame of the U.S., is exactly what is needed to define what it is. Therefore, any expression articulated is from the repository of black expression. Evidence of this can be easily illustrated.

For example, in set theory, any set C has at least one member, \( \emptyset \), if empty and if empty, then just \( \emptyset \). If it contains any individual x, then that set is represented as C: \( \{ \emptyset, x \} \) where \( \emptyset \) is both apart from and a part of the set without changing its identification. Every set A, B, etc. also contains \( \emptyset \). Therefore, a set can be known regardless of awareness of the presence of \( \emptyset \) or Not. In this way, evidence of the \( \emptyset \), which in this state of affairs is used to denote blackness in C can be traced the World aspect of every individual within the mechanism of the encounter. This illustrates Amiri Baraka’s concept developed in his work Black Music: the musical expression of blackness being a changing same indicative of a Black form of life.

Another example of how that which is Not being what is termed “Nothing” or \( \emptyset \) works is as follows. Take zero as a number outside of the set of natural or counting numbers. The invention of the number 0 is a symbol that asserts the existence of Nothing. It is a count or set whose sole member is Null, thus, can be represented as \( \{ \emptyset \} \). The next set, named “one” or 1, therefore, is represented as \( \{ \emptyset, 1 \} \); 2, then, is \( \{ \emptyset, 1, 2 \} \). The addition of zero to any expression by way of a formula or number does not change the value of it. It is both a part and apart from every expression. It is always a part of an
expression for zero is the first set from which any subsequent set is formed when counting. Let us suppose that there is an imposition of a frame of reference or system of categorization whose limits are set over a domain or collection of individuals. If an individual is outside that domain, regardless of their value, they become a part of Null. Say the reference frame are the numbers 1-10. Only 10 individuals exist in that frame. The choice of any one of them results in a value of 1 meaning true. Then 0, as well as 11 or 12, are all part of the null or $\emptyset$ set: their truth value is 0. However, 0 is possible to conceive, either through counting or any other operation such as for any number $n$, $(n+1)$, or $(n-1)$ with what is available within that frame of reference, of 0 and 11. Therefore, the frame is not identical to the individuals within it but is imposed over the state of affairs, constructed out of all whose value has been denoted as Null.$^{410}$

The product expressed in these encounters cannot be understood within the semantics of the state of affairs without a conception of the syntactic construction of that reference frame. Although Black modes of expression may have been paraphrased out, buried in the prose expressing the surface organization of society, as Null or $\emptyset$, blackness is nonetheless able to be demonstrated as being both a part of and apart from any expression constructed through the process of articulation.
APPENDIX III: Pied-Piping, Subject Continuity, and Rearticulation

Here we illustrate the process of a previously articulated individual becoming involved in another encounter. This process is termed rearticulation. Syntactically, and for illustrative purposes, I will handle this movement under the linguistic term pied-piping. From this it will be shown how new states of affairs are articulated as well as how a frame of reference is built that attempts to ensure how articulated individuals are defined. This is so to stipulate their significance with these states of affairs.

From chapter one and Appendix I, we know that individuals are defined as having three aspects, the triplet of terms: < World, Name, Relation of name in World>

It is important to note that rearticulation is based on a subsequent encounter from individuals composed as known or known-unknowns from a generally grasped antecedent context. The order of encounters will be represented in the sub-notation for each World in the state of affairs the encounter is occurring. The base level articulation will be denoted by $W_0$.

Let,
A: < World, Name(a), Relation of (a) to World >
B: < W, Nb, bRW >

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
W_0 & Na & aRW \\
W_0 & Nb & bRW \\
\end{array}
$$

The formula $[A \times B]$, represents what happens in the encounter between these individuals. It does not merely describe their antecedent conditions or consequence:

$$
[A \times B] \Rightarrow C: < W_c, Nc, cRW >,411
$$

$$
Na(bRW) - aRW(Nb) \\
W(bRW) - aRW(W) \\
W(Nb) - Na(W)
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
W_0 & Na & aRW \\
W_0 & Nb & bRW \\
\end{array}
$$

With the articulation of $C$, another state of affairs is generated out of $W_0$. Let this state of affairs be $W_1$.

With the articulation of $C$ mapped, it is now possible to see what second order articulation would entail. From here on, a second-order encounter, as well as others proceeding from it, will be referred to as rearticulation. Let rearticulation be the articulation of an individual from one state of affairs for use in another by virtue of an encounter. This is represented as:

$$
[C \times D] \Rightarrow E \text{ such that, } < W_i, Ne, eRW >
$$

The encounter is represented by:

$$
\begin{array}{ccc}
W_1 & Nc & cRW \\
W_1 & Nd & dRW \\
\end{array}
$$
Immediately we see that C is only recognized within the second encounter of W₁ under the name Nc. Nc defines C within the reference frame of this current state of affairs by how the name ‘C’ is to be used. However, Nc’s reference is composite as C is the result of a process of articulation from W₀. Outside of the name, C is actually the assemblage: < [Na(bR W₀) – aR W₀ (Nb)] , [Wo(Nb) – Na(W₀)] , [Wo(bR W₀) - aR Wo(W₀)] >; if any of its constituents were absent, it would not be C. This is what is called an organic whole. Concerning reference, it is ambiguous as to which constituent of C, that Nc is to refer. The matrix created in the first level encounter constitutes Nc’s frame of reference from which the function of N of C, or Nc, can be strictly defined within the context of the second level encounter W₁.

Let this context or domain, hence forward called a frame of reference, of the naming function Nc in W₁ be defined as:

< [Na(bR W₀) – aR W₀ (Nb)] , [Wo(Nb) – Na(W₀)] , [Wo(bR W₀) - aR Wo(W₀)] >

where Nc can refer to any one of the elements within the body of constituents to C. This “body of constituents” represents the episteme of Nc. It is important to note that these constituents are not present within W₁ but remain in W₀. They are represented by Nc. Thus, these constituents, though they make up the body that is the individual C, are outside, i.e. not of the reference frame of W₁. Therefore, are present within the set of all constituents determined as Null or Ø, but apart from the reference frame of W₁ whose basis is Null.

Nc’s use or function within the second state frames the field of reference from which it was articulated W₀ and is governed in such a way so that one does not need to know the history of the assemblage of that individual only its use within that second state’s reference frame. As a matter of syntax, this is what is known as the Empty Category Principle: C’s constituents are apart from that state of affairs but are nonetheless a part of Nc. Thus, Nc is handled as an empty category in the second level of articulation, a function with a nondeterminate object, its operation indicative of the use the name representative of C constitutive of its meaning.

Outside of the reality of the frame of reference in the encounter between [C x D], what actually occurs is the merge between,

[ < [Na(bR W₀) – aRW₀ (Nb)] , [Wo(Nb) – Na(W₀)] , [Wo(bR W₀) - aR Wo(W₀)] > x D]

where the constituents of C are only brought into the subsequent encounter as the name C. Thus, the constituents remain outside of the encounter which generates the subsequent reference frame but, nonetheless, exists within a frame of their own. They are the lexicon with which encounters articulate alternative forms of life. As rearticulations ensue, the length of those constituents continue to grow causing an inverse relationship between the strictness of the frame of reference that is to ensure knowledge of what occurs in the encounter within a state of affairs, for example [C x D], and the ambiguity as to which element of that body of constituents the name refers.

With this illustration, it is possible to count levels of rearticulation as a set within a set of individuals [A x B [C x D] w₁ . . . ] w₀. Their cardinality is denoted by N representing the elements in that level of articulation represented as a class. The cardinality of a state of affairs is composed of the elements held within that encounter: all the relevant W’s, N’s, and R’s. This illustration, as it is nested, shows that all that is not a part of those states of affairs’ frames of reference are, therefore, of the Null and, yet, the Null is full of all the constituents to any state of affairs articulated. To count the levels of articulation can be formalized through the use the term N₀, for the Null and Nₙ for each subsequent articulation, where n= [1, 2, 3, . . . ]; in accordance with set theory, proves to be the set of all possible articulations. With each incease in level, each rearticulation, the frame of reference becomes narrower as each possible set is constructed from Null. However, ambiguities increase as the set previous, being the assemblage of elements constituting the individuals in that subsequent encounter,
do not enter the next reference frame, only the names they are known under. Thus, subjectivity grows with each negated feature of that individual made for the sake of identity within the categories of a reference frame.

According to Bertrand Russell, with every finite set there is an exponential amount of classes that can be generated when placing those elements in differing orders. For example, the assemblage of the constituents of those individuals that are pied-piped through articulations, instead of merely the symbol used to denote an articulated individual “Ne”, but its constituents, \([Na(bRW) – aRW(Na)] . . . ,\) are thus a part of the null, \(N_0\), but part of the states of affairs under a name \(N_1, N_2 . . . \). The length of these constituents can be counted as well and denoted with an ordinal \(\omega\), where \(\omega_0 = N_0\) for they are both referencing the Null. In this way, \(\omega_1\) is a result of the first encounter \([A \times B]\) which yields \(C\) and is equal to \(C\)’s constituents: \(< [Na(bRW) – aRW(Nb)], [W(bRW) – aRW(W)], [W(Nb) – Na(W)] >\) \(\omega_1\) and so on for each subsequent rearticulation. It is important to note that \(\omega_1\) does not have to equal \(N_1\), an individual from one level of articulation does not have to enter into an encounter with an individual of the same level. The ordinal of each individual spatializes these encounters within the Null, the set of all possible articulations insignificant to one particular frame of reference, yet part of all. Through this spatial conception to states of affairs, we are able to construct a topology of the actual world. What is real is that which is significant within varying frames of reference represented in states of affairs and constructed through the concept of pied-piping.

A consequence of positing states of affairs in this way is that counting levels of rearticulation is only a description of the topology of the actual world; a picture of where one states of affairs, one reality, is in comparison to another. Mistaking a description \(N_1\) for the value of a state of affairs has dire consequences. For any assemblage of constituents, \(< . . . [W(bRW) – aRW(W)] . . . ,\) amounts to 0, asserting its belonging in the actual world which is the Null, the set of all which cannot be universally quantified. The constituent \([W(bRW) – aRW(W)]\) only describes the relation that individual has within that world. If a state of affairs is taken to have a value of 1, or any other count of cardinality, it signifies the imposition of a hierarchy to states of affairs which takes one frame of reference as a universal that overdetermines others. Universal or global parameters only highlight a set of conditions, there is no all-encompassing function or description that can count everything imaginable. The benefit of this illustration is that it is possible to locate whom and what is overdetermining others, motivating a tactic to check the legitimacy of impositions of reference frames and, as a result, change them. The ordinal is infinitely divisible according to set theory, meaning the count is an assumption or adheres to a standard set within that frame of reference. In this way, it is possible to keep track of underlying assumptions.

The imposition of determinant value conflating the level of rearticulation with its significance in the world amounts to what has been combatted as a behaviorist and strictly positivistic approach towards the empirical analysis of state of affairs. What has been developed here is simply that what we experience as “reality” is in terms of our frame of reference. Behaviorism is a brute force approach to explaining methods of creating thought as ways of being in the world. It has been shown, most notably through Chomsky, that with regard to language, behavioristic approaches cannot account for: i) the ability to create expressions newly experienced within a context, not random, and appropriate but not caused by it; ii) the poverty of stimulus in such an environment and the ability to utilize that finite lexicon in infinite means, evidenced by the subject’s capacity to form expressions or redefine their relation within that context not experienced before by a predetermined conception of future responses causally linked to stimuli based on prior experience; iii) the ability to put elements previously experienced in certain ways to different uses; and iv) a mode of expression as a method of creating thought and being in the world outside of communication. As anything can be used to communicate, the capacity to create or put to use elements does not have to be externalized—there are thoughts we can say, ones we cannot say but still think, and those that can be said but are devoid of sense.
This Descriptionist’s account amounts to a brute force imposition of significance and meaning based on a retroactive program of matching empirical facts as reasons for prior causes. Thus, in being retroactive our method reveals one’s assumptions and bias in the analysis of a state. For the mere collection of data, though useful, does not presuppose an understanding of what it represents; as well as it does not account for the construction of facts from that collection of data which can be utilized to represent any explanatory theory so to substantiate a particular view of the world representing a frame of reference.

From the above, we have a formal representation of incorporation by dispossession through pied-piping. Most often, this process is called appropriation, however, appropriation is only one aspect of this process. What is produced (C) from one state of affairs (W₀) is translated for use in another state of affairs. What is known as C, Nc in W₁, is piped into that state of affairs from W₀ as representative of the assemblage of its constituents. Thus, the second level encounter is as follows:

\[(C: [A \times B]) \times D \Rightarrow E\]

where the constituents of the encounter between \([A \times B]\) are translated into another state of affairs under C. The ambiguity inherent in the reference ‘C’ makes to the now object of the name function of \([C \times D]\), N of C, in its encounter with E, is only resolved with the imposition of a frame of reference dictating the use of the name of C determined in W₁, Nc. The imposition requires a paraphrasing mechanism known as ellipsis deletion for the sake of the translation of that individual into the next reference frame. As subsequent encounters ensue and rearticulation continues, the compounding of the piping of terms from preceding states of affairs that are transposed into others under a singular name, results in the paraphrasing out of the constituents of those individuals present within that state—trading the set of constituents for the name only. Thus, \([A \times B]\) is made interchangeable with Nc. As Nc is all that is incorporated in the subsequent frame of reference, acknowledging the ontological commitment to the constituents of C found in A and B is denied. If a term is not known or defined within a frame of reference, it does not exist within that frame.

However, these constituents cannot be used in the articulation of subsequent encounters for the only term that has a sense within the frame of reference is the name Nc in W₁, not the sum of features which compose the individual it supposedly represents. This produces an empty category which is governed by the parameters of this frame of reference. The name does not refer to any member of W₁, and yet does have a use or function expressing its role and significance to that frame. If all one has access to is this frame—their reality—then everything in all other possible frames is that which is denoted as Nothing. Nothing becomes a void that is not empty, filled with all the constituents of the subject save for the name utilized in this and only this frame, shown formally through rearticulation, pied-piping.

As the subject can always articulate something other than that which is retroactively named within a reference frame, a conception of Wittgenstein’s assertion that the world is made of "facts," not things, with which we use to express a world in many ways can be formalized. That which is Nothing with regards to which frame one resides becomes the base from which the expressions of that frame can be formed. It is from these "facts," names and their function, that frames of reference are constructed. Whether they are true or false representations of the actual world, they nonetheless are real, have consequences.

It is now possible to see the consequence of the Empty Category Principle. Frames of reference are empty save for their functions which have yet to obtain any objects that express what references are to mean and to whom. They are akin to definitions without terms or propositions without subjects. A name function outside of a reference frame situated within a state of affairs is meaningless as it has no thing with which to form an expression, no form of life. It is simply N(?), a (N)ame of what? Which begs the question of reference frames imposed over others which, then, makes those impositions empty for their construction would yield, N(N(?)). Let the reference of Nc = ∅, such that ∅ is the set
of members that are a part of \( W_0 \) which articulates \( C \), yet apart from \( W_1 \), whose use is defined within that frame of reference.

From this, \( W_0 \) becomes the base structure for subsequent articulations. Thus, the interface between base structure syntax and the transposition of terms from one state of affairs for use in another, so to force agreements between frames of reference, make the interpretation of the significance, or semantics, of articulations possible. It is through the concept of pied-piping that a continuity of the individuals articulated across encounters can be conceived, although known under different names. Here, we have a tentative thesis for subjectivity. The subject is the assemblage of constituents that holds across frames of reference, through each encounter, present in each stage of articulation, but only represented in this current encounter within that stage of the development of states of affairs. What is identified in a particular context is a discrete interval over the form of life, the vector that is the subject itself, within the parameters of that finite context. In sum, all that makes up an individual \( C \) from the encounter \([A \times B]\) that is brought in under a name in the subsequent encounter but only known under the name of \( C, N_c \). What is important to notice is that the relation between the different constituents hold, despite their being transposed into other frames of reference.

We are also able to ascertain that as frames of reference becomes stricter the higher the level of rearticulation, the body of terms to which a name denotes increases as well. Although identification epistemologically gets stricter, ontologically subjects become increasingly ambiguous. The more articulations an individual becomes involved in, the farther alienated a name becomes from what composed it in that initial encounter. Each rearticulation not only leads to ambiguity in reference, but growth in the repertoire of materials from those previous encounters from which what could potentially be expressed by that individual reside. In so doing, new expressions of the same subject can be formed within this context, but not caused by it and yet appropriate within that state of affairs. It is also plain to see how a specific arrangement of constituents of a given individual can come to be known under different names, contingent to the frame of reference in which they are used. A name does not exhaust what an individual actually is, although it does a/effect how it is interpreted. Finally, it is also through this illustration that we see the nested construction of frames of reference and, therefore, the consequence that \( \varnothing \) is the base as well as present within all possible articulations.

The conclusion drawn from this illustration is that Nothing does have a mode of expression. No other mode of expression would be possible without it as its base. Taking the Afro-Pessimist position, the impossibility of building a movement out of Nothing which takes blackness as the marker of cultural death, blackness through the theory of articulation is defined as being both apart from and a part of any articulation. A value placed on a frame of reference could then be considered as an imposition or a set of parameters on interpretation.

For example, a state of affairs which privileges a White frame of reference. As blackness is not of a White frame of reference, save for its being named – Black, African-American, Negro, etc. – blackness, then, is expressed by virtue of rearticulation itself.\(^{417}\) Blackness is expressed by the function of the “function,” the rearticulation of Black identity. The difference between blackness and its name is crucial, as the rearticulation of blackness within a frame of reference outside of its own can only be expressed through the language of the frame in which it is presented.\(^{418}\) The deep structure of blackness opens the field of possibility for a semantics to be had within the rearticulation of a White frame of reference as all the constituents to which names refer lie outside of frames. In frame, names only refer to other names which leads to ambiguity: \( N_1(?)=N_2(?) \) cannot demonstrate what it is referring to or whom.\(^{419}\)

With blackness being made equivalent to Youth culture—see Appendix II—through an apparatus of governmentality which attempted to define Counter-Culture in the U.S., it is now possible to illustrate how a different frame of reference can be formed up and against a dominant frame within the same state of affairs. This will be termed a Future Perfect. In this light, a Counter-Culture is here conceived as the capacity create a frame of reference indicative of a form of life that resists the paraphrasing of ontological commitments.
The surface organization to states of affairs from here on will be discussed as its grammar. The act of creating this alternate form of life will be termed doing violence to that grammar due to mistranslations occurring in rearticulations. A violence to grammar is the affirmation of that which exists outside of a name. An individual can form a different relation within the world it inhabits outside of what may overdetermine its meaning within the current state of affairs. Above, this was illustrated through the total constituents of an individual being greater than the limited number referenced by its name, set within a definitive frame of reference. Thus, a name does not exhaust all the possible elements to which it can refer. Naming inevitably leads to contradictions between how an individual is known or labeled within a state of affairs and what that individual is composed of, what it is. The movement of the totality of what composes that individual is termed the Gerund. Gerunds taken as a verbal form, hence movement, are constructed across frames of reference as an assemblage of constituents, for example the constituents of \([A \times B]\) pied-piped into the encounter between \([C \times D]\) under the name \(N_c\). For the frame of reference for that name in that subsequent encounter, cannot account for the movement of an individual from one state of affairs for use in another.

Gerundive nominals syntactically are the verbal forms of the subject of a proposition. Amiri Baraka refers to this as the changing same, the flow of “is.” Zora Neale Hurston makes this a key analytic with regard to Negro expression, the formation of “verbal nouns.” Linguistically, Gerundive nominals cannot be broken up within the formation of propositions. As modes of expression are taken as indicative of modes of creating thought, Gerundives are the evidence of the subject outside of framed identification. If the Gerund form is semantically correct but syntactically falling apart, most often, they cannot be formed outside of a proposition and, thus, are the mark of where the imposition of a frame of reference was motivated. The analysis put forward here forms a sound framework to check the validity and use of the imposition of frames of reference which further the subjugation or overdetermination of the subject for the sake of Identity.

The capacity to articulate an alternate form of life, as another frame of reference within a state of affairs, is the Future Perfect. Linguistically, the Future Perfect is a form that is complete in another reference frame but lived vicariously as it is not yet a part of but nonetheless real in this one. The ability to articulate a Future Perfect through Black musical expression amounts to creating an alternative set of relations in the world. For Jacques Attali in *Noise*, music harbors this capacity through the articulation of a "space." I take ethos as a mode of being in the world and therefore a spatial conception generated through the relation obtained between individuals within a state of affairs. A punk ethos through Black subjectivity holds this concept as key. It is the scene created and an individual's relation to it during performances that engenders the continuity of this form of subjectivity outside of just merely being identified as a particular song, genre, or type of individual. The Future Perfect shows that the musician is not a mirror of the productive relations of their time but articulate appropriate, though not yet seen, responses to it. They retain the capacity to rearticulate regimes of order and cadence in the surface organization of society as expressed through, "the imprisonment of the visionary" which evinces relations of “power, totalitarian or otherwise." Sound becomes a more complete analytic to study the existence of subjectivity; vision only cements static conceptions of identity as interchangeable with the ontology of a state of affairs.

Subjective continuity shows how a history of overdeterminations is carried through each rearticulation, yet plausibly denied in current contexts by those who substantiate the dominant reference frame; Black subjugation denied by White supremacy, yet a disavowal of it with structural benefit to a White frame of reference. Subjectivity illustrated as the sum of the constituents across reference frames through pied-piping, a cultural endowment, also shows that harbored in that continuity are the tools to undo current overdetermination; for what is known does not mean that the dominant, mainstream, frame understands the totality of a subject's capacities whose repertoire of encounters and the elements to form expressions lie outside of that frame. This repertoire as endowment is found in that which is determined as Nothing.
This is illustrated through the constituents that an individual A accumulates up to the most current encounter, say between individuals X and Y, or Z, which are not in that encounter save for their names; for instance, the (N)ame of Y such that (Ny), etc. All of those constituents to an individual A, taking the Afro-Pessimist position, are what reside in that which is determined Not of this current encounter within this state of affairs. Thus, when A comes into that most recent state of affairs, it comes to fit into a role within that state under a name, N(A), which expresses overdetermination. However, it still holds the capacity to change the relation that name has within that state. That capacity lies outside of that particular reference frame, for in N(A(. . .)), N obtains an nondeterminate object (. . .) through A. Unless fighting to fit in, that fight is obviously a fight against one’s self: subject to the language with which that state articulated itself, becoming the object of the dominant frames propositions.

It is from these fragments outside of the frame that alternative frames are built and brought into states of affairs unbeknownst to the Identity functions and language of that state. This movement expresses the Future Perfect viz. N(A(. . .)) in which the Future Perfect is found in (. . .)’s use. The formal representation of an epistemic break in the surface organization within a state of affairs.

I formulate Future Perfect articulation using syncopation as an analytic of Black subjectivity’s expression. From this, it is possible to link Black musical expression from the core elements of the blues to be found in Punk: a musical form whose very existence is to resist overdetermination by musical genre and whose form of life also resists overdetermination through a function of brute force identification within states of affairs. For Attali, music as a method of creating thought through sound is a "language without meaning." Meaning” here is in terms of a presupposed definition. Music is non-representation, without predetermined meaning and, therefore, is the method of creating the thought. The semantic content of the expression is not in how the sound is defined or predetermined and is not a one to one correlation with the articulate song. It is in how elements are formed, the way they are used in articulating that thought. Not is a undefinable object that is both a part of and apart from any expression. Thus, there is only the Null, the set of all possible expressions, and functions of its use which is the generation of a Future Perfect frame of reference. It can be shown that blackness can generate its own frame of reference within a state of affairs for there is no all-encompassing proposition, or a universal quantification, that can hold the totality of its expressions. Hence, something that does not carry meaning but generates it is able to undo overdetermined relations within a reference frame, a musical genre or the shutting down or policing of a scene. "The modern musician says nothing, signifies nothing," and so blackness, as determined outside of reference frame as "Nothing," is able to articulate itself from nothing—an ability inextricably tied with the articulation of modernity. To use what is not to express some thing is linked to the possibility and potentiality.

Black musical expression puts the sonic elements available within an environment or repertoire of signifying practices to another use in order to generate expressions not experienced in that state of affairs. This is the act of profaning sanctioned uses of these elements that were categorized within a dominant reference frame. Blackness articulates its expressions out of a void that is not empty, a lexicon outside of the dominant vocabulary, voicing insufficiency in definition and refusing recuperation. This is what is meant by doing violence to grammar, undoing an individual's categorical incarceration, their predetermination of expression by stipulating one use per term. As a dominant reference frame can only take in what it "knows" to be the case, and what it knows can only be defined by what that thing is not, as it must take in what is not itself in order to determine what it can be, a system that asserts its dominance by dictating what is subordinate to it also takes in the means by which it is undone. It does so by utilizing what it takes in to express its self by what it is not. Just as well, that which is subordinate utilizes the internal contradiction embedded within the enactment of overdetermination so as to have the conditions in which it is determined subordinate write themselves out of existence.
The violence done to rigid state of affairs creates a Future Perfect is formalized through rearticulation. Future Perfect construction cannot occur in W₀ because that state of affairs is the field of possibility for any state of affairs. For example, a Future Perfect from C is brought into W₁ by the name Nₑ. If the name is made to refer to one element of the constituents of C, [Na(bRW)-aRW(Nb)], then there is a named world and new relations that are not exhausted by the mere naming of C that are apart from the W₀ frame of reference but nonetheless a part of the state of affairs of W₁. Otherwise, C would not be C. In Appendix II the [Youth x Subculture] that produced a Counter-Culture named Punk, the name could refer to a named relation, but the articulated encounter shows a known possible world [W(Nb) – Na(W)] in the second state of affairs that the frame of reference does not have access to, thus creating an alternate form of life.

