# 1NC

### 1

#### Interp and Violation: The affirmative must only defend that the appropriation of outer space by private entities is unjust and may only garner offense from the hypothetical implementation of the resolution – they don’t

#### Private entity is defined by

Cornell Law n.d. “private entity” <https://www.law.cornell.edu/definitions/uscode.php?width=840&height=800&iframe=true&def_id=6-USC-625312480-168358316&term_occur=999&term_src=title:6:chapter:6:subchapter:I:section:1501> TG

1. In general Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph, the term “private entity” means any person or private group, organization, proprietorship, partnership, trust, cooperative, corporation, or other commercial or nonprofit entity, including an officer, employee, or agent thereof.

#### Article 2 of the Outer Space Treaty defines outer space and appropriation

OST 66 “2222 (XXI). Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and Use of Outer Space, including the Moon and Other Celestial Bodies.” UN Office for Outer Space Affairs, 1499th plenary meeting, Dec 19, 1966, <https://www.unoosa.org/oosa/en/ourwork/spacelaw/treaties/outerspacetreaty.html> TG

ARTICLE II. Outer space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, is not subject to national appropriation by claim of sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means.

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Fairness – post facto topic adjustment structurally favors the aff by manipulating the balance of prep. They can specialize in 1 area of literature for 4 years which gives them a huge edge over people switching topics every 2 months and locks us into a predictable null set of monolithic criticisms that are susceptible to the perm. Fairness is an impact - a] it’s an intrinsic good – debate is fundamentally a game and some level of competitive equity is necessary to sustain the activity which they’ve ceded validity to by participating, b] probability – individual ballots can’t alter subjectivity even if long term clash over a season can, but they can rectify skews which means the only immediate impact to a ballot is fairness and deciding who wins, c] it internal link turns every impact – a limited topic promotes in-depth research and engagement which is necessary to access all of their education

#### 2] Clash – argumentative testing along a stable tether and SSD are good – they force debaters to consider a controversial issue from multiple perspectives through nuanced 3rd and 4th level testing that only occurs alongside a stasis point for preparation. Non-T affs allow individuals to establish their own metrics for what they want to debate leading to ideological dogmatism – our argument is that the process of defending and answering proposals against a well-researched opponent is a benefit of engaging the topic regardless of the truth value of those proposals.

#### 3] TVA – prove the material enactment of the res is bad

#### Use competing interps – topicality is question of models of debate which they should have to proactively justify and we’ll win reasonability links to our offense.

#### They can’t weigh the case—lack of preround prep means their truth claims are untested which you should presume false—they’re also only winning case because we couldn’t engage with it

#### No impact turns—exclusions are inevitable because we only have 45 minutes so it’s best to draw those exclusions along reciprocal lines to ensure a role for the negative

### 2

#### Interpretation: Debaters must disclose all constructive positions on open source with highlighting on the 2020-21 NDCA LD wiki after the round in which they read them and before the next round they debate.

#### Violation – they don’t wiki and I asked

Graphical user interface, application, table

Description automatically generatedGraphical user interface, text, application, chat or text message

Description automatically generated

#### 1] Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs who can’t bypass paywalled articles.

Louden 10 – Allan D. Louden, professor of Communication at Wake Forest (“Navigating Opportunity: Policy Debate in the 21st Century” Wake Forest National Debate Conference. IDEA, 2010)

Groups interested in engaging in competitive National Debate Tournament (NDT)-Cross Examination Debate Association (CEDA)-style policy debate are entering an exciting time in the debate community where **digital resources are making research and networking increasingly accessible**. Those developing programs should be encouraged to choose their own topics and resolutions, but they should also make use of the massive resources available by focusing on the official NDT-CEDA resolution. **New initiatives in the field of open-source debate make evidence sharing, such as the Open Caselist, a powerful tool for new programs to engage and compete against established teams**. It is no coincidence that **the winners of the NDT tend to be the schools with the largest coaching staffs, but the increased distribution and free sharing of evidence and resources have made smaller debate programs increasingly capable of competing against larger institutions**. We are now seeing the beginnings of **increased resource sharing**, with multiple initiatives focusing on regional evidence sharing for groups of developing debate programs. This **is one example of dramatic changes occurring in the community that are capable of opening the doors for new participation in debate**. Regardless of outside influence, such as an organized campaign by preexisting debate organizations to increase resource distribution, students are independently capable of establishing the foundations for a larger competitive program. The following suggestions are a nonlinear set of options available to students who wish to establish a struc-tured and coached debate program, and eventually developing the capability to maintain multiple professional teaching positions, such as those discussed earlier in the chapter.

#### 2] Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify pre-round that cards aren’t miscut or highlighted or bracketed unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat

#### 3] Depth of clash – it allows debaters to have nuanced researched objections to their opponents evidence before the round at a much faster rate, which leads to higher quality ev comparison – outweighs cause thinking on your feet is NUQ but the best quality responses come from full access to a case.

#### Voters:

#### Drop the debater – a) they have a 7-6 rebuttal advantage and the 2ar to make args I can’t respond to, b) it deters future abuse and sets a positive norm.

#### Use competing interps – reasonability doenst make sense on disclosure

#### No RVIs – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) norming – I can’t concede the counterinterp if I realize I’m wrong which forces me to argue for bad norms, c) baiting – incentivizes good debaters to be abusive, bait theory, then collapse to the 1AR RVI,

### 3

#### We endorse the entirety of the aff except the appropriation of outer space by private entities except for Large Satellite Constellations in Lower Earth Orbit.

#### Pics do negate – proves aff wrong

#### Terrestrial Internet Cables are vulnerable now – risks access.

Griffiths 19 James Griffiths 7-26-2019 "The global internet is powered by vast undersea cables. But they’re vulnerable." <https://www.cnn.com/2019/07/25/asia/internet-undersea-cables-intl-hnk/index.html> (CNN Analyst)//ELmer

Hong Kong (CNN) - On July 29, 1858, two steam-powered battleships met in the middle of the Atlantic Ocean. There, they connected two ends of a 4,000 kilometer (2,500 mile) long, 1.5 centimeter (0.6 inch) wide cable, linking for the first time the European and North American continents by telegraph. Just over two weeks later, the UK’s Queen Victoria sent a congratulatory message to then US President James Buchanan, which was followed by a parade through the streets of New York, featuring a replica of a ship which helped lay the cable and fireworks over City Hall. In their inaugural cables, Queen Victoria hailed the “great international work” by the two countries, the culmination of almost two decades of effort, while Buchanan lauded a “triumph more glorious, because far more useful to mankind, than was ever won by conqueror on the field of battle. The message took over 17 hours to deliver, at 2 minutes and 5 seconds per letter by Morse code, and the cable operated for less than a month due to a variety of technical failures, but a global communications revolution had begun. By 1866, new cables were transmitting 6 to 8 words a minute, which would rise to more than 40 words before the end of the century. In 1956, Transatlantic No. 1 (TAT-1), the first underwater telephone cable, was laid, and by 1988, TAT-8 was transmitting 280 megabytes per second – about 15 times the speed of an average US household internet connection – over fiber optics, which use light to transmit data at breakneck speeds. In 2018, the Marea cable began operating between Bilbao, Spain, and the US state of Virginia, with transmission speeds of up to 160 terabits per second – 16 million times faster than the average home internet connection. Today, there are around 380 underwater cables in operation around the world, spanning a length of over 1.2 million kilometers (745,645 miles). Underwater cables are the invisible force driving the modern internet, with many in recent years being funded by internet giants such as Facebook, Google, Microsoft and Amazon. They carry almost all our communications and yet – in a world of wireless networking and smartphones – we are barely aware that they exist. Yet as the internet has become more mobile and wireless, the amount of data traveling across undersea cables has increased exponentially. “Most people are absolutely amazed” by the degree to which the internet is still cable-based, said Byron Clatterbuck, chief executive of Seacom, a multinational telecommunications firm responsible for laying many of the undersea cables connecting Africa to the rest of the world. “People are so mobile and always looking for Wi-Fi,” he said. “They don’t think about it, they don’t understand the workings of this massive mesh of cables working together. “They only notice when it’s cut.” Network down In 2012, Hurricane Sandy slammed into the US East Coast, causing an estimated $71 billion in damage and knocking out several key exchanges where undersea cables linked North America and Europe. “It was a major disruption,” Frank Rey, director of global network strategy for Microsoft’s Cloud Infrastructure and Operations division, said in a statement. “The entire network between North America and Europe was isolated for a number of hours. For us, the storm brought to light a potential challenge in the consolidation of transatlantic cables that all landed in New York and New Jersey.” For its newest cable, Marea, Microsoft chose to base its US operation further down the coast in Virginia, away from the cluster of cables to minimize disruption should another massive storm hit New York. But most often when a cable goes down nature is not to blame. There are about 200 such failures each year and the vast majority are caused by humans. “Two-thirds of cable failures are caused by accidental human activities, fishing nets and trawling and also ships’ anchors,” said Tim Stronge, vice-president of research at TeleGeography, a telecoms market research firm. “The next largest category is natural disaster, mother nature – sometimes earthquakes but also underwater landslides.” A magnitude-7.0 earthquake off the southwest coast off Taiwan in 2006, along with aftershocks, cut eight submarine cables which caused internet outages and disruption in Taiwan, Hong Kong, China, Japan, Korea and the Philippines. Stronge said the reason most people are not aware of these failures is because the whole industry is designed with it in mind. Companies that rely heavily on undersea cables spread their data across multiple routes, so that if one goes down, customers are not cut off. How a cable gets laid Laying a cable is a years-long process which costs millions of dollars, said Seacom’s Clatterbuck. The process begins by looking at naval charts to plot the best route. Cables are safest in deep water where they can rest on a relatively flat seabed, and won’t rub against rocks or be at risk of other disturbances. “The deeper the better,” Clatterbuck said. “When you can lay the cable down in deep water you rarely have any problems. It goes down on the bottom of the seabed and just stays there.” Things become more difficult the closer you get to shore. A cable that is only a few centimeters thick on the bottom of the ocean must be armored from its environment as reaches the landing station that links it with the country’s internet backbone. “Imagine a long garden hose, inside of which are very small tubes that house a very, very thin fiber pair,” Clatterbuck said. That hose is wrapped in copper, which conducts the direct current that powers the cable and its repeaters, sometimes up to 10,000 volts. “The fibers are wrapped in urethane and wrapped in copper and wrapped again in urethane,” he said. “If we’re going to have to put that cable on a shoreline that is very shallow and has a lot of rocks, you’re now going to have to armor coat that cable so no one can hack through it.” Cables in less hospitable areas can be far thicker than garden hoses, wrapped in extra plastic, kevlar armor plating, and stainless steel to ensure they can’t be broken. Depending on the coast, cable companies might also have to build concrete trenches far out to sea, to tuck the cable in to protect it from being bashed against rocks. “Before the cable-laying vessels go out they send out another specialized ship that maps the sea floor in the area when they want to go,” said TeleGeography’s Stronge. “They want to avoid areas where there’s a lot of undersea currents, certainly want to avoid volcanic areas, and avoid a lot of elevation change on the sea floor.” Once the route is plotted and checked, and the shore connections are secure, huge cable laying ships begin passing out the equipment. “Imagine spools of spools of garden hose along with a lot of these repeaters the size of an old travel trunk,” Clatterbuck said. “Sometimes it can take a month to load the cable onto a ship.” The 6,600 kilometer (4,000 mile) Marea cable weighs over 4.6 million kilograms (10.2 million pounds), or the equivalent of 34 blue whales, according to Microsoft, which co-funded the project with Facebook. It took more than two years to lay the entire thing. Malicious cuts The blackout came without warning. In February 2008, a whole swath of North Africa and the Persian Gulf suddenly went offline, or saw internet speeds slow to a painful crawl. This disruption was eventually traced to damage to three undersea cables off the Egyptian coast. At least one – linking Dubai and Oman – was severed by an abandoned, 5,400 kilogram (6-ton) anchor, the cable’s owner said. But the cause of the other damage was never explained, with suggestions it could have been the work of saboteurs. That raises the issue of another threat to undersea cables: deliberate human attacks. In a 2017 paper for the right-wing think tank Policy Exchange, British lawmaker Rishi Sunak wrote that “security remains a challenge” for undersea cables. “Funneled through exposed choke points (often with minimal protection) and their isolated deep-sea locations entirely public, the arteries upon which the Internet and our modern world depends have been left highly vulnerable,” he said. “The threat of these vulnerabilities being exploited is growing. A successful attack would deal a crippling blow to Britain’s security and prosperity.” However, with more than 50 cables connected to the UK alone, Clatterbuck was skeptical about how useful a deliberate outage could be in a time of war, pointing to the level of coordination and resources required to cut multiple cables at once. “If you wanted to sabotage the global internet or cut off a particular place you’d have to do it simultaneously on multiple cables,” he said. “You’d be focusing on the hardest aspect of disrupting a network.”

