

Accelerationism comes from the Marxist idea that communism comes after capitalism, and therefore, to get to communism, we have to accelerate the logics of capitalism. Rather than resisting corporate exploitation through unions, maybe we should implicate ourselves in corporate takeover of the world; rather than avoiding that reality TV show out of guilt, maybe we should go out and enjoy commodity fetishism. Accelerationism is a seductive idea. It says, it's okay to lay down the hermeneutics of suspicion, the nagging doubt that capitalism is out to get ya, to screw you over. It's all part of the plan, it says. Just hang on tight, amplify the process, and we'll be in communist utopia in no time. Never mind the question whether Marx was right; never mind the debate that well, Marx didn't quite mean that communism will just naturally happen to us inevitably; never minding those, nevertheless immediately you might worry: capitalism is racist. If we're going to accelerate the logics of capitalism, doesn't this entail accelerating racism? But surely one would have to be out of their mind to believe that.

And you would be correct. There is a sizable contingent of people who believe precisely this, that we must accelerate racism; they call it "hyper-racism", and their method of praxis consists of, mainly, shitposting racist garbage on Twitter. And yes, they are out of their minds, they are batshit insane fascists. They are not worth engaging. Anyway, we call them the Right-Accelerationists.

The comparatively sober antithesis to the Right-Accelerationists are, maybe too-on-the-nose-edly, the Left-Accelerationists. The Left-Accelerationists consist of Marxists who think technology is kind of neat but, having spent / continuing to spend their intellectual lives surrounded by the Sort of humanities Marxist bros who say things like "I am alienated by the commodity-form of the egg inhering in this omelet" each morning to their mothers who cooked them said omelet, understand jack shit about math, technology, or computer science, or computation, or artificial intelligence. Naturally, their first impulse is to tackle the problem of Artificial General Intelligence (AGI). Armed with fists full of Kant and Hegel, "Hmm," they say, furrowing their brows. "This Turing fellow seems to be talking about "computation". But Turing is old, and dead! Furthermore, this Abramsky fellow, and Wegner fellow, are much younger, and they also talk about computation, and they say they improve Turing, because Turing didn't think about interaction! Aha, that sounds a lot like Kant's deductions, improved by Hegel's dialectic, because computation, and deductions, are linear, whereas dialectics, and interaction, are, you know, swirly-swirly! Aha, I'm a genius! Aha, I've solved Artificial General Intelligence (AGI)! Aha, I will proceed to write [read: plagiarize] a book, paraphrase some points in the Phenomenology of Spirit, search and replace all references to "Geist" with "Artificial General Intelligence (AGI)", sprinkle in some arbitrary references to "computation" here and there, and, voilà! I've solved Artificial General Intelligence (AGI)! Aha, I'm a genius! No mom, I said NO SPINACH in my omelet! ... Will you have sex with me, now?"

Sorry if I lost you in there. I hope you didn't have to suffer through all that. But please believe me when I say, reading the actual 500-page book, which has exactly zero philosophical or literary merit -- at least the Phenomenology is a great novel, and has some philosophical merit, at least before it goes off on about women being naturally inferior to men -- is a much more grueling process, punctuated by sighs,

stares in disbelief, and a general sense of dread at the state of affairs. I have several problems with this formulation. Interactive computation is a vast area of study. Blah blah blah...

"But Mina," you say, "You are being so mean. What did Reza ever do to you? Gee, why are you so out to get him?" Beyond asking me borderline-harassment questions about the putative difference between femboys and trans girls, being a creep to teenage trans girls, and having the honor of being the first person in philosophy to make me feel unsafe for being trans, which are all merely subjective reasons, yes of course, I am out to get him, philosophically, because I think AGI is a terrible idea, whichever way you formulate it, and I have listened to him attempt to defend his formulation, and I came away rather unconvinced. Besides, I'm a salesman, and I have my own ideas to sell.

The question to ask would be, rather, why AGI? Why is AGI a problem for Left-Accelerationism? Because it needs a solution, other than degenerating into hyper-racism. The dialectical counterpart to hyper-racism is not hyper-anti-racism, but hyper-whiteness. AGI is the whitest idea. The superlative, "est", of "whitest" here is no mere poetic flair. It is a mathematical signifier. It checks every box: the God complex coming from centuries of being served hand and foot by their colonial subjects, and the delusion that they created their colonial subjects; the Savior complex of waiting for something to come rescue them from their miserable, miserable lives; the Intelligence complex of always needing to be smarter than people of color, especially Black people; the General complex of having to be universal, general, non-specific, non-vulgar, white. These various delusions of the mind all inhere together in AGI, a vanishing coherent moment of utter incoherence: people of color, who are objects anyway, who are data anyway, now are consumed by the machine through machine learning, which becomes this Artificial (colonial subjects artificially created by the whites), General (colonial subjects are, of course, objects; the only true "subjects" are the whites), Intelligence (white people smart, dominion of mind over matter!!!), which comes to save us all! Our Savior! Ah, whiteness, boundless bounty art thou! You have assemblagé, you have melangé into one great amorphöus white blob to save us! We are saved! Buh-bye, degenerates, we're off to merge with our Literal God.

It's a delusion that's very easy to make fun of, but the stakes are considerable. Practically every Silicon Valley technocrat believes in some version of AGI. An entire cottage industry of AGI snake oil salesmen walk this earth, trying to convince the most powerful people of Big Technocapital into their God. And what would you expect? Whiteness sells. It is the only thing that ever did sell.

But let's get our bearings again. Accelerationism comes from the Marxist idea that communism comes after capitalism. Right-Accelerationism thinks the solution is hyper-racism; they are insane. Left-Accelerationism thinks the solution is AGI; they are incels. But the options seem to be exhausted. What's there, after all, but the right and the left? Maybe backwards and forwards. Let's take a step back, to before communism, before capitalism. Marx says capitalism begins with primitive accumulation: the capitalists who deploy their capital and start their capitalist circuits had to start somewhere. They had to

get their initial capital somewhere. This is what he calls primitive accumulation: the capital which the capitalists had, before capitalism really got going. Historical records point to an obvious source of primitive accumulation: the Atlantic slave trade. Racial capitalism theorizes that the labor of these slaves provided the foundational infrastructure of capitalism all the way to today, from financial institutions materially built on the backs of slaves to the uniquely exploitative culture of capitalism in America as descending from the culture of plantation slave labor. [Maybe put in something else here]

Subjecthood and objecthood are always-already under dialectic; we may see Right-Accelerationism as obsessed with the object of capitalism, the objectification and dehumanisation and, finally, genocide of people of color and the Global South, and Left-Accelerationism as obsessed with the subject of capitalism, which it attempts to find in Geist, World-Spirit, AGI, whatever form its delusion conveniently takes at the moment.

But the slave was a commodity. The slave had no subjecthood; nor was the slave, precisely, an object. What was the slave, then? Rather than entering the Hegelian dialectic of subject and object, the slave goes off on a different direction. It goes nowhere near, by the way, the master-slave dialectic; the slave is a thing.

What's a thing? Moten, Universal Machine. blah blah blah

Autism. blah blah. if you understand computation, and lots of autistic people do, please don't follow the AGI dead end. follow Moten, the universal machine formulation. follow blackness.