Evidence of this and its connection to blackness can be seen through pied-piping. Blackness subjected to the propositions of governmentality – [Powell x Huntington x Moynihan] – was made equivalent with Counter Culture. Blackness is piped through expressions of this state of affairs under the label of Counter-Culture from the encounter between Youth and Subculture. Aesthesis becomes our methodology to analyze the movement or transpositions of blackness across states of affairs and its significance within this imposition of a frame of reference. Aesthesis, etymologically, captures the relation of individuals to their environment and with one another through ethos, as well as the act of creation through poeisis. Blackness as expressed through the blues is rearticulated as punk music during the 1960s-1970s. Punk becomes the Blues played fast. The grammar of the blues echoes in the voice of Punk.429 Black aesthetics—as expressed through hairstyles, tattoos, body modification, etc.—are brought into Counter-Cultural visual expressions either through art or fashion.430 We see this culminating in the mistranslation of “Mash it up” during Punk shows to “Mosh,” which eventually becomes the term to describe the dance at shows called the mosh pit.431 This translation illustrates the generative capacity of black subjectivity through a punk ethos.

Pied-Piping shows the continuity of subjectivity. What the world is, is the state of affairs as it is, the relation of facts that are the case. Therefore, a politic taking this into account formalizes rearticulation as a means to transform states of affairs. Through this conception, rearticulation cannot be reactive as all that is the case is all we have, we cannot go back into history and rearrange the constituents to subjectivity from reference frame to frame, articulation to rearticulation. Thus, the capacity to imagine new relations open up, for the next in a series can be imagined any way—it cannot be predicted beyond doubt for it is senseless to speak of knowledge, belief, in a context in which there is no doubt.

Logical series, according to Wittgenstein, are not internally rule-based, as any rule can be retroactively made to account for the next in the series. In this way, it is possible to create a series where 2 and 2 make 5 which would be logically valid, yet, incorrectly mathematically. This is the basis for considering violence to grammar, or catcharthesis. Catcharthesis, linguistically, is an expression with an inner logic and syntactic-structure, but whose form is incorrect semantically for the reference frame in which it is introduced; wrong use, but makes “syntactic” sense. Wittgenstein warns against a utilitarian switch of one master or grammar for another masked in the goals and well wishes of positivism, any reason can be found retroactively to substantiate a series. Wittgenstein proves that stating that “this” outcome is better than any other when in actuality they state the same thing, illustrates that correctness only comes within a system of categorization which dictates our reality. Outside of that frame, there are other “correct” answers. In the retroactive fitting of a rationalization to the rules applied to explain the result of a logical series built from atomic elements, just because a reason fits does not mean that it is correct. This has had a profound impact on Ethics as well, for Ethics is not an a priori system but is only descriptive. Ethos is a way of being in the world, ethics its description. Any talk of “should” or “ought” leads to dogmatism by virtue of definition. Therefore, to borrow from Wittgenstein again, there are only individuals, not equal to any other, and functions of those objects—their use. Identity and, therefore, an Identity politic based on a proprietary position within a state of affairs, falls short. For ‘x’ does not equal ‘a’, for x is only x, and if asserted any other way, is only so retroactively.
Issues of Authenticity come into play here as well. Any assertion of authenticity, then, must be arrived at inductively. Thus, an assertion of authenticity, this is "the real" that—as opposed to another thing—is only reached from an external and, therefore, retroactive identification. "Authenticity," as well as nominal originality, are obtained through inauthentic means. Origins are ontologically necessary. Ontology, as a system of categorization, is concerned with categorizing the constituents of the world, which is not the same as what does or does not exist in the world. This can be stated as long as we are careful not to take Ontology as a stand in for Epistemology, which states that what "is" is only so, only exists, if it fits into a system of knowledge, if not then non-existent. Origins, however, are epistemologically contingent as knowledge of where an individual originates does not have to enter into the context in which that individual participates. What is "truly" or "really" this or that, merely amounts to a description from a particular point of view, a predicate of truth or reality affixed to that which is actually the case. For what is "Really" Black or "truly" Punk or "Authentically" of an ethnicity, etc. is ambiguous outside of a reference frame and form of life. Therefore, there are no necessary constants save for within a body of knowledge in which a subject is a part, that that subject puts to use to express a form of life. Universals are arrived at retroactively and indicative only of a point of view; one gets to the universal, the set of conditions and relations that hold it together, through the particular.

By arriving at universal quantification through particulars as a method of constructing a reference frame, seeing the relations between particulars as indicative of their way of being in the world, these systems of relations can be subject to examination with regard to a substantiation of their legitimacy. The reverse is not the case. Assuming a universal stance or lens held static regardless of context, and through which to view that world, is tantamount to wielding prejudice. An *a priori* universal frame of reference applied to a set of particulars amounts to dogma or merely opinion of applied retroactively.

Through this conception of individuals that are none other than themselves—a tautology saying nothing about the world but itself, forming the basis for any possible expression—and what they do—their functions and/or use—we are able to recover subjective continuity outside of the strictures of an imposed Identity function. The subject despite its name lies outside of one's purview, in that which is Not expressed or externalized for others. For no knowledge of what an individual does or how they are defined can exhaust who that subject is, their capacities. Just like a song, despite a difference in notation, is only recognized by the pattern of silences holding those notes together, syncopation becomes evidence of the subject outside of the identity of the song after it is expressed. This is handled in the same vein as elements which have no reference save for how they are used in the formation of expressions, are evidence of the subjective capacity to create a thought through language. Subjectivity formation is possible only in the way individuals and their terms are used, their syntactic structure, not in how they are defined.
APPENDIX IV: Calculating Overdetermination

In our formulation of the process of rearticulation, we briefly spoke of calculating how overdetermination occurs within an encounter so as to identify from where and whom this determination is imposed. Our concern was with a flaw in Althusser’s development of the concept of overdetermination in which positions of power place individuals within a set of conditions or environment in which their relation to others, or their position within the organization of society, is determined as one of subordination. Without this initial “determination,” relations of power would be a useless or vacuous concept. My use of the term “direction” implies that a position of subordination was imposed in such a way that an individual’s condition becomes or is labeled overdetermined. Tacit in the name or identification of a position within society as overdetermined is this determination of one’s being so. The following will illustrate this calculation through the mechanism developed thus far. The hope is to provide a way in which our mechanism can be applied towards the “reading” or interpretation of states of affairs as well as the analysis of events and their possibilities in the actual world.

Despite superficial manifestation or chaotic appearance, there is always a core producing a finite kernel of structures through a recursive operation which generates an infinite variety what is articulate on that surface.\textsuperscript{432} If the encounter between two individuals is represented as the cross product of two vectors or movements within a state of affairs, value assignments to each aspect of those vectors will be appropriate to the “level” or $n$-order of articulation—where $n$ can be a first, second, third, etc. order and when $n=1$ we understand 2 stages of articulation from where that aspect was originally located.

We can map the encounter in three dimensions—along axes $x$, $y$, $z$—in order to show the process of overdetermination. For example, if we have an individual A, whose inner logic is represented \textit{viz.} our Gerund structure such that $<W, N, R>$, where $W$ stands for the world or state of affairs, $N$ the name obtained in that World, and $R$ the relation obtained by that individual (n)ame or identity in and to that World. We can assign the following values to each aspect in accordance with a decision procedure determining whether we know (yes=1) or do not know (no=0) the value of that aspect. For example, if we have a set up where one individual’s value according to our Gerund structure is $<0, 0, 1>$ and another is $<1, 0, 1>$, the encounter produced will yield 1 giving us a way to reason out of the Null set. $<0, 1, 1>$ is derivable from $<0, 0, 0>$, for although we do not know the world (0) we, nevertheless, can conceive of it as Null which then becomes the name attributed to it (1) and from there we can infer the relation that name holds within that world (1). Other Gerunds can be found in this way: $<1, 0, 1>$, $<1, 0, 0>$, $<0, 1, 0>$, etc.; each harboring different products from finite means, 1s and 0s alone. There only being a few arrangements of 0 and 1 that yield the possibility of articulating a Gerund from one level to the next means that articulations from this limited set of particular structures are always specific because appropriate to context. This finding affirms both that from Null, the set of all possible arrangements of 1 and 0, we have the material to articulate any state of affairs; as well as that no matter what is articulated from Null, the Null is never empty. From these initial inferences we can formulate a kernel of core Gerund structures. However, for the following example we will stick to the following aspect assignments:

\begin{itemize}
  \item W: 0
  \item N: 1
  \item R: 1
\end{itemize}

The value assignment 0, states from which level of articulation that aspect is derived. Thus, W of A, is derived from the Null (the set of all possible arrangements and, therefore, a part of all sets, yet representing a set apart from this one); while N is a second-order rearticulation of that name which is assigned a value of 1.
We can do the same for another individual B, such that:

W: 2
N: 1
R: 1

showing that the same Name is an object of two separate functions, namely being an aspect of both A and B. We can stipulate that W in B is 2, a third-order, second level articulation from prior knowledge of its causal antecedents.

Placing these values within our articulation mechanism we have represented in matrix notation the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>W</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The cross multiplication procedure of these vectors generates the following results:

- **N(R)- R(N):** 1-1 = 0, the World view or reference frame of A, Wo, overdetermines B.
- **W(R) – R(W):** 0-2 = -2, with absolute value 2 and direction away/external to the encounter, entails a second-order Name overdetermination from a state of affairs external to the context under consideration.
- **W(N)-N(W):** 0-2 = -2, with absolute value 2 and direction away/external to the encounter, entails a third-order Relation overdetermination.

Which gives us <0, -2, -2> as the product of our encounter. Generating another individual C from A and B, the product represents the Gerund expressed viz. the “function” of the operation or affairs of the encounter between [A x B] and, thus, engendering a new state to be analyzed. The result is read as the function of the operations of the constituents involved in that encounter, with C obtaining a value assignment of 0 as the cofactor expansion of Sarrus’ rule using Laplace’s formula sums the components of the resultant vector in the form, +(x=0)-(y=-2)+(z=-2). The result being 0 tells us that this individual is internal to the reference frame of the encounter, while the true value of the product, 0, tells us that overdetermination has occurred within the context of A, e.g. A over B, as W in A was 0. However, overdetermination is not total. Knowing the value of the components of each vector tells us where that overdetermination may have occurred. A component value of -2 means an act of overdetermination external to context may occur from some second level rearticulation off of this initial encounter.

The value determined, in accordance with the calculation for vector cross products, gives us a magnitude or significance represented as the coefficient to the individual generated. This coefficient can be compared with other individual’s known within our state of affairs. In effect, we obtain a measure which allows us to ascertain relations of power. C’s coefficient being 0, A’s 0, and B’s 2, means that B is in a relation of dominance over A and C after the encounter although A was assumed dominant prior to the encounter within the “social” structure mapped by our mechanism. We find that systems that stipulate subordinate positions for others produce the means with which they may be overturned. The potential to do so, though unknown before the encounter, was latent in B all along, but only expressed with the change in conditions viz. encounter. As this calculation is based on the point/constituent wise addition internal to the vectors involved as individuals of this encounter and their subsequent multiplication, we know that vectors extend indefinitely. The measure illustrated
here shows the field of possibility from which various descriptions of the results of articulation may occur in the space under the arc of the vector produced. However, the magnitude between points of significance along those lines can be approximated. The internal addition of constituents reveals the extent to which an individual's world harbors consequences for others. All that we can ascertain from our multiplication is the direction overdetermination is coming from and whether it is from within this frame (+) or is external to this context (-). Summing the value of the constituents of each individual, we can measure the direction from which each individual came. By finding the sum of the third individual produced by virtue of the encounter, we gain the relative position of that individual conceived in regard to the originating conditions set by those individuals originating the encounter. For what we are looking at in these sums is the extension of that vector’s world or the extent to which we hold it significant within the mapping of our state of affairs. So, if the point-wise value of A and B is positive, then C being 0 says that C, representing the aggregate of the pairing of the constituents entering the articulation process, extends the field of encounter between \[ A \times B \], but is likely overdetermined by an individual that falls under the conditions set by B. The overdetermination comes from any one of those individuals not-B created along that line. Thus, what is not-B, making it a member within the Null set, is what overdetermines C. The constituent wise cofactoring of the encounter revealing the value of the two individuals participating in that encounter amount to the magnitude of an individual being equivalent to the breadth of its cultural endowment, the number of previous encounters and rearticulations it has undergone.

When calculating the effects of an encounter and to consider the individual produced, if an aspect—W, N, or R—of this newly formed individual, say W(N), is 1, then it is with this term in the composition of that resultant individual that it has been overdetermined. Where the calculation results in a 0, that aspect represents a point at which overdetermination could be subverted. If all the aspects of an individual are 1s, then that individual is completely overdetermined in and only in that frame of reference. Conversely, if all aspects are 0s, then that individual is nondeterminate. As a result of our calculations above, we can put forward that no individual is fully overdetermined.

In this way, we can utilize a two-valued system within our articulatory mechanism so to develop a decision procedure towards rearticulating states of affairs. However, this two-valued logic only goes so far as we take this current encounter as a superficial reading of the state of affairs at hand. In other words, we only have knowledge of or access to this sole context.

Our decision procedure for changing states of affairs lies in changing the parameters or reference frame of the context so as to render acts of overdetermination inconsequential within that state. Analysis lends itself to changing conditions and not creating different inputs so as to try to generate different outputs which ultimately leaves the system and structural dominance unchanged. The articulatory mechanism's inner logic is based on the theorem "If, if A then B, then C" which can be reduced to "If A and B, then C" which is encapsulated in our articulation formula A x B \rightarrow C. From this we can illustrate the value system of a state in the following way. 1 meaning known and overdetermined and 0 non-determinate, we show:

If A \times B then C:

i) A\,1, B\,1, C\,1 = 1 = each element within this context is overdetermined and so is the individual articulated.

ii) A\,0, B\,1, C\,1 = Null + 1= Null or 1 = the individual is overdetermined from a context outside of this encounter.

iii) A\,1, B\,0, C\,1 = Null + 1 = (ii).

iv) A\,0, B\,0, C\,0 = 1(0) = from our proof of articulation—some thing from the set of everything which is no one thing—we know that 0=1—0=(1-1)/(1-1)=1—which states that it is true that C is non-determinate. Logical division is illustrated here by, "A/B=C then BC = A" or "[if (if B then A), then (if (not-B then C), then A)] then [if (B and C) then A]."
Verbally, we can explain i) - iv) in the following way:

i) The antecedents and consequent are true; thus, we can assert the antecedent as the set of conditions for the overdetermined consequent. If we negate the consequent, then negate conditions.

ii) and iii) state that one of the antecedents is false, one true, and we have a true consequent. Thus, we cannot definitively assert the antecedents as the set of conditions producing the consequent. However, we can assert that if we negate or deny the consequent, then the existence of those conditions is unassertable. Therefore, overdetermination comes from elsewhere which represents a second order articulation. The existence of either individual as existent and the individual produced as non-existent automatically denies the existence of the former. For example, to admit that Black identified individuals are subjects under White supremacy and by doing so deny the existence or ontological significance of those Black people denies the existence or validity of White supremacy overall.

iv) If all aspects of this individual are non-determinate, then implication true that this individual is a part of the state of affairs but is not a member of the system of categorization (Race, Gender, etc.) that organizes that state. Therefore, we may assert a false consequent, overdetermination has not occurred, and the consequent is undetermined. Being non-determinate, the assertion of the newly introduced individual destroys the antecedent attempt at overdetermination. For (1-1), which is to say 0 or non-determinate, logically formalized is “1 or not 1.” So "(1-1)/(1-1)" is to say that (1-1) is a subset of itself or “if (1-1) and 1 then (1-1)” is a material implication, an assertion of the individual itself and, therefore, 1. A material implication being "if C then C" which just affirms C. In other words, "(1-1)/(1-1)" states the same thing as "'(1-1) and 1' or '(1-1) x 1'" which is 0=(1-1).

Taking the aspects of the individual produced, they create a disjunctive series in which any aspect with value 0 comprising A or B or C or . . . etc. represents that which is at once a part of the state of affairs but apart from the dominant reference frame. Listing these elements—this list being that which has been referred to as a cultural endowment—reveals a common aspect, namely 0, by which a relation of affinity can be obtained. The structure that is formed from this specific relation presents a course of action to overturn the process of overdetermination which maintains a structure which seeks the subordination of the individuals who are both present within the state of affairs, non-determinate within that dominant reference frame, yet participate in an alternate form of life.

The various zeroes associated with different aspects across this disjoint series of individuals—A or B or C. . . — make for a set of relations or a network of free association comprised of those aspects of these different individuals. This engenders a form of life between these individuals, both antecedent and to come, that holds the basis for an alternative cultural endowment composed of the plurality aspects of value 0 now connecting these individuals. For example, a W(N)=0 from one individual can link with the N(R)=0 of another and so on. Thus, an individual alternative is created of multiple aspects outside of the stipulation of what constitutes or defines the various singular individuals which are coming together to form this network. For instance, a single person or multiple individuals form the base of a movement or organization outside of a dominant reference frame. They are connected by these features, these 0s, continuous over contexts and events. As this movement of individuals is composed of a series of 0s, the form of life created is not overdetermined.

In sum, our calculations illustrate that the Null is apart from yet a part of every articulation as 0 persists within the aspects of the individual newly produced thus forming the subjective continuity of a movement. By way of our articulatory mechanism we can put forward a further description of what determines an individual within our study. Individuals are vectors which entails force (value assignment) and direction (positive/negative). In this way, even that which is determined coming from Nowhere or whose significance is absolutely Nothing can form a movement, for an individual can be construed as a single entity, a person, institution, or a movement.
From this illustration we see that in this instance, overdetermination occurs from a context that was rearticulated from another context. Due to the negative sign that individual produced is not present within the context analyzed but, nevertheless, is represented within the reference frame articulated as a result of this encounter. For example, if previous to the encounter one individual was given a negative direction and another a positive, through cross multiplication if we yield a negative Gerund we understand that overdetermination is occurring from the set of conditions that produced, possibly but not necessarily by, that negatively quantified individual. In conclusion, the imposition of a frame of reference over another is now conceived as a value assignment over the aspects of the individual’s involved in the articulation of that state of affairs. Assignments only have “value” within a system of categorization indicative of that very same frame of reference. With the formalization above, we have in tow a method with which we can apply the articulation mechanism to a particular event in order to analyze either its result or possible consequences derived from its becoming involved with or encountering other contexts.

This alternate structure composed of the 0 value aspects of different individuals and created outside of dominance can become an input to change the surface structure and overdetermined organization of society itself which is not just the outputs, policies, and individuals it produces. The alternate form of life composed of these various individuals' aspects and across contexts reveal a phrase or form that contravenes the process/progress of overdetermination. The structure of 0s from these individuals now forming one movement represent an input for this overdetermined system and operation that acts in such a way that structural overdetermination writes itself out of existence. Therefore, if blackness is no one thing, then the combined aspects of all the things that are blackness is illustrated to be a coalition outside of overdetermination whose identity within that dominant frame is vacuous or 0 resulting in the failure of an operation of subordination.
In linguistic theory, there is an embedded structure to the mechanism of creating thought indicative of the language faculty. Our linguistic analysis is taken from the Extended Standard Theory or EST of generative linguistics, first developed by Noam Chomsky in Current Issues in Linguistic Theory (1964) and Aspects of the Theory of Syntax (1965). This was to account for a mechanism which can generate multiple expressions from a finite lexicon, new in our experience, yet not random, appropriate to, but not caused by the contexts in which these expressions were uttered.

Syntax and the concept of the language faculty was from then on taken as a generative mechanism. This is a nested concept which involves an overall lexicon, followed by a Syntax, and then a syntactic-structure. The next level contains a logical form to expression and a phonetic form. The phonetic form is contingent to the context in which it is expressed and is mapped onto the combination of a logical form and syntactic-structure that persists across contexts as evidence of the subject which is actively forming these expressions. The logical (LF) and syntactic-structure (S-structure) together form the deep-structure to expressions. Although there are many ways in which to express the same thought, many functions of the same terms, the object of these functions, these expressions, can be derived from the same deep-structure. If the LF + S-structure change, then the object of the expression, its generative capacity is of a different lexicon. This can be applied to the analysis above in accordance with the concept of the language faculty put forward throughout this project: language is meaning with sound.

From the Wittgenstein example, we have the structure, \[\text{X}\] and from Johnson, \[\text{Y}\]. These two, surface level “phonetic” representations are contingent to the song in which they appear. However, their logical form is indicative of the structure put forward above. Both, in some way, express the thought “I destroy,” but are doing it in different ways—the same subject utilizing two functions, producing different forms but obtaining the same object.

Johnson would be one of the first to analyze the syntax of these expressions derived from a kernel or lexicon indicative of black subjectivity. The inner logic to these expressions, formalized \([1 \, 0 \, 1 \, 1 \, 1]\), closely illuminates the deep structure to the formation of many expressions, appropriate to context, not random, yet not caused by context, and by the same subject. This formal structure is taken into the mechanism of articulation and formalized in this project to account for what Johnson calls the “technique” found within blackness’ modes of expression. It is from the use of the term technique that we tacitly assume a mechanism that embodies a set of processes which utilize finite means to produce results different from its inputs. Mechanism as a concept is expressed \([\text{v}i\text{c}]\), the function of the “operation” or function utilizing these finite means. From “tech”-nique, we derive a mechanism for creating thought with sound. \[\ldots\] [The rhythm characteristic of Spanish and Latin-American music. A considerable portion of Bizet’s opera, Carmen, is based on this originally ‘African’ [my quotes] rhythm.] Johnson contends, and I agree, that this is empirical proof that black modes of expression contain the logical form and s-structure indicating the deep-structure to form and from which are derived multiple genres of Music. Although different in the surface structures that may appear, these expressions are of the same subject, blackness, from which Jazz, the
Blues, Rock, Rhythm and Blues, Punk, even the Opera are derived from the pregnant pause, the syncopated rhythm, the
Null, present within the logical form embedded in the phrases produced. The Null or breaking pause becomes the horizon of
possibility for these other forms. Endemic to this mode of expression is the tendency, in line with Wittgenstein’s assertion
of a thought which could not be expressed, but nevertheless retained a logical form and method of construction, that moves
towards the destruction of overdetermination by musical notation, and for this project, racial categorization. (See: James

This much has been shown by Bertrand Russell in illustrating that a number symbol does not show up in the world, but is
conceived and utilized as a class or set of individuals which obtain that class description. For the numeral ‘1’ does not mean
that, when asked, we point to a thing 1, but that that symbol is a tool with which one works in dealing with, describing, and
manipulating facts about the world concerning the concept one; for there are many different individuals which when
considered within the domain of mathematics obtain that description: a member of the class or set ‘1’. (See: Bertrand
Russell, Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy.)

Richard Dedekind, a nineteenth century mathematician, shows a continuity outside of the identified numbers, here to be
considered rational, by developing what he termed a ‘cut’ that differentiated between rational and those we consider
“irrational” numbers. The set of irrationals lied outside of those previously identified as rational, in a sense, giving the
concept Rational the limits within which its assertion is significant. Instead of just stating the non-existence of irrationals,
Dedekind showed their continuity outside of the rational numbers which had the capacity to describe mathematical
phenomena unknown to the algebra of the positive integers. If rational numbers represent that which can be identified within
a specific system of mathematics, Irrationals here can be conceived as a continuity outside of what is identified in that once
sanctioned domain, thereby yielding the mathematical possibility for a conception subjectivity. After this “discovery,” the
question became how can we move from this one domain to the other. The space between 1 and 2 on a number line is
infinitely divisible. The space between one type of number and the other can be conceived in much the same way.

Georg Cantor, another nineteenth century mathematician, showed how one could move from one infinitely expansive or
divisible set to another. Cantor also showed the continuity within the domain of each type. It is through Cantor’s work with
set theory that it is possible not only to see that there are different types of infinity, but count those infinities as well. Through
Cantor, one can measure the size of each set without having to count each individual member. Cantor likened this operation
to lining up the fingers of one’s hand to show the similarity in the “number” of fingers without having to count each
individual digit.

One need not know logic to note that in a finite field of experience, it is impossible to empirically know all or the infinite
cases and ways that individuals obtain a particular categorization. This is easily seen through Gödel’s incompleteness
theorem. Logically “for all x, x is black if and only if x is equal to nothing.” But if x is nothing, how can one categorize a
definite number of black individuals? In every system, there is a statement formed from the vocabulary of that system that
will run forever, cannot be computed, and thus is indeterminate. Therefore, every system contains within its syntax the
means toward the destruction of its own semantics.