#### Mega-constellations provide fast, affordable internet that bridges digital divide – independently, competition lowers prices across the board.

Novo 21 Paula Novo 3-31-2021 "Will Starlink Change the Internet?' <https://www.highspeedoptions.com/resources/insights/will-starlink-change-the-internet> (With over four years of broadband experience, Paula Novo is the Site Editor and Senior Writer for HighSpeedOptions. She has helped develop the criterion by which HighSpeedOptions reviews and recommends internet service providers, striving to simplify and guide the user’s decision toward the best communications services. Paula also leads HighSpeedOptions coverage of the digital divide, ISP reviews, and broadband policy.)//Elmer

While it’s not the first – and won’t be the last – company to test low Earth orbit satellites, Starlink, the satellite internet division of SpaceX, is making waves in the telecommunications industry for its residential beta program launched in 2020. As the first U.S.-based firm to successfully bring LEO internet to market, Starlink shows promise where others have heroically failed. Every satellite company in history to launch a low Earth orbit (LEO) constellation has gone bankrupt, except for Starlink, that is. Said best in a tweet by Elon Musk, founder and CEO of this venture, “Starlink is a staggeringly difficult technical and economic endeavor. However, if we don’t fail, the cost to end-users will improve every year.” In the span of a decade, broadband moved from a “nice-to-have” to a “must-have” – the COVID-19 pandemic simply speeding up the clock on its shift towards a utility. Yet, we’re a far cry away from total connectivity. Due to availability and cost issues (to name a few), millions of Americans don’t have access to reliable internet, which further widens the education and wealth gaps. If successful, Starlink – and LEO satellite internet as a whole – may be the first real solution for billions of people missing out on the benefits of broadband. Current State of the Telecom Industry Despite advances in technology, the telecom industry is lagging behind. And, contrary to what internet service providers and the media report, the United States’ internet options are still very limited. The three biggest hurdles standing in the way of real progress include access, affordability, and lack of competition. Access According to the Federal Communications Commission’s (FCC) 2020 Broadband Deployment Report, roughly 6% of all Americans have zero access to fixed broadband at home. And, of those without access, a majority live in rural areas. That’s about 19 million people who, even if they could afford to subscribe to internet service, are out of luck. The FCC defines broadband speeds as just 25 Mbps down and 3 Mbps up, which may be fast enough to check emails but won’t reliably support your Breaking Bad marathon. You can see how living in an underserved area, then, can severely limit a person’s job prospects, schooling, and social connections. Still, we can’t rate internet access without also looking at affordability. While some 19 million Americans do not have access at all, as many as one in three Americans choose to not subscribe to internet service, citing cost as a leading factor. Affordability FCC data shows that nearly 35% of Americans, or about 114 million people, do not subscribe to broadband service at their homes. Affordability – or lack thereof – is often cited as the main driver for this decision. Despite government intervention via efforts like the FCC Lifeline Program and ISP subsidies to incentivize network expansions, America still seems to lag behind other developed countries when it comes to internet cost. In a 2020 study by New America, it turns out that we pay quite a bit more for internet service than most developed countries in Asia and Europe, regardless of speed. Before factoring in data caps and other ancillary ISP fees, we pay “nearly twice as much as European countries for high-speed internet.” Naturally, the ballooning question pops up – How did we fall behind? Lack of Competition The lack of competition today may be the single greatest obstacle preventing the telecom industry (read: ISPs and consumers) from thriving. A long history of privately-owned infrastructures and government regulations has enabled monopolies to quash competition in the marketplace and ignore the demand for innovation. Unsurprisingly, the Institute of Self-Reliance released a new report finding that two of the largest broadband companies in the U.S. – Comcast and Charter Spectrum – maintain a monopoly over 47+ million American households. It also sheds light on an additional 33 million homes only serviceable by one or two DSL providers. While these are just a few examples of the current market, you can easily see how large segments of the population lack the competitive supply needed to drive down costs and push for more development. What if there was a solution to address these pitfalls with the internet? What if Americans (or, really, anyone in the world) could circumvent some of the physical and political barriers stopping us from connecting from seemingly anywhere? These are questions Starlink is attempting to answer. Ways Starlink May Change the Internet First, what is Starlink and how is it different from other internet providers? It’s an Elon Musk satellite internet company bringing life to the telecom industry. In the last year, Starlink launched over 1,000 satellites into low orbit with the goal of offering a new type of broadband. If successful, this LEO service could not only supersede traditional satellite internet like HughesNet or Viasat but also rival the likes of fiber internet in rural and remote communities. Unlike GEO satellite providers who use a few hundred large satellites orbiting over 35,000 kilometers from Earth, Starlink plans to use up to 42,000 small satellites in low orbit no higher than 1,200 kilometers. Because of these key differences, Starlink is anticipated to offer reliable speeds up to 1 Gbps with lower latency of 20ms to 40ms worldwide. Essentially, it’d combine the performance of grounded internet with the geographical freedom of traditional satellite internet so people can live anywhere on Earth while staying connected. In general, LEO satellite service represents a real chance at solving connectivity issues for anyone outside city limits. Starlink may also pave the way for tangible changes to the industry as a whole, including lower prices, faster speeds, and better economic opportunities. Pricing of Internet As Starlink enters new markets, the added competition has the potential to drive down the cost of internet over time. In a study by the Analysis Group, they calculated that when just one new competitor joins a designated market area (DMA), the price of plans with speeds ranging from 50 Mbps to 1 Gbps sees a monthly decline of $1.50. That’s it? McDonald’s saves me more than that. Not so fast, though. Remember how we said Starlink isn’t the only company testing low orbit satellites? With other ventures like Blue Origin, OneWeb, and Telesat itching to launch their own LEO constellations, it won’t be long before new players enter the market. At which point, the Analysis Group guesstimates an 8% reduction in monthly broadband prices, or about $7.50. For low-income households, that may be the difference needed to break even on bills. And, even though Starlink itself is quite expensive, its presence in the market has the potential to still benefit consumers who could choose a (now) cheaper internet provider. Internet Speeds Similarly, the buzz around LEO internet speeds has industry heads raising their eyebrows as well. While Starlink is only testing speeds of 50 Mbps to 150 Mbps right now, in time it’s expected to offer speeds up to 1 Gbps with low latency. Normally these speeds are reserved for grounded connections like fiber or cable internet. So, if Starlink manages to deliver, we may no longer be limited by our geography. Even further, the Analysis Group reports that the availability of higher internet speeds in a DMA “increases the likelihood that other providers will introduce high-speed plans to match […] their competition.” In particular, they found that broadband providers are 4 to 17 percent more likely to increase their speeds on an annual basis because of competition. This goes to show that a little healthy rivalry in the marketplace first and foremost benefits the consumer. Economic Opportunity If Starlink is successful, we expect to see economic opportunity improve for billions with a B as well. With global availability, more people will have the means to compete for jobs in today’s digital age. To put things into perspective, consider the world population. Of the current 7.8 billion people, a little under half of them (40%) lack regular internet access. That’s nearly one out of every two people. If LEO satellite service can make it to where geography, price, and speeds aren’t roadblocks anymore, what happens? In general, more people with internet access equates to more job access. And, as jobs continue to transition online, it’s safe to assume that people won’t be as limited by obstacles such as disabilities, poor education, and wealth disparities when they compete for openings. In these ways, Starlink has the potential to help offset poverty where many governments have failed.

