

9

FUGITIVE WORLD-BUILDING

Rethinking the Cosmopolitics of Anti-Slavery Struggle with Arendt and Glissant

Niklas Plaetzer

“Notre héritage n'est précédé d'aucun testament.”¹
—René Char (Arendt 1963, 215)

Introduction

The political thought of Hannah Arendt does not cease to inspire and provoke. More than 40 years after her death, Arendt's critiques of sovereignty and human rights have lost nothing of their urgency in a world marked by the violence of border regimes. Her perspective has been particularly pertinent for recent debates on migrant movements and action beyond nation-state sovereignty (Benhabib 2008; Beltrán 2009; Gündoğdu 2015). In Arendt's view, “with today's power relations, the nation-state's notion of sovereignty, which in any case comes from absolutism, is a dangerous megalomania” (Arendt 2017, 261). Indeed, her critique of sovereignty extends from a questioning of national borders to a rejection of the French model of sovereign constituent power, to a reconceptualisation of the subject of action beyond sovereign selfhood (Arendt 1963; Honig 1992; Volk 2015). This fundamental and multidimensional critique of sovereignty in Arendt's work has made her a powerful interlocutor for contemporary theoretical accounts of cosmopolitics, which take their cue from the practical experiences of migrant struggle.

In contrast to Kantian moral philosophy, an Arendtian position vis-à-vis cosmopolitanism is resolutely *political* insofar as it does not rely on a grounding in a transcendental ‘humanity,’ imagined as pre-given and ‘to be realised,’ but is instead constituted by plural and radically inventive forms of ‘world-building.’ Like the modern revolutionaries who Arendt describes in her work

On Revolution, contemporary movements of undocumented migrants “have no authority to do what they have set out to achieve,’ [...] as they demand rights that do not yet exist in international human rights law” (Gündoğdu, 175). Their action cannot be contained in the existing framework of states, since for Arendt, the stateless are more than “an unfortunate exception to an otherwise sane and normal rule” (Arendt 1968, 267–168). As Gündoğdu (2015) has argued persuasively, their ‘unauthorised’ rights-claims go beyond the demand to be integrated into the system of national sovereignty that produces statelessness in the first place. But neither can their acts of re-foundation be reduced to the ‘anti-political’ “rights of victims” who are allegedly in need of paternalistic care or humanitarian intervention (Fassin 2012). The rights-claims of the stateless hence point to the ‘groundless’ character of all rights, which are introduced in “declarations of rights that cannot be authorised by existing legal and normative frameworks” but depend on practices of “democratic iteration,” as Gündoğdu argues, following Benhabib (2008).

Despite such meaningful insights that Arendt’s thought has generated for analyses of migrant struggle, a commitment to Arendtian theory also entails the risk to inherit the notorious blindspots of her work. Indeed, her ambition to think action with “eyes unclouded by philosophy” (Arendt 2011, 2) should also be taken as an invitation to read her own work ‘against the grain.’ This task becomes indispensable when the realities of migrant struggle immediately speak to a history which Arendt herself either sidelined or wrote off as ‘pre-political’: the history of slavery and slave revolt. Following a CNN report on 14 November 2017 that confirmed the existence of slave markets among migrants in Libya (Elbagir et al. 2017), protests have taken place across West Africa and Europe, putting the memory of slavery at the heart of a solidarity campaign with migrants and reconfiguring the practices of migrant mobilisations. Indeed, the media coverage on contemporary slave markets that have emerged in the chaos of post-intervention Civil War in Libya, where African migrants are being sold as slaves at the price of \$400 for a human being (Youssef 2017), has been followed by new forms of transnational mobilisation. Following a protest in Paris on 18 November, demonstrations took place in the cities of Lyon, Marseille, and Nantes, as well as in Conakry and Bamako (Cascais 2017). Since 18 November, more protests have been organised in Yaoundé, Abidjan, Dakar, Lagos, Lyon, Marseille, Brussels, London, Berlin, Tunis, Rabat, and New York City. They all inscribe themselves in one wave of transnational mobilisation, coordinated by coalitions of African diaspora groups, who have rapidly constituted a networked space of action beyond nation-states through the use of social media.

Even though organisations of migrants played a central role in many of the mentioned protests, the specificity of their position as migrants (e.g. the presence of *Sans-Papiers* groups in the Parisian demonstrations) tended to be erased in favour of a diasporic solidarity. Importantly, French *citizens* of African

descent and undocumented *migrants* demonstrated together and performatively erased the difference between *citizen* and *non-citizen*. Instead of invoking universalist discourses of human rights or a “revolutionary spirit” derived from European historical precedents (Arendt 1963), the protesters opened up spaces and temporalities at a distance to both nation-state sovereignty and metropolitan vocabularies, enabled by the memories of slavery and decolonial struggle. The simultaneity with protests in Africa brought about a counter-cosmopolitics that might still be described in terms of ‘world-building,’ but remains radically at odds with Arendt’s own commitments regarding race and the haunting figure of the slave. Drawing on Roberts’ illuminating account of the tradition of *marronage*, that is, the memory of run-away slaves (*maroons*), this chapter probes the limits of an Arendtian framework by acknowledging her insights on non-sovereignty and cosmopolitics, while paying close attention to experiences of action for which the figures of the *migrant* and the *run-away slave*, not that of the *citizen*, take centre stage (Roberts 2015).

The transnational protests of 2017 did not frame their demand for the end of slavery in Libya by way of an invocation of republican principles or even through a creative redeployment of human rights; their chants did not ‘iterate’ the French Revolution or the Paris Commune, but centred around a diasporic sense of belonging: “*Libérez nos sœurs, libérez nos frères!*” (“Liberate our sisters, liberate our brothers!”). Cross-reading the 2017 movement, on the one hand, and the work of Martiniquais philosopher and poet Édouard Glissant on cosmopolitan spaces *after* and *out of* slavery, on the other, this chapter calls for an engagement with non-Eurocentric approaches to both critique and meaningfully extend an Arendtian perspective.

Cosmopolitics as World-Building

Arendt’s cosmopolitan thought entails an activist conception of ‘world-building.’ Her rejection of Kantian moral philosophy in the 1959 Lessing Prize address is particularly instructive on this point, as she contrasts a Kantian transcendental humanity to Lessing’s appreciation of plurality and the worldly realm of opinions. In Arendt’s reading, Lessing “rejoiced in the very thing that has ever – or at least since Parmenides and Plato – distressed philosophers: that the truth, as soon as it is uttered, is immediately reduced to one subject of discourse among others” (Arendt 1968a, 27). More drastically, Arendt claims that the existence of an absolute truth – including the truth of a reason-based philosophy – “would have spelled the end of humanity” (ibid.). While Arendt later turned to Kant’s *Third Critique* to find a political notion of judgment in his aesthetic philosophy, she decidedly rejects the Kantian attempt to ground action in the transcendental realm. She in fact denounces Kantian humanism for its “inhumanity” (ibid.) and *worldlessness*: its loss of sight for spaces of action that never rely on transcendental guarantees, but depend on ever-different perspectives that come to assemble.