This can be seen through the following illustration. Let us assume a universe that contains an indeterminate number of
individuals. For all individuals within that universe, those individuals are ‘Black’: (x)(Bx), for all x, Bx. Now, if we suppose
for all those individuals, they are objects of a description ‘Nothing,’ then there exists an individual that is Nothing: “if
(x)(Nx)” then “there exists an x that is (Nx)”—our logical derivation can show that Nx, that individual is Nothing, is false if
considered universally. For there need not be any x, any individual, which obtains the description ‘Nothing’. Therefore, for
the function above to be valid or true, this statement must be a definition within a frame of reference which is applied before,
even if possible, to the totality of those individuals known within that universe. That statement is not self-evidently true, a
truth function that can stand on its own. (See: Quine, Methods of Logic. Cambridge (1982).)

This train of thought is found in Wittgenstein’s Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus, but comes to fruition in his later work The
Philosophical Investigations.

Proponents of this theory include Orlando Patterson’s, Slavery and Social Death A Comparative Study, as well as Jared
Sexton’s “The Social Life of Social Death”, and Frank B. Wilderson III’s Biko Lives!.

G.E. Moore in his Principia Ethica introduces the concept of the Naturalistic Fallacy. Moore operationalizes Ethics as a
mode of being in the world, a function. In determining what is the ‘Good’, the Naturalistic Fallacy confuses its function as a
thing in the world, as if the term ‘Good’ denotes an object which is interchangeable with it. If asked to point to what is
“Good” one feels the inclination to point to something. If “Good” is equal to something else, then any thing and therefore no
one thing at all can be ‘Good’ as each individual, most likely, would point to something different.

This can also be applied to behaviorist models with regards to language. Behaviorists take speech as an object that is equal
to communication, in lieu of ‘speech’ being an object taken up in the function or use of the language faculty. One object of
which this function utilizes are sound elements considered in a specific linear conception as “representative” of speech
overall. Speech, then, is only one way that communication is possible. The behaviorist model fails in the way outlined
above which considers one and only one object to be denoted by communication which is made equal to Language. This
fallacy treats semantics as primary and syntax as merely a description or report on the speech data available. Anything
outside of particular objects categorized as Language is, therefore, nonsense; thus rendering all syntactically sound but
Taking the behaviorist position, the answer would be yes. The latter position, language as a generative syntax producing structures on which phonetic data or sounds considered speech are mapped onto, considers language as a form of creating thought. The generative terms provides evidence for the formation of subjectivity. This latter view is what I agree with and put forward throughout this project.


Logically, the dichotomy is represented as there being an individual x, and that individual is (W)hite or (B)lack; where W and B are predicates whose function are indicative of their value within the reference frame of that individual inhabits. It is important to remember that Wittgenstein in the *Tractatus* does away with the trivial notion of predicates so as to get out of issues regarding the distinguishing or categorization of different types of signs: ‘predicates’ from ‘relations’, from ‘functions’, which inevitably leads to being forced to make categorizations of categorizations. For Wittgenstein, this is the difference he forged between operations and functions. A function cannot be its own argument; an operation is the result of that function, is the expression of it and what its arguments are doing. A predicate qua description is indicative of how a term is used within a state of affairs which is, in all, expressive of a function. The difference between a relation function, or a description function, can only be determined by its use within a frame of reference, thus doing away with the confusion of the ‘sign of identity’ with the function of identity.

Taking on a racial dichotomy, W is given the value true and B that of falsity. It is important to emphasize here that Black identity defined as false does not mean the negation of B, only that its truth value or import in this frame is Not. In other words, it is true to assert its falsity. Thus, for all individuals that obtain W they are true, for all individuals who do not obtain W then they are B, and it is true that B is false. With the quantification of the terms that obtain these divergent functions, we see that we get the tautologies W=W or B=B. Also, the negations of these propositions also yield tautologies: not-W or B; W or not-B; not (W or not-B); not (not-W or B); etc. All give us the identity of W=W and B=B. Also if B is made identical to Nothing, then the negation of W yields an affirmation of B’s existence and the negation of B only affirms what we already know.

10 This is the larger failing, although there are some benefits to the skeptical conclusions of Afro-Pessimism. Jared Sexton’s article equates Afro-Pessimism with what he terms Afro Optimism. Trading one for the other description does not attend to the syntax-structure of the mechanism forming those propositions in the first place. Just as well, it only affirms the possibility of forming those propositions within a reference frame that assumes White identity’s superiority. We see these same issues arise in Frank Wilderson III’s assertion that it is impossible to make a movement from blackness which is absolutely nothing in *Biko Lives*! This is especially so when that which is ‘Nothing’ is merely a function that treats blackness as its object. Finally, Orlando Patterson’s affirmation of blackness as an object forged in slavery which, through the illustration above, becomes the subject of a function which proposes its existence as a cultural death—which is not what Patterson asserts in the statement that blackness, as an object, i.e. Black identity, is equated to or made interchangeable with ‘Cultural Death’.

11 Again, this proposition is akin to asserting a fact qua description: there exists an individual, (x), such that that individual is Black, B(x); and, for any and all other individuals (y), if those other individuals are Black B(y), then x = y and B(x,y) = N(x,y) where N(…) is Nothing. However, therein is one crucial flaw. The function of the predicate of the category B is not interchangeable with a single individual x. One can, therefore, form a proposition that states that “for all x, x is Black B(x) if and only if B(x) is N(x),” which yields Black identity is interchangeable with Nothing; which is not that that individual is identical, with Nothing. Another interpretation that yields interesting results is that if B and N are made interchangeable, then the objects which come under those functions—here the function of the categorical labels Black and Nothing—then N(x,y); both x and y become known as or fall under the category name B. However, only B=B, leaving the objects, or individuals, or persons . . . x,y. . . as known unknowns.

The function of Nothing is revealed as a void that is not empty. Its domain is the Null set as a field with every possible individual expression or proposition of . . . x,y. . . that remains under ‘Nothing’ unless known within some reference frame by a name made interchangeable with Nothing, here Black. Thus, an individual, x, is apart from the class which is to denote its identity, and yet a part of any expression that can be formed indicative of that class.

12 This is from a proposition assuming the first premise if B is Black and N is Nothing, and they are equivalent, then: (x)Bx and if Bx then Nx. The counterexample which negates the above proposition yields not-Bx, and yet, affirms x whose expression is stated through the function of N. It was P.T. Geach, then W.V.O. Quine, who formulated that equivalence is a logical biconditional which can be paraphrased universal quantification, identity. Taking that to heart, we have the conjunction, “‘if Black then Nothing’ AND ‘if Nothing, then Black’. ’ Thus, blackness, if nothing, is everything, for it is not-Nothing, the negation of nothing, and therefore is everything. For every Black identified individual is Nothing or there exists an individual that is Nothing but not a Black individual. Hence, individuals are arrived at through their relation with other individuals and, therefore, applying a predicate for the sake of categorization can only be indicative of a domain or frame of reference regarding the finite set of individuals that one has experienced from which their thesis was derived. The
issue is how far does that description extend? As this cannot be made certain, that propositions assertion only affirms that universal quantification can only be justified or proved within what is indicative of a disposition, a reference frame in the strict sense. For example, “All White people are evil” has no empirical basis; “All Black’s operate out of a cultural death” obtains the same consequence. Thus, reference frames are incomplete and require what makes up “Nothing” in order to substantiate them. ‘All’ does not say which, what or this, that or how many, because its extension or reference is by definition indeterminate. Consequently, all universal propositions express are the reference frame itself.

So, we define: N= nothing; B= Blacks; “if x then y”= not-(x and not-y). Proceeding by our rules of transformation:

For all B there exists a category N such that if B then N. It follows that there does not exist a B and it is not-not the case for all N that not if B then N. As “not-not all”= all, there does not exist a B for all N such that not if B then N, which is to say B and not-N. Thus, for all B there exists an N such that not-B or N. So, if for all B then N, it is not the case that for all N, B and not-N. From this, we can derive that there are no B’s and just N, because for all B, N if not-B. Just as well, it not being the case that for all N, not-N, we assume that this is just N.

We can stop here, otherwise we get our initial proposition. Roughly, what we obtained here translates to what we determined above.

15 Wittgenstein determines in his *Tractatus* that a predicate and different types of predicates, relations, names, etc. do not have meaning in and of themselves, but only acquire such because of their use within a reference frame which. All in all, the use is expressive of a relation involving two arguments, objects of thought. In so doing, Wittgenstein does away with the distinction in his notation between predicates, relations, and functions. It is in this way that Wittgenstein offers a solution to the conundrum set forth by Russell of having to distinguish different types of predicates and functions. For in the attempt to categorize these different types of signs or symbols denoting certain operations, these categorizations in turn require categorization in which those descriptions or signs cannot be members of that former set. A term’s use, indicative of its meaning, is a function of that term and can be represented in a multitude of ways and yet are still nonetheless a function. (See: *Tractatus* Propositions 3, 5, and 6 as well as their subordinate clauses.)

16 The Afro-Pessimist paradigm can be summed up by the following quote from Wilderson in *Biko Lives!*: “There is a type-persona for whom a movement fights and there is a corresponding loss that a movement seeks to regain for this type-persona. A [black] movement cannot be built, let alone sustained on behalf of ‘nothing, absolutely nothing’ – a nonentity. What would the politics of a dead relation, a slave, look like.” Through this chapter, I will show the logical fallacy inherent to this notion.

17 The rationalist tradition is not to be confused with ratiocination or reason. The rationalists were concerned with how knowledge can be had without recourse to actual features in the outside world, as well as the ability to verify these facts of knowledge empirically. The empiricists believed that knowledge was only able to be had by the experience of facts about the world.

21 Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole, *Logic or the Art of Thinking*.

22 Children’s stories play with this notion, particularly with concerns to identity carrying over even if the form of the individual changes. For example, take the princess and the frog. The David Poeppel experiments of 2016 have provided evidence of this fact and form the empirical basis for my assertion here. Poeppel states that the language acquisition apparatus in brains, shows evidence that children play with prosodic phrases and not individual words that are then correlated with specific meanings. This shows a profound link between lingual phrases and music. (See: Nai Ding, Lucia Melloni, Hang Zhang, Xing Tian, and David Poeppel, “Cortical Tracking of Hierarchical Linguistic Structures in Connected Speech,” p. 158-64.)

In later chapters, this will be the basis for our conception of punk as an ethos or form of life, within which lies the capacity to utilize a finite lexicon of objects to infinite means. These objects of thought’s meaning is a function of their use within a form of life. Meaning is not a thing used in place of another thing, which in turn requires another objective “meaning” in order to substantiate its use. According to the philosophy of language, one does not “mean” something by something else. This leads to many a paradox and often contradiction. Language is a recursive operation which utilizes some thing whose function can obtain or express something qua object of thought in multiple ways. This is what constitutes the language faculty, not Language as an object which replaces something else in order to communicate some end or goal.

Arnault saw a union between the concepts “body” and “mind” within the concept of the Human which he wrote in a letter to Descartes in 1648. These concepts were two notions, two different points of view, or aspects talking about the same individual. It is plausible to think of this letter being one of the first to link language and subjectivity as psychic continuity in modern terms. Arnault saw the stipulation between Mind and Body as just that, a stipulation within the limits of a theory.

The theory of innate capacities has been met with some unease. However, it was shown by theorists, most notably Chomsky, that it is because of this that the creative capacity seems limitless regardless of context. If an individual’s capacity to create thought had a one to one correlation with its environment, that individual would become a mirror of its environment. They could become anything, therefore would be no thing at all. Our cultural environment was conceived as a mirror because we construct societies. As humans have innate capacities, this basis allows for context independence. Although, one’s experience of that context still affects the manifestations of these capacities, there remains the ability to act outside of the parameters set by the environment and, therefore, the ability to change it. Physical traits, which are apt to change, do not refer to the object experienced. For philosophers of the mid-twentieth to twenty-first century, such as Bertrand Russell, this was a denotation and identity problem. For W.V.O. Quine (1960) it was an ontological problem and, to Saul Kripke (1970), a problem with names and reference. Each theorist saw language as key to exploring solutions to issues of reference.

According to Chomsky, expressions have an, “inner and outer aspect. A sentence can be studied from the point of view of how it expresses a thought [generative] or from the point of view of its physical shape, that is, from the point of view of either semantic interpretation or phonetic interpretation [Descriptionist].” (33) The Logic was able to distinguish between the surface structure and deep structure to forms of expression. This also did away with a dualist notion that held the form and its generation as separate. In more recent terms, it had to do with intension (the logical structure of an expression that does not have recourse to facts outside of itself) and extension (the range or class of entities an expression denotes). (See: Rudolf Carnap, Meaning and Necessity: A Study in Semantics and Modal Logic.)

This was formulated by the rationalists, in particular the Cartesians, who illustrated that animal systems could be accounted for purely mechanistically. It was Géraud de Cordermoy (1626-84) that conducted Cartesian thought experiments which showed the impossibility for a mechanical account of human language use that answered Descartes’ proposal of a “creative” capacity indicative of language use in Humans. This demonstration showed that a model of language could not be constructed by illustrating the mechanics of forming utterances—the physio-articulatory apparatus of individuals. What lay outside the physical was a mystery to empirical investigation, especially with concerns to conveying thoughts through this physical apparatus. Thus, “[W]e find that human language appears to have no reference relation, in the sense stipulated in contemporary theories of reference for language in philosophy and psychology, which take for granted some kind of word-object relation, where the objects are extra-mental. What we understand to be a house, a river, a person, a tree, water, and so on, consistently turns out to be a creation of what 17th century investigators called the ‘cognoscitive powers,’ which provide us with rich means to refer to the outside world from certain perspectives.” (See: Piatelli-Palmarini, Massimo, Juan Uriagereka, and Pello Salaburua, eds. Of Minds and Language: A Dialogue with Noam Chomsky in the Basque Country, p. 27.)

The nineteenth century dilemma between sign and signified proposed by the linguist Ferdinand de Saussure.

W.V.O. Quine, “Two Dogmas of Empiricism” in The Philosophical Review 60, p. 20–43.

Michelangelo once stated that his statue of David had always resided within the block of marble provided. It was the work of his chisel to bring it out. The statue of David could have looked otherwise, dependent upon the context and the experience of the man with the chisel. “David,” however, was in there nonetheless.


Chomsky, The Minimalist Program.

X-Bar Theory in linguistics states that as sets cannot overlap each other, if we take two objects as already formed sets of features, and combine them to produce another object or set, that one of the two objects is “projected” from the item created so as to express its function indicative of its meaning within the expression formed.
Modification of Occam’s razor.


Graphically, the structure of the language faculty is represented in the following way:

```
Lexicon
  Syntax (S)
    S-structure
      Logical Form (LF) / Phonetic Form (PF)
```

\[ LF + S-structure = \text{Deep Structure (D-structure)} \]

*Phonetic Form is context contingent. PF is mapped onto the D-structure dependent on need or the possibility of externalization. Even if the expression or proposition is not externalized, the thought and, therefore, the subject retains an inner logic and method of generating thoughts appropriate to context, but not random, and not caused by those contexts.*

Instead of a tree, we can also represent this structure in a nested fashion:

```
[ Lexicon [ Syntax [ S-structure [ LF and/or PF ] ] ] ]
```

This construction has three consequences in regard to the formation of expressions: i) a proposition can obtain the form: LF + S-structure + PF, meaning the proposition formed is externalized and understood and communicated; ii) propositions obtain the form: LF + S-structure with no PF, meaning it can be understood but not externalized; or iii) a proposition can take the form: S-structure + PF, an expression externalized but without an inner logic or semantic interpretation.

The third form (PF + S-structure) does not hold, for no Logical Form (inner logic) to the construction of the expression does not allow for a semantic interpretation. The method in which one obtains an understanding of the function, sense, or use (“what is meant”) by the proposition cannot be derived. Thus, all forms of thought and their method of creation have an inner logic, LF, and method of construction, S-structure, regardless of whether they are externalized to ensure that a semantic interpretation, the function which that expression obtains within a form of life, can be had. A PF+S-structure must point to something other than the expression is, in order to obtain a function or meaning; whatever that other “object” or “phrase” is, no doubt must contain a LF+S-structure that is understood by those participating in the exchange which, nevertheless, renders the former expression (PF+S-Structure) nonsensical or superfluous as what was really wanted and required was the latter proposition expressed.

Antoine Arnauld and Pierre Nicole, *Logic or the Art of Thinking*.

Quine, *Word and Object*, p. 33.

Lawrence Bouton, "Antecedent-contained Pro Forms" in *Papers From the Sixth Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society*.

“A language is defined by giving its 'alphabet' (i.e. the finite set of symbols out of which its sentences are constructed) and its grammatical sentences.” (See: Chomsky, Noam, *Syntactic Structures*, p. 21.)


Modern linguistics understands the interface between internal creative capacities and external grammars as the possibility for semantics, i.e. where meaning is made and, therefore, culture or what Baraka calls the "expression of a people." (See: Chomsky, *The Minimalist Program*.)


This is a theme that appears throughout Richard Rorty’s *Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature*. 
inaudible, but there nonetheless. This notion is taking from Amiri Baraka’s concept of the “changing same.” (See: LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka, “The Changing Same (R&B and the New Black Music)” in Black Music.)

This concept is derived from Henry Louis Gates, Jr. (See: Henry Louis Gates Jr., The Signifying Monkey.)


“His very words are action words. His interpretation of the English language is in terms of pictures. One act described in terms of another . . . It is easier to illustrate than it is to explain because action came before speech.” Through the rest of her study, Hurston goes on to show how so called “developed languages” attempt to explain concepts of the world as if they are “detached ideas.” Through her analysis, she begins to put together the method in which this very concept of a world is made through the use of certain “characteristics,” now called linguistic principles, which are used in the formation of the ideas themselves, indicative of a world view. (See: Hurston, “The Characteristics of Negro Expression,” p. 55-71.)

Hurston also cites etymologists who state that Blacks have not introduced any “African” words to the English language, however, have “made over a great part of the tongue.” If one is to hold to a lexicon of elements with predefined uses or a one to one correlation between an internal mode of creating thought and external objects, how then can we account for what was termed “new” and creative uses of the language as indicative of a way of being in the word? Especially without an account for how these uses were generated?

Sean Cubitt, “Listening Subject” in Reading Pop: Approaches to Textual Analysis of Popular Music, p. 156.


“The hypothesis is that we see what is not there in a given performance by understanding the relationship of the non-objective and non-representational elements to the objective representational elements. To do so is to envision the interpenetration rather than the distillation of dialectical concepts such as the spectacular and the mundane, distraction and contemplation, subject and object, and the one and the many”, sec: Jason King, “Blue Magic: Stardom, Soul Music and Illumination.”

Frantz Fanon, “The Negro and Language” in Black Skin, White Masks.

Henry Louis Gates Jr., The Signifying Monkey.

Chomsky quickly refutes this claim as evidence for the loss of free will.
(See also: C.S. Soon, A. H. He, S. Bode, and J.-D. Haynes, “Predicting free choices for abstract intentions”.)

This ordered triplet holds the same as our previous form of the Gerund: <world, name, relation>. (See: P.F. Strawson, Individuals, p. 54-80.)

The study of syncopation and blackness is the major concern of Fred Moten in In the Break.

Hurston and tense as a marker of blackness aids in setting the relation between subject formation and identification through the Other. Blackness is between identity and identification; and its signature is found in syncopation.

Composer Alfred Schnittke (1934-1998) illustrates this concept beautifully. The now deceased composer asks for a very loud (fff) silence (rest), over a fermata or extra beat on his grave stone, illustrating that the rests in music are full of sound; inaudible, but there nonetheless.
Examples can be found in Chomsky’s work regarding merge functions in the process of forming various expressions out of a finite set of lexical elements. (See: Chomsky, “Problems of Projection” in Linguistics, p. 33–49.)

The concept developed sees the mixing or “stacking” of tones to create a sound as working along the lines of a feature sharing aspect within generative grammar. This has led to my assertion that it is in the syncopation between tones that we find the character of a sound, as well as reveal that sound qua musical phrase’s method of generation. This was handled linguistically in a paper by Yohei Oseki (2014) based off of Chomsky’s labeling algorithm and feature sharing description (2013). Philosophically and literally, we see this in Baraka’s description of the assertion of one’s subjectivity when “voice interjects harmony.” (See: Yohei Oseki, “Bare Adjunction as ‘Two-Peaked’ Structure.”)

This refers to feature sharing principles and a twin peaked linguistic structures for tones. Twin peaked structures represent a copula which forms an individual viz. an object and its function. In other words, what “it” is doing. For example, take Tx where x is an object held within a field of pitch, and the function T, what it is doing, its verbal aspect. The verbal aspect is indicative of a deep structure, the inner logic of the operation it performs and syntax, while x is the object of that operation. The copula, Tx, represents the individual tone.

In linguistics, this makes for a structure with “twin peaks” that works along a feature sharing aspect, here to be analyzed under the concept “family resemblance.” Feature sharing projects across the “peaks” of the syntactic structure within the inner logic of the phrase, present but not expressed or superficially apparent. The structure resembles the following tree diagram where ‘[+]’ represents a feature shared amongst the different objects forming the expression S. 'V^N^NP' represents the “twin peak” structure:

```
S[+]
 / \  
NP  S[+]
 / \  
V NP[+]=ADJ
```

* The feature [+] is continuous across the proposition structure expressed by the collection of its objects.

A feature [+FP] in our articulatory mechanism represents one of the resulting aspects of an encounter. (See: Yohei Oseki, “Bare Adjunction as ‘Two-Peaked’ Structure.”)

This twin peak structure resembles McCawley’s Verb-Subject-Object notation (VSO = V^S^O), in which the adjunct is represented V^N^NP.

```
VP/S
 / \
V NP=ADJ
 / \ 
S O
```

which reduces to

```
ADJ
 / \ 
V S O
```

where V relates S and O as the function of the subject, NP, putting to use N to express a VP. This gives us our structure from above where ADJ= V^N^NP such that ADJ(V(N, NP)) is ADJ(V(S, O)). S becomes the determiner or identifier within the noun phrase (NP=T + N) and the object is what the verb is the expression of the subject putting to use these terms.

The deep structure illustrated above takes on the form VSO (V + S + O). This is represented in what surfaces as Subject-Verb-Object or SVO (NP + V + N^N^NP) by a rewriting rule VSO → SVO which transforms the logical form of an expression into a form appropriate to context.

The term “voicing” here is taken from Baraka. (See: LeRoi Jones / Amiri Baraka, Blues People: Negro Music in White America, p. 69.)

Fred Sommers in “Types and Ontology” utilizes the same sort of formulation in order to show that as a problem for thought, category distinctions have a bearing on our knowledge of what “types” of things are in the world, our reference frame.

It was the goal of our first section to detail how a linguistic analysis is necessary to form a theory of subjectivity through the concept of articulation. Now it is necessary to detail the inner composition of individuals so to illustrate how sound worlds and their subjects come to fruition.
It is simple enough to show this in a formal way. Take the following diagram:

\[ L_1 \cdot L_2 \cdot L_3 \cdot L_4 \ldots \{ \text{set of all possible lexical features, finite, denumerable, and yet the limit is unknown as continuous conjunctive series} \]

\[ L_\text{R} \land \lor \{ \text{syntax, features are set in relation to each other creating object language, continuous disjunctive series} \]

\[ M(s) \lor \ldots \{ \text{observable event, function of object expresses type of event, another disjunct series} \]

Through these different levels we map the process of articulation in a “nested” process. The former level provides the base for the subsequent set created. In this way, we see that the first level, for our purposes the Null, represents the set of all possible features which is a part of each subsequent level, and yet is apart from the particular arrangements created from it. The second level is comprised of particular arrangements created from null that are distinct from each other, indicative of an inner logic and syntax which joins elements in ways appropriate to context, yet not caused by the previous level. The final level sets a function for the “sound” produced which is not random but whose horizon of possibility is due to the first level. The “object” produced is experienced based on a relation of being the subject expressed or subjected to the environment, frame of reference, in which it was articulated. This contingency is required to understand the concept of overdetermination as a relation between dominance and subordination—illustrated through the process and mechanism of articulation.

Chomsky, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, p. 87.

This seems to work along the lines of Kripke’s analysis of names in that after their initial baptism, names are derived from the context in which they were first introduced. Issues may arise with regards to “language” in a conventional sense, but sounds by definition carry until they are suppressed. In effect, this means that a sound continues to exist regardless of context, even after it is generated. Dissipation seems to be a relation of one’s position to that sound: a relation that starts from the time it is first generated to the amount of space it creates as it is carried off. This more so befits an understanding of volume, both in the spatial and frequency sense.

Stacking is how tones interface with our articulatory mechanism from section one. The foundational aspect of articulation assumes the encounter between at least two individuals A and B. Our mechanism \([A \times B]\) can be translated in the following way. With regard to tonal encounters, articulation produces a sound whose function expresses other aspects like syncopation.

\[
\begin{align*}
&[\_ A \times \_ B ] \\
&[\_ \_ A \_ \_] \times [\_ \_ B \_ \_ ]
\end{align*}
\]

A tone is structured < Pitch (P), Tone (T), Timbre (Ti) > which is analogous to the Gerund < World, Name, Relation >.