#### It's comparably faster than current competitors.

Lumanlan 21 August Dominic M Lumanlan 8-14-2021 "How Elon Musk’s Starlink will be the future of the Internet" <https://medium.com/@augustlumanlan2017/how-spacexs-starlink-will-be-the-future-of-the-internet-8f07adb4eb2> (Engineering Author)//Elmer

Internet speeds, satellite equipment, and user feedback Starlink has very high internet speeds, higher than the speed of internet we currently have in our homes. Speeds average around 100 mbps but it could go as far as 200 mbps, or even 300 mbps. It has a latency of 20 milliseconds. Latency just means the time it takes for the satellite to transmit the data packets (YouTube videos, Facebook messages, Google searches, etc.) from the ground station, to the nearest Starlink satellite, which then transmits it to other nearby satellites and whichever one is closest above the user will transmit it downward to the Starlink dish that receives the data packets, which can finally reach your home router and now you’re connected to the internet and received the data packets. The process can repeat vice versa. This means that the internet connection with Starlink is much faster than our current internet connection which has around 60 milliseconds of latency. A lot of beta testers have shared their experiences online and have been picked up by the media to know more about the Starlink internet program’s capabilities and the user’s feedback about them. What they say is true: They are so happy about it, they think it’s worth it. Because its so fast and reliable to many places around the world, you can easily connect to the internet and be able to do multiple things like watch YouTube or Google search, or even work conveniently anywhere you wish, as long as you have a ground Starlink dish with you.

#### Internet solves extinction

**Eagleman 10** [David Eagleman is a neuroscientist at Baylor College of Medicine, where he directs the Laboratory for Perception and Action and the Initiative on Neuroscience and Law and author of Sum (Canongate). Nov. 9, 2010, “ Six ways the internet will save civilization,”  
 http://www.wired.co.uk/magazine/archive/2010/12/start/apocalypse-no]

Many **great civilisations have fallen**, leaving nothing but cracked ruins and scattered genetics. Usually this results **from: natural disasters, resource depletion, economic meltdown, disease, poor information flow and corruption**. But we’re luckier than our predecessors because **we command a technology that no one else possessed: a rapid communication network that finds its highest expression in the internet**. I propose that there are six ways in which **the net has vastly reduced the threat of societal collapse. Epidemics can be deflected by telepresence** One of our more dire prospects for collapse is an infectious-disease epidemic**. Viral and bacterial epidemics precipitated the fall of** the Golden Age of Athens**,** the Roman Empire and most of the empires of the Native Americans. **The internet can be our key to survival because the ability to work telepresently can inhibit microbial transmission by reducing human-to-human contact**. In the face of an otherwise devastating epidemic, businesses can keep supply chains running with the maximum number of employees working from home. This can reduce host density below the tipping point required for an epidemic. **If we are well prepared when an epidemic arrives, we can fluidly shift into a self-quarantined society** in which microbes fail due to host scarcity. Whatever the social ills of isolation, they are worse for the microbes than for us. **The internet will predict natural disasters We are witnessing the downfall of slow central control in the media**: news stories are increasingly becoming user-generated nets of up-to-the-minute information. **During the recent California wildfires,** locals went to the TV stations to learn whether their neighbourhoods were in danger. But the news stations appeared most concerned with the fate of celebrity mansions, so Californians changed their tack: they uploaded geotagged mobile-phone pictures, updated Facebook statuses and tweeted. The balance tipped: **the internet carried news about the fire more quickly and accurately than any news station could.** In this grass-roots, decentralised scheme, there were embedded reporters on every block, and the news shockwave kept ahead of the fire. This head start could provide the extra hours that save us. If the Pompeiians had had the internet in 79AD, they could have easily marched 10km to safety, well ahead of the pyroclastic flow from Mount Vesuvius. **If the Indian Ocean had the Pacific’s networked tsunami-warning system, South-East Asia would look quite different today. Discoveries are retained and shared** Historically, **critical information has required constant rediscovery**. Collections of learning -- from the library at Alexandria to the entire Minoan civilisation -- have fallen to the bonfires of invaders or the wrecking ball of natural disaster. Knowledge is hard won but easily lost. And information that survives often does not spread. **Consider smallpox inoculation**: this was under way in India, China and Africa centuries before it made its way to Europe**. By the time the idea reached North America, native civilisations who needed it had already collapsed. The net solved the problem. New discoveries catch on immediately;** information spreads widely. In this way, societies can optimally ratchet up, using the latest bricks of knowledge in their fortification against risk. **Tyranny is mitigated Censorship of ideas** was a familiar spectre in the last century, with state-approved news outlets ruling the press, airwaves and copying machines **in the USSR**, Romania, Cuba, China, Iraq **and elsewhere**. In many cases, such as Lysenko’s agricultural despotism in the USSR, it **directly contributed to the collapse of the nation**. Historically**, a more successful strategy has been to confront free speech with free speech -- and the internet allows this in a natural way.** It democratises the flow of information by offering access to the newspapers of the world, the photographers of every nation, the bloggers of every political stripe. Some posts are full of doctoring and dishonesty whereas others strive for independence and impartiality -- but all are available to us to sift through. Given the attempts by some governments to build firewalls, it’s clear that this benefit of the net requires constant vigilance. **Human capital is vastly increased Crowdsourcing brings people together to solve problems.** Yet far fewer than one per cent of the world’s population is involved. We need expand human capital. Most of the world not have access to the education afforded a small minority. For every Albert Einstein, Yo-Yo Ma or Barack Obama who has educational opportunities, uncountable others do not. This squandering of talent translates into reduced economic output and a smaller pool of problem solvers. **The net opens the gates education to anyone with a computer**. A motivated teen anywhere on the planet can walk through the world’s knowledge -- from the webs of Wikipedia to the curriculum of MIT’s OpenCourseWare**. The new human capital will serve us well when we confront existential threats we’ve never imagined before. Energy expenditure is reduced** Societal collapse can often be understood in terms of an energy budget: **when energy spend outweighs energy return, collapse ensues**. This has taken the form of deforestation or soil erosion; **currently, the worry involves fossil-fuel depletion. The internet addresses the energy problem with a natural ease**. Consider the massive energy savings inherent in the shift from paper to electrons -- as seen in the transition from the post to email. **Ecommerce reduces the need to drive long distances to purchase products. Delivery trucks are more eco-friendly** than individuals driving around, not least because of tight packaging and optimisation algorithms for driving routes. Of course, there are energy costs to the banks of computers that underpin the internet -- but these costs are less than the wood, coal and oil that would be expended for the same quantity of information flow. **The tangle of events that triggers societal collapse can be complex,** and there are several threats the net does not address. **But vast, networked communication can be an antidote to several of the most deadly diseases threatening civilisation.** The next time your coworker laments internet addiction, the banality of tweeting or the decline of face-to-face conversation, you may want to suggest that the net may just be the technology that saves us.

#### Independently, Starlink bridges the Splinternet – that solves Fake News and Disinformation propagated from censorship – affordable, un-blockable, and accessible internet is key.