What Arendt is after is not a philosophical system capable of grounding rights and duties for all of humanity. Her goal is at once more moderate and more ambitious. What is moderate about it is its emphasis on concrete political experiences, which must always fall short of any universalist aspirations. Political humanity, she acknowledges without illusions, remains less-than-universal. This is an aspect which has worried many of Arendt's more cautious readers, who liken her rejection of transcendental in politics to a dangerous kind of immorality: "Arendt is playing with fire," as Katelyn affirms (1983, 32). For some, then, Arendt is daringly moderate. What is ambitious about her project, however, is that she hopes to get a hold of those experiences, which could bring into existence a (perhaps paradoxical) community of citizens without any recourse to underlying sameness: a groundless community of political actors, united not by identity, but by the world they make between them. Arendt is in search of "actually existing cosmopolitanisms" (Malcomson 1998, 238), which can gesture towards "worlds not yet built" (Honig 2008, 120) rather than merely realising the already given content of universalist reason or a particular identity.

What holds together a plural community of actors and sustains their activity of world-building is neither their nationality, nor their abstract status as a right-holding human being. As Arendt put it in private correspondence with the director of the Marbach Literature Archives, Ludwig Greve, to whom she wrote on 20 July 1975, half a year before her death: In public-political affairs, I can only speak as a citizen, and this is something that people do not know about in Germany. The citizen is neither a fellow country-man, nor a subject of the state [*Der citizen ist weder Volksgenosse noch Staatsbürger*] (Bülow 2015, 13). Challenging the dichotomy between the ethnonationalism of *Volksgenossen* and the abstract rights protections of *Staatsbürgerschaft*, Arendt specifically makes use of the English term "citizen" in her German letter to Greve in order to point to an alternative. The *political* citizenship she envisions is constituted by 'acting in concert' and the performance of shared principles. Arendt's famous notion of the "right to have rights" should thus be understood as the right to be admitted into the realm of those who 'speak as a citizen,' independently of pre-political forms of belonging that would predate the moment of action itself. Understood in these terms, Arendtian citizenship values the possibility of radically new meanings that are given to shared principles among *citizens-in-becoming*, who are neither *Volksgenossen*, nor *Staatsbürger*. Citizenship thereby becomes an immediately cosmopolitan affair, insofar as it depends on its constant foundation through practices of "world-building" rather than any pre-political identity, such as nationality or even 'humanness.'

Arendt's 'performative' understanding of citizenship and the idea of a "right to have rights" have found such an immense echo in recent scholarship on migration and migrant struggles that one might speak, without any exaggeration, of an 'Arendtian turn' in the literature. Tassin (2003) and Balibar (2004), Benhabib and Honig (2008), as well as Krause (2008) and Beltrán (2009) have

all made use of Arendt's framework to theorise migrant protests as insurgent enactments of a "right to have rights." This line of scholarship has powerfully deployed Arendt's political thought to challenge technocratic depictions of migration as a policy challenge in need of management solutions. More importantly still, it has fundamentally questioned the portrayal of migrants as passive recipients of aid, instead paying close attention to their self-organisation. Arendtian theory has thereby helped to shift scholarly attention to migrant movements, not just as important sites of resistance, but as laboratories for a rethinking of citizenship at today's historical juncture. Nevertheless, an emphasis on 'groundless' rights-claims and ruptures has also tended to foreclose an appreciation of Arendt's concern with permanence and institution making. Benhabib, for instance, has worried that Arendt's vision would remain "institutionally unanchored, floating as if it were a nostalgic chimera on the horizon of politics" (Benhabib 2003, 198), whereas Honig (2006) has defended the anarchic dimension of Arendtian action.

Masterfully building on the debate around Arendtian cosmopolitics and migrant struggle, Gündoğdu has responded to the 'anti-institutionalist' reading and brought to light the serious concern with institutional permanence in Arendt's work, centring on the idea of the 'principle.' As Arendt puts it, "what saves the act of beginning from its arbitrariness is that it carries its own principle within itself, or, to be more precise, that beginning and principle, *principium* and *principle*, are not related to each other, but are coeval" (1963, 212). In this sense, her notion of "principled action" points to an aporia: a beginning that nevertheless perpetuates a tradition. Arendt's ambition is to bring together the exhilarating spontaneity of insurgent moments with the conservative care for a precious inheritance: "The very fact that these two elements, the concern with stability and the spirit of the new, have become opposites in political thought and terminology [...] must be recognised to be among the symptoms of our loss" (1963, 223). In *On Revolution*, Arendt gives a rich illustration of this idea through her account of the 'hidden tradition' of revolutionary councils that binds together the 1871 Paris Commune, the German *Räterepublik* of 1919 and the 1956 Hungarian Revolution (1963, 215–283). Instead of reducing these experiences to isolated episodes or failed experiments, she sees them as part of one subterranean tradition of revolutionary institution-building. Her narrative of such a counter-tradition does not only illustrate the insurgent quality of action, but points to a new form of statehood beyond nation-states, no longer deriving its authority from 'the people' but from the 'augmentation' of principles in the absence of a unitary foundational subject. Gündoğdu has extended Arendt's list, as it were, and included contemporary migrant movements in the revolutionary tradition. In her inspired reading, the contemporary *Sans-Papiers*, not unlike the black revolutionaries of the Haitian Revolution, draw on the French tradition and 'augment' its principles in unauthorised ways, both extending their scope and radically challenging their meaning.