Various “stacks” derived from the cross multiplication of two tones create the following aspects in accordance with our illustration of the articulatory encounter from section one:

\[
\begin{align*}
&T(\text{Ti}) – Ti(T) \\
P(\text{Ti}) – Ti(P) \\
P(T) – T(P)
\end{align*}
\]

Each pair expresses different concepts characteristic of the sound produced. As an example, the operation of T becomes the object of the function Ti—represented Ti(T)—which expresses the characteristic or concept of volume. For the timbre of one individual overdetermines the name given to the “tone” of the other, thereby re-determining its relation or “quality” within a field of pitch. Graphically, stacking can also be represented taking the two individuals themselves in the following way:

\[
\begin{align*}
&[\_ \_ A \_ \_ [\_ \_ B \_ \_ ]] \\
or
&[\_ \_ B \_ \_ [\_ \_ A \_ \_]]
\end{align*}
\]

Taken in tree form we can show this as follows:

\[
\rightarrow [\_ \_ \_ \_ \_ C \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ ]
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
&[\_ \_ A \_ \_ [\_ \_ B \_ \_ ]] \\
or
&[\_ \_ B \_ \_ [\_ \_ A \_ \_]]
\end{align*}
\]

from the line,

\[
[\_ \_ A \_ \_ [\_ \_ B \_ \_ ] \_ \_ \_ \_ C \_ \_ \_ \_ ]
\]
articulated' in accordance with modern linguistics, articulate is the object of the function "past understood within the state of affairs. The word "articulated" is formed by the merge of items [+ past ascertained through our use of syntax. "Tense" as a lexical item does not appear superficially, however, its a/effects are indeed participate in that form of life, have access to because a participant in its method of construction. This getting written out of the surface organization of society in this way, but is understood as being there among those that affairs, categories outside of the inner logic and method of construction of that form of life. The Future Perfect survives...

The latter representation is better suited for our spatial conception of syncopation via stacking. We can see the expression of this concept linearly by taking the full line of constituents composing a tone, say that of C resulting from the merge or encounter of A and B. C, therefore, is composed of the following constituents:

C: [< T(Ti) – Ti(T), P(Ti) – Ti(P), P(T) – Ti(P)>]  
Representative of an endowment passed down through the duration of the song—even across different performances of the same song—the concatenation of these elements under C are taken up for use in subsequent encounters. The following encounters only serve to elongate the string that is consequently denied for the identity or name of the tone within the context it is uttered. (See Appendix on pied-piping and what that entails for the expression of a cultural endowment and how we can derive blackness in the deep structure of multiple forms and genres of Music). We can also conceive of syncopation spatially as the “stacked” cross multiplication of two tones literally does not line up vertically in an “expected” or uniform way with the subsequent sound tone produced.

Speed, as well as other aspects, are obtained depending upon which tone overdetermines another. Effectively, during the process of a song we model overdetermination and subversion of tones within space-time outside of merely being labeled as a particular song. This also sets up what is expressed as one tone encounters others during the articulation of a song. The length of C does not match up with the lengths of A or B, and when C encounters D, that tone may not line up with the others in a predictable or measured fashion. We will see this with regard to the correlation between increases in speed by virtue of the repetitive use of the elements that end with consonants from a set lexicon which directly connecting music to the language faculty and the ability to sonically create thought. Speed, then, is expressed by the various arrangements of tones: either linearly over a definite measure of time or spatially. For example, when multiple tones are played by different individuals within a moment, the sound is “tensed” as the (in)ensity of the sound is derived from its quality which is not measured across time but by the space, it creates and/or fills. This “space” cannot be measured in accordance with a meter but felt or understood in the context in which it is articulated.

A tone [__A__] of a certain length and tone [__B__] of another, such that A≠B:

[[__A__] · · · [__A__] · · · [__A__] · · · [__A__] · · · [__A__] · · · [__A__] · · · [__A__] · · · [__A__] · · · [__A__] ...  
[__B__] · · · [__B__] · · · [__B__] · · · [__B__] · · · [__B__] · · · [__B__] · · · [__B__] · · · [__B__] ...  
| 1 · · · 2 · · · 3 · · · 4 · · · 1 ...  

(Remember that these symbols are not “notes” in the traditional sense but merely tones undergoing the process of articulating a song or sonic pattern.)

The spaces between the first and second level do not match, creating a syncopated pattern between tones which persists in the inner logic and mode of expression of the “song,” despite its phonological or externalization. The surface structure of this song changes contingent to artist, performance, instrumentation, mood, etc.

The sonic pattern illustrated above shows a horizontal line which represents an assumed meter or reference frame. The vertical line shows a spatial overtone of the note of the meter. In both directions the overlay of tones represents an off beat in regard to the assumed reference frame, as well as in the space in which they are articulated. Thus, syncopation is expressed by virtue of the function of the operation of these tones both in music and spatially as a matter of matching and pairing sounds outside of an assumed musicality.

Linguistically, a lexical element such that [+ FP] merges with another entity within a state of affairs S’s lexicon; a particular arrangement, say x and y such that R(x,y) in S enters into an encounter which is represented through our mechanism [ R x FP ]; S[R x FP] or the function of the operation represented by that encounter expresses an alternative form of life within that state. As [+ FP] is a part of the deep structure of that alternate form of life, a relation alongside and at times against others, it does not appear or have a surface representation accessible to the external organization of that state of affairs, categories outside of the inner logic and method of construction of that form of life. The Future Perfect survives getting written out of the surface organization of society in this way, but is understood as being there among those that indeed participate in that form of life, have access to because a participant in its method of construction. This much can be ascertained through our use of syntax. “Tense” as a lexical item does not appear superficially, however, its a/effects are understood within the state of affairs. The word “articulated” is formed by the merge of items [+ past-tense [articulate]] → ‘articulated’ in accordance with modern linguistics, articulate is the object of the function “past-tense.”
In accordance with modern linguistics, the recursive operation merge combines two lexical objects to form a new syntactic unit that composes an inner structure that then becomes the subject of certain principles in the process of articulating a thought. A "sentence" or surface expression is mapped onto that deep syntactic structure for semantic interpretation. In this process, an object 'past tense' or 'Future Perfect' would not appear in the surface structure of a sentence. However, as a result of these features entering into the articulation of an expression through merge, they do produce the transformation of a lexical item in that surface structure. For example, "go" to "went" by virtue of "go" + [past tense] → "went". The transformation those features entail in the deep structure of the expression is understood between those who participate in the form of life in which the Future Perfect is a function expressed by the individuals that participate in it, and the relation it poses as a possibility to obtain. Similar to the feature sharing principle developed by Chomsky (Labeling Algorithm, 2013) and Yohei Oseki ("Bare Adjunction," 2014), the way in which Future Perfects are constructed in our system illustrate a relation obtained between individuals within a state of affairs which is not identified within the reference frame (sentence).

Nonetheless, Future Perfect’s maintain an inner logic and syntax (deep structure) outside of that frame, yet still within that state of affairs. As these features do not appear superficially, [+FP] is not a phenotypic distinction—neither are the constituent features or signifying practices of blackness—and is understood by the way in which and the deep structure to how a form of life is expressed and surfaces for various semantic interpretations (different identities for the same subject). Feature sharing represents a relation of affinity in the deep structure outside of dominant surface level descriptions that attempt to set an individual in relation to a category external to their form of life.

If "use" expresses a category which can only be obtained through a label indicating a class of individuals that hold certain features, then a unique relationship within such a category, as opposed to others, is understood by the use of the label we attribute to certain classes of individuals. When certain features are arranged in a particular way, what is indicated is the frame of reference we occupy. The one in which that label obtains a function. The use of features within our mechanism is needed to illustrate the substitution of lexical items into core structures that are arranged into the objects expressed and representative of a given state of affairs. Linguistically, these items, such as the sub-units of words (both phonetic and the morphemes their groupings create), when arranged in a particular way, form the units which are mapped onto the concepts articulated through the language faculty. This process automatically assumes that some such system exists within the formation of concepts that does not appear in the surfacing expression, but are there so as to make the mapping of a phonetic representation and its semantic interpretation possible.

A matrix of abstract, but formally bound and constrained, subunits of a lexicon are arranged as inputs to a language/articulatory mechanism that then produce labeled bundles of these features as outputs. This comprises the relation between the underlying abstract arrangement and the surfacing structure comprising the "features" of the expressed thought upon which a phonetic and semantic interpretation can be applied. For us, a set of signifying practices as lexical items enter into the articulatory mechanism which produces an identified individual or sound appropriate to context but not caused by it. This product is distinct from the subjectivity of that individual, but, is the result of that subject's putting to use the objects within its environment. Use expresses the subjectivity of that individual through its function within a form of life, subsequently identified, defined, and labeled by an external grammar or system of categorization. These products, once labeled, become the inputs which enter into the same process for other individuals.

Phrase markers (NP, VP, etc.) and feature labels are not intrinsic to the lexical items that are the inputs into this mechanism. They are only attributed to the output for analysis. The attribution of a label represents the external aspect of the propositions produced and mapped onto the product of an internal aspect—the way in which a matrix of non-labeled particles is arranged before identification—of abstract features, whose output occurs before identification within a category. The matrix of "features" that enter into the mechanism before labeling set the conditions for relating a phonetic representation to the syntactic structure of the thought produced and subsequently labeled for semantic interpretation.

As features are abstract atomic items which amount to "bundles" or arrangements of bound lexical units that cannot be divided any further, the vocabulary produced through the mechanism results from certain processes of selection from the lexicon. These products use within a form of life involves an explication of features to delimit the particular and appropriate uses of these elements to form propositions. For example, "blackness" consists of two morphemes or unbreakable units with distinct sets of "features" underlying its expression: 'black' resulting from a bundle of features we attribute to it ( [+syllabic] and others) and, 'ness' comprised of another set of features that are arranged in a particular way. From these, our mechanism forms the word "blackness" from 'black'/'-ness'. The elements which enter into the process of articulation are not yet known under a certain label. The act of definition and identification in accordance with certain bundles of features are a result of the items created by these abstract form's use within a form of life. Surface representations must be mapped onto these structures in accordance with context and, therefore, are secondary to the process of articulation. This affirms that the use of "feature," here, is more akin to the inner aspect or logical form of a signifying practice, rather than an ad hoc, phenotypic, distinction attributed after the fact in order to organize a state of affairs. Throughout our analysis, we are to be sure that a strict distinction is to be adhered to between the technical use of feature and "phenotype." Thus, we arrive at the label Black after it is applied and after the expressions formulated by "Black"/'-ness, the subject putting certain features or signifying practices as elemental inputs to the articulatory mechanism. Blackness does this in such a way so that these items are put to use in a particular way to express its self.

77 Halle and Chomsky’s phonological features work in the same way. (See: Noam Chomsky and Morris Halle, The Sound Pattern of English, 1968.)
next. We can connect this to our kernel from section one in the following way:

The series of stops can be read through a Boolean logic example, a given string of sonic features can be represented through the representation of stops and other features within that tone. A tone is an ordered series such that \[<. . .>\]. For Chomsky, et. al. Therefore, no tone, silence, or noise is vacuous.

In linguistics this is known as the Extended Projection Principle (EPP). Every verb must have an obligatory argument, its object; every Gerund produced must be the object of a proposition if it is to be articulate. Therefore, the existence of these objects cannot be denied even if they do not appear on the surface level of expressions. (See: Chomsky, Some Concepts and Consequences of the Theory of Government and Binding, p. 10.; and Chomsky, Knowledge of Language: Its Nature, Origin and Use, p. 84.)

The Twin Peak structure to adjunction ensures subject continuity through feature sharing, even if unrepresented in the externalized or “surfacing” expression, as features do not have a “label” or categorization available to grammatical “search”/parsing in the syntax of the surface structure. (See: Yohei Oseki, “Bare Adjunction as ‘Two-Peaked’ Structure” and Chomsky’s Labeling Algorithm in “Problems of Projections,” Lingua 130: 33-49.)

The issue of prolonged tones, brought to the fore by Fred Lerdahl and Ray Jackendoff to create a “song,” is diminished through the representation of stops and other features within that tone. A tone is an ordered series such that \(<. . .>\). For example, a given string of sonic features can be represented within a state of affairs \([[A]]\) of tone ‘T’:

\[[. . . [± < x, #, x, #, x, #, x, #, #> . . .]]\]

It is possible to compose a tone full of stops as # is the only feature that can stand on its own—see the phonological analysis of Chomsky, et. al. Therefore, no tone, silence, or noise is vacuous. The series of stops can be read through a Boolean logic of starts and stops which represents the spatial relation between the positions of the initial production of a feature and the next. We can connect this to our kernel from section one in the following way:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c}
1 & \emptyset & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\end{array}
\]
The more stops between features, the lower the frequency of the tone. The inverse is also true. The fewer stops, the higher the frequency, with features representing the peaks in the frequency, the space between those “peaks,” and occupied by stops (#s) representing the “valleys.” With the spacing between valleys differing between tones, we can conceive of the shape of different wave forms.

A system similar to this was developed by Chomsky and Halle (1968) in dealing with the phonetics or the representation of sound in language. (See: Chomsky and Halle, The Sound Pattern of English.)

George Boole in “Thought” was able to reduce all expressions consisting of a logical form and a syntactic structure to a yes (1) and no (0) truth condition which is valid in and only in the conceptual scheme constructed. This in turn made the construction of conceptual schemes our only access to validity or truth with any certainty. Thus, a conceptual scheme is valid if its method of construction can be shown to be so. According to traditional truth tables of logic, any proposition can be represented using just these two values. If we have two objects, \(x\) and \(y\), a truth table for conjunction, or the AND operator can be derived as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(x)</th>
<th>(y)</th>
<th>(x \text{ AND } y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We can derive all other logical operations, OR, IF/THEN, etc. if we assume the basic function of the NOT operator, also known as the function of negation. Either \(x\) is true or if “not \(x\)” is true, then \(x\) is false. Assuming that the function of conjunction and the operator AND was found through considering assertion and negation of a single variable under the table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(x)</th>
<th>(\text{NOT } x)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, if A is true and B is true then the proposition is true. However, if either A is true or B is true, with the other false, then the proposition formed is false. If both are false, then the proposition formed is true in the sense that it is false, i.e. outside of the system. This last line ensures the possibility of constructing other conceptual schemes to avoid or correct the short coming of former.


Malcom McLaren initially wanted to call the punk sound as articulated by the Sex Pistols and other U.K. bands “new wave.” (See: Jon Savage, England is Dreaming.)

Chomsky and Halle, The Sound Pattern of English.

Chomskyan view on distinctive features. (See: Chomsky, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, p. 81.)

If, for example, I illustrate a tone using our set of features from above, we can show two tones in succession in the following way:

\[
[<\# x \#>] [<\# x \#>]
\]

The linking of #’s in the merge of tones whose encounter articulates a sound illustrates a “master sound” in P.F. Strawson’s sense, here conceived as the Null, as a continuous field of … ####... It is from Null that each tone is articulated by the encounter of certain features within that field. Thus, noise and silence can be represented as the horizon of possibility that carries on and over, despite the tones extracted from that base:

\[
[S \rightarrow / \ \_ / \ _/ \ \_ \ \_ \ \_ \ \_ \ \_ \ \_ \ \_ \ \_ \ \_ \ _/ \ ] \text{ mechanism}
\]

Once some tone is articulate from silence, a second order articulation allows us to represent noise or distortion using successive x’s as the Null “sound” in the following way:

\[
[<\# x \#>][<\# x \#>]
\]
sensory deprivation" in subject or that much of the creative capacity of thinking sonically occurs in the head as this leads to adverse psychological effects that contravene their use. There is a lot of research on the brain’s production of hallucinatory sounds in the absence of external stimuli to maintain psychological stability. Humans can hear sounds at or above a frequency of 20 Hz. The production of sounds “in the head” with the absence of actual sound both does not disprove that sounds exists around that subject or that much of the creative capacity of thinking sonically occurs in a way that does not get externalized for consciousness or communicative use. Some studies include: Mason and Brady, “The psychotomimetic effects of short-term sensory deprivation” in Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, p. 783–785.

Baraka, Black Music: Essays, p. 213.

Baraka, Black Music, p. 227.

Baraka, Black Music, p. 125, 213, 227.

Baraka, Black Music, p. 205.
Baraka, *Black Music*, p. 84.

“... Black music leads us inevitably to religion, i.e., spirit worship. This phenomenon is always at the root in Black art, the worship of spirit – or at least the summoning of or by such force [subjectivity]. As even the music itself was that, a reflection of, or the no thing itself.” (Baraka, *Black Music*, p. 207.)


Baraka, *Black Music*, p. 84.

For Baraka, a literary analysis is as close to a total analysis we can get. (See: Baraka, *Black Music*, p. 207.)


Jones/Baraka, *Blues People*, p. 47.

This concept is tied to Jean-Jacques Nattiez’s notion in *Music and Discourse* that elements do not carry meaning. The subject is found in the drop between tones as a way of referencing its method of generation. The subject’s capacity to form expressions is revealed through syncopation. Rhythm is not tone, but the syntax to the construction of sounds by virtue of tones engenders or expresses our concept of rhythm. (See: Jones/Baraka, *Blues People*, p. 26.)

Taking the sonic Gerund, <Pitch, Tone, Timbre/Relation of Tone in Pitch>, it is possible to illustrate the encounter of tones generating a particular sound through the following mechanism, illustrated in section one. [A x B], such that:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>Pa</th>
<th>Ta</th>
<th>aRP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Pb</td>
<td>Tb</td>
<td>bRP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many examples of merge and transformation were carried out by Richard Middleton in *Studying Popular Music*. I do not have the space here, but his various descriptions of this process are sufficient to acknowledge the method put forth.

This is expressed through our articulation mechanism viz. the function Na overdetermining bRW, Na(bRW), i.e. setting the “function” of the function bRW, just as well and on the same level as aRW can do the same to Nb—see Appendix I.

Evan Rapport in “Hearing Punk as Blues” transcribes “T.V. Eye” illustrating the substitution options for the bass and the call and response motif utilized by Iggy Pop which creates an overall structure of an emphasis on the first sound articulated which passes over a Null period, the rest, before the next riff evidenced in the musical notation. It is at these points that the bass guitar has the option to respond to the tone issued forth by Iggy. Formally, Iggy is represented by the bolded portions of the blues core representing the riff, and the bass guitar is represented by the latter portions responses on the lower level:

\[ [1 \ 0 \ 1 \ 1 \ 1] \]

(See: Evan Rapport, “Hearing Punk as Blues,” Example 3.)

“Blitzkrieg Bop” renders the most direct example of the concept of punk being the blues played fast. Consider the musical notation of the beginning phrase in comparison with our formal blues core indicative of the kernel to Black expression detailed above:
Again, it is important to emphasize that blackness, here, has nothing to do with phenotype, but it is the assumption that it does which is being critiqued; as well as the assumption that the being or significance of blackness is vacuous.

This follows Chomsky’s Extended Projection Principle (EPP) rules.

Baraka linked tone and voice to rebelliousness in order to reconfigure significance. (See: LeRoi Jones/Baraka, *Blues People Negro Music in White America*, p. 24.)

Baraka warns of conflating classical conceptions of Music as musicality and the ability to create music. (See: Baraka, *Black Music*, p. 82.)

Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures*.


Baraka would go on to say, "even heavily rhythmic blues licks (and some electronic devices), by new music musicians point toward the final close in the spectrum of the sound that will come. . . The whole people.” (216) Forming expression outside of the imposition of a dominant reference frame, blackness is a "poeticizing beyond what we think the present (the 'actual') has to offer. But that is true in the sense that any clear present must include as much of the past as it needs to clearly illuminate it." (223) Therefore, the Future Perfect is blackness articulated within the vocabulary of its own form of life and reference frame. "The future revealed is man explained to himself.” (227)

Examples of this can be found in Evan Rapport’s “Hearing punk as blues.” (See: Evan Rapport, "Hearing Punk as Blues" in *Pop. Mus. Popular Music* 33.01, p. 39-67.)

Evan Rapport, “Hearing Punk as Blues.”


See Fred Sommers on “Types and Ontology,” to see how use and non-applicability express the function of the operation of articulation with regard to the expression of types. The limits to applicability indicates modality as ways of being in the world.

Baraka highlights the connection between musical expression and other forms of expression in his analysis of voicing. He also illustrates this capacity in the pages of his own writing. Examples include the use of ‘wd’ instead of “would” and slashes indicating that the prose is more like lyrics to be sung, rather than read. These exemplify a structural syncopation in blackness’ expression, most noted in the study of scat. Baraka hints at the deep structure within Black expressivity not only in music but in conventional language as well. (See: Jones/Baraka, *Blues People Negro Music in White America*, p. 62.)
These rules fall in line with those proposed in Chomsky’s syntactic structures (See: Chomsky, Syntactic Structures, p. 46.)

In Bauer’s transcription of the scatted syllables, there are 21 options with 52 possible positions, yielding a 1 in $1.92 \times 10^{14}$ chance of getting the same song if we were to adhere to a Descriptionist account. If the Descriptionist method were to stick to an analysis of the song bar by bar, they would have to account for 12 bars at a 4 count, rendering 495 possibilities to get this particular song. Although this is better, we still would have to create an immense dictionary of rules to run through this unwieldy lexicon to limit the possibilities so as to get this one particular song, let alone, re-identify it as distinct from others—a requirement of any ontological schema according to P.F. Strawson in Individuals. The Descriptionist faces the logical conclusion that their method is not derived from within the song itself, but is imposed as an outer measure of musicality.

Chomsky works this out for English in accordance with rewrite rules representing structural transformations. He does this to illustrate the movement of elements from the morphophonemic or word form level, to the ordered arrangement that is finally externalized and appears on the surface. (See: Chomsky, Syntactic Structures, p. 46.)

In a study of “scat” conducted by William Bauer, Betty Carter’s “Babes Blues” demonstrates the limits of a probabilistic description of the syntax to her scatted lyrics. The encounter between the sounds generated are shown to revolve around the silences, the objects of propositions allowed to sound until, through merge, stops are placed to give the strings their overall form. (See: Bauer, "Louis Armstrong’s “Skid Dat De Dat”: Timbral Organization in an Early Scat Solo" in Jazz Perspectives 1.2, p. 133-65.)


A more recent citation of our blues core comes from Funk, through Go-go, and to Punk in regards to “the drop” after the first note by bass player William “Bootsy” Collins when he played for James Brown. This is a direct result of what Evan Rapport in “Hearing punk as blues” states is the space opened up by this particular blues progression. The drop allowed for a DIY and experimental amateurism to be introduced through Black music into other forms of musical expression. James Brown would request that Bootsy give him a one, then a break or drop, in order to synchronize the sonic thought being articulated. After this was done, Bootsy could play whatever he wanted until giving Brown another “one.” Brown is quoted saying, “It all follows from the One.” This formula mimics our blues core, $[\Omega \Omega \Omega \Omega \Omega \Omega], \Omega$ being where Brown would interject and “the one” being the bolded constituent of the string initiating the sequence whose syntactic structure expresses the blues core from which the music is generated. (See: Smith, RJ, The One: The Life and Music of James Brown, Gotham Books: 2012).


Jones/Baraka, Blues People, p. 69.

Michel de Certeau in The Practice of Everyday Life, makes a critical distinction between the extension of names in their use in states of affairs (strategies) in his reading of what exists in that state; and the tactics (internal creative capacity) of the subject in writing out an existence by the acts of their everyday life. (See: Michel de Certeau, The Practice of Everyday Life.)


In Stuart Hall’s call for a theory of articulation, he wanted to account for how difference as well as affinities come together in a unity within complex conditions. (See: Stuart Hall, D. Morley, D., and K-H Chen, Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies, p. 115.)

For Michel de Certeau, strategies are for institutions and the means by which power is enacted. Tactics are the actions taken by those “overdetermined” by these constructed cultural, societal, and political institutional structures. (See: Michel de Certeau, “Making Do”: Uses and Tactics in The Practice of Everyday Life.)

Stefano Harney and Fred Moten, The Undercommons: Fugitive Planning & Black Study, p. 74.

Toni Morrison, “Unspeakable Things Unspoken” in An Anthology of African American Literary Criticism from the Harlem Renaissance to the Present Within the Circle, p. 368-98.

ZFC axioms provide the proofs for these stipulations.

Tavia Nyongo makes this point about race and miscegenation as well. (See: Tavia Nyongó, The Amalgamation Waltz.)

Jacques Derrida, “Violence in Metaphysics” in Writing and Difference.

Richard Wright develops this notion in White Man, Listen! According to Wright, blackness can be conceived from two vantage points, that of identity and that of an entity in and of itself. Identity strives for personal identification with something
not its own; entity strives for the expression of a self out of blackness’ own vocabulary. (See: Richard Wright, White Man, Listen!)


159 Richard Wright, *White Man, Listen!*


161 It is interesting that later on, Du Bois’ work would be used to proffer the cult of the talented tenth of Black society that should bring up the race. This paved the way for a respectability politics of Identity from within blackness to be cultivated and utilized both within and outside of the U.S. regardless of ethnicity.