Koetsier 20 John Koetsier 1-9-2020 "Elon Musk's 42,000 StarLink Satellites Could Just Save the World" <https://archive.is/K6Lq0#selection-3087.0-3131.123> (I've been a journalist, analyst, and corporate executive, and have chronicled the rise of the mobile economy. I built the VB Insight research team at VentureBeat)//Elmer

Elon Musk’s other company, SpaceX, is building Starlink, a global communications constellation that could approach a staggering 42,000 satellites. And it could be all that stands between us and a fragmented world living in virtually — and actually — different realities. How? World War II can tell us the answer. In the early 1940s a tyrannical power using fake news, hate speech, military might and hegemonic power controlled most of Europe: the Nazis. They controlled public life, news and local economies. Resistance groups dotted the European mainland, with one lifeline for non-official communication from free countries: radio. As such, radios were contraband and confiscated. One of the activities the allies undertook to support resistance fighters was shipping in radios for communication and outside news. Today, radios aren’t at risk of being confiscated. But the internet is. And as a cloud-delivered service, hijacking the internet happens largely out of public sight, in servers and routers that enable services like Netflix and the BBC and Facebook and Google. It’s called splinternet, and it’s the ongoing division of a worldwide interconnected internet into separate and isolatable fiefdoms, each of which can be controlled and managed so that governing powers can control what their populations see. The Great Firewall of China is the most well-known example, but Iran, Syria and Vietnam also control significant portions of the internet for their populations. Russia just completed technology to wall off its internal networks, servers and internet users from the wider internet. And India, in its attempt to control unrest following its anti-Muslim citizenship law, has employed a particularly heavy-handed approach: simply blocking the internet entirely. (One unintended result: contractors in India can’t reach their employers in the U.S.) Another country, United Arab Emirates, took a different approach: outlawing all messengers except one that it built a digital backdoor into: Totok. However it happens, it allows governments to control what people see, read and hear from outside sources — and censor what their own people say. Starlink can change all of that. Elon Musk recently revealed details about how people will access StarLink. It will be incredibly simple, and it will enable access to the relatively free global internet from anywhere on the planet. Starlink Terminal has motors to self-adjust optimal angle to view sky. Instructions are simply: plug in socket, point at sky. These instructions work in either order. No training required. Elon Musk What that means is that anyone can access the internet from anywhere. Chinese citizens will be able to access Google and information about Tiananmen Square. Russian citizens will be able to see external analysis of Putin’s financial dealings if even Russia blocks outside sources. Indian protesters can’t be cut off from the internet. Of course, governments will make the Starlink Terminal illegal. But that in itself will be a victory. Censorship works best when it is invisible: when people don’t even know that there is alternate information, other understandings of reality. (Chinese teenage exchange students at a relative’s house last year, for example, had never heard of Tiananmen Square, and refused to believe stories that, they felt, painted China in a negative light.) But when a device to connect to the outside world becomes contraband, the glass walls become opaque. People realize that walls have been erected to prevent them from seeing other opinions. And that is at least one step to maintaining a free, open and accessible internet globally, which should help combat fake news, propaganda and information deprivation aimed at controlling populations. And it’s a step towards making the splinternet harder to achieve. 1,000 satellites will be enough to enable basic service, Musk has said. SpaceX just launched a third batch of 60 satellites, and is expected to continue launching that many every two weeks through the rest of 2020. (For context, only about 9,000 satellites have been launched in all of space history, about 5,000 of which are still in orbit. And only 2,000 are actually still operational. So even at a quarter or a fifth of total capacity, Starlink is a ridiculously large satellite constellation and unprecedented in human history — and astronomers have legitimate concerns about light pollution.) While Musk has applied for launch permission for up to 42,000 satellites, he’s unlikely to launch them all. But at the current pace, a global and unblockable internet service should be available in less than a year. This doesn’t mean that all will instantly be rosy. Governments, of course, can try to jam satellite signals. That’s unlikely to work — or even be possible — in all places and all times, however. They’re also likely to continue to try to engage in false flag and other misinformation projects. And people seem to be pretty good at fooling themselves these days: locking themselves in reality bubbles that block dissenting narratives. But any gaps in the emerging splinternet are opportunities for different perspectives and, hopefully, true facts to emerge.

#### Fake News is an existential threat – hurts global cooperation on every significant issue and results in geopolitical conflict spirals.

Al-Rodhan 17 Nayef Al-Rodhan 6-7-2017 "Post-Truth Politics, the Fifth Estate and the Securitization of Fake News" <https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/07/06/2017/post-truth-politics-fifth-estate-and-securitization-fake-news> (Prof Nayef Al-Rodhan is an Honorary Fellow at St Antony’s College, University of Oxford, and Senior Fellow and Head of the Geopolitics and Global Futures Programme at the Geneva Centre for Security Policy)//Elmer

Even so, what we are witnessing today, in the “post-truth” era is more menacing because of the multiplication of channels of communication. Information now can circulate freely and unverified on the Internet, providing possibilities of misinformation and propaganda on a scale that was previously virtually impossible. In effect, it is now possible to share fake news more frequently than verified news, also due to the fact that social media has enabled the proliferation of authentic-looking or misleading fake accounts that help spread lies, most often directed against the liberal public. What is truth anyway? The Oxford Dictionaries dates the first use of the term to a 1992 essay by Steve Tesich, a Serbian-American playwright writing in The Nation following the Iran/Contra scandal. Tesich reflected that after the Watergate revelations and reporting of atrocities from Vietnam, Americans had become contemptuous of uncomfortable truths. He noted: “we came to equate the truth with bad news (…). We looked to our government to protect us from the truth”. Journalist David Roberts also used the term “post-truth” more than two decades ago to refer to the response of some US politicians refuting scientific claims about climate change. In 2004, Ralph Keyes proclaimed we had reached the age of “post-truth”. In his 2004 book, “The Post-Truth Era: Dishonesty and Deception in Contemporary Life”, Keyes expressed the concern that we are losing the stigma attached to lying, meaning that lies can be told with impunity. For Keyes, such times of “post truthfulness” represent an ethical twilight zone. The common theme running across the history of the term is that post-truth is defined by lies spread routinely by politicians, with little or no significant consequences for their legitimacy and reputation. But there are inevitable consequences for the future of democracy and the future of humanity: a future in which scientific facts are repudiated cannot be anything but insecure. Veritas, or truth, and facts are crucial for humanity, and indispensible for effective decision-making and ultimately, for human progress. Moreover, facts-based policies are also important in an existential sense and indispensible to our own survival – the case of the debate on climate change being a prime example. Geopolitics and Fake News Geopolitics in the era of fake-news is also complicated because post-truth disrupts a fundamental element of diplomacy and international politics, namely communication. Unsubstantiated allegations and groundless claims will distort diplomatic relations and lead political and military processes astray. False claims about the money ‘extorted’ from the UK by the European Union helped build the case for Brexit, with its ensuing implications for stability in Europe and elsewhere. The Russian state used social media to spread allegations that the Ukranian government crucified a child – a claim later debunked, yet telling of how fake news can help fuel wars. Similarly, populist rhetoric about NATO’s inadequacy and misinformation about its funding mask ignorance about the real benefits of the alliance for its members’ common security. Although unsubstantiated, such comments are enough to create anxiety in political quarters and prompt some Eastern European nations to see their state security in a wholly different geopolitical light. In the post-truth era, a complete lack of understanding of military strategy and the intricacies of warfare will be less relevant in devising policies, and this comes at the risk of dismantling security communities and the foundations of the liberal order. The possibility of hijacking national elections also has profound geopolitical and security implications. This has been a particularly key topic in the aftermath of the US elections. The stakes are especially high in France, which is a key member of the European Union and NATO, and where the winning candidate can, quite unequivocally, impact the future of the liberal order.

#### Starlink solves internet monopolies

**Krow 21** Krow, A. (2021, February 27). *Will Starlink disrupt spectrum’s internet provider monopoly?* Medium. <https://medium.com/technology-hits/will-starlink-disrupt-spectrums-internet-provider-monopoly-c3b33d20be11> (Teacher. Writer. Future Author. Aspiring Linguist. Progressive Voter. Twitter @ajkrow\_writer.) //Aadit

Throughout college and well into my teaching career, I’ve spent several hundred dollars sitting in coffee shops, drinking a latte or a Frappuccino while I completed work using their Wi-Fi until closing. Once I arrived home, I opened YouTube on my phone and played a video at the lowest resolution, 144p. I waited for several minutes as the video buffered. This became a daily occurrence when living in a rural area. Millions still don’t have access to fast internet at home As of [2019](https://www.digitaltrends.com/web/31-percent-us-households-no-broadband-internet/), a third of households nationwide do not have a reliable internet connection. The only way those families can access the internet is to leave their homes and go to a public library, school, or Starbucks. A week before schools transitioned to virtual learning in 2020, I remember some of my students stared at their phones under their desks. When I caught them and asked them to turn it in, they refused. For many students, the only internet access they had available was at school. [As of September 2020](https://usafacts.org/articles/internet-access-students-at-home/), 3.7 million children still did not have access to an internet connection at home. In August of 2020, teachers were expected to provide live (synchronous) classes to students via Zoom. I panicked. I still did not have access to the internet in my rural home. I immediately went on apartments.com and searched for a decent apartment that would have access to the internet. Once school started, many students could not log in to Google Classroom or Zoom and attend class. Of the seventy or so students I see every other day, less than half log in to Zoom. All the other students have never logged in, nor have they turned in a single assignment since school began. As a result, teachers, schools, and [districts nationwide failed them](https://apnews.com/article/distance-learning-coronavirus-pandemic-oregon-7fde612c3dbfd2e21fab9673ca49ad89). Corporations control who gets access to the internet In the United States, only two companies control a majority of the internet service available in the country. Those are Spectrum (also known as Comcast) and Charter (also known as Xfinity). Both companies decided they wouldn’t compete against each other. Instead, they would each claim one area and be the only internet service provider available. By doing so, they could raise prices and provide data caps. Customers have no choice other than to agree to the terms and conditions. In the U.S., [83.3 million people](https://ilsr.org/report-most-americans-have-no-real-choice-in-internet-providers/) are controlled by an internet monopoly: either Charter or Spectrum. Since both corporations have no other competition, they have no incentive to innovate or expand their services to other areas, namely rural areas. Spectrum and Charter see no benefit in laying out hundreds or thousands of feet of underground cable and spend tens of thousands of dollars to provide internet to a rural home, as the customer would only pay $50-$100 a month. Meanwhile, their “competitors” provide poor services and fail to offer any sort of competition to Charter or Spectrum. ViaSat, for example, offers limited data plans — its most expensive plan offers 150GB for $200 per month. In a family of four or five people, where children are connected to Zoom meetings, that data plan will reach its limit very quickly. This data plan also can’t compare to Spectrum, which offers unlimited internet for a quarter of the price of ViaSat. However, ViaSat and HughesNet are the only internet service providers available to rural areas. Since ViaSat and HughesNet face no competition from Spectrum and Charter, they have no incentive to provide fast speeds for their consumers. The average speed of ViaSat clocks in at [11.7Mbps](https://testmy.net/hoststats/viasat), or 1.4 Megabytes per second. At that speed, a YouTube video has to be played at the lowest resolution and would still buffer. Google Fiber failed to disrupt the market Roughly ten years ago, Google announced it would become an internet service provider. Google planned to disrupt Spectrum and Charter’s current control of the market by offering internet using fiber-cable. This new technology would allow for faster speeds. [As of 2020](https://support.google.com/fiber/answer/6250056?hl=en), it is about five times faster than Spectrum internet. Today, a majority of the U.S. population still does not have access to Google Fiber. According to Google, Fiber is [only available in twelve cities](https://fiber.google.com/) in the country. Rural customers still don’t have a solution, nor do city people have access to more than one or two options. Starlink will do what Google couldn’t A few years ago, Elon Musk announced Starlink, a division of SpaceX. Musk intends on providing internet access to everyone around the world wirelessly through the use of satellites. So far, SpaceX has launched over a thousand satellites into low-Earth orbit, though the FCC has approved SpaceX to launch over 12,000 satellites for Starlink usage. As more satellites are launched into space, internet coverage will expand around the world. Whether you live in an urban, suburban, or rural area, you will have access to high-speed internet. Many YouTubers who have preordered the Starlink service have already received their installation package and are testing it out in remote areas. As of [a few days ago](https://www.cnbc.com/2021/02/22/elon-musk-spacex-will-double-starlink-internet-speed-later-this-year.html), Elon Musk made a few promises. People would have access to 300Mbps speed internet, and coverage will be available worldwide by the end of 2021. This timeline beats Google Fiber, as Google is only providing coverage to a dozen cities in the U.S. For people who lack internet access or want something other than Spectrum or Charter, Starlink will be the answer.