Yet it is precisely the move from an *ontological* understanding of action as beginning to an *ontic* appreciation of one concrete (Western) ‘tradition’ of principled action that ends up limiting the horizon of world-building. To be sure, Arendt does not conceive of this tradition as linear or uninterrupted and specifically highlights that the “revolutionary tradition” has forgotten its own ‘lost treasures’ of the councils. As her essay on her friend Walter Benjamin similarly suggests, for Arendt, “the break in tradition and the loss of authority which occurred in his lifetime were irreparable” (1968, 193). Thinking politically would thus mean to go on a dive into the history of concepts, like a “pearl diver who descends to the bottom of the sea [...] but not to resuscitate it the way it was and to contribute to the renewal of extinct ages.” What motivates the pearl diver instead are the corals which have “suffered a sea change and survive in new crystallised forms and shapes” (205–206). For Arendt’s Benjamin, the past has become a productive reservoir of citable elements, to be assembled by unauthorised explorers, travelling without map or navigation devices. It is thus important to insist that the revolutionary councils did not themselves make up “the revolutionary tradition” for Arendt, which has not preserved their memory “any better than the liberal, democratic, and, in the main, outspokenly anti-revolutionary trends of political thought in America” (Arendt 1963, 221). It needed the pearl diver Arendt to bring their memory back to the surface, if in a newly crystallised shape.

Despite this suggestively non-linear understanding of historical memory, for Arendt, *principium* and *principle* appear together in one and the same instance, allowing for the ongoing reconstitution of what might be called a ‘post-traditional’ line of continuity. But if the openness of action (*principium*) becomes identified with the ‘lost treasures’ of a specific tradition and its *principles*, Arendt ultimately falls back into the linear narrative centred around a certain (European) heritage that she tried to avoid. The ontological openness of action is thereby domesticated within the boundaries of a provincial tradition and a limited set of experiences that get to count as ‘lost treasures.’ Arendt’s idea of action thus departs from its cosmopolitan intent and espouses an untenable European parochialism insofar as the principles at stake become identified with the particularity of a certain heritage.

The problem is not whether for Arendt social issues might become part of political action; this is clearly the case, as her praise for the labour movement makes evident (cf. Gündoğdu 2015). But if Arendt’s position *does* allow for the politicisation of social concerns through their articulation with principles of action, then what prevents her from politically thinking about *slavery*? Indeed, her inability to think slavery and slave revolt *politically*, that is to say, as instances of her own notion of action, already permeates the pages of *The Human Condition*, where she contrasts the *political* history of the labour movement with the *pre-political* existence of slaves throughout history: “The incapacity of the *animal laborans* for distinction and hence for action and speech seems to be confirmed

by the striking absence of serious slave rebellions in ancient and modern times” (1958, 215). While Arendt celebrates the passage of the labour movement from the conditions of labour and work to the ‘properly’ political realm of action – in fact even calling the labour movement “the most glorious and probably the most promising chapter of recent history” (*ibid*) – a similar politicising move with regard to slavery and the revolutionary history of the “black radical tradition” (cf. Johnson and Lubin 2017) is nowhere to be found in her work.

Similarly, in *On Revolution*, Arendt offers insightful readings of the American and French Revolutions, whereas the Haitian Revolution remains conspicuously absent (Gines 2014, 74–75). She thereby excludes slavery struggle from political memory in ways that are not only methodologically questionable and normatively troubling, but also pose serious problems for an Arendtian reading of those migrant movements, which have today become inseparable from the struggle against slavery. If one were to follow Arendt’s relegation of slavery to a non-political realm, “revolutionary antislavery” would present itself as “a contradiction in terms,” as Fischer has eloquently put it (2004, 9). Due to Arendt’s “deeply ingrained Eurocentrism,” “Haiti becomes unthinkable,” (*ibid*) – just as unthinkable as contemporary movements for whom the difference between *migrant* and *maroon* is becoming increasingly blurred.

Gaffney (2017, 15) has offered a powerful critique of Arendt on this point and called for a politics that would allow for “memories of exclusion to appear as a part of the legacy that we have inherited.” Yet an engagement with the 2017 transnational movement against slavery suggests that its action did not just aim at the extension of Euro-American memory to acknowledge its haunting blindspots. Perhaps, more radically, their practices constituted a form of *counter-cosmopolitics*, marked by the refusal to frame their demands in reference to the metropolitan tradition of citizenship altogether. In Arendt’s view, however, “the Greek *polis* will continue to exist at the bottom of our political existence – that is, at the bottom of the sea – for as long as we use the word ‘politics’” (Arendt 1968, 204). While this phrase should be read in line with the Benjaminian figure of the ‘pearl diver,’ it also suggests an unaccounted attachment to a certain tradition of citizenship (as fractured as it might be), stretching from the “isonomy” of the Greek *polis* to the principle of “equaliberty” among modern council democrats (Balibar 1994). For Arendt, this ‘heritage without a testament’ constitutes the tradition of politics *tout court*. Alternative historiographies, such as those centred on anti-colonial struggle or slave revolt, are not only ignored in her work, but relegated to a non-political zone at a distance to the venerable tradition of revolutionary citizenship. While she celebrates the memory of councils and even that of ancient Rome as the hallmark of revolution, she regards “Negro demands” as “clearly silly and outrageous” when they concern the teaching of “African literature, and other nonexistent subjects,” such as Swahili, which Arendt calls a “nineteenth century kind of no language” (Arendt 1970, 96). Unable to envision the activation of ‘lost treasures’ in a black

tradition, Arendt places Africans outside language altogether and hence “outside politics” (Norton 2010).

As ‘performative’ and open as one might wish to reconfigure the tradition of citizenship in Arendt’s writings, it cannot possibly encompass all of those experiences from the underside of history that never evolved around the Greco-European idea of the ‘citizen’ in the first place. Beyond a lack of historical attention and a set of blindspots, Arendt’s genealogy becomes *politically* worrisome where it limits the very possibility of world-building that she hopes to defend. Where principled action remains constitutively tied to a particular history that privileges certain ‘beginnings’ over others, a rethinking of Arendtian cosmopolitics presents itself as an urgent theoretical task.

Worldly Pariahs: The 2017 Transnational Movement against Slavery

On 14 November 2017, a CNN report confirmed what many had suspected. Undercover journalists had managed to give evidence for the existence of “slave auctions” in Libya, where migrants from West African countries on their way to Europe are sold as human “merchandise” (Elbagir et al. 2017). Recent interventions by the Libyan coast guard have left “smugglers with a backlog of would-be passengers on their hands. So the smugglers become masters, the migrants and refugees become slaves” (*ibid*). While the situation remains opaque and no numbers are available as to the extent of slavery in Libya, the CNN coverage of November 2017 caused an international wave of outrage, a condemnation on the part of the African Union, and an investigation by the Libyan government (Wintour 2017). The presence of slave auctions in Libya, however, had already been known for years. An Amnesty International report from 2015 had spoken out against the sale of migrants by human traffickers in the destabilised situation of Libya following the end of the Gaddafi regime (Karasapan and Shah 2018). In April 2017, the International Organisation of Migration had condemned the sale of African migrants as slaves in Libya (Graham-Harrison 2017). But it was only the CNN report entitled “People for sale,” which prompted global media attention as well as condemnations by political leaders and international organisations.