162 Mainstream culture is founded on the notion of common sense. It is constructed through a sense of “normalcy” which is achieved through bipartisan, Conservative and Left, ideology. Constructed in this way, there no longer are divergent voices within what has been termed a dominant frame of reference. One that supplants and provides motive for the surface organization of a state. Therefore, the mainstream is a weaker, more general, and collective set of prejudices, i.e. an external grammar, used to effectively orient the relations individuals obtain within a state of affairs; their knowledge of that state of affairs; and the possible modes of expression of those individuals as well as their experience of others’ modes of expression. Inevitably, this creates a closed loop of social references in order to manage society through the identification prescribed to the subjects therein.

163 For Jones/Amiri Baraka, it is “White” as reference frame, not blackness, which can be described as and is a void. “White”-ness posited as transcendent judge over the expressions within a state of affairs is, therefore, not of this world and only is so through the incorporation of that which it deems other. From this passage in *Black Magic*, it is clear, outside of Jones’ being identified as absolutely nothing because Black, it is possible to articulate an individual out of “absolutely nothing,” contrary to Frank B. Wilderson’s critique. Articulation from what is considered Not is what Jones intends to do through his work and has done.

164 Wittgenstein, Piero Sraffa, and Russell show how the products of mind expressed can be used in different combinations to create different meanings with the same objects. This goes against the scarcity model of markets and mind. A set containing two elements can be used to create two sets. Those two sets can turn into four, depending on the arrangement of their terms, etc.

165 Punk comes from a literary tradition: poetics, literature, and theater. Its progenitors, as a cultural phenomenon in the U.S., was seen as the Beat poets who were cited by musicians such as John Cooper Clarke, Joe Strummer, Lou Reed, John Sinclair, Jon Cale, Tom Verlaine, Ivan Julian, Richard Hell, etc. as their inspiration. It is through this line of reasoning that I propose LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka as one of the first black punks and a basis to be considered for a punk mode of expression overall. The punk ethos is a very erudite and intellectual tradition, although on the surface it has been mistranslated as adhering to anti-intellectualism. This mistranslation is produced through a dominant reference frame which dictates that punk expression is not of the same or acceptable language of the state of affairs it governs. Though punks may not speak the same language as the academy or popular political discourse, they nonetheless speak eloquently and possess an inner logic within their articulations. The music was then a description of the state of affairs in which it participated, espousing a distinct body of signifying practices. Its texts were written in punk’s own language, one detailing the socio-economic and cultural state of affairs at large. This was an insight form the perspective of a punk subjectivity, not the identity of Punk as a genre of music, which could only express a self within the language that sought to incorporate punk dissidence into the act of its own subordination. Baraka’s literary practice set up the form and scope for ‘zine writing practices: personal, incisive, poetic. Similar to Toni Morrison’s notion that in writing, one is writing one’s self, thus articulating one’s own modality, Baraka’s ‘zines were integral to the mode in which violence to strict overdetermination, the grammar of a state of affairs, can and would be accomplished. The Beats created a network of free association in downtown New York city that would later be adopted by the Punks. (See: Victor Bockris, *Beat punks.*)


167 This lineage would come from a literary base up through “the New Orleans Rhythm Kings, Bix Beiderbecke, Paul Desmond, Dave Brubeck, Stan Getz, Stan Kenton, Chuck Mangione or Elvis Presley, Bill Haley and the Comets, the Beatles, Rolling Stones, Kiss, and John Travolta. A long time before dudes started calling themselves PUNKS!” (Baraka, *The Autobiography of LeRoi Jones*, p. 78)

168 Wittgenstein makes this point clear. “A tune is a kind of tautology, it is complete in itself; it satisfies itself” (See: Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, Proposition 4.3.15)

169 Jesse Prinz’s “Aesthetics of Punk” describes “visual form” “challenged the norms of social etiquette” without proposing a prescribed identity politics to which others should submit. (See: Jesse Prinz, “The Aesthetics of Punk Rock” in *Philosophy Compass*, 9, p. 583–593.)
Underground newspapers printed illegally out of the “Underground Press”: Rat Subterranean News (1968, NYC) and East Village Other (1965, NYC), Chicago Seed (1967) and Cross Roads (1987, Chicago), Distant Drummer (1970, Philadelphia), Black Dwarf (1968, UK), and The Quicksilver Times (1969, Washington D.C.) provided the model of the dissemination of literary bodies and how to evoke a revolutionary counter mood. James Baldwin makes an appearance in the East Village Other in 1970. LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka in East Village Other in 1968. Jones would also appear as an editor of Kulchur review with Frank O’Hara and work alongside Allen Ginsberg and William Burroughs through Kulchur as well as Jones’ Floating Bear publication. (Figure 9)

“Lines to Garcia Lorca” in Yugen no. 1


The debate between blues as an expression of black subjectivity, thus a people, rather than a form which should be secured, protected, and rigorously formulated into a respectable category of Art, was held between LeRoi Jones /Amiri Baraka (the former view entitled a Black Aesthetic) and Ralph Ellison (of the latter view entitled a Blues Aesthetic). (See: Amiri Baraka, “The ‘Blues Aesthetic’ and the ‘Black Aesthetic’: Aesthetics as the Continuing Political History of a Culture,” Black Music Research Journal, and Ralph Ellison, “The Blues,” New York Review of Books, 1964.

Wittgenstein in his Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus states that the only necessary operator within logic is that of Not, which does not negate the object of which it is an operation, but is a function of that object.

Underneath the image of Marcus Garvey is a Public Notice of whom Yugen is going to ship back to the “dark” continent to remind them from what and where they came:


A taunt and trite remark toward the institutionalization and canonization of the avant-garde, co-opted by the very powers they criticized.

Jennifer Jazz Plays, Schomburg, New York Public Library.

Richard Wright, White Man, Listen!

For a history of the Black Arts Movement and Jones, now Amiri Baraka's, intentions, see: Werner Sollors, Amiri Baraka/LeRoi Jones: The Quest for a “Populist Modernism.”

There is a reason that the place that war takes place is called a theater, the battles being the various acts of the play.

Jose Munoz is able to locate Jones/Baraka through his writing and the production of his plays during this period. (See: Muñoz, “Cruising the Toilet: LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka, Radical Black Traditions, and Queer Futurity” in GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies, p. 353-367.)

The appearance of the term ‘BLACK’ is to signify its inflection, which is the assertion of an attitude or belief in the validity of that term. Either it is true that one believes the object of that term is there or it is true that it is not, i.e. the negation of that term is true. E.g. Black as the function B of x is true, or it is true that B is not of x—i.e. the negation of B, not the negation of x— which could or could not be an object of B. x always “survives” to use Jones’ turn of phrase, on the function is negated.

P.F. Strawson, Individuals.

There are many examples of this in Chomsky’s Lectures on Government and Binding. (1981) The Logical Form (LF) and Syntactic Structure level within a given grammar retains transformation and transposition capacities as it pulls from a given lexicon to form thoughts/expressions. LF + S-structure provides the basis to the Deep-structure which forms the generative capacity of expressions. A phonetic articulatory interpretation (Phonetic Form, PF) of that structure is contingent to context as it is dependent on the “language” or vocabulary of the external environment as well as to certain dialects or vernaculars of speech. Therefore, there are a multiplicity of forms to what comes out of the mouth or, for example, through hand gestures
that expresses the same thought. The structural representation of this concept of generative grammar in language, if you recall from our first chapter, is as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Lexicon} & \\
\text{Syntax} & \\
\text{S-Structure} & \\
\text{Logical Form} & \quad \text{Phonetic Form}
\end{align*}
\]

\(\text{S-Structure} + \text{LF} = \text{Deep-structure}\)

PF is contingent to reference frame, i.e. the vocabulary available within context

187 Baraka, Black Music, p. 97.

188 Baraka, Black Music, p. 188.

189 The idea of bodies as “books” or texts and the inscription of texts on bodies has been formalized in works such as Cedric Robinson’s *Black Marxism* and David Harvey. The nation as a book and text as a bureaucratic apparatus is at the heart of modern democracy as conceived by John Stuart Mill’s *Utilitarianism*. Paul Gilroy in *Between Camps* would utilize the work of the poet and scholar Elizabeth Alexander to describe the sonic creation of thought as a “text carried in the flesh” and Eve Sedgwick in *Touching Feeling* would describe the act of being in the world as one of reading and writing one’s self into existence. For Sedgwick, this act is akin to “putting on a skin.” Contrary to popular belief, reading is not private either. Just as Wittgenstein states that there are no private languages, possibly private conversations but even that is up for debate, there can be no private acts of reading as meaning is made and value is taken of that which is read. This implicates those read and those who are reading these “bodies” of text. Reading is concurrent with writing one’s self into existence.

Applications of this concept have been formalized through the work of Kimberlé Crenshaw and Patricia Hill Collins on the intersectionality of Race, Class, and Gender through a legal context; as well as D.A. Bell Jr.’s concept of interest convergence with regard to education and desegregation in schools. Today, it is in such acts like the Russian Gay Propaganda legislation of 2017 which states that people’s very presence is a form of propaganda, wrote by their actions and read by others legitimizing their removal from schools and public office; or in Brazil, where Race can be chosen by an individual, however, the structural effects of the enactment of the system of Race as racism on those bodies fall along similar lines. A distinction can now be formalized between Identity, Subjectivity, and the act of identification.

190 “If p then q” is only retroactively seen as causation. Derivation yields either not-p or q, meaning the relation highlights that p is present in another context; not present in this one, but only represented in this other context as a relation which is the condition for q, present in this context but not represented in that other. We see p’s effects in q emergence although p may or may not be there. Surely the symbols “2+2” and “2×2=4” and “4” are not identical; to understand that two and two are 4 is a relation that is not present within those symbols although one might know to trade one symbol for another. However, that is a rule only know retroactively: to understand is to understand the relation between these symbols. One is a question in one context that is traded as a solution in another, equivalent across contexts but not within them. The formal example is a metaphysical problem, the latter an epistemological problem. Fanon and Wittgenstein agree, even if identified, blackness poses issues to the metaphysics of a state of affairs organization, the translation of its identities into the reference frame in which it’s being is defined. (See: Frantz Fanon, *Black Skin, White Masks* and Saul Kripke, *Wittgenstein On Rules and Private Language: An Elementary Exposition.*)

191 The two individuals whose encounter is illustrated here is through the mechanism of articulation formalized in our first chapter. The encounter between, let us say, a Mainstream World (A) and that of Counter-Culture (B), such that \(\{A \times B\}\) yields an individual C which is the genre of Punk in 1977. Take the following terms: A < W: Mainstream; N: Music industry; R: industrial >; and B < W: punk; N: Counter-Culture; R: DIY >. The cross product of the encounter results in aspects such as N(R), the overdetermination of the relation individuals obtain in that state of affairs by the naming function of another. For example, the Music industry overdetermines DIY praxis such that recording practices are moved from live venues into studies, Lo-fi recording to Hi-fi. For an illustration of the other cross-products see Appendix I, II, and Chapter 1.

192 David Lewis in *Counterfactuals* illustrates this point. For Lewis, possible worlds, here treated as a state of affairs generated within another, are just as real as this world. The only concept of reality plausible, outside of making it a material thing in the world up for debate, is such that states of affairs have consequences to how we envision the arrangements of the facts of the world. These states, with their own frames of reference, within a “dominant” state, are not the same sort of thing within the system of categorization or value as that which composed the original. They differ in content but, not necessarily
in kind. Lewis also states that these rearticulated state arrangements cannot be reduced to something more basic or into the language representative of the state of affairs in which the encounter from which they were produced occurred; they are irreducible entities and, thus, undefinable within the previous frame of reference’s vocabulary. Finally, a universal claim that this frame of reference within a state of affairs is “indexical,” one merely states that this is their reference frame and nothing more. One frame cannot be held over others across contexts without internal contradictions, therefore, “actuality” merely asserts the reference frame one occupies, i.e. a limited point of view.

For a further detailed musicology of this connection, see Evan Rapport’s “Hearing Punk as Blues.”

Laing, One Chord Wonders: Power and Meaning in Punk Rock.

Formally, this can be represented in our mechanism of articulation—see Chapter One—by forming these two individuals: A such that its state of affairs is < (W)orld: UK, (N)ame: Punk/McLaren, (R)elation: Market >; and individual B such that: < W: U.S., N: Negro/Black, R: blues/punk ethos >. The encounter of these two yield the description above such that, e.g. N(R): Punk/McLaren of A overdetermines the blues/punk ethos of B.


Noam Chomsky, Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures.

Much of this is in the work of Wittgenstein’s Tractatus and Philosophical Investigations. “I destroy, I destroy, . . . ,” as illustrated in our introduction musically, can be explained linguistically through a metaphor of garden path sentences and many illustrations by Chomsky such as his famous, “Colorless green ideas sleep furiously,” example.

Rearticulation will be handled in further detail in the final chapter. For now, the articulation model we have thus far shall suffice to show the incorporation of the product of one encounter within one state of affairs or context for use within another. If we take the state of affairs to be the U.S., we then draw two individuals such that: A is < (W)orld: U.S., (N)ame: UK PUNK, (R)elation: Counter-Culture >; and B is < W: U.S., N: Rock, R: Mainstream >. From this encounter we show how both UK PUNK and Rock are tied into a U.S. reference frame such that the U.S. overdetermination of Rock, which incorporates blackness’ mode of expression and thus subjectivity, is tied with a UK PUNK overdetermination of the U.S. Historically, this is the cultural phenomenon called the British Invasion of the 1960s-70s. What is more, this is enforced with N(R), UK PUNK overdetermining a U.S. mainstream; and R(N), a commodified Counter-Culture from Malcolm McLaren overdetermining Rock. Finally, with W(R) and R(W), we have Counter-Culture becoming Mainstream in the U.S. in accordance with Justice Powell Jr.’s recommendation in his memorandum of 1971 so to control and put to use Counter-Cultural expression for the production of value to substantiate that U.S. social-cultural and political reference frame.


Wright, White Man, Listen!

Wittgenstein’s N-operator from the Tractatus.

In accordance with Fregean logic, an ancestral relation can be shown as the inner logic to the idea of a cultural endowment that is expanded in our concluding chapter on Rearticulation through the concept of pied-piping. It also provides the logic of the branch-relation within cultural endowments that Zora Neale Hurston coins in Their Eyes Were Watching God.

Ancestry can be conceived as a precedence relation such that a group of individuals x and y forming a set of conditions S such that S(x,y) precedes or are the “ancestors” of an individual z. This is so, if and only if there is something, namely n, which falls under the concept of cultural endowment which we will term C. This object is required so as to understand that there is such a thing as precedence in relation to others within C. Precedence, such that P(S(x,y), z), states S and its particular arrangement of constituents comes before z. In stating the arguments for P, S and z fall under the endowment of C for they are objects other than n which concern our concept expressed via the “function” of the operation of precedence. In other words, our precedence function P operates over the function of the objects S and z, and expresses the concept of cultural endowment for it states that S relation to z is that it (P)recedes z.

We can state this another way. There is a set of conditions expressed by the arrangement or state of affairs x and y, known or named S, such that S is the function which expresses or indicates the set of conditions obtaining x and y. This is represented S(x,y) which merely asserts the existence of a (S)ate of affairs. S precedes z if and only if there is a concept of a (C)ultural Endowment and another object n related to or expressing that concept. Formalized in this way, we show that:

i) n falls under C or C(n)—a concept can be expressed by any one object, thus we need only know at least one object, even if that object is nothing, that falls it in order for it to obtain significance within our form of life;
ii) $z$ is the one product of the conditions within the concept of $C$; and

iii) $S$ is the set of conditions other than $n$ falling under $C$.

Formally, this can be represented:

$$(\forall y)(z \in y) \& (\forall x)(\forall y)(\text{Precedes}(x,y) \rightarrow x \in z)$$

whose operation expresses the concept of Cultural Endowment.

For all intents and purposes, within an overall world constructed by various sets of conditions $U$, $S(x,y)$—from now on $S$—is the set description which ultimately is an objective expression of the concept of a cultural endowment. Put into relation with another object ($n$), their conjunction expresses the two constituents of that concept such that $C(S, n \ldots)$. In a world thus constructed, a division emerges such that $S$ becomes a subset of conditions that represents the inverse of another subset of $U$ which includes $z$. Therefore, $S$ becomes an object of a function $P$ whose solution is $z$ such that $S$ precedes $z$ or $P(S,z)$.

'z' can be understood as an object of the function of Null as we only "know" $S$ and as yet have been acquainted with $z$ as an object which cannot be known until it becomes related in some such way that expresses a lineage or movement from $S$ to $z$ that can be described or named. The Null function reduces to just $z$ in the surface level expression of the state of affairs as Null is non-determinate, thus no one thing. The reduction is possible as the consequent of antecedent conditions does not yet have to obtain a predicated function or name, especially if it was newly introduced to our state of affairs. We as of yet have only experienced the object itself. Names in this way can also be considered objects with no function, therefore, Null.

With the Null in hand, the concept of causality dictates that it is not necessary to know the exact one to one correlation between an object considered the cause and the emergence of $z$; for any one object out of a set of conditions could have accomplished this task. It is sufficient to understand the conditions in order to infer a relation between a priori set of conditions and the objects it produced. This notion is useful in combatting the idea that Black folk in the U.S. have no culture because they are no longer tied to their “African” roots. Blackness can still express a self without a singular “cause” or tie to an object within its antecedent conditions. As blackness is blackness and not another thing, the subjective continuity of blackness can be described without recourse to external means. This fully describes Hurston's assertion of blackness being branches without roots and the queer ends this relation produces. The function of the operation of precedence expresses a cultural endowment such that $S$ becomes a member of that concept once it is put into an ancestral relation with $z$. The function $P(S,z)$ representing an operation over the function $S$ and $z$ expresses the concept $C$ and $z$'s relation to its antecedent conditions. All in all, this process can be reduced into a two-place relation such that $C$ is a function whose argument is $S$ representative of a particular arrangement $x$ and $y$ which are the conditions from which and whose solution or the next link in the endowment is $z$ (blackness) which is an entity in itself. The formula derived is $C(P(S,z))$ in accordance with our technical use of the term expression. We could also say that the precedence relation overdetermines $z$ via $S$ which expresses the concept of Cultural Endowment.

With regard to the relation between Hurston-Baraka and Bikceem, we show this “ancestral” relation as Bikceem's membership in the cultural endowment of Hurston-Baraka in the following manner:

i) Blackness falls under the concept of a Cultural endowment;

ii) Bikceem is a part of that Cultural endowment;

and iii) Hurston-Baraka are a part of that Cultural endowment other than Bikceem.

205 NYU, Fales Archive Box 5, Folder 21

206 Noam Chomsky’s reinterpretation of Aristotle’s definition of language in What Kind of Creatures Are We?

Recall our structural formulation of the process of articulation from chapter one. The articulation mechanism was derived from a concept of language as a system of creating thought, a recursive operation that ran through the following structure: [Lexicon [Syntax [S-Structure [Logical Form (LF) and/or Phonetic Form (PF)]]]]. LF and PF are two branches off of the trunk of this tree structure, of the same “level”, yet not causally dependent on each other. The combination of a LF + S-Structure expresses a deep structure to expressions which is where our articulation mechanism lies. Regardless of context, the subject can form different expressions or enlist the same expression with different functions contingent to context, but which obtain the same object or thought. In this way, subject continuity is maintained and semantic interpretation is possible. PF’s or the surface representation of those thoughts are dependent upon the context and that contexts vocabulary, the finite set of elements available to form expressions. An expression’s deep structure need not always or necessarily have a superficial representation mapped onto it. Thus, even silence or that which cannot be said, can be thought—or can retain an inner logic and structure. A PF may not be available because either the materials present to externalize the thought may be inappropriate to the thought or context; there is no representation available that can express the inner logic and structure of the thought; or that structure remains inarticulate yet retains its inner logic and the syntactical means of construction.

The benefit of this construct is that we can account for a subject that persists across contexts and that is the means of generating a reference frame at all. With this in tow, we discover that surface representation is not necessary to the subject’s existence, but because that subjectices appearance/identity is context contingent, its meaning dependent upon context, we have multiple interpretations as well as modes of generation available for the same subject/thought. Subjects are always present even if they do not appear in the articulated or externalized appearance of a state of affairs, or at all even. There is no way to discount the subject’s capacity to create a self or discount the logic and structure to what they articulate. This is
important to a study of blackness, governmentality, and overdetermination through identification. It is through this linguistic apparatus to how subjects create thoughts that we show that there is always the possibility of that subject to operate outside of how it is identified and despite overdetermination.

208 The Sum Stratification of the Cultural State of Affairs:

Below, the relation each level has to each other, representing the structure of our state of affairs, is formalized. Taking the following:

(D)ominant
(M)ainstream
(P)opular

and by our concept of stacking for sonic syntax from chapter one, the articulatory mechanism works for the social as well. We can then form the following structures illustrating the relationship between each level and in so doing which structures are valid or invalid, although all are logically consistent:

i) D 
   ↓
   M
   P

is invalid as the Dominant level or frame of reference—considered within the context of this study the frame of White supremacy—is empty. It is a function without objects and, therefore, cannot stand on its own. Thus, it is revealed as an imposition.

ii) D 
    M 
    ↓
    P

is valid, as a Dominant frame of reference is imposed directly onto the popular level. However, there are other frames of reference indicative of forms of life that lie outside of the Dominant, but still a part of our state of affairs. Here, this is the Mainstream. Finally,

iii) D 
    M 
    ↓
    P

is valid, because the Dominant frame is able to acquire objects or individuals so to express a particular social organization. It acquires individuals from the popular who assimilate into the functions of the Dominant and in so doing further the status quo indirectly through the operation of the Mainstream. However, what is revealed is that the Popular, although represented indirectly through the Mainstream, exists in excess of the dominant.

209 Formally stated, a state of affairs is constructed such that a state S,

\[ \text{State of Affairs: Context} + \text{Reference Frame} = \text{Point of View} \]

\[ \text{indicates} \]

As individuals are both a part of and apart from states of affairs, the forms of life held within a state retain the capacity to change that state of affairs; the arrangement or various groups of individuals and their function presents the capacity to express the concept of that state. It follows that forms of life (F) are greater than or equal to the reference frames (R) in a state. From this we can calculate the permutations, the possible "roles" or functions within a state by \( P(F, R) \). We can also calculate the possible state of affairs that can be expressed or that are available for rearticulation as various individuals and their forms of life encounter each other. Each individual brings with it their own context indicative of a previous state of affairs (S). These possible combinations can be expressed via the formula, \( C(F, S) \). From this we show that if we have two individuals, and one frame of reference, that there are two possible functions obtained by individuals indicative of two forms of life within that one state of affairs. However, if we have two individuals of different states of affairs, whose encounter is now bound within one state, the possible rearticulations of that state are two. Thus, there cannot be one absolute state and frame of reference over all others.

210 D: R(M or G or C. . . ) → D(M=R • G=R• C=R. . . , R)

A Dominant structure (D) such that a Role (R) overdetermines the function of another. Those functions, then, are made identical, interchangeable, with specific roles within the structure and reference frame within that state of affairs.

211 The arrival of the “Third World,” in actuality is a mistaken interpretation of the non-aligned movement in those countries. This movement attempted to not “align” itself with the U.S./U.K or Russia during the Cold War, shortly after a landslide of
countries newly achieved independence. The hope was to articulate a new form of government outside of soviet style communism or neoliberal capitalism. (See: Vijay Prashad, The Darker Nations.)

Incarceration of Blacks creates a slave economy due to a caveat in the 13th Amendment that denied rights to those who have committed a crime. After slaves were freed, the Black Codes started a trend that incarcerated Blacks at a higher rate so southern states could rebuild their economy. Blacks were institutionalized and placed in penal labor for crimes such as vagrancy which was easy to capture as blacks were freed but not given places to stay. 2015, 1.3 billion U.S. dollar industry not including capital gains from investment. Labor force in prison is approximately 2.5 million people. (See: Michelle Alexander, The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness.)

Thomas Jefferson and James Madison advocated for these measures and the implementation of the Alien and Sedition Acts. The issue was pressed to the foreground during the War of 1812. This notion was also found in Ronald Reagan’s presidential elections, effectively changing the political party make-up of the U.S. Blacks initially supported Republicans because they freed slaves, but after voter redistricting, Republicans supported Reagan and Blacks become Democrats.

Randy Martin, Knowledge Ltd: Toward a Social Logic of the Derivative.

This strategy would also be found in the aptly named “Southern Strategy” of the 1980s. Reagan staff member Lee Atwater was quoted stating that the party needed to target Blacks because of their participation in the Counter-Culture of the previous era.

Alexander Lamis, The Two Party South.

Section 4b and 5 of Voting Rights Act were voted down in 2013, Shelby v. Holder. States and municipalities that have a history of discrimination towards Black voters no longer have to appeal to the Federal government if and when they change laws. Redistricting of counties ensued which in turn diluted the Black vote in those areas, diverting Black participation and representation in politics.

This process has been recently described and incentivized by Alan Greenspan in his The Federal Reserve’s Semiannual Monetary Policy Report before the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, to the U.S. Senate on February 26, 1997. Greenspan argued for an assurance of domestic control through the encouragement of increased job insecurity to change popular concern towards consumption, rather than encouraging participation in the social political matrix that sets their affairs within this value system.