#### Focus on large scale catastrophes is good and they outweigh – appeals to social costs, moral rules, and securitization play into cognitive biases and flawed risk calculus – 2020 is living proof

Weber 20 (ELKE U. WEBER is Gerhard R. Andlinger Professor in Energy and the Environment and Professor of Psychology and Public Affairs at Princeton University.), November-December 2020 Issue, "Heads in the Sand," Foreign Affairs, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2020-10-13/heads-sand> mvp

We are living in a time of crisis. From the immediate challenge of the COVID-19 pandemic to the looming existential threat of climate change, the world is grappling with massive global dangers—to say nothing of countless problems within countries, such as inequality, cyberattacks, unemployment, systemic racism, and obesity. In any given crisis, the right response is often clear. Wear a mask and keep away from other people. Burn less fossil fuel. Redistribute income. Protect digital infrastructure. The answers are out there. What’s lacking are governments that can translate them into actual policy. As a result, the crises continue. The death toll from the pandemic skyrockets, and the world makes dangerously slow progress on climate change, and so on.

It’s no secret how governments should react in times of crisis. First, they need to be nimble. Nimble means moving quickly, because problems often grow at exponential rates: a contagious virus, for example, or greenhouse gas emissions. That makes early action crucial and procrastination disastrous. Nimble also means adaptive. Policymakers need to continuously adjust their responses to crises as they learn from their own experience and from the work of scientists. Second, governments need to act wisely. That means incorporating the full range of scientific knowledge available about the problem at hand. It means embracing uncertainty, rather than willfully ignoring it. And it means thinking in terms of a long time horizon, rather than merely until the next election. But so often, policymakers are anything but nimble and wise. They are slow, inflexible, uninformed, overconfident, and myopic.

Why is everyone doing so badly? Part of the explanation lies in the inherent qualities of crises. Crises typically require navigating between risks. In the COVID-19 pandemic, policymakers want to save lives and jobs. With climate change, they seek a balance between avoiding extreme weather and allowing economic growth. Such tradeoffs are hard as it is, and they are further complicated by the fact that costs and benefits are not evenly distributed among stakeholders, making conflict a seemingly unavoidable part of any policy choice. Vested interests attempt to forestall needed action, using their money to influence decision-makers and the media. To make matters worse, policymakers must pay sustained attention to multiple issues and multiple constituencies over time. They must accept large amounts of uncertainty. Often, then, the easiest response is to stick with the status quo. But that can be a singularly dangerous response to many new hazards. After all, with the pandemic, business as usual would mean no social distancing. With climate change, it would mean continuing to burn fossil fuels.

But the explanation for humanity’s woeful response to crises goes beyond politics and incentives. To truly understand the failure to act, one must turn to human psychology. It is there that one can grasp the full impediments to proper decision-making—the cognitive biases, emotional reactions, and suboptimal shortcuts that hold policymakers back—and the tools to overcome them.

AVOIDING THE UNCOMFORTABLE

People are singularly bad at predicting and preparing for catastrophes. Many of these events are “black swans,” rare and unpredictable occurrences that most people find difficult to imagine, seemingly falling into the realm of science fiction. Others are “gray rhinos,” large and not uncommon threats that are still neglected until they stare you in the face (such as a coronavirus outbreak). Then there are “invisible gorillas,” threats in full view that should be noticed but aren’t—so named for a psychological experiment in which subjects watching a clip of a basketball game were so fixated on the players that they missed a person in a gorilla costume walking through the frame. Even professional forecasters, including security analysts, have a poor track record when it comes to accurately anticipating events. The COVID-19 crisis, in which a dystopic science-fiction narrative came to life and took everyone by surprise, serves as a cautionary tale about humans’ inability to foresee important events.

Not only do humans fail to anticipate crises; they also fail to respond rationally to them. At best, people display “bounded rationality,” the idea that instead of carefully considering their options and making perfectly rational decisions that optimize their preferences, humans in the real world act quickly and imperfectly, limited as they are by time and cognitive capacity. Add in the stress generated by crises, and their performance gets even worse.

Because humans don’t have enough time, information, or processing power to deliberate rationally, they have evolved easier ways of making decisions. They rely on their emotions, which serve as an early warning system of sorts: alerting people that they are in a positive context that can be explored and exploited or in a negative context where fight or flight is the appropriate response. They also rely on rules. To simplify decision-making, they might follow standard operating procedures or abide by some sort of moral code. They might decide to imitate the action taken by other people whom they trust or admire. They might follow what they perceive to be widespread norms. Out of habit, they might continue to do what they have been doing unless there is overwhelming evidence against it.

Not only do humans fail to anticipate crises; they also fail to respond rationally to them.

Humans evolved these shortcuts because they require little effort and work well in a broad range of situations. Without access to a real-time map of prey in different hunting grounds, for example, a prehistoric hunter might have resorted to a simple rule of thumb: look for animals where his fellow tribesmen found them yesterday. But in times of crisis, emotions and rules are not always helpful drivers of decision-making. High stakes, uncertainty, tradeoffs, and conflict—all elicit negative emotions, which can impede wise responses. Uncertainty is scary, as it signals an inability to predict what will happen, and what cannot be predicted might be deadly. The vast majority of people are already risk averse under normal circumstances. Under stress, they become even more so, and they retreat to the familiar comfort of the status quo. From gun laws to fossil fuel subsidies, once a piece of legislation is in place, it is hard to dislodge it, even when cost-benefit analysis argues for change.

## Case

#### The role of the ballot is to determine if the aff’s a good idea—anything else is self-serving, arbitrary and begs the question of the rest of the debate. Solves their offense since they can weigh the aff. Evaluate consequences

Christopher A. Bracey 6, Associate Professor of Law, Associate Professor of African & African American Studies, Washington University in St. Louis, September, Southern California Law Review, 79 S. Cal. L. Rev. 1231, p. 1318

Second, reducing conversation on race matters to an ideological contest allows opponents to elide inquiry into whether the results of a particular preference policy are desirable. Policy positions masquerading as principled ideological stances create the impression that a racial policy is not simply a choice among available alternatives, but the embodiment of some higher moral principle. Thus, the "principle" becomes an end in itself, without reference to outcomes. Consider the prevailing view of colorblindness in constitutional discourse. Colorblindness has come to be understood as the embodiment of what is morally just, independent of its actual effect upon the lives of racial minorities. This explains Justice Thomas's belief in the "moral and constitutional equivalence" between Jim Crow laws and race preferences, and his tragic assertion that "Government cannot make us equal [but] can only recognize, respect, and protect us as equal before the law." [281](http://web.lexis-nexis.com/universe/document?_m=cd9713b340d60abd42c2b34c36d8ef95&_docnum=9&wchp=dGLbVzz-zSkVA&_md5=9645fa92f5740655bdc1c9ae7c82b328) For Thomas, there is no meaningful difference between laws designed to entrench racial subordination and those designed to alleviate conditions of oppression. Critics may point out that colorblindness in practice has the effect of entrenching existing racial disparities in health, wealth, and society. But in framing the debate in purely ideological terms, opponents are able to avoid the contentious issue of outcomes and make viability determinations based exclusively on whether racially progressive measures exude fidelity to the ideological principle of colorblindness. Meaningful policy debate is replaced by ideological exchange, which further exacerbates hostilities and deepens the cycle of resentment.