On 18 November, the first major street protest in response to the CNN article took place in front of the Libyan embassy in Paris, drawing about 1,000 people from a variety of African diaspora organisations and migrant movements (5,000 according to the organisers). The Parisian protest was organised by a “Collective against Slavery and Concentration Camps in Libya” (*Collectif contre l’esclavage et les camps de concentration en Libye, CECCL*) that had formed a few days earlier, right after the news had been released. Claudy Siar, a black French media personality, radio show host, and a former French government delegate for equality of opportunity in the French overseas departments acted

as a key organiser. In his video message that widely circulated on social media (with around four million views, Siar 2017), Siar powerfully insisted on the connection between the memory of the transatlantic slave trade and the ongoing enslavement of young African migrants. Siar's call to protest on 18 November went viral via social media in the spaces of the African diaspora; Black French celebrities such as actor Omar Sy, football player Didier Drogba, and former Miss France Sonia Rolland all shared his video message, and controversial Pan-Africanist activist Semi Keba joined Siar in the organisation of the first demonstration. While the location of the protest pointed to the Libyan government at its target, the protesters' outrage was also directed against the French government and political elite, with resounding chants of "*Sarkozy, assassin!*" ("Sarkozy, murderer!") in reference to then President Sarkozy's responsibility in the military intervention in Libya in 2011. "We don't have to respect the people, the state, or international organisations that do not respect us," as a Parisian protester put it (Agence France Presse 2017a). The demonstration culminated in confrontations with the police, who used teargas against the predominantly black crowd on the *Champs Elysées*, producing images charged with symbolism that were subsequently picked up by international media (Youssef 2017).

After the unexpectedly massive turnout of African diaspora groups, another protest took place in Paris on 24 November, drawing an even larger crowd. While migrants and refugees had already been present at the first demonstration, this second event was organised by a coalition of 22 different associations that now explicitly included a number of migrant collectives (such as *Coordination des Sans-Papiers 75*, *United Migrants*, and *La Cuisine des Migrants*) as well as migrant solidarity groups. At this second protest, African diaspora groups continued to make up the majority of organisers and participants (with collectives such as the *Fédération des Travailleurs Africains en France et en Europe*, *Togo Debout* or the Malian group *Anté À bana*). Yet against certain media representations of the protest as based on an essentialist understanding of racial belonging (Tsimi 2010), a large variety of groups from the French workers movement, with unions such as the *Confédération générale du travail* and parties from the radical left (e.g. the *Nouveau Parti Anticapitaliste*) also participated in the organisation (NPA 2009). Similar coalitions rapidly formed in other French cities, with protests in Lyon, Marseille, and Nantes in response to social media campaigns.

But what certainly irritated some observers was that the predominantly non-black groups from the radical left remained only at the margins of the protests, thereby reversing the racial dynamics of traditional social movement mobilisations in France. Without a doubt, the language of diasporic fraternity ("*Libérez nos frères!*"), the presence of various African country flags, and the affirmation of a shared sense of blackness must have all disappointed the expectations of a French republican discourse for which race remains a notorious taboo. In a political context in which white actors typically get to speak from the place of 'the universal,' the mere fact that black protesters formed the majority in the

demonstrations led certain French journalists to pejoratively speak of a particularist, ‘communitarian’ movement. Right extremist media even referred to the anti-slavery campaign as “race riots” (*émeutes ethniques*), while simultaneously – and contradictorily – highlighting the presence of white activists and slogans against the French government’s austerity politics amongst the protesters in Nantes (Moulin 2017).

The French movement of November 2017 evolved in a context of trans-national mobilisation that included simultaneous protests in at least seven different African countries. On 20 November, a protest took place in front of the Libyan embassy in Conakry, Guinea, where young activists carrying signs stating “Stop the sale of blacks” and “Free our brothers” were joined by the Minister of National Unity and Citizenship, Khalifa Gassama Diaby, as well as trap artist Djanii Alfa (Diallo 2017). At the same time, a sit-in took place in the Malian capital Bamako, targeting the Libyan embassy before moving to the “pyramid of remembrance,” a highly symbolic memorial site for the independence struggle in Mali. Opposition politician Tiébilé Dramé stated on this occasion that the protests in Bamako are also directed against the European Union since the “Libyan authorities are playing the role of its watchman on the African continent [*garde-chieurme*, also denoting the overseer of slaves on a ship]” (RFI Afrique 2017). Protesters in Yaoundé, Cameroon on 20 November carried banners with the slogan “Black Men are not cattle” (“*L’homme noir n’est pas du bétail*”); the protest around the activist Nzodjou Fotsing was ultimately dissolved by governmental security forces and numerous arrests were made (Cameroon Voice 2017). In Abidjan, Ivory Coast, a group of young activists followed a call by reggae artist Alpha Blondy to protest in front of the Libyan embassy on 20 November; the Ivorian police arrested three of the protesters (Ivoire Times 2017). On 23 November, demonstrations followed in Tunis (Kapitalis 2017), and Rabat, with dozens of black protesters in Morocco symbolically wearing heavy iron chains (Nouvel Observateur 2017). The next day a protest of about 100 people took place in Cotonou, Benin, on 24 November, organised by the group *Urgences panafricanistes* (Benin Web TV 2017), in simultaneity with the second Parisian demonstration. Subsequently, a similar protest was staged in Dakar, with twenty-eight different associations co-organising the event, including the Senegalese section of Amnesty International (Agence France Presse 2017b). The Dakar event of 25 November involved an assembly on the *Place de l’Obélisque*, a politically significant space commemorating Senegal’s 1960 independence from France. During this assembly, which has been recorded in its entirety by the local activists, numerous speeches thematized issues as wide-ranging as the historical memory of the slave trade, struggles of decolonisation, the importance of economic solutions for African migration, the critique of the European border regime, as well as possible forms of solidarity between African and diasporic communities (Dakar Actu 2017).

The transnational movement finally reverberated back to the Global North, with a protest in Berlin on 25 November, primarily organized by migrant and refugee groups, as well as a demonstration in New York that was organized by the Reverend Al Sharpton's civil rights group, the National Action Network (NAN 2017). The demonstration in Brussels the same day turned violent, as a group of 50 "looters" of 15–18 years of age "raided two department stores and damaged a police car." As *Deutsche Welle* reports the incident, "police responded by deploying a helicopter and a water cannon at the scene and arresting around 50 people" (Deutsch Welle 2017). For the following two months, new protests appeared around the world, with a group of civil rights activists around Nigerian musician Charly Boy shutting down the Libyan embassy in Abuja on 30 November (Vanguard Nigeria 2017), hundreds of people protesting in Lagos on 1 December, and an even larger mobilisation in London on 8 December (Okundia 2017; Grafton-Green 2017). The same week, migrant organisations in Germany organised new demonstrations in Hamburg, Frankfurt, and Cologne (Kölner Stadt Anzeiger 2017; Majic 2017). On 12 December, activists from several African countries held a march in Pretoria that mobilised several hundreds, including collectives by Nigerian migrants in South Africa (PM News Nigeria 2017).