This notion dovetails with the positivist analysis made by Karl Marx in Capital, Volume I, Chapter 3. Money is the name of the labor objectified in a commodity. From our analysis of names, names are epistemologically necessary. Socially necessary labor time is what conduces or induces the naming of objectified labor within a commodity. However, price as name is ontologically contingent, the same commodity may have different price names. From this it is easy to conceive why money would be considered a form of speech. Money is the language, prices become the meaning bearing elements utilized to form the phrases which go on to express the values of that society’s political economy.

The epitome of this practice came in 2013, with the voting down of Sections 4b and 5 of the Voting Rights Act—a hallmark of civil rights legislation—in Shelby County v. Holder. Sections 4 and 5 of the act mandated checks on changes to voting laws in historically racially segregationist parts of the U.S. Devaluing the black vote through redistricting or reorganizing municipalities to dilute Black solidarity in voting for proper representation quickly followed.

This is known as binding theory in the fields of linguistics and science.


Theodore Adorno and Stuart Hall link fascism to Youth control, as well as racialization tendencies between Germany and Italy with U.S. and U.K. Here, the presumption is that forms of fascism stem from a conflation of Race and nationalism.

The connection between the census and being overdetermined occurs both external to blackness and from within. Jesse Jackson attempted to name Blacks, “African-American,” at the Democratic National Convention in Chicago during a 1988 speech. The intention was to give Blacks a cultural significance within the U.S. His pronouncement was inevitably based on a concept of ethnicity or “cultural endowment,” however, he mistakes this endowment with a sanctioned national belonging. The overarching assumption by Jackson was that there was no culture there to begin with. He utilized the technique of hyphenating Identity to ameliorate the issue. “African” became a function of American to import a cultural endowment from one context for use in another. However, this technique leads to ambiguities as both Blacks, who have been in the U.S. for centuries, are lumped together with newly arrived “Africans” regardless of ethnicity. By the year 2000, this term had been coopted by the census. This act overdetermines blackness with the assumption that there was no cultural endowment there in the first place or, at least, that what was there was not legible to mainstream dominant culture in the U.S. determined White.

For a formal proof of this articulation, please refer to Appendix I and II.
Black is Not.

“Ontology—once it is finally admitted as leaving existence by the wayside—does not permit us to understand the being of the black…” (Frantz Fanon, “The Fact of Blackness,” in Black Skin, White Masks.)


Dave Marsh, Louie Louie, p. 21.

Wayne Kramer from the band MC5 in 2012 talking about the blues.


Figure 6. Poster of MC5 and Baraka at Brooklyn Academy of Music

Stuart Hall and Jefferson, Resistant Through Rituals: Youth Subcultures in Post-War Britain.


Etymologically, folk comes from the German volk or wolk which stands for ground.

Jones/Baraka, Blues People: Negro Music in White America.


Paul Gilroy, “Between the Blues and Blues Dance,” in The Auditory Culture Reader, p. 325.

Kant, Critique of Judgement.

Paul Gilroy, “Between the Blues and Blues Dance,” p. 327.

Wittgenstein makes the connection that through the etymological notion of “Aesth,” ethics and aesthetics are one. (See: Wittgenstein, Notebooks: 1914-1916, p. 77.)

Our formalized kernel derived from James Weldon Johnson occurs here, as well as in “Louie Louie.” If we look at the Richard Berry’s notation for the Kingsmen’s 1963 version:

![Notation](image1)

The tone emphasized on the first note, carries over the null to the next, which is again emphasized once the recursive operation of forming the sonic thought begins once more.

We see the same structure in the treble clef of the “Dallas Blues” notation by Hart Wand:

![Notation](image2)

In the bass clef, the “deep structure,” of the “St. Louis Blues,” illustrates the generative capacity and nondeterminancy within the Null. As the first tone carries over to the next in the base clef, a variety of tones appear in the “upper level” of the treble clef:
Revealing this core to the deep structure of these songs, we find that regardless of what the song or expression “sounds” like or how it superficially appears, there is a syntactic structure and lexicon from which we derive evidence of a faculty indicative of a cultural endowment. This faculty puts these once separate, finitely many, objects together to express multiple expressions of the same subject. Infinite use of a finite vocabulary is put to use to express different things, in different ways. This core, according to Johnson, provides the kernel for Black musical forms found in the Southern U.S., South America, the Caribbean and around the Atlantic Rim. The blues core to Berry’s interpretation of “El Loco Cha Cha” by Ricky Rillera and the Rhythm Rockers can be ascertained from the tradition Berry was a part of, including the recording practices and talents at Modern Records with whom he was involved during the 1950s. This included among its roster blues artist Lightnin’ Hopkins, John Lee Hooker and many others.

(For more on the influences and history of the song Louie Louie, see: Dave Marsh, Louie Louie: The History and Mythology of the World’s Most Famous Rock ‘n’ Roll Song, p. 14.)

244 See: David Laing, One Chord Wonders: Power and Meaning in Punk Rock, p. 79.

245 For example: in the key of A, we formalize a core phrase of this kernel by taking five chords such that:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{A} & \text{B} & \text{C} & \text{D} \\
\text{T} & \text{P} & \text{D} \\
\end{array}
\]

which represents our base from which a blues progression would take shape. That progression in our system is represented:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c|c|}
\text{<A>} & \text{<D>} & \text{<E>} \\
1 & \varnothing & 11 & 1 \\
T & P & D \\
\end{array}
\]

This structure, sounded out over a three line twelve bar cycle, indicates a tonal spacing between chords that illustrates our concept of the Null (\(\varnothing\)). Null is the space between A and D. We illustrated how the tonal deep structure onto which these chords are mapped represented the surface structure to the articulated sound in accordance with our study in chapter one, section two. Tonal analysis reveals that D is doubled during the production of this “blues sound” at the same time it encounters E. This doubling results from the Null being the predominant chord. Null is no one note and, yet, is a part of the sound expressed. The concept of progression is implicitly defined as it is derived from the structure between chords, indicating their qualities, and not a predetermined notation or measure of aural effect. The first chord carries over through the predominant or Null, leading into the dominant tone in such a way that expresses our blues core and the sonic structure from chapter one. The structure produced is such that:

\[\{1 \varnothing 1 1 1\} \text{ or } \{1 \varnothing ([1 1] 1)\}\]

where \([1 1]\) is IV, in our example is D. The structure of the progression articulated from this scale provides the opportunity for syncopation. Contemporary theorist Oswald Jonas states that this form of progression “unequivocally defines the point of origin and the total system, the key,” according to 20th-century music theorist Heinrich Schenker's hypothesis of music. It is from Schenker that we derive our analysis above and of whom Jonas was a student. This structure aligns with ours in the following way. Schenkerian analysis formalizes this progression as T-P-D where T is tone, P is predominant, and D is dominant and is structured such that the relation between P and D forms the opportunity for syncopation at the heart of blues and punk in alignment with our blues core. This structure, embedded in punk and many other musical forms, points back to its blues roots. (See: Oswald Jonas, Introduction to the Theory of Heinrich Schenker: The Nature of the Musical Work of Art, p. 23.)

246 Evan Rapport, “Hearing Punk as Blues”, p. 47.

247 Derrida cites Nietzsche as linking breathe and being to musicality. (See: Jacques Derrida, Writing and Difference.)


250 Chomsky and Linguistics: where NP is a Noun Phrase and VP a Verb Phrase, (NP + ( VP = V+ (NP) ) )

251 “. . . purity is etymologically linked to shit. ” (See: Tavia Nyongo, The Amalgamation Waltz, p. 15.)

252 For Wittgensten: P and not-not-P are not equal. \(\neg \neg P\) refers back to the world, the set of conditions in which it is possible to infer \(\neg P\), and \(\neg \neg P\). For the symbol P is P and same for \(\neg \neg P\). If expressed, their meaning is found in the functions that form how we are to use them in describing the world, not in the mere application of the symbol for negation, \(\neg \).

Negation affirms existence in some sense, just not in this sense. (See: Wittgenstein, Philosophical Grammar.)
Just as well, for Alain Badiou, ‘not-not-‘ as a logical operation is not a turn back to an identified individual, but to a set of conditions, a world. (See: Alain Badiou, Logic of Worlds: Being and Event.)

253 This is a notion that stems for John Locke and brought forward by Noam Chomsky with regard to its connection to language.

254 Old as Hume’s eighteenth century paradox and written into the constitution by James Madison to quell problems with democracy: any increase in popular participation in democratic processes inversely effects the governing power of the Governors expressed through the ownership over the means of producing government and the production of value.

255 Aristotle, Politics.

256 Gilroy, Between the Blues and Blues Dance, p. 326.

257 Paul Gilroy, Between the Blues and Blues Dance, p. 332.

258 The general principles of computation as represented in a generative view of linguistics states that there are design features of language that give up communicative efficiency. Communication, or rather externalization, is forgone so that the language faculty is freed up as a system for creating thought. This is accomplished through the following needs: reflexiveness (the ability to use language to talk about “Language”); discreteness (the ability to use both separate expressions as well as their constituents); arbitrariness (to be able to use these objects in different ways and to different purposes); duality and meaning not innate (the ability for different objects to mean different things); cultural transmission; and eleven others.

Charles Hockett in 1960 came up with these design features which characterize human languages and added more in 1982. His conclusions, which entail communicative primacy, ultimately lead to internal contradictions. His most noted debates on the generative capacity of grammar were against Noam Chomsky. However, the argument came to a fuller close when taken up by Jerry Fodor, who restated the conclusions of the design features of language as indicative of a system of creating thought. (See: Jerry Fodor, The Language of Thought, Harvard University Press: 1975. and Charles Hockett, “The Origin of Speech” in Scientific American, 1960, rev. 1982.)

259 W. V. O. Quine, “Two Dogmas of Empiricism.”

260 Paul Gilroy, Between the Blues and Blues Dance, p. 324.

261 Paul Gilroy, Between the Blues and Blues Dance, p. 329.

262 Classical definitions for physical were destroyed after Newton’s failure to define it as a trait that could stand on its own. As no such mechanical physicality to the universe exists, save for how we define it per Newton, save for within a frame of reference which gives the term meaning. The physical becomes a theory that can be proven, but is not a thing in the world. We only grasp its concept by showing how the word “physical” is to be used within the theory constructed.

263 This is our “two peaked” structure from chapter one. The inner logic and syntactic structure remains the same despite a difference in the surfacing or externalized expressions they produce. We grasp them by their functions, indicative of the form of life that produced this structure. For example, regardless of what the appearance of a sentence S, a feature [+]

survives in the deep structure those various forms:

\[
S[+] \\
/ \ \\
NP S[+] \\
/ \ \\
V NP[+]^NP[+]^=ADJ
\]

So, for any object of a given “phrase” XP, here the VP of S:

\[
XP \\
/ \ \\
X[+] YP[+]^NP=ADJ
\]

With the phrase “John hit Sam” it is understood in the sentence (S) that we question ‘John,’ a word which does not appear in S. We see this when we illustrate the structure of “Wh- did Sam cry [ADJ= John hit <who?>]”. The subjective continuity of John survives even though invisible to the surface organization of the externalized phrase “Why did Sam cry?”

Our discussions of VSO or verb first structures above, relating our analysis to that of the Gerund, draws the above tree in the following manner:
noun is only known by what it is doing

The doings of multiple beings come to repeat.

affairs.

possibility to do violence to the grammar of social policy meant to organize the surface organization within a U.S. state of ev

leaving 5.5 million present but not represented viz.

million to 25.2 million unaccounted for; which in actuality could comprise the suspected minority population in total,

measures that of the sample projected, extended, to the suspected, nondeterminate, total population. There is
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1
verbs begin to stack and to make sense of expressions on the surface, repeats are deleted which is akin to paraphrasing the ontological commitment to the how these phrases were constructed. Labels are no longer used in modern linguistic practices as, contingent on use, a word can be seen as a noun or verb. We call these linguistic artifacts or descriptions that are only functions of these individuals and do not alter the individuals themselves. Linguistics now states that what is paraphrased out on the surface remains “buried in the prose” and for purposes of communication, to know “what” one is talking about, the VP’s and their core NPs, must be understood to be present though not represented.

272 W.T. Llahmon, Deliberate Speed, p. 94.

273 This act regulated radio transmissions in the U.S. and gave government the right to terminate stations in times of war. The legislation effectively shut down two-way use of public radio. The U.S. has technically been in war or conflict ever since: involvement in other countries due to NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) and by the Anglo-American Loan’s bankruptcy of colonial powers. In 1934, a Federal Communication Commission begins to regulate licenses for individual broadcasts.

274 James Hunter, Culture Wars: The Struggle to Define America.

275 Jones/Baraka, Blues People, p. 63.

276 Jones/Baraka, Blues People, p. 24.


278 Jones/Baraka, Blues People, p. 69.

279 Jones/Baraka, Blues People, p. 86-87.

280 Paul Gilroy, “Between the Blues and Blues Dance,” p. 324.

281 W.V.O. Quine on ontological commitment and language. (See: Quine, Word and Object.)

282 Wittgenstein, Philosophical Grammar.

283 29.1.15 and 7.2.15 from Wittgenstein’s Notebooks. (See: Wittgenstein, Notebooks: 1914-1916.)


286 Amiri Baraka, Black Music.

287 This notion is also discussed by Caron Atlas as a Naturally Occurring Cultural District. (See: Randy Martin, The Routledge Companion to Art and Politics.)

288 Alain Badiou, Logic of Worlds: Being and Event.

289 Notion of general computation developed by mathematicians Alan Turing after George Boole.

290 David Laing, One Chord Wonders: Power and Meaning in Punk Rock, p. 79.

291 Self-published by The Fire!! Press, the first image depicts the journal’s manifesto. A statement of “self,” the letter presents a clear ethics/aesthetics or “ethos,” as well as stipulates whose subjectivity and the people the work represents. At the bottom of the letter, Hurston states that this collection represents a “spiritual endowment” outside of “capitalist” incentives. Fire!! was to illuminate the cultural endowment of blackness, the ethnicity of the spirit inherent to the ethos it revealed.

The second image is the cover to this first and only issue. Poorly received at its 1926 release, the ‘zine was thought to be vulgar, undignified, and stereotypical due to its use of Black idiom, references to homosexuality and prostitution, and its general disregard for the mainstream respectable Negro politics of the time.

Manuscripts, Archives and Rare Books Division, Schomburg Center for Research in Black Culture, New York Public Library.
Lenny Kaye’s liner notes to this album would make clear a cultural endowment and subjective continuity, linking “... those roots (blues, early rock)” which “… opening the once-rigid boundaries of individual musics – folk, jazz …” provided a “model” for Youth’s articulation of “punk-rock.”

Building a movement from “absolutely nothing” out of NOWHERE.


Blackness will be analyzed as a mode of articulation out of a set of historical conditions around the Atlantic and the cultural and economic exchanges around the Pacific rims. This is both before and after slavery and/or colonization, which then gave rise to a notion of subjectivity at the onset of Modernity. This occasion makes the black subject the horizon of possibility for Modernity. Circulation around this rim and blackness as a cultural coalition of modes of expression, exhausts Racial and national overdetermination. (See: Paul Gilroy, The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness; Ivan Van Sertima, They Came Before Columbus and African Presence in Early Asia.)

“There is a type-persona for whom a movement fights and there is corresponding loss that a movement seeks to regain for this type-persona. A movement cannot be built, let alone sustained on behalf of ‘nothing, absolutely nothing’ – a nonentity. What would the politics of a dead relation, a slave, look like?” (See: Wilderson, III, Biko Lives!: Contesting the Legacies of Steve Biko.)

The Wittgensteinian paradigm in viewing language as a form of life allows for a reorientation to analyzing modes of expression that is away from “controlling the expression.” The much sought after control over what expressions ought to mean amounts to not more than an “assertion” at best. Wittgenstein rightly shows that, outside an Identitarian dogma, the analysis of the use of language as an imposition to identify and define/describe the states of affairs amounts to setting the vocabulary of the state so that an expression of opposition cannot be formed. In the event that dissent is expressed, that proposition would “harmonize” with the grammar to that state of affairs so as to substantiate that frame of reference’s systems of value. Descriptionism, because it rests on a superficial reading of states of affairs, forgoes a structural analysis, and disallows the capacity to question institutional systems of value to make sure they are legitimately beneficial. And if not, to change them. (See: Wittgenstein, Tractatus, propositions 6 and 7.)

Accepting the Afro-Pessimist’s premise, this illustration will provide a reading closer to what Fanon meant in stating that the Black man is Not. The “Black man” is outside of a White reference frame; it cannot be accounted for within a White epistemology which supplants its ontology with a system of categorization. Blackness is the known unknown to “White”-ness, which requires blackness to substantiate its reference frame; otherwise, Black identification is Not—and neither is the White Man.

For Wittgenstein, there is no internal “meaning” to an expression, only that expression’s function obtained in a form of life. For him, meaning can only be known by ostention. To consider how an individual comes to form these expressions from a public set of elements/objects, we must consider syntax as the ground for semantics. An object separate and other to what is expressed, what is “mean” by another thing, is irrelevant to the shared public use or function of a term. (See: Wittgenstein, Philosophical Investigations.)

For Wittgenstein’s Philosophical Investigations, language, as a creative capacity, is a public tool for the expression of private life.


See: Appendix for formal proof of the encounter.

The statement “‘American’=White” and the grave error it commits should be an uncontroversial, although problematic, assertion at this point. The U.S. constitutional compromise of 1787 stated: 1= man and 3/5 of a man=slave=Black. This mechanism was constructed to make a distinction between citizenship—membership within the class labeled American—as opposed to property. Only Whites could own property, but for Blacks, in addition to their tax burden, they would pay, by virtue of labor (slavery) or when freed (crop or income), two-fifths more in order for Whites to remain a more economically abundant class. Three-fifths of a man stipulated one’s subordination. As membership was only for men, without naming one’s self White but by stipulating that man=1 and < 1 meant subordinate, Black’s were not considered “American.” The result left those who nominated themselves White, as the power to name can only be constitutionally had by “whole” men, with the ability to make White and American identical once Black’s were freed. They were able to do so because they authored the system. The remaining two-fifths became a mechanism to secure White’s dominant position within the state of affairs constituted. Blacks outnumbered Whites in the southern states of South Carolina and Mississippi due to slavery; although we can suspect that not all slaves were counted, for political reason, in that 1860 Census. Authored as such, the U.S. Constitution stated that for every two White individual’s, a proportion of three was exempt from paying taxes to the state because five Black, through labor of various sorts, made up the difference. Thus, Black individuals paid two-fifths more for each White individual. Hence today, we see the redistricting of domains of political speech by virtue of the vote being tied to land and property as a premium for membership within the union. This became the case when sections 4b and 5 of the 1965 Voting Rights Act were struck down in Shelby County v. Holder in 2013. A concept directly tied to a history of the
right to speech, regardless of form, and money being considered speech (Buckley v. Valeo). This mechanism was constructed to subsidize losses to White domination with the succession of rights to the subordinate. Especially, this was so due to increases in the Black population resulting in a waning potency in the White vote. This mechanism also provided cover for divesting from communities which are in actuality more numerous than those who benefit from minority rule. The aggregate of people of color and other markers of difference outnumbers Whites, caste in the likeness of Man alone, even in the U.S. Although, when considered and broken up into a racial order, the blackness’ population can be made to appear numerically less with each subset is targeted as such. In sum, the economic structure and the benefits derived from this racialized society could be maintained, even if gains were given to subordinate populations. The poor were to pay two fifths more so that the rich would pay less to construct the U.S. so to maintain the historical racial order. Payment for the construction of that state did does not necessarily entail membership within the union constituted. Tax burden shifted from the historical owners of capital, one cannot talk about this system without considering Race. Even if different terms are used, it is their function within the U.S. state which indicates their meaning. The system was/is based on a racial distinction as the source for constructing that national frame of reference.

Dispossessed of an additional two-fifths that was then incorporated into an enclosed whole, the system is structurally maintained although superficially different today. Race becomes the marker for access to wealth, even if some from one side of the color line are allowed to cross so as to maintain the imposed harmony of the status quo. However, as we have and will make plain, identity by virtue of quantification into a nondeterminate domain (Quine) leads to ambiguity in reference. Blackness was considered nondeterminate as only three-fifths were defined within the U.S. reference frame. The remaining two-fifths were only considered with concerns to the possibility of its producing something of benefit to the status quo. There were/are individuals that do not obtain the distinctions imposed by virtue of their negation from membership to the category American. As such, universal determination, also considered overdetermination by the imposition of some label to be indicative of one’s role, is not necessary to that nondeterminate domain of individuals. Universal stipulations come from some one/thing external to blackness’ form of life. Considered structurally, and as a matter of its method of construction, its syntax, the system is most likely contradictory. That which is defined as subordinate can be proven otherwise when the context changes or when what is nondeterminate is called upon to substantiate a prior claim. Substantiation forces the dominant to name themselves such as by the terms of the same lexicon with which that system was constructed. In turn, they make themselves subordinate to the system they have created.

One sees through Jim Crow legislation and more recently through redistricting constitutional speech qua vote, that what appears superficially to be about “equality” fixes that definition towards the maintenance of the status quo. This status quo is based on the same asymmetry as before, one expressed via access and the ability to transpose individuals into positions of dominance and subordinate within that system of value(s). Incorporation through dispossession reveals that the two-fifths incorporated into White dominance is nondeterminate to that system of value; and, thus, may be in contradiction to its assertion. This possibility proves dangerous to systems of strict identity as in each iteration of that identity, the probability that the system produces its own demise increases. As internal contradictions to the system abound, the subsequent construction of a mechanism to explain away these faults under the banner of equality does not fix the system, but places it and the term “equality” in a more precarious light. If there are contradictions in the system, the system should have been discarded a long time ago. The subordinate is shown as having the capacity to question these distinctions. The dominant has been shown to be made subordinate to the terms of their own system. To maintain conditions as they were before, legislation was created so that these “laws” became a prohibitive gate to secure the benefits derived from that system. This has repeatedly shown itself unsustainable. Its enactment produces the contradictions needed to overthrow its imposition with each articulation of the status quo. Therefore, blackness cannot be absolutely nothing, for it has been defined as some thing; however, this determination cannot be universal as by virtue of that definition, blackness cannot be accounted for in total. Afro-pessimism—blackness as absolute nothing, a void—must be incorrect.

Formally, the attempt to rearticulate blackness from within itself can be understood through the concept of a logical tautology. A tautology is defined as being true by necessity. For example, saying the same thing twice in an attempt to define it. The proposition “x=x” is a tautology. From this, blackness’ attempt to articulate itself is its citing itself to express a self by the same term in different ways. Thus, blackness, as a tautology, becomes the irreducible object of its own propositions, the subject of its own functions indicative of a way of being in the world. Without this concept, identity considered a predicate of the subject would be empty, akin to sentence with no subject, a function without object. Wittgenstein’s idea of tautology as expressed in his Tractatus Logico Philosophicus and Philosophical Grammar shows the importance of this concept as the ability to express that which is outside of a particular frame of reference. In sum, to express out of that which is Not. Blackness within a U.S. state of affairs is defined as outside of that frame of reference save for its label, “Black” or “African”-American. It is also defined from within through an Afro-Pessimist lens that states that blackness is a cultural death or Not of that reference frame. Blackness does not fit into the epistemology of a White frame of reference, according to Fanon, although that frame of reference requires “Black” individuals for its existence. This is a problem for Ontology as structured within this frame of reference. Ontology is supplanted by the creation of a body of knowledge, an epistemology, that is required and which dictates what is defined/exists within it.

Here is where tautology is important. Tautologies are the only necessary propositions. The assertion of a term as a term, x=x, says nothing about the world, but is necessary to and for “x” as it is x. The propositions that can be formed when tautologies are put into relation are contingent to context, meaning that their forms only have sense within the particular frame of reference in which the core tautologous terms are defined. Without these terms, there would truly be absolutely nothing with which one completes expressions or sentences. Only tautologies and completed expressions, whole individuals which are comprised of a function or role and the object which obtains that function, can stand on their own. Definitions are only
necessary in and only within that context. It is possible to articulate blackness outside of a frame of reference as blackness cites what is labeled Black within that frame, creating a self-referential referent. For Wittgenstein, a person must “project” a sense, which is to be a possible state of affairs, by thinking as one forms that expression as it becomes the object of a function. (Tractatus: 3.11) This makes an explicit link between expressions and modes of creating thought as ways of being in the world. Tautologies are ways of expressing that which is “Not” or unknown, i.e. outside, of the frame of reference. (Tractatus: 4.461) If these expressions are taken up within a frame, so as to define their use, a contradiction ensues as these expressions cannot make an assertion within a frame outside of their originating context. If taken up within another context, this becomes evidence of an external grammar which overdetermines that modes original use. Therefore, its sense within that frame, blackness now labeled as “African”-American, cannot be either true or false, for how they are defined in this frame of reference is only valid within this context and, yet, can be completely different in another. (4.462) “African”-American can mean someone who’s is from the African continent in one context, a “Black” American in another, etc.