#### Vote neg on presumption – 1] command F space in their aff – only their first card about a photo is actually about outer space and it’s literally only read maybe twice – even if they win their method is good, they also need to provide a reason that their advocacy text is good for that method 2] can’t solve earth based exploitation – all their cards are about our relationship to the Earth – banning expansion into space just refocuses that capitalist energy back to Earth 3] can’t solve public appropriation – the government can continue to expand

#### Affect theory is false – we don’t just blindly follow our desires i.e. if I get angry that doesn’t necessarily mean I’m going to attack them

#### Morally repugnant – there are infinite fluid identities, so we have infinite obligations to all persons – that means we can never act to satisfy those obligations, so any action is permissible including slavery

### Humanism

#### Resuscitating radical humanist thought is key to human survival --- their strategy embraces the Eurocentric conception of identity which naturalizes oppression and brackets-off theory from world concerns.

Isaac KAMOLA 17, an Assistant Professor of political science at Trinity College [“A time for anticolonial theory,” *Contemporary Political Theory*, First Online: October 5, 2017, p. 1-8, https://link.springer.com/article/10.1057/s41296-017-0161-8]

Today the world seems profoundly broken. Decades of endemic financial crisis and stagnant real wages have produced planetary inequality of such magnitude that eight white men now own the same wealth as the poorest half of the world’s population (Oxfam, 2017). Seemingly nihilistic armed conflicts engulf many regions of world, contributing to a reality in which one in every hundred people on the planet lives as a refugee (Connor and Krogstad, 2016). It is now ninety-five percent likely that temperatures will rise above the two-degree Celsius threshold, making the most dangerous effects of global climate change largely inevitable (Raftery et al., 2017). And this does not even include the success of racist, alt-right, and fascist movements across the United States, Europe, and elsewhere. All this at a time when governments and institutions around the world seem completely ill-equipped to even begin engaging the issues central to human survival. This brave new world is not only profoundly dispiriting, it poses very serious challenges to those whose academic and political practice involves critically engaging the world with the aim of crafting the theoretical tools – or, as Amílcar Cabral (1979) might suggest, weapons – needed to change it. Today, the academic workbench of concepts, theories, and analysis seems woefully inadequate to honestly stare into the abyss before us, much less provide meaningful guidance for systemic transformation. One reason for the considerable gulf between available theories and present political realities stems from the fact that much of the intellectual tradition structuring the academy today was built alongside imperial or liberal political and historical trajectories. Many of the cherished thinkers we draw upon to construct the contemporary political imaginaries were often coconspirators in the solidification of the European state system and Western imperialism. During the twentieth century, theorists engaged in celebrating a politics of mass demonstration and deliberation, social movements, democratization, and post-Cold War cosmopolitan civil society. The theoretical lessons learned from these historical moments now seem either complicit in, or overly stressed by, the weight of the current pressures. Similarly, many of the political and theoretical apparatuses used to critique this history pale in the face of a historical moment that seems to demand a renewed militancy of purpose, a willingness to take risks for justice, and the urgent need for even more vibrant and vital networks of human solidarity. It is not surprising, therefore, that within the current conjuncture political thinkers in the Western academy have begun returning to the shelves of the African anticolonial archive (for example: el-Malik and Kamola, 2017; Phạm and Shilliam, 2016; el-Malik, 2016). The twentieth-century struggles against colonialism in Africa, the African diaspora, and around the world, seem to once again speak in instructive and unexpected ways. There is good reason for this return. These voices are poetic yet strident, theoretical but immediately practical to the particularities of struggle. These writings on colonialism, race, class, violence, and governance avoid abstract musing – and the polish and perfection of argument that goes along with it. Instead, they are timely statements made with great urgency. The assumed audience of African anticolonial thought was often not scholars, but rather one’s immediate and intimate comrades. The horizons of these texts and arguments often contain futures filled with possibility, even if the specific outlines are not entirely discernable in the present moment. Several recent books have argued, in different ways, that returning to thinkers of African anticolonial struggle greatly enriches the theoretical understandings and political struggles of the present. Gary Wilder’s Freedom Time: Negritude, Decolonization, and the Future of the World (2015), Robbie Shilliam’s The Black Pacific: Anti-Colonial Struggles and Oceanic Connections (2015), and Achille Mbembe’s Critique of Black Reason (2017) all make the compelling argument that the ideas, concepts, and modes of argument developed during anticolonial struggles in Africa and by the African diaspora are uniquely suited to help make sense of – and intervene into – the present. Unlike previous debates about ‘African philosophy’ or the popular turn towards ‘comparative’ or ‘global’ political theory, these three authors neither seek to ‘bring’ black and African voices ‘into’ an academic field; nor do they take anticolonial thought as confined to a location, limited to specific set of ‘problems’, or focused exclusively on the aim of national independence. Instead, Wilder, Shilliam, and Mbembe treat the work of anticolonialism as a human inheritance, one that transcends time and space. Wilder, for example, clearly states that he is less interested in ‘provincializ[ing] Europe’ than in working to ‘deprovincialize Africa and the Antilles’ (p. 10). To do so, he tackles the political and intellectual work of Aimé Césaire and Léopold Sédar Senghor in ways that force attention to their broader commitment to articulating a post-national (and post-continental) human politics, as a radical critique of Western modernity rather than the limited plotting of national independence or a black political identity. Similarly, Shilliam foregrounds the epistemic and manifest networks through which the liberatory desires embedded within black power movements and RasTafari spiritual practices circulated among religious, activist, and youth communities in Aotearoa (New Zealand) and beyond. Mbembe also rejects the compartmentalization of ‘Africa’ from the world, demonstrating that the racialized practices and knowledges once used to justify the colonization of Africa have become widely generalized beyond race. The political and epistemic practices that used ‘Black’ and ‘Africa’ as references to concoct racialized categories have become universalized beyond race. These authors share a commitment to rereading African peoples, practices, and thought – especially as they relate to the refusal of the Western modern and colonial project – as central to understanding the contemporary condition. They contextualize anticolonial thinkers within their specific conjuncture, while taking care not to reduce their arguments to these temporal and spatial contexts. This work short-circuits the all-to-common assumption that the anticolonial project is a finished – or largely failed – project. However, rather than rebutting such accusations, Wilder’s Freedom Time gracefully argues that such claims are only relevant if one assumes that Césaire and Senghor, the two protagonists of his book, were primarily concerned with ending colonial rule within particular geographical spaces. Wilder argues that contemporary readers often miss the fact that these two thinkers understood their complex intellectual and political projects as engaged in a wholesale rebuilding of modern humanity beyond the nation-state. As such, the work of Césaire and Senghor should not be understood through the lens of national independence, but rather read for the not-yet-realized political visions they contain. Wilder writes: ‘Scholarship long promoted one-sided understandings of Césaire and Senghor as either essentialist nativists or naïve humanists…Negritude, whether embraced or criticized, was treated as an affirmative theory of Africanity rather than a critical theory of modernity’ (p. 8). Wilder argues instead that Césaire and Senghor actually reject ‘the doxa that self-determination required state sovereignty’ and instead proceeded from a position that ‘colonial peoples cannot presume to know a priori which political arrangements would best allow them to pursue substantive freedom’ (p. 2). In this way, Césaire and Senghor were intellectuals who lived as complex and fluid thinkers engaged in a ‘pragmatic orientation’ that ‘was inseparable from a utopian commitment to political imagination and anticipatory politics through which they hoped to transcend the very idea of France, remake the world, and inaugurate a new epoch of human history’ (p. 2). This requires understanding Césaire and Senghor as practicing a form of thinking that is simultaneously ‘strategic and principled, gradualist and revolutionary, realist and vision, timely and untimely’ (p. 2). Wilder’s book alternates chapters between Césaire and Senghor, tracing the evolution, exchange, and collaboration between these two intellectuals, as well as tracing how their ideas evolved over the course of their engagement with party and state politics. Reading these texts as already instantiated within a political terrain makes it possible to grasp their full nuance. For example, in a chapter on Senghor’s African socialism, Wilder writes that Senghor ‘called neither for France to decolonize Africa nor for Africa to liberate itself, but for Africans to decolonize France’ (p. 214). To this end, African socialism was not simply a political platform, or an effort to remake Marxist theory, but rather a way of imagining the world that left open the possibility that Africans were the agents of ‘planetary salvation’ and ‘human emancipation’ (p. 215). This approach helps explain the seemingly quixotic political commitment that Senghor held concerning regional federalism and his insistence on maintaining a fraternal relationship between Senegal and France (two political positions often cited as evidence of his inability to uphold the true promise of national independence). Instead, Wilder suggests that thinking ‘with Césaire and Senghor’ requires us to ‘engag[e] a future that might have been’. While the specific conclusions Césaire and Senghor arrive at might not necessarily ‘be applied to our times’, ‘the problems they identified’ still ‘persist’, and their ‘utopian realist thinking, at once concrete and world-historical, still resonates’ (p. 256). Shilliam’s book, The Black Pacific, similarly traces connections among anticolonial activists and intellectuals across space and time. However, rather than examining the exchange between Francophone Africa, France, and the Caribbean, Shilliam locates his study in the dense relationships between the Māori and Pasifika peoples of Aotearoa (New Zealand) and the ‘children of Legba’. Legba is a reoccurring figure from African cosmology that mediates the spiritual and physical worlds. Shilliam opens with the story of a 1979 exchange between Māori elders and their guests, a black theater troupe and a RasTafari band visiting Aotearoa NZ from England. The elder, or kaumātua, greeted the visitors, saying: ‘everyone being one people’ to which the theater director replied: ‘the ancestors are meeting because we have met’ here today (p. 1). This exchange reflects Shilliam’s larger argument about the already existing ‘deep, global infrastructure of anti-colonial connectivity’ (p. 3). He contrasts these lived and meaningful connections with the colonial ethnographic mapping practices that sought – and still seek – to firmly establish separation between colonial subjects, with a gaze remained firmly trained on Europe. Shilliam counters by offering a ‘decolonial science of “deep relation”’ (p. 13) that draws out the moments of connectivity between the spiritually synchronistic descendants of Legba, the Pacific Island figure of Tāne/Māui, and the Arcadian Hermes within the Western philosophical tradition. In doing so, Shilliam provides evidence of the profound spiritual bonds that ground relations of strength and connectivity. He argues that, while the ‘manifest world is a broadly (post)colonial one, structured through imperial hierarchies that encourage the one-way transmission of political authority, social relations and knowledge’, there also exists alongside this world vast ‘hinterlands of the spiritual domains’ (p. 20). Legba, Tāne/Māui, and the Arcadian Hermes continually assist in that translation and binding of the manifest and spiritual worlds and, in doing so, they eschew a ‘developmentalist understanding of time’ in favor of one that can account for ‘the reparation of ancestral ties’ (p. 21). Re-grounding anticolonialism in this shared spiritual inheritance emphasizes the dense human connections that, through their cultivation, might inform the healing of colonial wounds. Shilliam demonstrates the durability of these deep relations in chapters examining the movement and adaptation of Black Power in Aotearoa NZ, the embrace of the political concept of blackness among the Māori and Pasifika peoples, the spiritual and cultural circulation between liberation, RasTafari, and indigenous Rātana theologies, and the movement of Māori and Pasifika activists between Ethiopia, South Africa, the Caribbean, and the African diaspora in England. Unlike Wilder and Shilliam, who locate anticolonial thinking and practice within the expansive spatial, temporal, and spiritual realities of specific individuals, Mbembe’s Critique of Black Reason engages in nothing less than a rewriting of the history of modernity as the ‘mobiliz[ation]’ of ‘Africa and Blackness’ with the goal of ‘the fabrication of racial subjects’ (p. 129). As a ‘river with many tributaries’, Mbembe’s book examines the evolving nature of race and Blackness within a world in which ‘Europe is no longer the center of gravity’ (p. 1). The book moves rapidly and expansively between theoretical engagements – with Fanon, Césaire, Foucault, Arendt, and others – and the historical events that created both modernity and racialized partition (the slave trade, the Haitian and American Revolutions, the Algerian War, and others). He re-casts ‘the biography’ of the ‘assemblage that is Blackness and race’ into ‘three critical moments’: the Atlantic slave trade, the ‘birth of writing’ marked by Blacks demanding ‘the status of full subjects in the world of the living’ (spanning from the Haitian Revolution, abolition, African decolonization, American civil right movement, to the dismantling of apartheid), and concluding with the current period of ‘neoliberalism’ (p. 3). In this latest period, we now inhabit an economic and racial order defined by the ‘industries of the Silicon Valley and digital technology’, in which ‘time passes quickly’, where workers have been replaced by ‘laboring nomads’, and ‘the tragedy of the multitude’ – comprising ‘superfluous humanity’ – has become ‘that they are unable to be exploited at all’ (p. 3). Within this new epoch, race and Blackness have taken on new forms such that the colonial technologies once developed to separate and manage human beings according to racialized categories have now become replaced by a universalized Blackness that extends beyond race: ‘for the first time in human history, the term “Black” has been generalized. This new fungiblity, this solubility, institutionalized as a new norm of existence and expanded to the entire planet, is what I call the Becoming Black of the world’ (p. 6). Islamophobia, for example, operates according to the traditional logics of racism; however, the characteristics once used to describe supposedly biological races has now been applied to ‘“culture” and “religion”’ (p. 7). While Blackness has become universalized beyond race, Mbembe argues that the ‘Western consciousness of Blackness’ – which reduces humans to ‘a racial subject and site of savage exteriority’ – has always existed alongside the ‘Black consciousness of Blackness’, namely the articulation of Blackness within ‘a long history of radicalism, nourished by struggles for abolition and against capitalism’ (pp. 28, 30). Blackness therefore exists within a ‘manifest dualism’, both ‘the living crypt of capital’ through which ‘skin has been transformed into the form and spirit of merchandise’, but simultaneously ‘the symbol of a conscious desire for life, a force springing forth, buoyant and plastic, fully engaged in the act of creation and capable of living in the midst of several times and several histories at once’ (p. 6). Drawing from these ‘reserves of life’, and the awesome refusal to ‘retreat from humanity’ that defines Black life, makes it possible to maintain the ‘possibility of restitution, reparation, and justice’ (p. 179). For Mbembe, whatever our own ‘horizons of…struggle’ might be today, the fundamental struggle remains ‘how to belong fully in this world that is common to all of us, how to pass from the status of the excluded to the status of the right-holder, how to participate in the construction and the distribution of the world’ – that is, the creation of a ‘world in common’ (p. 176). Taken together, these three books offer insights into the potential benefits of grounding contemporary political and theoretical practices within the contours of African anticolonial thought, widely understood. First, all three are fundamentally concerned with the question of time and temporality. While colonialism is still often studied in a linear fashion – representing a break from a pre-colonial past, and eventually giving way to a post-colonial present (Cooper, 2002, pp. 14–16) – these three authors highlight how emancipatory conceptions of freedom require tarrying with modernist, developmentalist conceptions of time. Mbembe points out, for example, that the ‘remembrance among Blacks depend[s] to a large extent on the critique of time…Time is born out of the contingent, ambiguous, and contradictory relationship that we maintain with things, with the world, or with the body and its doubles’ (p. 121). In Freedom Time, Wilder examines ‘how a given historical epoch many not be identical with itself and historical tenses may blur and interpenetrate’ (p. 15). This attention to time and temporality allows the past to become more malleable and contingent and, thus, the future becomes more open. Wilder highlights this point, situating his book within the ‘postwar opening’ – a historical moment that was fluid, contested, and heterodox, existing between ‘earlier moments of epochal transition’ (i.e., 1790s–1840) and our ‘contemporary conjuncture’ (p. 14). Second, these three books demand that we examine the relationships between the possible politics, economics, and epistemologies within the academy and those demanded by a still-very-present anticolonial politics. For example, Shilliam reminds us that if we aim for ‘epistemic justice’, then the ‘seedbed of such a decolonial project’ cannot ‘be found in academic discourse but in the living knowledge traditions of colonized peoples’ (p. 7). If one takes this argument seriously then both ‘personal and institutional’ anticolonial practice within the academy requires acknowledging that even our own ‘self-reflexivity’ is not ‘a unique product of modernity’ but rather an ‘institutionally traditional’ form of knowledge, and one that demands that any claim about the ‘superiority of Western academia’ be ‘radically questioned’ (p. 9). Unlike academic, colonial, and Western sciences, ‘decolonial science cultivates knowledge, it does not produce’ knowledge – production is an act of extending the self, while the cultivation of knowledge requires that we ‘till’ in order to ‘turn matter around and fold back on itself so as to rebuild and encourage growth’ (p. 24). Cultivating knowledge involves planting and tending seeds for the unexpected, unknown, and even impossible. The decolonial science of deep relations, therefore, engages in the cultivation of its own ‘biotope’, involving a ‘circulatory’ and ‘constant oxygenation process’, thereby establishing a ‘grounding’ of its own (p. 25). Finally, these three texts share a common affirmation of a politics of freedom, of solidarity, and interconnectedness that is both extremely fragile yet durable beyond imagination. Wilder, Shilliam, and Mbembe insist that anticolonial thought and practices are already embedded within the present, and remain part of our human inheritance. They also suggest that turning to this body of work makes it possible to understand political freedom and human emancipation as a project that remains radically inclusive, spatially expansive, and temporally heterodox – both already present, rooted in the past, and always on the horizon.