Just as the earlier Parisian protests, these mobilisations were all characterised by a set of grievances that cannot be folded into one neat agenda, vertically addressed to one identified target. While all of the protests remained in a sense directed at the Libyan government, their choices of location and web of historical symbolism speak to the complexity of a transnational constellation. Their movement was neither exclusively directed against one foreign government, nor did it make claims vis-à-vis local representatives. Instead, movement actors conjugated the question of slavery in Libya with global questions such as migration and structural economic reform, while simultaneously putting forward 'local' grievances, from the freedom of assembly in Abidjan and Yaoundé to urban inequality in Bruxelles and Nantes. In doing so, they engaged in forms of world-building and opened up spaces beyond the figure of a sovereign people – perhaps even introducing the germs of a "a new concept of the state [...] to which the principle of sovereignty would be wholly alien" (Arendt 1972, 233). Yet in contrast to Arendt's revolutionaries, the protesters against slavery did not link their grievances to an enactment of republican principles. Frank (2009) and Zerilli (2012) have both shown that an Arendtian notion of action can be deployed to understand the 'augmentation' of constitutional principles on the part of the oppressed, offering compelling readings of Frederick Douglass' speech "What to the Slave is the Fourth of July?" But instead of invoking the principles of a metropolitan tradition, the transnational anti-slavery movement of 2017 drew on different histories: no longer centred on citizenship and its promises, but erasing the line that separates *citizens* from *migrants*, and *migrants* from *slaves*. Insofar as today's migrant struggles converge with memories of

anti-colonial resistance and slave revolt, “the *refugee-immigrant* is a late modern maroon” (Roberts 2015, 170) and not a citizen-in-becoming.

This shift of perspective entails a rethinking of action from the viewpoint of liminal figures – pariahs, migrants, and slaves – who are confronted with imperial testaments that tend to be closed off against their dissenting redeployment. Hence, the slogans one could read at the Parisian protests of November 2017 did not echo any republican heritage, but instead included “*Je ne suis pas à vendre*” (“I am not for sale”) (France24, 2017). Black protesters – citizens and non-citizens alike – did not enact Arendtian principles, but instead made the radical choice to configure themselves as the migrant and run-away slave that they themselves might have been. This counter-staging of a marginalised identity indeed resonates with a line of thought in Arendt’s earlier work. In her 1943 essay “We Refugees,” published in the Jewish journal *Menorah* during her exile in Paris, Arendt paid tribute to “the tradition of a minority of Jews who have not wanted to become upstarts, who preferred the status of ‘conscious pariah.’” Instead of favouring integration, Arendt (2007, 274) here makes the striking claim that “refugees driven from country to country represent the vanguard of their peoples – if they keep their identity.” Like Arendt insisted with regard to refugees who emerge as revolutionary agents “if they keep their identity” (*ibid.*), one might today argue that the most critical practices of world-building can occur when the haunting link between the figures of the migrant and the colonial subject or even the slave is affirmed. In the 2017 movement against slavery, non-Eurocentric ‘pariah traditions’ began to animate a counter-cosmopolitics from the South. In such moments, a different kind of heritage might be augmented, for another kind of world-building.

Arendt with Glissant: Cosmopolitics of the *Tout-Monde*

In his call to join the Parisian protest on 18 November, French rapper Booba gave voice to a diasporic sense of solidarity by way of a quote from one of his songs: “*J’atteste qu’il est unique, que ma race sert de crash-test/Déraciné, ma terre est sous mes baskets.*”²

The Pan-African solidarity of the transnational movement against slavery should thus not be mistaken for an ethnonationalist defence of racial particularism. None of the 2017 protests proposed a vision of racial purity or a return to a mythical homeland, but rather spoke to the diasporic condition of a networked sense of selfhood: “routed” rather than “rooted,” as Gilroy has put it (1993, 33). What achieved its unity across various locations was not a return to an ethnic wholeness to be recovered or the recognition of the past “how it really was;” rather, a worldly space was generated *politically* through a symbolic demand that activated “a memory as it flashes in a moment of danger” (cf. Benjamin 1942). The constellation between past and future, between the struggle against the enslavement of migrants in Libya and its historical antecedents in colonialism

and the transatlantic slave trade, can occur when the history of the vanquished, their ‘lost treasure,’ becomes itself generative of a form of world-building. Such “islands” of non-sovereign action might prepare a future in which Europe, as Glissant suggested, “like the Caribbean before it, is transforming into an archipelago” (Glissant and Schwieger Hiepko 1988). The imagined geography of what Glissant calls an “archipelago,” spanning geographical borders and even non-linear frames of historicity, is opposed both to ethnonationalism and to an Arendtian cosmopolitics for which principles from the centre are said to be taken up and ‘iterated’ at their colonial periphery, be it among historical slaves of Saint-Domingue or today’s migrants in Paris.

At a time when the figure of the African migrant is constantly re-inscribed in the violent logics of racialized exclusion or humanitarian care, a radical counter-cosmopolitics might emerge from a “primal history of modernity to be reconstructed from the slaves’ points of view” (Gilroy 1993, 55). The political insistence on diasporic networks that have remained inseparable from histories of slavery and anti-colonial resistance could thus point the way towards a post-sovereign order in the making. In fact, the remarkable anxiety in French political culture over what is called ‘communitarian’ (*communautaire*), typically referring to postcolonial communities and practices beyond the grasp of the French ‘People,’ might itself be indicative of their radical potential for a non-sovereign politics. Instead of neutralising such plural counter-powers within an ‘augmented’ Eurocentrism, a critical Arendtian approach should acknowledge the interplay of multiple inheritances.