Tautologies, here discussed as a self-referential, agree with all combinations of truth values. Its inverse is a contradiction, which agrees with none. Self-referential conditions of truth agree with the world, all its embodying relations, and do not express the reality of what is there within a frame of reference but are what is actually there; the expressions formed are, therefore, not a mirror of the environment. Blackness, as this self-referential, is, therefore, not caused by the parameters set by a frame of reference, but nonetheless harbor the capacity to make appropriate expressions regarding a reality, a valid description, with the parameters themselves. As tautologous, blackness forms the lexicon in which those parameters are expressed. This is possible so long as it does not adopt a label from within that frame, which inevitably leads to an overdetermined expression that harbors contradictions. Self-referentials leave the infinite whole of logical realities open, contradictions cut off those possible relations. Thus, the adoption of an overdetermined position is evidence itself of control.

Wittgenstein’s conclusion, and the one taken up in this discussion, is that the logic of the world is shown through tautologies. (Tractatus: 6.22) As these self-referentials speak viz. the Not, the foundation of any state of affairs or world is this “nothing” which the Pessimist speaks of, and makes any one thing possible. The Not is the set that contains all possible relations and elements that are both apart from and a part of any articulation. The truth is to be found in the silences between expressions which set their relation within a state of affairs engendering the imagining of possible worlds. Facts are only descriptions of the function or roles prescribed of these tautologies. Any expression or proposition, then, is an assertion or description and can only formally show truth, not say it.

One mode of Black expression that is indicative of blackness and has been studied extensively is syncopation in music. It is the silences that set the relations expressions obtain to the truth. One can only speak to create facts. Silence, Noise/Distortion, and syncopation allow us to syntactically formulate modes of Black expression. These silences and the distortion between sounds structure the music and allow for Black modes of expression to be understood through this form. The pattern of silences and sound, as well as distortion, give way to a syntax of Black expression in lieu of a post facto attribution of descriptions regarding what is expressed. (See Chapter 1, part 2 on articulation and a formal analysis of scat)

Blackness is blackness and not another thing. If made to mean something by virtue of some other object, “Black,” then this later expression is only a description. In Black Vernacular English, one can say, “I is what I is.” Therefore, the Black subject retains the possibility to become subject of its own propositions, even if overdetermined. Formally, this is all that the assertion of an “I” amounts to: becoming subject of a proposition.

The implication of this is that blackness has the capacity, despite its being overdetermined by a grammar external to its own form of life indicative of an internal creative capacity for expression, to articulate possible realities, possible reference frames, within others. Blackness also has the capacity to utilize the very parameters themselves that attempt to narrow its range of expressions to rearticulate that state of affairs.

305 Fredric Jameson, “Periodizing the 60s” in Social Text, no. 9/10, p. 178–209.

306 See Appendix and The Electric Church for a review of this articulation in formal terms.

307 See Appendix and The Electric Church for a further discussion of governmentality as well as the configuration of the Powell, Huntington, and Moynihan reports and their effects to how government and democracy were re articulated during the period of the 1960s-70s.

308 Pied-Piping becomes the formal illustration of rearticulation—see Appendix. Linguistically, piping occurs when a phrase from one expression is taken up into another expression. For our purposes, rearticulation through pied-piping is when an articulate individual or event from one context is incorporated for use in another. The formulation of this concept is useful in coming to understand how frames of reference are constructed.

309 Empty Category Principle. (See: Chomsky, Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures.)


In our articulation mechanism, the encounter between two individuals A and B is composed of the cross product of A: <W₁ State of affairs, Name: the function of the object ‘a,’ Relation the name A has in that World>, and B: <W₁, Nb, bRW>. This yields C, such that C: [Na(bRW) - aRW(Nb)], [W₁(bRW) - aRW(W)], [W₁(Nb) - Na(W)]. (See Chapter 1, part one and Appendix I) However, C in any subsequent encounter is understood as the triplet C: <W₂, Nc, cRW>. What constitutes Nc are piped through the subsequent encounter but not the constituents themselves. This inevitably causes an ambiguity within the frame of reference for the frame of the subsequent encounter, [C x D] or <W₂, Nc, cRW> cross product with <W₂, Nd, dRW>, takes in the whole named by Nc, but what Nc refers to cannot be discerned for its reference can be any one of the six terms that made up the individual C from [A x B]. Thus, the stricter the frame of reference purports to be, a direct correlation between ambiguity and subsequent encounter can be made. The more encounters, the more terms to which the individual articulated can refer. There is an inverse relation between how narrow a frame is, with respective to definitiveness, and ambiguity in reference. Therefore, it is possible to show how the rearticulation of C contains a name which speaks of individuals which are not present, though represented, within that subsequent encounter.

Names are ambiguous outside of the domain of a conversation in which all who participate agree on their meaning with respect to their function, the role they play in expressing a form of life. However, discussion and definition require continuity and movement. Languages don’t evolve, they change. Subjects evolve, so the use of names evolve, different names can be used to say the same thing. The names in a language are either used or not. Thus, static conceptions in the definitions held by frames of reference are merely divergent and static points of view on the names and function obtaining dynamic individuals. The subjects those names label are different than they were at the point of naming.

This is handled in more detail by Chomsky’s Empty Category Principle. For individuals from one state of affairs that are taken up for use in another state of affairs, Chomsky states that ambiguities in reference increase as that individual moves from the position of a subject—one that forms the expressions in which individuals of the same state of affairs become the object—to themselves becoming the object of the propositions of an external state of affairs, here studied as the formation of a frame of reference.

The individual C, articulated from an encounter between A and B constituting the state of affairs X, is taken up for use in another encounter, [C x D], constituting Y. The constituents of C are overdetermined by the frame of reference or grammar of Y. It can be shown through pied-piping and the process of rearticulation that what is referred to as “C” represents what is not present in Y’s state of affairs.

A frame of reference, then, is built by virtue of pied-piping. Pied-piping is the translation of what is articulated from one state of affairs for use in another. Movement of an expression from one context indicates an implicit lexicon and vocabulary with which it was expressed, that then becomes the object language of another state which has its own frame of reference. This secondary encounter as the process of rearticulation, then, contains a reference frame which can be considered a meta-language external to the originating state of affairs. Finally, what is engendered is another state of affairs becoming the object, from the first state, “translated” into this next state. The meta-language is the one in which both state of affairs attempt to reach an affinity or set a relation between the two contexts. This attempt is to try to fix the reference of the shared constituents of that state, two functions of the same object. Translation is not about discernment between object and meta-language, but is an attempt to define the use of the objects from one encounter for another, so that that individual obtains a position within the dominant roles of the latter state of affairs. If this relation does not obtain, the grammar of the secondary state paraphrases away what was expressed by the former, deeming it insignificant. The obtaining of a position is what is referred to as an ontological commitment within that frame of reference. For, once the object of the function or roles expressing that new state of affairs, it is possible to “know” how that individual operation is valued within this other frame. Therefore, there are different forms in which to speak of the same object, with each mode of expression representing a form of life. Each mode is valid, but if an expression lies outside of the sense in which the grammar of a context expresses itself, it is determined insignificant. The act of translation, therefore, becomes an attempt at fixing the indeterminacy of reference; an act contingent to the context in which the individual is expressed. Thus, the fight to fix terms to reference, regardless of languages used, will be a place of contention and, therefore, is indicative of attempts at control.
As the subject can always articulate something other than that which is retroactively named within a reference frame, here I consent to a conception of what Wittgenstein asserts as the world being made of “facts,” not things. These facts are what we use to express a world in many ways. Use of “facts” can be formalized to show the active construction of a frame of reference. That which is Nothing with regards to which frame one resides, becomes the base from which the expressions of this frame can be formed. It is from these “facts” that frames of reference are constructed. Whether they are true or false representations of the actual world, they, nonetheless, are real because they have consequences to how we understand the world.

This much has been discussed extensively, and effectively, by W.V.O. Quine’s “Two Dogma’s of Empiricism.” There is no rule outside of the imposition of a frame of reference which can determine a priori how to categorize these individuals and when. (See: Quine, “Two Dogmas of Empiricism” in The Philosophical Review 60, p. 20-43.)

The semantic dogma can be formally expressed as saying that a description D is an individual x: D=x or “Victor” is Victor. This is opposed to the distinction that identity is merely a description of the individual, one way of many, in which we can speak of that individual: of x, D, i.e. Dx; or there is an individual named Victor. As such, D and “Victor” are functions of that individual expressed by x through those descriptions. If the semantics of Identity are primary, an individual would not be able to have more than one name. “=” must mean that we have two names for the same object. It cannot mean that a name is interchangeable with that object, i.e. x=D(?)]. The former is dangerous to the dogma. Therefore, the dogma is untenable.

Logically, this harbors a notion of causality in which the relation “if p then q” is not what is seen in the world, but has material effects. These effects are what is perceived as reality. What one sees in the world is only q. However, the relation expressed by the conditional “if p then q,” is not of the world, but is the reality in the reference frame constructed to provide a sense for q within that particular state of affairs.

For Leila Gleitman (1990), movement of verbs, their use in the formation of expressions, is how lexicons are formed and categories denotative of definition are created. (See: L. Gleitman, “The Structural Sources of Verb Meanings” in Language Acquisitions 1:1, p. 3-55.)

In generative linguistics, this concept is known under the Extended Standard Theory (EST) which regards a deep-structure and syntax as determining the frame of reference in which semantics are determined or structured. (See: Chomsky, Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures.)

When one attempts to put their thumb down on a ticker tape and tries to hit a predetermined spot, this act inevitably results in one’s thumb landing on a position otherwise than what was intended. This point has sped along and away. This same concept can be seen in Heisenberg’s “uncertainty principle”: change in appearance or location is had just by observation. Rationalizing and, therefore, naming a movement as something to define it is always a retroactive act. That movement is no longer that which one has named it or emblematic of the leader it is identified with. This implies the concept of time. Time is considered not as a reality but a spatial construct. For this is the creation of a mode of being in the world, movement as a moment.

This is proven through the Empty Category Principle. For more see: Chomsky, Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures.

There is a difference between merely describing an individual q, and setting a relation for q within context by virtue of the conditional “if p then q.” The proposition p is of another context whose material effect is q in this context, whereas the relation is not part of either, but, nonetheless, real. One does not see the sign of an if/then proposition or a relation in the world, only its effects.

From our pied-piping example, this is easily illustrated. When an individual C is rearticulated through an encounter proceeding its initial articulation, what is used in that subsequent encounter is only what C is known as in that reference frame, i.e. Nc. What constitutes Nc—the knowledge of the original frame of reference of A and B, the relation that A and B had within that frame, and what they were known as, their names, which only has a function in that frame—does not enter into the second level articulation but is the frame of reference for C alone.

Rudolf Carnap, The Logical Syntax of Language.
This is also known as Russell’s Paradox.

This argument has been developed through G.E. Moore’s Naturalistic Fallacy as well as Robert Hopkins more recently. (See: Robert Hopkins, “Aesthetics, Experience and Discrimination” in Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 63:2, p. 119-133; G.E. Moore, Principia Ethica.)

This is derived from our pied-piping illustrations.

The conflation of these terms—Race, Nationality, Ethnicity—leads to an apparatus of control based on Indentititarianism. The control over Identity on the surface level of a state of affairs can be teased out to determine how the intersections rather than the confusing of individuals with categorizations can manifest itself. For example: A national categorization’s use of ethnic constructs may lead to fascism; an ethnic categorization’s use of race motivates notions of purity; A racial categorization’s use of ethnicity can lead to racial essentialism and the use of national terms can lead to an isolationist sovereignty; and a national categorization’s use of a race motivate segregation.

W.V.O. Quine, Ontological Relativity, and Other Essays.

This has been developed as “Wh”-raising with regard to the study of language. When an unknown is introduced from one context for use in another, transposition motivates a “Wh”-question to ensure reference frame. (See: Chomsky, The Minimalist program.)

W.V.O. Quine, Ontological Relativity, and Other Essays.

Noam Chomsky, Studies on Semantics in Generative Grammar.

Linguistically, the result of a “move” or the transposition operation.

The theory of subject and predicate consistency has since been disproven. (See: Alain Badiou, Logic of Worlds: Being and Event, p. 164.)

Linguistically, this concept is called Verb Phrase ellipsis/deletion.

Chomsky elaborates upon this concept by virtue of an analysis of distinct sets of features that, if redundant in the deep-structure of an expression, changes the surface structure of that phrase. The surface structure of that expression must be in a form that fits within the frame of reference of that state of affairs. Surface level transformations ensue to make sure an expression fits, “agrees.” The fixing of a distinct form to the features of a surfaced expression is in the grammar external to the inner logic and mechanism of generating the subject. External, here, should be understand as an expression from one state of affairs being held to the parameters of the one in which it is introduced.

For example, ‘0’ is the actual world, the set of all that is insignificant in one frame of reference, yet a part of all. From there on we can suppose a “value” assignment for each aspect of a Gerund, dependent on the level of articulation from which each aspect emerged. For example, Gerund B, with a formal representation of <W N R> is such that W=2, N=1 as it is the same name piped in for use in this encounter from the one prior, and R=2 as the name is set in a relation within the world of B. From our articulation mechanism, W(Nb) - Na(W) = 0. Two different realities within the same, actual, world. Significance is only found within the domain or frame of reference denoted by the function W over the function or role Nb plays in this state of affairs. W(Nb) shows how that relative overdetermination can be read. If there is a registered difference in this encounter, say a second level articulation represented by W(Nc)=2, 2 being a value placed on the significance, or possibly the level, of that encounter within a reference frame, that overdetermines the first articulation Nb(W) = 1 which results in 1, the result of W(Nc) - Nb(W) is indicative of control. As a result, we know that a hierarchy has been imposed as values are only attributed to these relations, not inherent to the “relation” themselves—see Appendix for calculations of overdetermination using value assignments to aspects of the Gerund.

The effects of intersectional analysis, an individual enduring the real a/effects of belonging to multiple categorizations simultaneously, is a methodology developed within the scope of a legal framework by Patricia Hill Collins and Kimberlé Crenshaw. Collins looks at Race through Critical Theory, as developed by Derrick Bell Jr., while taking into account the complexities of Gender, Class, Sexuality, etc. The mechanism of articulation analyzes the encounter between individuals through the set of conditions in and through which they are expressed. The rearticulation of individuals from one frame of reference or state of affairs into another, highlights that only the name or “identity” travels across contexts, not that individual’s constituents. This causes a stacking assumption in which only the most recent articulation is identified and taken into the frame of reference, not the assemblage of constituents which provide a continuity of the subjectivity indicative of that individual. The stacking assumption alone paraphrases out the continuity of the individual articulated across states of affairs. The intersection of these terms through rearticulation express the concept intersectional, one form of analysis does not overdetermine the significance of another. If the articulation of an individual was just stacking one descriptor on top of another, ordering the front facing description as that, and only that, which is significant in the state of affairs, it would only reinscribe a hierarchy with regard to reading what occurs in the articulation process. Hierarchies are produced by erasing
those elements constitutive of an individual for the sake of those now seen interchangeable with whom that individual really is. We can formulate our concept in a way akin to the nested construction of the description of an individual being, for an individual x of multiple functions: [Class [ Race [Sex/Gender [ x ] ]]] but only taking into account [Class [x ] ] as that individual.

With concerns to governmentality, and the overdetermination of one frame of reference for the sake of another, hegemony, Race, Sex, Class, etc. are not superficial descriptors of an individual's circumstance, but are an interlocking arrangement within a field that sets the relation that individual obtains in the world. (See: Patricia Collins, Black Feminist Thought.; Kimberlé Crenshaw, Mapping the Margins.)

347 For Stuart Hall, Race, Articulation, and Society are structured by relations of dominance.

348 This has been revealed through the rearticulation model and pied-piping illustration above. The constituents of an individual C produced from the encounter of A and B do not enter into the rearticulation of C. In its encounter with another individual D, the name that C is known under, Nc, is equated with C itself such that Nc=C, and is what is used within the encounter. Nc’s frame of reference, all the constituents of the encounter from the previous encounter, including [W(Nb) - Nat(W)] etc., does not enter into C’s rearticulation. Thus, as the frame of reference becomes more rigid, as the use of Nc becomes more defined, what C or any subsequent individual actually refers to, the assemblage of all the elements from its previous encounters, gets larger and larger. Inevitably, this leads to the incorrect reference or use of these elements although they maintain a sense within the immediate state of affairs under a given name. Syntactically, this event is called catchresis.


350 Take the term “African-American.” Blackness is a cultural coalition that is not exhausted by nominations of Nation or Racial categorization and taken as a repertoire of signifying practices. Blackness identified as “Black” is then able to cite itself in using the elements within that frame of reference to create expressions not of the set of propositions already in use within that state of affairs, but, nonetheless, appropriate to it. Names are contingent to frames of reference but necessary in discourse. Therefore, names are contested across states of affairs. Contestation leads to the capacity to take advantage of nominal ambiguity in reference. Names, identities, are able to be used in ways outside of the mandate of the grammar of one reference frame, for they can have an alternative use within another. Rearticulating overdetermination occurs in the act of naming itself. By expressing a self-referential referent that uses ambiguity, despite its expressions being delimited, blackness is able to extend this capacity to other states of affairs. This is derived from blackness’ stipulation as “Not” or outside frames of reference, both as apart from and a part of the articulation of other states of affairs. (See: Henry Louis Gates Jr., The Signifying Monkey: A Theory of African-American Literary Criticism.; and Saul Kripke, Naming and Necessity.)


352 Alain Badiou, Logic of Worlds: Being and Event.

353 Frantz Fanon, “The Black Man and Language” in Black Skin, White Masks.

354 G.E. Moore, Principia Ethica.

355 Baraka illustrates this in his logic expressed in The System of Dante’s Hell. The mode of expressing the object of the narrative is the expression of its own subjectivity; emphasizing the act of putting together words as expressing the thought, rather than the assumed definitions “behind” those words acting as a mask or barrier to embodying the text. He purposefully inserts functors such as ‘/’ to indicate to sing the line as well as represent conditional or possible worlds viz. “if/then” functions within the propositions of the narrator. The use of ‘/’ forces one to breath. For Baraka this is the positing of the creation of the subject behind the prose for Dante’s Hell is the articulation of his own subjectivity.

Baraka, as well as Derrida and Nietzsche, likened being or existence for others, by virtue of positing a self, to breath. The syncopation of those breaths indicates the song’s inner logic and syntactic structure as evidence of subjectivity within the parameters of a White reference frame. A White dominant reference frame in the case of the blues and the Mainstream with punk. Baraka also links sound to image—the logic of this expression is to picture a world outside of a conceptual scheme of sight; a metaphor avoided throughout the book. Baraka is noted as analyzing musical performance as a book, written and read simultaneously throughout the duration of a performance. The time signature of the expression signifies the subject putting together elements to create a sonic thought. Baraka is interested in the act of signing itself, not the rendered signature. The accentuation of the break in expressions, known as the off beat, has been detailed to move the listener into the act of expression to supply the missing beats making way for a collective improvisation. For Baraka, the Blues was the expression of black subjectivity. Blues as the condition for the expression of a Punk subject shows the grammar in the voice of the articulation of Punk that comes from the modes of blackness’ expression.

N(R) is known as the function of function or the function of a function. However, the function of a function can be expressed in a way that another function is created producing a set with elements from each set produced by prior functions. This “third” or n-ary function represents the relation between the others such that a “function of a function” or the function of an operation can be expressed. For example, a function which produces the set \(\{a, b, c\}\) and another function which produces the set \(\{1, 2, 3\}\) are compositionally related by a function which is represented by the set \(\{(a, 1) , (b, 2), (c, 3)\}\) as a one to one mapping of the terms of the other two functions.


This is exemplified in set theory. For example: from any two elements, four classes could be made when they are set in relation to each other. For example, \([\text{Null}], [\text{Null}, 1, 2], [\text{Null}, 2, 1], [2, 1, \text{Null}]\). (See: Bertrand Russell, *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy.*

Frederick Douglass would describe this circular dance as operating under the auspices of “Christian” worship, but in actuality was a profanation of the system of bondage which slaves endured. Onlookers, because they were not of this form of life, could only name but not understand what was going on in the circular dance. The names, placed over these swirling events around fires in the backwoods of the south, were hopelessly ambiguous. (See: Frederick Douglass, *Narrative of the Life of Frederick Douglass, an American Slave,* Boston: 1849, p. 14.)

Here, we formalize an expression whose inner sense remains intact, but whose movement changes relations. The external experience of the function that generated different meanings according to context is akin to the Doppler effect. Taking these aspects in mind, the ethos to black subjectivity and, therefore, punk mentality, is a move captured in the saying “I feel you” used in black modes of expression. This idiom typically means, “I understand.” Two functions, same object; not two objects, one function—one meant by the other. There is a distinction made between “I feel you” and “I see you.” I feel means to understand and intends an intimacy and affinity that can be struck. Seeing is to be identified or named, chosen to represent a whole. To be identified is to be possessed by a body of knowledge, owned by definition in that reference frame. Blackness is an affinity, to be Black is to be identified. The creation of a scene through performance in the evocation of the mosh pit brings to the fore that one can know the space, but it remains to be seen if one understands where they are. Also, if the space’s appearance changes, one can still understand the articulation of the subject in the occasion of its appearance. One only discerns A or B in the context of C. (See: A.N. Whitehead, *Process and Reality. An Essay in Cosmology.* This notion was made more concrete in the work of F.P. Ramsey (See: F.P. Ramsey, *Foundations: Essays in Philosophy, Logic, Mathematics and Economics.*)

This notion has been described throughout the Black literary tradition. For more see: Richard Wright’s description of this phenomenon in writing about the “ring shout” and ritual in *White Man, Listen!* (1957) and *Native Son* (1940); W.E.B. Du Bois in *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903) in his analysis of negro spirituals; Henry Dumas’s description of the circle in “Ark of Bones” (1974); Sterling Stuckey *Slave Culture: Nationalist Theory & Black American* (1987) states that an affinity between slaves outside of the imposition of a dominant language under bondage. Although these gatherings were secret, if found out, where seen as nothing, the incomprehensible noise of the Black slave devoid of any language of their own.

Described by LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka in *Blues People* but also James Baldwin in “The Uses of the Blues” (1964) as an expression of the fact of Black life.

“Blues People” described by LeRoi Jones/Amiri Baraka’s, analysis of improvisation states that this form of expression forces a collective listening so as to create an individual thought. (See: Jones/Baraka, *Blues people.*)

See pied-piping example in our Appendix.


Evan Rapport in “Hearing Punk as Blues” links this directly with the \([1 \ 0\ 1\ 1]\) framework, expounded upon in our Introduction through James Weldon Johnson.

Wittgenstein on tautologies. (See: Wittgenstein, *Tractatus logico-philosophicus.*)


Developed, here, against the passive aesthetic experience developed by Kant’s *Critique of Judgement.*

Conceived through the articulation model developed in chapter one: \([A \times B]\) yields C, where N(R), the naming function overdetermining the relation that subject has within its state of affairs, is then rearticulated in an encounter with D, where N(R) is known as C. This subsequent encounter is not merely \([C \times D]\), but “C” such that its constituents enters the encounter.
as “not-[A x B].” Not-[A x B], not standing in for negation, means A and B exist in some sense, just not one of this state of affairs. The naming function of the subsequent state overdetermines those subjects’ relation within that state. D is held within another state, its interaction with what is nominally C, creates the set of condition in which the E may emerge. Therefore, D represents a reference frame unknown to C in this second order encounter and visa versa, so that all D knows within its frame is what C is named, its identity, not what it is in and of itself.

372 See illustration in Appendix III

373 From the expression “I wonder how John fixed the car,” you can question ‘the car’ with “Which . . .” or some other “Wh-”phrase; but, you cannot question ‘John’. For example, “Which car do you wonder whether John fixed?” is a sound and valid formulation. The object of the function “Wh-” is the car, not John. In attempting to form a question of ‘John’ we have: “Who do you wonder how fixed the car?” ‘John’, as the subject, is present but not represented, can’t be expressed in the second question forming phrase, although we can think it by virtue of the logical form and syntactic structure in the phrase: Subject continuity is derived from the first phrase to the first question forming phrase by virtue of this inner logic and syntax. “John” representing an island in the question forming phrases. Identity is communicated from what form of expression surfaces, causing ambiguity for semantic interpretation, even if externalized or not, for the second question forming phrase is still “grammatically” correct yet no semantic value.


375 Chomsky, Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa Lectures.

376 Rudolf Rocker, “Anarchist Syndicalism: Theory and Practice”.

377 The addition of a definition, or non-restrictive appositive, shows whether the forced explanation that an individual undergoes in its introduction to the reference frame, so to validate or invalidate its mode of expression, is “legible” and thus valued, or illegible. If valued, translatable, which is to say useful within the frame, the identification that is rearticulated into the subsequent frame of reference is significant, despite what the individual actually is as a matter of its own subjectivity. In dealing with Race and hegemony, those positions are already judged based on this a priori framework, regardless of one’s attempt to communicate in the same language or vernacular of the dominant reference frame. This is to hold how these individuals are identified across frames of reference. A “translation,” the name placed over an individual transposed across reference frames, becomes that individual. Though this name does not denote the individual that was rearticulated, it nonetheless is used to produce value for that state of affairs.