#### Anti-Humanism is a theoretical shortcut to elide analysis of alternative visions of freedom – strategically deploying humanism is necessary for political struggle

**Wilder 16** [(Gary, Gary Wilder works on the French empire, colonial states, historical anthropology, and social/political theory, with a focus on western Africa, the Antilles, and Europe. He is the author of The French Imperial Nation-State: Negritude and Colonial Humanism between the Two World Wars (2005), which traces empire-wide networks of science, administration, public opinion, and literature that linked colonial reformers in French West Africa to a black public sphere in Paris. His current research project, “Freedom Time: Negritude, Decolonization, Utopia,” examines post–World War II initiatives by African and Caribbean legislators to reconstitute France as a postcolonial federal democracy. Wilder was awarded a Mellon Foundation New Directions Fellowship, only one of ten awarded nationally in 2006, which allowed him to spend a year as a Visiting Fellow at the Human Rights Program of Harvard Law School. He holds a joint Ph.D. in anthropology and history from the University of Chicago and came to the Graduate Center from Pomona College in Fall 2009.) "Here/Hear Now Aimé Césaire!," South Atlantic Quarterly, 7/2016] TDI

These key terms illuminate crucial aspects of what made Césaire a distinc- tive thinker whose critical voice may continue to resonate for us today. But in order to attend to Césaire as he did his predecessors—as a contemporary— we should recognize how his intellectual orientation and insights brush against the grain of many current theoretical tendencies. In both critical theory and postcolonial studies, the standard operation is to unmask pur- portedly universal categories as socially constructed, culturally particular, and implicated in practices, systems, and logics of domination. These are indispensable critical moves. But this approach often devolves into a hunt for traces of universalism or humanism, whether in textual artifacts or political projects, in order to reveal the regressive or oppressive essence of the object. This “aha” moment thus becomes the punch line of the discussion rather than the starting point for analysis. Such fears of complicity with power do not only belie a longing for intellectual and political purity. They also make it difficult to think dialectically, to identify aspects of given arrangements that may point beyond their actually existing forms.