Glissant’s ‘archipelagic’ philosophy in many respects lends itself to an extended conversation with Arendt’s thought – a project which goes beyond the limits of this chapter, but which has already found first expressions in recent contributions by Dorismond (2009), Roberts (2015), and Gaffney (2017). Mirroring the Arendtian distinction between “earth” (that is, the givenness of the planet) on the one hand and the “world” (understood as the achievement of action) on the other, Glissant (1997a) opposes the violent processes of globalisation with a positive vision of the “*Tout-Monde*” (literally “*All-World*”). The dynamic worldliness of the *Tout-Monde* entails the acknowledgment of a plurality that is not reducible to a Rawlsian “fact of pluralism,” but is itself both constituted and troubled through constant inter-cultural criss-crossings. For Glissant, the creolised *Tout-Monde* is the always fragile achievement of an open-ended poetics in which differences are constructed not as the expression of their self-same identities, but through dynamic forms of relationality (*la Relation*). Just as Arendt shifts the emphasis from a foundationalist search for a cosmopolitan grounding to the revolutionary task of world-building, so too Glissant defends an uprooted, rhizomatic understanding of the self. Such an *identité-rhizome* only finds its meaning in the risky interactions that a relation between plural beings can afford. While Arendt compares Lessing’s political way of thinking to a “freedom of movement,” imaginatively travelling around perspectives, Glissant

(1997b, 21) develops a “thinking of errantry” that affirms the idea of a world “but willingly renounces any claims to sum it up or to possess it.”

Among the many affinities between their cosmopolitan visions, Arendt and Glissant both place special emphasis on the constitution of worldly space through a narrative activation of memory. As Glissant puts it in his 2006 *Une Nouvelle Région du Monde*, “let’s remember together, from all the coasts of these seas! Memory is an archipelago” (163). Yet the crucial difference with Arendt’s perspective lies in the fact that, for Glissant, the paradigmatic experience of a worldly space is no longer the Athenian *polis*, nor the ‘hidden tradition’ of Western council democrats. Instead, he regards Caribbean history out of slavery as a privileged point of access to an experience of worldliness in the sense of a plural *Tout-Monde*. The fractured and splintered history of the Caribbean – or, as Glissant (1989, 61) calls it, its “nonhistory” – “began with a brutal dislocation, the slave trade.”

As Glissant writes in a chapter entitled “History, histories” in his *Discours antillais* (1997c, 230–231), the experience of a politics out of slavery “teaches a dimension of human action that is as unexpected as it is evident: its *transversality*.” The transversality of action constitutes a form of worldly belonging across borders that does not rely on the figure of the citizen or the idea of the universal, but is instead associated with the dead bodies of black slaves on the bottom of the sea. Where Arendt imagines the revolutionary tradition in the joyfully maritime language of treasure hunters and pearl divers, Glissant flips this picture on its head: against Arendtian ‘world-building,’ Glissant’s *Tout-Monde* begins with the image of the slave ship and dead black bodies who have turned into “submarine roots” (1997c, 231) for a groundless humanity. The transversality of Glissant’s *Tout-Monde* is hence rendered possible only through the brutality of slave trade and colonialism to which it remains tied. The ‘revolutionary tradition’ of transversality that has emerged from this violence bypasses the privileged spaces of Athenian isonomy and Western assemblies, whereas it activates the hidden lineages of maroon struggle.

Drawing on Gilroy’s seminal work on the “Black Atlantic,” Danewid (2017) has recently proposed a transnational reading of the “Black Mediterranean,” revealing “the Mediterranean crisis not as a moment of exception or as a discrete event in time but, rather, as a late consequence of Europe’s violent encounter with the Global South” (1679). In a similar vein, the 2017 movement against slavery calls for a recentring of cosmopolitics on an understanding of history for which the experiences of the *migrant* and the *slave*, not the *citizen*, are taken as emblematic of a groundless condition of politics. Migrants and run-away slaves are what Glissant (1997b, 175–177), in a phrase highly evocative of Benjamin, refers to as “flash agents,” generating *échos-monde* that encapsulate worldly plurality in the miniature of their experience. Like Arendt put it, “the world’s reality is [...] expressed by their escape” (1968, 22). But against her identification of principled action with a metropolitan tradition and its ‘treasures,’ the 2017 movement against slavery has activated a revolutionary heritage that unsettles

European testaments. Yet perhaps it also offers “the chance to live the participative relativisation” that world-building must entail, for Glissant and Arendt alike, as a “conjunction which departs from uniformity” (1997c, 231).

Conclusion

The 2017 transnational movement against slavery warrants a rethinking of Arendtian cosmopolitics. It exemplifies a world-building for which the memory of slavery, not the European tradition of citizenship and republican principles, stands at the centre of political action. More specifically, this chapter has defended three interrelated points. First, it has distinguished Arendtian *cosmopolitics* from *cosmopolitan* philosophy, insofar as Arendt’s thought does not build on the foundationalism of a transcendental humanity, but instead highlights political modes of ‘world-building.’ Since Arendt rejects any grounding of action in either Kantian humanism or national sovereignty, she seems like a particularly fruitful partner for a dialogue on migrant movements that explode the limitations of existing theoretical vocabularies. Building on the ‘Arendtian turn’ in scholarship on migrant struggles, this contribution has defended the relevance of Arendt’s political theory insofar as it offers a powerful counterpoint to depictions of migrants as either victims in need of aid or threatening ‘Others.’

Yet Arendt’s notorious failure to engage with the histories of slavery and slave revolt turn into an untenable limitation for a theory of cosmopolitics when 40 million people live in conditions of enslavement around the world (ILO Report 2016) and migrants crossing into Europe from Libya have become indistinguishable from run-away slaves. As a second part has shown, the 2017 movement has not only activated memories of anti-slavery and decolonial struggle, but placed them at the heart of a *counter-cosmopolitics*. In contrast to the ‘world-building’ that Arendt theorises out of a Eurocentric tradition and its ‘lost treasures,’ the 2017 movement did not equate politics with the enactment of republican principles. With citizens and non-citizens acting in concert across Europe and West Africa, it demonstrated that some of the most promising instances of ‘world-building’ have little to do with the provincial experiences that Arendt cherished and falsely associated with ‘the revolutionary tradition.’

Against the Arendtian imagery of ‘lost treasures’ and pearl divers, a turn to Glissant sheds a very different light on the cosmopolitics of sea-crossings. Reading Arendt alongside Glissant, one might be able to decentre ideas of world-building towards memories of decolonial struggle and marronage. The 2017 movement gestured towards a cosmopolitan *Tout-Monde* whose groundlessness does not only derive from a critique of metaphysics, but builds on the ‘submarine roots’ of drowned bodies. Political theory from the North has to learn how to listen in on the politics of diasporic movements that today might confront the observer with the same kind of surprise that for Arendt is so characteristic of revolution. In the end, it might precisely be their illegibility from

the point of view of a metropolitan tradition that could set them apart from a mere re-articulation of state-based rights regimes and perhaps even contain the promise of new beginnings.