The tactic developed to counter this process can be understood under the concept, Nosus Decipio: a legal term which translates to “we cheat.” This tactic is how a Future Perfect is created through the mode of thought that holds legitimacy conditions for institutions by virtue of highlighting and using internal contradictions. These contradictions are revealed by how these systems are instituted, their act of naming, or claiming a position of dominance. Two examples of Nosus Decipio are below. The first is the 1807 Slave Trade Act in the United Kingdom, which used the economic competition and national rivalry between England and France as terms to put slave traders out of business when there was too much ideological opposition to the abolition of slavery itself. For the Slave Trade Act, it was during a conflict with French economic expansion that boats that had to dock in certain ports were subject to inspection and removal of goods. These goods included slaves whose transport was translated as aiding the enemy.

Another example is the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of the U.S. The Amendment did not attack the ideological stance of Blacks being inferior to Whites, but abolished slavery under the use of terms from the Constitution that stated that there was no judgement that could be made on individual quality (inner logic). None on the extension of a reference frame over a term. Equality was to be had under the propositions of law, whose precedent was material both in the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence. In the U.S., the 13th amendment was added by rearticulating the use of terms already deemed constitutional in the midst of rapid industrial expansion on the continent. Industrial expansion could not be achieved if slave labor was still utilized in subsectors of the economy. In effect, Nosus Decipio is a tactic to get hegemony to vote itself out of existence through the use of treating its propositions as valid, but showing the internal contradictions in their enactment to rearticulate change.

378 Truth conditions for Wittgenstein are a propositions structural relation to a tautology, a relation that is only obtained outside of descriptive frames of reference and in that which is ‘Not’ of frame. Tautologies have the capacity to say Nothing. All that is obtained in the frame of reference is the ascription to a name, the function of a role/position within the surface organizational structure of a state of affairs. The relation that name has with another name, or definite description in that frame, is represented by the terms of that frame, but the relation is not a thing present in it. The frame of reference can only substantiate itself from what lies outside of it. A fixed predicate or name, “X” can be obtained and its identity with x or y stipulated, x=x or y=y. A relation “if x then y” can be observed, but ‘=’ cannot be reduced to the names in that reference frame. Equality can only be conceived in how the function of identity by virtue of the symbol ‘=’ is used. For “x=x” says nothing and “if x, then y,” only that x is “not” or y “is”, affirming x=x and y=y. These relational signs or logical operators cannot be reduced to names within that frame as it is the frame of reference itself, and the parameters in which counting instead of the resultant ‘count’ as identity are imposed. For example, one does not see ‘=’ or object 2 in the world; but, it is through their use that we can understand what these concepts express.
Understanding occurs by an affinity between tautologies, not by superficially consequential propositions, assemblages of them, or the determination stipulated as a description of their relating the objects of our thought. Thus, it is in that which says “nothing,” to borrow Wittgenstein's concept of tautologies, that the subject of those propositions, their deep-structure, is understood. An equivalency statement such that, "Px if and only if Py" appears on the surface with P=P and x=y, two objects obtaining the same function or form of life. However, the truth conditions which say nothing of the world: “P∧P”; “if x then y” and “if y then x”; then, “x=y” because x is not equal to y or “y=y” because y is not equal to x, is what makes that expression true, represent what statement that sentence expresses. This makes understanding that proposition possible, even if its appearance is different from context to context. Therefore, "x if and only if y" for they both contain the same truth condition. In order to assert one, you must affirm the existence of the other, which only affirm one’s self.

379 With regard to modes of expression, Liela Gleitman’s research on language acquisition and psychology, as well as studies through the Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s on bio-linguistic language acquisition, has found that individual expressions that are semantically unsound but syntactically correct are treated by the subject as puzzles. This recognition indicates that language, as a mode of creating thought, does not take terms or propositions as individuals but play with the parameters in which they were created themselves and generate the individual expressions of one’s own making. These expressions are not random but, appropriate to context and not necessarily caused by that context. It is not the semantics or what is willed or intended that automatically dictates the form of the expression or its interpretation, it is an individual’s verbal constructions which determine their semantic context, meaning that syntax generates the possible meanings that can be generated. (See: L. Gleitman and B. Landau, The Acquisition of the Lexicon.)

380 A well-known example of this is how cognitive capacities handle garden path sentences.

381 Détournement was a practice developed by the Situationists Internationale in the late 1950s-60s. It was a tactic that utilized symbols or expressions against their overdetermined uses. It is this practice which takes advantage of the ambiguities inherent to the reference for particular symbols, i.e. their contextual meanings, in order to turn phrases or terms used to subjugate a subject against their assumed or mainstream definitions. It is in this way that new configurations of one’s state of affairs can be created from the finite set of symbols, expressions, or principles available within context.

382 The anarchist symbol is an O with an A drawn over it. The ‘O’ stands for order. The ‘A’ placed over it symbolizes a “new” order, one rearticulated or expressed out of the vocabulary of the original state of affairs. Together they stand for “Anarchy is the mother of Order,” a statement attributed to Pierre-Joseph Proudhon.

383 Naturalistic Fallacy developed in G.E. Moore’s ethics. (See: G.E. Moore, Principia Ethica.)

384 Jared Sexton’s Afro-Pessimism as “Afro”-Optimism restates the main problematic of the interaction between these positions as two names that obtain the same object. The names are, therefore, interchangeable. In accordance with the formal analyses completed throughout this project, this has been disproven as Pessimism makes Black identity interchangeable with the function of “Nothing,” a statement which obtains no object. If Pessimism and Optimism were two functions of the same object, then those functions would be interchangeable which still does not get us closer to the issue at hand, the object of these propositions. Baraka’s populism as nationalism runs into the same issue. Both lead to logical contradictions. ‘A is A’, as opposed to ‘A’ being A because it is defined with B, ‘A=B’ which makes ‘A’ not equal to A, but to another thing. Both do not attend to the issue of blackness, as blackness is not of the reference frame and therefore, not defined or identical with what it is named. Blackness cannot be arrived at by “another thing”. It is a mode of being. (See: Jared Sexton, “The Social Life of Social Death: On Afro-Pessimism and Black Optimism.”; Werner Sollors, Amiri Baraka/LeRoi Jones: The Quest for a Populist Nationalism.)


386 The inner logic noted above takes the form of one or more functions indicative of a form of life, obtaining an undefinable object qua subject that resides outside of a categorical label of Identity. For example, three functions—say F, G, N—of a nondeterminate object may obtain a relation of affinity (A), such that the subject by their various modes of expression, dependent upon the frame of reference, F or G or N or . . ., are indicative of different individuals, but are not mutually exclusive to each other. Formally represented, (gArn or gAn or nArn or . . .) reveals a structure in which F, G, and N share a commutative relation with each other, the operations of each expresses the function A. The function of their articulation, their operation through F, G, N, expresses a network of affinity in which those functions are equivalent, but their operations are not interchangeable. Their operations, their subjectivity; the function expressed, a form of life. This can also be illustrated with multiple subjects of different reference frames obtaining an affinity relation in the same context. We have referred to this above as the Future Perfect: F such that [(xAy and xA and zA) or . . .]. Our three functions being affirmatively related means that: IF “if F, then G, then N” AND “if N, then F, then G,” THEN “if G, then N, then F.” By the logical principles of antecedents and detachment we can obtain the following: “if FG and GH, then FH.” Written graphically, this reveals a circular formation which remains outside of the overdetermination of the dominant structure which can only be maintained by virtue of an identity function that ties individuals to a singular frame of reference. Each individual is revealed as being a part of their respective frames of reference, as well as apart from each other’s contexts, yet connected to each other by an alternative form of life outside of those contexts. By the principle of detachment, if one individual is fully overdetermined, the entire structure of affinity is not necessarily overdetermined. Therefore, these individuals maintain an
alternate form of life.

F ⎯ G
\ /
N

387 The syntactic structure of overdetermination can be summed up as follows. There is a function D of which a form of life x obtains, regardless of its function or form of life, where that set of identities, and their functions, of x are rigidly defined and determined within a frame of reference. This universal determination can be conceived as a conjunctive series of identification. This occurs in such a way that, D(Fx,y,z and Gx,y,z and Nx,y,z . . . ), where, D(Fx=R, Gx=R, Nx=R . . . ), regardless of “function,” the object of those expressions are made identical with a role set by D through R. Therefore, the domain of D ranges over a set of finitely many roles, fixed to an an nondeterminate number of individuals. Automatically, this brings into our discussion the possibility of other individuals, and arrangements qua states of affairs, proposing possible worlds as an alternative to this one. For the roles are finitely many, not the set of individuals which can obtain those roles. In other words, the function D does not have access to the inner structure posited by the relations of affinity presented in the model discussed above. D can only accumulate structures and set how those relations have been identified in its domain to a sufficient role within the finite extension of determinations represented in D’s frame of reference. Incorporation through dispossessing subjects of modes of expression, so as to substantiate the frame being constructed through a relation of dominance, is mobilized through this function and motivated by these limitations.

388 Where in our introduction we logically showed that something can come from nothing through the formula "1 = \{(x\cdot x\cdot x)\} = 0" for articulation, here we illustrate overdetermination as a universal categorization over anything. Universal quantification yields interesting results. A universal, 1, over no one “thing,” 0, stipulating that population as nothing, yields anyt

The one over a nondeterminate population represents a totalitarian logic, the assertion of a universal quantifier regardless of context. A simple representation of this project’s conception of overdetermination is shown through the formula, \( \frac{1}{0} = \infty \). Ultimately, the expression of the concept of Overdetermination disproves itself in its assertion, 0 divides 1 infinitely many times. The function of overdetermination essentially expresses an ordinal number through the operation of division: how many times does some/any “thing” go into one category so as to organize the reference frame, or form of life? We know from set theory that ordinals represent another type of infinity, the expanse between one integer and another is infinitely divisible. Being identical to infinity shows that there is no clear decision procedure for categorization save by stipulation. For the subject defined via the function of 1 over all is nondeterminate, even if the it is the object of a singular categorization or universal quantification. Subject x is undefined, for \( \frac{1}{0} = \infty = x \). The first formula, that 1/0 = infinity can be proven in the following way. Taking the operation of division as the inverse of multiplication we have:

\[ \frac{1}{0} = \infty = x \]

From here, we show that if,

\[ \frac{y}{0} = x \]

then, through division’s being arithmetically defined as the inverse of multiplication,

\[ 0 \times x = 0 \]

As x can be any number, x remains undefined, non-determinate. In terms of calculus, x is infinite in both directions as it approaches 0. Therefore, \( \infty = x \).

The second formula, the disproving of overdetermination in the act of its being asserted, can be shown through rearticulating the formula in the following way:

\[ \frac{1}{0} = \infty = x \]

which is equivalent to,
\[
\frac{1}{1-1} = x
\]
and mutatis mutandis,

\[
x \times (1 - 1) = 1
\]

Thus, arriving at our articulatory formula showing that we can obtain some thing, from nothing.

\[
0 = 1
\]

These two formulae are not fallacies of logic. Therefore, because they can be formed, they can be thought, and have a function or form of life within our state of affairs. They teach us something about our form of life, they are not tautologies. The epistemic break in the reference frame of Mathematics, the systematic categorization and function of ideas, using its own rules, shows that overdetermination is never complete. Using categorical overdetermination’s own principles, these statements are true, grammatically and syntactically valid; but, they express a different concept of "sound"-ness. Therefore, divisions are not of the world, but an imposition upon it. The question becomes, how are these "divisions" being used to stipulate particular forms of life for certain individuals?

Russell’s Paradox. For example: If not-me, then you; but for you, “not-you” is me; thus, by these statements we unify you and I by virtue of not. "Victor" is expressed through a set of features in which an object 'Victor' is not a feature, but the label expressed by that particular collection and applied to it. The 'US' is a set of constituents of which an object ‘US’ is not found but is expressed by the function of those members, and non-members, under that label. In number theory: \(0 = 0, \{0\} = 1, \{0, (0)\} = 2, \ldots\), 0 being a member of each set although each set appears differently as either 1, 2, etc. Therefore, if blackness=0, then blackness is a part of each set constructed, articulated, off of that core.

Arnauld and Lancelot, Port Royal Grammar.

For example: “to sing,” “have sung,” “sang,” to be a "singer," are all derived from the inner sense of a context, and without recourse to the extension of other facts, i.e. reference to one’s “singing”. Without this initial transformation, regardless of point of view or tense, there would be no relation which could become the object of a proposition then, now, or future.

Chomsky, Syntactic Structures, p. 32.

Syntax is stated here at the top to show how a deep structure within this generative mechanism is expressed. Deep or D-Structure is the conjunction of a logical form and syntactic structure. Rather than stating it outright, D-structure is conceived in this way to avert an ambiguity in how structure got there in the first place. In traditional outliners of the system, deep structure at the top, although not incorrect, requires more explanation. It is usually represented as arrows drawn outside the diagram in order to show how the logical form and syntactic components are related in order to express what that deep structure entails. We forgo this confusion by showing their connection by representing both the deep structure and how the mechanism works in one diagram. The overall syntax with which a syntactic-structure is embedded is to represent the inner logic and organization of a collection of individuals and their aspects, the constituents of which are the subject from which multiple identities can be expressed—in other words, various PFs branching off a continuous S-Structure + Logical Form indicative of that Deep-structure of the identity expressed. It is in his way that we account for Chomsky’s hierarchy of grammars and the formulation adopted here from his Lectures on Government and Binding (1981). What is produced are all the product of a generative syntax, but have different syntactic structures or types: recursively enumerable, context-free, context-dependent, etc.

Another example: a group of people gathered in worship is subsequently given the name Triumph. Their coming together along with that label’s function expresses the concept of church. As that “church’s” name gains more notoriety, that label no longer refers to that specific group of people, but more so to the concept of church itself. This change is due mostly in part to the dissemination of that name throughout various communities. Later, that originating group of people either pass on or no longer worship at all, or go to other churches (entropy). The change in the constituents of the church does not force a change in name, or a change in what that label expresses, even with that originating group now under the care of different churches or different denominations.

In our articulatory mechanism, if \(S\) such that \(\tilde{A} \times \tilde{B}\), then \(\tilde{C}\). Formally, \(S[\tilde{A} \times \tilde{B}] \rightarrow \tilde{C}\), where the function \(S\) over the operation of \(\tilde{A} \times \tilde{B}\), is such that \(S[\tilde{A} \times \tilde{B}]\) represents the deep structure to the articulation of \(\tilde{C}\). A or B do not necessarily appear in the surfacing expression representing \(\tilde{C}\).
propositions we form about the world. Their consequence to how one pictures reality. The imaginary may not be in the actual world, but it does have consequence to the propositions, and reality within the world is composed.

If we have A, then A, we represent it as: A→A

Not A then, not A: -A→A

So, -A→B

and from this operation, “not A then B,” we can continue to populate a state of affairs S.

If we can derive a state S, then

A→S→A and

B→S→B

such that within our state we have

S→A and

S→B so that we have a state of affairs with A and B as constituents or

S→A.B or S→A x B

From here we can reason,

S→(A.B), and - (A.B)→, S which is to be read if we have state S then A and B are obtained. If we do not obtain A and B, then we no longer are in the state S.

From our first set of operations populating the universe of objects A, B, . . . we know that if we have an individual C then,

C→C and so on. From here it is possible to show that

C→[S→(A.B)]→C or if C then there is a particular arrangement consisting of A and B when expresses a state of affairs S, such that C is not of that arrangement. However, from here we can derive,

[S→(A.B)]→C which provides the logic and deep structure of the encounter illustrated through our mechanism of articulation.

S, A.B→C where [S→(A.B)] or the function of S over the operation of the encounter between A x B, provides the inner logic and mechanism of generation for C. We know this through our inferences above; although [S→(A.B)] does not appear in the surging expression of C, C is generated or caused by this operation as the conditions for C are logically represented as the negation of their being an A and B without there being C:

- ( [A x B] ) and - ( C ) which is equivalent to [A x B]→C which occurs in S.

The multiplication of vectors, here the set of conditions in which Gerunds encounter each other, is derived from a system developed by Josiah Willard Gibbs and Oliver Heaviside. William Kingdon Clifford coined the term the vector product using cofactor expansion as a development of the Sarrus rule (1842) for computing cross products. (See: Michael J. Crowe, *A History of Vector Analysis: The Evolution of the Idea of a Vectorial System.*)


Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures.*

Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari state that every act of territorialization is an act of deterritorialization within a socio-cultural and political landscape. (See: Deleuze and Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus,* p. 60.)

An example of the mechanism of Articulation’s application can be seen in Stuart Hall’s highlighting an encounter between youth and subcultures that generated the “Hippie” phenomenon in the 1960s. In reading the encounter through the mechanism proposed above, we are able to account for the generation of difference itself for we are concerned with the relations obtained, expressing the set of conditions in which events emerged, not what happened based on what did not. We can show Hall’s approach in detailing the Hippie movement articulated out of a backdrop flanked by the Powell (1971) and Huntington (1975) reports that advised the U.S. government’s response to what they termed “The Crisis of Democracy” in the 1960s; between the waning Baby Boomer years of World War II and the advent of the Vietnam War; and the Beat generation’s mixing with downtown art and music scenes. All of these events generated particular world conditions. The change in how the U.S. population was categorized and racialized, as well as the enactment neoliberal policies, did much to change the relation that individuals had within those conditions. In this way, I am able to account for the Punk movement at the beginning of the 1960s as well as Hippies, and a variety of others. In having to set the parameters in which my reading occurs, I automatically have to implicate myself in this reading of the state of affairs. With some effort, a state of affairs can be successfully read within a frame of reference so as to show the dynamism occurring during the moments in which these entities were being articulated. This task I save for the short case studies to come.

Russell’s notion of definite descriptions is helpful here. As these individuals cannot be represented outside of a propositions, and reality within the world is composed of a set of propositions, the way these individuals are in the world has consequences to how one pictures reality. The imaginary may not be in the actual world, but it does have consequence to the propositions we form about the world.
Our choice of the modal system K exemplifies this nicely. The kernel to this mechanism creates an initial baptism which only has two valuations: true or false (1 for true, 0 for false). From this binary, an infinite amount of combinations can be created with which to construct a system or theory of the world, one “meaningful” within that theory. This assemblage is “identified” by a naming function within state of affairs which itself is subject to the grammar determining it from prior articulations. Once named over, the simplicity of this kernel utilizes the substitution function within grammars to exchange these more compounded assemblages with labels that are then sent into the encounter/merge operation creating another set of terms. The products of this process are to be taken up in a subsequent encounters. Each level has an internal sense, which may or may not be equivalent (have the same method of construction and derivation) to others, but not necessarily so. If so, knowledge of what is to mean what by some other thing could traverse contexts. If not, an understanding may be forged, but the value of these articulations are subject to the propositions of states of affairs which do not have access to where meaning is derived. Therefore, “value” is taken up, as wholes (a complete object under one or more functions), under a single name from one context and utilized to create meaning within another.

This view is held by both P.F. Strawson and W.V.O. Quine.

Adopted from Alfred North Whitehead’s process philosophy. (See: Whitehead, Process and Reality.)


Where ‘\( \land \)’ def= xA and xB such that \([x]\) is set C which \([\emptyset, x]\) and \(A \neq B\). See ZFC axioms.

See Chapter 1 for formal proof. Cross multiplication of vectors is derived from Sarrus’ rule developed off of the cofactor expansion from each component of a vector. One must remember that we are not adding the values of these components, only formalizing them.

Proof against Afro-Pessimism’s statement that blackness operates out of cultural death. This procedure uses standard set theory as developed by G. Cantor, B. Russell, and the later developed through the axioms of E. Zermelo and A. Fraenkel.

See chapter one for formal proof. Cross multiplication of vectors based from Sarrus’ rule.

Chomsky Empty Category Principle

In Introduction to Mathematics, Russell illustrates this concept by the following example: elements 0 and 1 can create four sets: \([0], [0, 0], [0, 1], [0, 0, 1]\). This illustration also levies a critique regarding the fallacy of market “scarcity,” showing that in cases of classical production, scarcity is a concept imposed due to the overproduction of a single type of product. Overproduction outstrips demand, thus, forces government to impose restrictions on some industries while subsidizing others.

G.E. Moore’s Naturalist fallacy.

Frege, Logical Investigations, and W.V.O. Quine, Ontological Relativism.

Linguistically, as there is a deep structure regardless of appearance, we can see the racist underpinning to statements by their inner logic and syntactic structure, the operation within forms of life, despite how they appear on the surface or if predetermined innocuous. A term’s use actively constructs the frame of reference in which its function is indicative of its meaning.

“But the Negro’s greatest contribution to the language is: (1) the use of metaphor and simile; (2) the use of the double descriptive; (3) the use of verbal nouns.” (See: Zora Neale Hurston, “Characteristics of Negro Expression.”)

According to Wittgenstein’s Philosophical Grammar, the distinction between blackness and its identification or name as Black or African-American, is the same as stating that there is an individual x and a function of x such that, F(x); as well as the negation of that function of x and an individual expressed by that function of y, such that there are functions not-F(x) and F(y), where x=y and y=x; etc. For Wittgenstein, the negation of an individual function, here predicate, does not negate the existence of that individual, in fact it affirms it. Negation is a function which stipulates that that which is negated is not a member of this frame of reference. The illustration above shows that within a state of affairs, there is the grammar of how x is used, its function, which gives it its meaning within a frame of reference; as well as a grammar to y, F(y), such that x is present but not represented or expressed, but the use of y is well defined. Therefore, \(N(F(x))\), as Not is a function for W, meaning x is of another frame yet of the same state. This mimics how sets are named so as to avoid Russell’s Paradox.

The formal example: \((x)Fx \supset (x, y)N(Fx), Fy \supset \ldots\)

In Frege’s Logical Investigations, the Not, which he handles under the concept of negation, can be represented in an if/then statement known as a conditional. In this way, Not becomes the grounds for articulation as it formally presents possibility itself. For Not can be used to construct a multitude of propositions that adhere to the form of an “if/then” statement.
Take Frege’s solution to the Liars Paradox. How would one determine the truth conditions for an expression: “This statement is false.” If true, the statement is false; if false, then the statement is true. If you put this statement in a conditional, it automatically creates a reference frame in which it can obtain a truth value: “if this is a ‘statement’, then that ‘statement’ is false.” The conditional states that if the expression is true, then it is true that the statement is false. If the expression is false, then the negation of that statement would be true. The conditional allows for its value to be discerned in and only in that reference frame.

The solution to showing how the Not is utilized to form expressions that create their own frames of reference, illustrates how the expressions formed from this base subverts brute determination of meaning and/or significance within states of affairs. When applied to blackness’ modes of expression, we see that if we assume the Afro-Pessimist premise that blackness is Not, then we must concede that blackness’ very existence, through its signifying practice undoes the overdetermination, its significance and, or, the meaning of its expression in the world is possible because it forms expressions from Not. This automatically questions through “if/then” statements the legitimacy of imposed frames of reference.

420 Leila Gleitman’s biolinguistic approach.

421 Chomsky on Semantics.

422 Wittgenstein’s concept of a form of life; Baraka’s concept of modes of expression as the expression of a people.

423 The concept of an epistemic break and its relation to black subjectivity is developed through the work of Sylvia Wynter. (See: Sylvia Wynter, “1492 A New World View” in Race, Discourse, and the Origin of the Americas: A New World View, ed. Hyatt and Nettleford, Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1995.)

424 Attali, Noise, p. 25.

425 For Wittgenstein, there is that which “is,” which amounts to stating a tautology, or the assertion of its being, x=x; and there is that which is a function of that which is’s use, the ways “is” exists in the world. These functions are the creation of facts, which for Wittgenstein is the state of affairs. G.E. Moore describes the ethos of these individuals, their ethics or mode of being, as the unanalyzable and formalizes their functions in his work Ethics, which greatly influenced Wittgenstein.

426 Attali, Noise, p. 114.

427 “Living in the void means admitting the constant presence of the potential for revolution. . .”. (147) Tautology is here again important. “Nothing” makes the expression of something possible. For Wittgenstein, the core to expressions are these tautologies that actually say “Nothing.” With each term within a tautologous statement, say “if p, then q,” there are 2^n possible expressions (2 because there are two values attributed to each term, true or false; and where n is the number of terms in the formula) that can be built: p, q, not p, p and q. In the articulation model put forward here, there are 3^n possibilities engendered in each encounter. Three, because an encounter results in the triplet: world, name, and the relation of that name in that world/state of affairs.

428 Attali calls this act blasphemous. Noise, p. 137.

429 WT Lahmon on Chuck Berry in Deliberate Speed and Evan Rapport in “Hearing Punk as Blues”.

430 James Spooner, Afro-Punk documentary.

431 Salad Days documentary.

432 This was developed by Frank Plumpton Ramsey and is known as a “Ramsey Number.” Ramsey Numbers prove that complete disorder is impossible and is only superficially determined as such. Here, this concept is handled through our articulation mechanism which produces an infinite array of articulate individuals from within a finitely many lexicon of objects representing a set of conditions. The purpose is so to simultaneously illustrate those individuals entering the encounter as well as those produced, showing the possible relationships those individuals generate and obtain within the purview of their encounter.