Notes

- 1 “Our heritage was left to us without a testament.”
- 2 “I attest that it’s unique that my race serves as a crash test/uprooted, my soil is underneath my sneakers” (*Commis d’Office*, from the 2004 album *Panthéon*).

Bibliography

Agence France Presse (2017a). “Esclavage en Libye. Des mobilisations dans plusieurs villes françaises.” November 25, 2017, www.ouest-france.fr/monde/libye/esclavage-en-libye-des-mobilisations-dans-plusieurs-villes-francaises-5403715. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Agence France Presse (2017b). “Non à l’esclavage en Libye: manifestations à Paris et Dakar.” November 24, 2017, www.lorientlejour.com/article/1085923/non-a-lesclavage-en-libye-manifestations-a-paris-et-dakar.html. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Arendt, Hannah (1958). *The Human Condition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Arendt, Hannah (1963). *On Revolution*. London and New York, NY: Penguin Books.

Arendt, Hannah (1968). *Men in Dark Times*, Orlando: Harcourt Brace and Company.

Arendt, Hannah (1972). *Crises of the Republic*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Arendt, Hannah (2007). “We Refugees.” In *The Jewish Writings*, eds. Kohn and Feldman, 264–274. New York, NY: Schocken Books.

Arendt, Hannah (2011). *Essays in Understanding, 1930–1954: Formation, Exile, and Totalitarianism*. New York, NY: Schocken Books.

Arendt, Hannah (2017). “Nation-State and Democracy.” *Arendt Studies* (1), 7–12.

Balibar, Étienne (1994). *Mases, Clases, Ideas: Studies on Politics and Philosophy Before and After Marx*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Balibar, Étienne (2004). *We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Beltrán, Cristina (2009). “Going Public: Hannah Arendt, Immigrant Action, and the Space of Appearance.” *Political Theory* (37: 5), 592–622.

Benhabib, Seyla (2003). *The Reluctant Modernism of Hannah Arendt*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Benhabib, Seyla (2008). *Another Cosmopolitanism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Benin Web TV (2017). “Manifestation contre l’esclavage en Libye à Cotonou au Bénin.” *Youtube*, November 25, 2017, www.youtube.com/watch?v=sD58tPAAS14. Last accessed: April 10, 2018.

Bülow, Ulrich von (2015). *Hannah Arendt in Marbach*. Spuren 105. Marbach am Neckar: Deutsche Schillergesellschaft.

Cameroon Voice (2017). “Cameroun: des manifestants contre l’esclavage en Libye interpellés à Yaoundé.” November 21, 2017, www.cameroonvoice.com/news/article-news-31862.html. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Cascais, Antonio (2017). “Slave Trade in Libya: Outrage across Africa.” *Deutsche Welle*, November 22, 2017. www.dw.com/en/slave-trade-in-libya-outrage-across-africa/a-41486013. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Dakar Actu (2017). "Revivez le grand rassemblement contre l'esclavage de migrants en Libye." November 24, 2017. www.dakaractu.com/REPLAY-PLACE-DE-LA-NATION-Revivez-le-grand-rassemblement-contre-l-esclavage-de-migrants-en-Libye_a142463.html. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Danewid, Ida (2017). "White Innocence in the Black Mediterranean: Hospitality and the Erasure of History." *Third World Quarterly* (38: 7), 1674–1689.

Deutsche Welle (2017). "Looters Arrested in Brussels after Protest against Libyan Slave Trade." November 25, 2017. www.dw.com/en/looters-arrested-in-brussels-after-protest-against-libyan-slave-trade/a-41533182. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Diallo, Toulaye (2017). "Mobilisation devant l'ambassade de Libye pour dénoncer l'esclavage que subissent des africains." *Guinée 360*, November 18, 2017. www.guinee360.com/18/11/2017/mobilisation-devant-lambassade-de-libye-denoncer-lesclavage-subissent-africains/. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Dorismond, Edelyn (2009). "Créolisation de la politique, politique de la créolisation." *Cahiers Sens Public* (3: 11–12), 137–146.

Elbagir, Nima, Razek, Raja, Pratt, Alex, and Jones, Bryony (2017). "People for Sale: Where lives are Auctioned for \$400." CNN, November 14, 2017. <https://edition.cnn.com/2017/11/14/africa/libya-migrant-auctions/index.html>. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Grafton-Green, Patrick (2017). "Anti-Slavery March: Hundreds of Protesters Descend on Libyan Embassy in London." *Evening Standard*, December 9, 2017. www.standard.co.uk/news/london/antislavery-march-hundreds-of-protesters-descend-on-libyan-embassy-in-london-a3714796.html. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Fassin, Didier (2012). *Humanitarian Reason*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Fischer, Sibylle (2004). *Modernity Disavowed: Haiti and the Cultures of Slavery*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

France24 (2017). "Libye: 'Je ne suis pas à vendre'." November 23, 2017. www.france24.com/fr/oeil-medias/20171123-libye-je-suis-pas-a-vendre. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Frank, Jason (2009). *Constituent Moments*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Majic, Daniel (2017). "Lautstark gegen Sklaverei in Libyen." *Frankfurter Rundschau*, December 11, 2017. www.fr.de/frankfurt/protest-lautstark-gegen-sklaverei-in-libyen-a-1405329. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Gaffney, Jennifer (2017). "Memories of Exclusion: Hannah Arendt and the Haitian Revolution." *Philosophy and Criticism* (44: 6), 1–21.

Gilroy, Paul (1993). *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gines, Kathryn (2014). *Arendt and the Negro Question*, Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press.

Graham-Harrison, Emma (2017). "Migrants from West Africa Being 'Sold in Libyan Slave Markets'." *The Guardian*, April 10, 2017, www.theguardian.com/world/2017/apr/10/libya-public-slave-auctions-un-migration. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Glissant, Édouard and Schwieger Hiepko, Andrea (1988). "L'Europe et les Antilles: Une Interview d'Édouard Glissant." *Mots Pluriels* (8), <http://motspluriels.arts.uwa.edu.au/MP898ash.html>. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Glissant, Édouard (1989). *Caribbean Discourse: Selected Essays*. Charlottesville, VA: University of Virginia Press.

Glissant, Édouard (1997a). *Traité du Tout-Monde*. Paris: Gallimard.

Glissant Édouard (1997b). *Poetics of Relation*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Glissant, Édouard (1997c). *Discours antillais*. Paris: Gallimard.

Glissant, Édouard (2006). *Une Nouvelle Région du Monde*. Paris: Gallimard.

Gündoğdu, Ayten (2015). *Rightlessness in an Age of Rights: Hannah Arendt and the Contemporary Struggles of Migrants*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Honig, Bonnie (1992). "Toward an Agonistic Feminism: Hannah Arendt and the Politics of Identity." In eds. Butler and Scott, *Feminists Theorize the Political*, 528–533. New York, NY and London: Routledge.

Honig, Bonnie (2006). "Another Cosmopolitanism? Law and Politics in the New Europe?" In *Another Cosmopolitanism*, ed. Benhabib, 102–127. Oxford and New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

International Labor Organization (2016). "Forced Labor, Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking." <http://www.ilo.org/global/topics/forced-labour/lang--en/index.htm>. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Ivoire Times (2017). "Côte d'Ivoire: Manifestation contre l'esclavage de 'leurs frères' à Abidjan." November 20, 2017, <https://ivoiretimes.com/societe/cte-divoire-manifestation-contre-lesclavage-de-leurs-freres-abidjan-arrestations-et-ambassade-de-libye-quadrille/>. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Johnson, Gaye Theresa and Lubin, Alex (2017). *Futures of Black Radicalism*. London and New York, NY: Verso.

Kapitalis (2017). "Manifestation à Tunis contre la traite des noirs en Libye." November 23, 2017, <http://kapitalis.com/tunisie/2017/11/23/manifestation-a-tunis-contre-la-traite-des-noirs-en-libye/>. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Karasapan, Omer and Shah, Sajjad (2018). "The Slave Trade in Libya: What can development actors do?" *Future Developments Blog*, Brookings Institution, January 25, 2018, www.brookings.edu/blog/future-development/2018/01/25/the-slave-trade-in-libya-what-can-development-actors-do/. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Kateb, George (1983). *Hannah Arendt: Politics, Conscience, Evil*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.

Kölner Stadt Anzeiger (2017). "Kundgebung gegen Versklavung von Flüchtlingen in Libyen." December 9, 2017, www.ksta.de/kundgebung-gegen-versklavung-von-fluechtlingen-in-libyen-29268202. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Krause, Monika (2008). "Undocumented Migrants: An Arendtian Perspective." *European Journal of Political Theory* (7: 3), 331–348.

Malcomson, Scott L. (1998). "The Varieties of Cosmopolitan Experience." In *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling Beyond the Nation*, eds. Cheah and Robbins, 233–246. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Moulin, Louis (2017). "Sales putes de blancs! La manifestation contre l'esclavage en Libye tourne à l'émeute ethnique." *Breizh-Info*, November 25, 2017, www.breizh-info.com/2017/11/25/82944/nantes-sales-putes-blancs-manifestation-contre-lesclavage-libye-tourne-emeute-ethnique. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

National Action Network (2017). "NAN National Organizers Lead NYC Members in a Coalition Protest to Spread Awareness and Fight to End Slave Trade Happening in Libya." <https://nationalactionnetwork.net/featured/nan-national-organizers-lead-nyc-members-in-a-coalition-protest-to-spread-awareness-and-fight-to-end-slave-trade-happening-in-libya/>. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Norton, Anne (2010). "Heart of Darkness: Africa and African Americans in the Writings of Hannah Arendt." In *Feminist Interpretations of Hannah Arendt*, ed. Honig, 247–261. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Nouveau Parti Anticapitaliste (2009). “Stop à la mise en esclavage des migrants en Libye!” November 23, 2017, <https://npa2009.org/evenement/paris-rassemblement-stop-la-mise-en-esclavage-des-migrants-en-libye>. Last accessed on March 20, 2018.

Nouvel Observateur (2017). “Leur vie vaut 400 dollars!”: mobilisation au Maroc contre l’esclavage en Libye.” November 24, 2017, <http://www.nouvelobs.com/galeries-photos/photo/20171124.OBS7777/photos-leur-vie-vaut-400-dollars-mobilisation-au-maroc-contre-l-esclavage-en-libye.html>. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

PM News Nigeria (2017). “Africans in South Africa Protest against Slavery, Human Trafficking in Libya.” December 12, 2017, <https://www.pmnewsnigeria.com/2017/12/12/africans-safrica-protest-slavery-human-trafficking-libya/>. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Roberts, Neil (2015). *Freedom as Marronage*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

RFI Afrique (2017). “Mali: des manifestations prévues contre l’esclavage des migrants en Libye.” November 20, 2017, <http://www.rfi.fr/afrique/20171119-mali-manifestations-prevues-contre-esclavage-migrants-libye/>. Last accessed: July 30, 2018.

Okundia, Jennifer (2017). “Nigerians Stage Protest for Slave Trade in Libya.” *Sahara Reporters*, December 2, 2017, <http://saharareporters.com/2017/12/02/nigerians-stage-protest-slave-trade-libya>. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Siar, Claudio (2017). “Nos jeunes sont vendus comme esclaves en Libye et le monde ne dit rien.” *Video Message*, November 15, 2017, www.facebook.com/claudysiari/videos/1506523042765264/. Last accessed on March 20, 2018.

Tassin, Étienne (2003). *Un Monde commun. Pour une cosmo-politique des conflits*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.

Tsimi, Charles (2017). “Étrange manifestation contre l’esclavage.” *Les Blogs de Média-part*, November 19, 2017, <https://blogs.mediapart.fr/charles-tsimi/blog/191117/etrange-manifestation-contre-lesclavage>. Last accessed on March 20, 2018.

Vanguard Nigeria (2017). “Charly Boy’s Group Shuts Down Libyan Embassy in Abuja, Protests Slave Trade.” November 30, 2017, www.vanguardngr.com/2017/11/charly-boys-group-shuts-down-libyan-embassy-in-abuja-protests-slave-trade/. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Volk, Christian (2015). *Arendtian Constitutionalism: Law, Politics, and the Order of Freedom*. London: Bloomsbury.

Wintour, Patrick (2017). “‘Fake News’: Libya Seizes on Trump Tweet to Discredit CNN Slavery Report.” *The Guardian*, November 28, 2017, www.theguardian.com/world/2017/nov/28/libya-slave-trade-cnn-report-trump-fake-news. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Youssef, Nour (2017). “Sale of Migrants as Slaves in Libya Causes Outrage in Africa and Paris.” *New York Times*, November 19, 2017, www.nytimes.com/2017/11/19/world/africa/libya-migrants-slavery.html. Last accessed: March 20, 2018.

Zerilli, Linda (2012). “Value Pluralism and the Problem of Judgment: Farewell to Public Reason.” *Political Theory* (40: 1), 6–32.