The current insistence on negative critique also makes scholars reluc- tant to identify desirable alternatives and specify the kind of world they might want to create. But what do we concede if we are unable or unwilling to risk affirming more just, more human, ways of being to which we can say “yes”? It is not easy for radical thinkers to reconcile a nonprescriptive orienta- tion to a radically open future with the imperative to envision more desirable arrangements (Coronil 2011). But ignoring or deferring the challenge does not make it disappear. Following anticolonial thinkers like Césaire, espe- cially those located within the black Atlantic critical tradition, may remind us not to forfeit categories such as freedom, justice, democracy, solidarity, and humanity to the dominant actors who have instrumentalized and degraded them.

Given this dilemma, the attention paid to Vivek Chibber’s recent polemic against subaltern studies is not surprising. Such attention, however, seems to be less about the merits of his universalist Marxism than about a sense of some of the limitations and impasses into which certain currents of postcolonial thinking have led (Chibber 2013).7 Partha Chatterjee himself has recently written, “The task, as it now stands, cannot . . . be taken forward within the framework of the concepts and methods mobilized in Subaltern Studies . . . what is needed are new projects” (2012a: 44). He suggests that such projects should probably focus on “cultural history” and “popular cul- ture” with a renewed focus on visual materials and embodied practices rather than written texts and on ethnography rather than intellectual his- tory. Moreover, he links this invitation to study “the ethnographic, the practi- cal, the everyday and the local” to a focus on subnational “regional forma- tions” and “minority cultures” and languages whose specificities, he observes, had not been sufficiently engaged by earlier subaltern studies research on “India,” “Pakistan,” or “Bangladesh” (47–49). Valuable as such studies would surely be, it is not clear how a renewed focus on locality, with place-based assumptions about territory, consciousness, and categories, could do the kind of critical work necessary to grasp the deep shifts in politi- cal logics, structures, and practices that characterize the world-historical present. On the contrary, such approaches risk reproducing precisely the culturalist and territorialist assumptions about political identification and affiliation that need to be rethought in light of contemporary conditions.8

Chatterjee’s surprising emphasis on local ethnography seems consis- tent with one trend in postcolonial thinking that risks reviving the types of civilizational thinking, and associated assumptions about origins and authenticity, that it had earlier set out to dismantle (Chakrabarty 2007; Mah- mood 2005; Mignolo 2011). Consider the important ways that Talal Asad has invited us to rethink liberal assumptions about “tradition,” with respect to liberal and nonliberal forms of life. In dialogue with Ludwig Wittgenstein and Alasdair MacIntyre, Asad (1986) has developed a powerful critique of liberal secularism—and the secularist logic that subtends many modern lib- eral states—from the standpoint of embodied and discursive traditions. On the one hand, he reminds us that “Islamic tradition” is neither singular nor unchanging; it is a structured and dynamic space for reasoned argument. On the other hand, he reminds us that despite liberalism’s claims to post- traditional neutrality, it too constitutes a particular tradition (albeit one that defines itself in opposition to inherited, embodied, and practice-oriented forms of tradition-based reasoning).

Asad’s genealogical insights have rightly informed recent critiques of Western liberal ideologies, states, and politics especially regarding their arro- gant, condescending, and violent responses to tradition-rooted practices and practitioners, whether outside or inside the West. But his interventions, how- ever unintentionally, have also led scholars to establish dubious chains of equivalence between modernity, the West, and liberalism. Such operations seem to disregard Asad’s important invitation to understand traditions as capacious, heterogeneous, and dynamic spaces of inquiry, disputation, and revision, not simply as a set of rigid behavioral scripts, unchanging cultural formulas, or dogmatic ideological precepts. This reduction of political moder-nity to a one-dimensional liberalism obscures, for example, the many currents of progressive antiliberalism within the tradition of modern Western political thought. It fails to recognize the significant number of non-European colonial intellectuals engaged in anti-imperial struggles who were active participants in such “traditions within traditions.” It also disregards the contradictions within and redeemable fragments of even liberal political thinking, fragments that, if realized, might point far beyond, and possibly explode, liberalism itself.

To reify modern or Western politics into a static and stereotypical liber- alism is to risk practicing an unfortunate form of “Occidentalism” that would reinforce archaic civilizational assumptions about incommensurable and unrelated worlds (and worldviews) and disregard the actual history and open possibilities for practices of cross-cultural solidarity whereby anti- imperial actors outside Europe could enter into dialogue or affiliate with, or even discover ways that they are already situated within, counterhegemonic “Western” political traditions. Critics have rightly mobilized singularity, incommensurability, or untranslatability against liberal attempts to discover an abstract humanity and thereby discount situated and embodied forms of life. But the question is whether we treat incommensurability or untranslat- ability as an epistemological or political limit or as an always imperfect start- ing point for practices of dialogue, coordination, affiliation, reciprocity, soli- darity. For isn’t the impossibility of full transparency or undifferentiated unity simply the unavoidable condition within which all communication, sociality, and politics must be attempted?9

My point is not to congratulate dissident currents within the West, let alone to recuperate liberalism. It is rather to approach radical and emancipa- tory politics from a place of not-already-knowing, of not presuming to know a priori which aspects of a tradition are irredeemable, which traditions may become allies or habitations, what the boundaries of (thoroughly plastic) tra- ditions must be. This nondogmatic and experimental orientation to politics, traditions, and concepts is one of the most precious and timely gifts that Césaire may offer to us now. He practiced a concrete cosmopolitan relation- ship to modern traditions of philosophy, aesthetics, and politics, one that was highly developed by the robust tradition of black Atlantic criticism within which he was firmly rooted along with predecessors (e.g., Toussaint and W. E. B. DuBois), contemporaries (e.g., C. L. R. James, James Baldwin, Suzanne Césaire, Senghor), and descendants (e.g., Fanon, Edouard Glissant, Stuart Hall, Paul Gilroy, Achille Mbembe, David Scott).

Understandable concerns about totalizing explanation and Eurocentric evaluation have led a generation of scholars to insist on the incommensurable alterity of non-European forms of thought. But perhaps we should be con- cerned less exclusively with unmasking universalisms as covert European particularism than with also challenging the assumption that the univer- sal is European propert

y. I read Césaire not in order to provincialize Euro- pean concepts but to deprovincialize Antillean thinking. Césaire’s critical reworkings remind us that the supposedly European categories of political modernity properly belong as much to the African and Caribbean actors who coproduced them as to the inhabitants of continental Europe. Similarly, Afri- can and Caribbean thinkers, no less than their continental counterparts, produced abstract and general propositions about “humanity,” “history,” and “the world.” In contrast to invocations of multiple modernities, Césaire never granted to Europe possession of a modernity or universality or humanity that was always already translocal and fundamentally Caribbean. He never treated self-determination, emancipation, freedom, equality, or justice as essentially European and foreign. Césaire’s intellectual and political inter- ventions radically challenged reductive territorialist approaches to social thought. He refused to concede that “France” was an ethnic or continental entity, that Martinique was not in some real way internal to “French” society and politics, or that he was situated outside of modern critical traditions. Thus his ongoing and unapologetic engagements with Hegel, Marx, Proud- hon, Nietzsche, Lautréamont, Rimbaud, Mallarmé, Bergson, Freud, Breton, Frobenius, and Lenin, alongside his many African, Antillean, and African American interlocutors.

The sonic blurring between “here” and “hear” in the title of this essay is meant to signal not only the contemporaneity of Césaire’s thought for us here now but the imperative that we open ourselves to his presence and recognize his actuality across the epochal divide by hearing what he actually said. This gesture builds on Walter Benjamin’s insight that every now is a “now of rec- ognizability” whereby “what has been comes together in a flash with the now to form a constellation” through which past epochs become newly legible (1999: 462). I also follow Césaire himself, who engaged in dialogue with pre- decessors as if they were contemporaries and who addressed future interlocu- tors directly as if they were already present. Like Benjamin, Césaire practiced a form of radical remembrance that connected outmoded pasts to charged presents. This attention to vital histories was bound up with a poetic politics that identified transformative possibilities dwelling within existing arrange- ments and a proleptic politics that anticipated seemingly impossible futures by trying to enact them concretely in the here and now. But Césaire can only speak to us now if we listen rather than presume to know what someone like him in his situation must have, or should have, been saying.

Until very recently, scholarship on his work has been overdetermined by methodological nationalism (that puzzles over his refusal to pursue state sovereignty), identitarian culturalism (that debates how adequately Césaire expressed Antillean lived experience and whether or not he was an essential- ist), and a disciplinary division of labor (that too often splits his poetry, criti- cism, and politics into separate domains). Generally, Cold War scholarship was shaped by a need to evaluate him in relation to canonical anticolonial nationalists and fit him into a narrative of decolonization-as-national-inde- pendence. This has made it difficult to recognize the epochal character, world-making ambition, and global sensibility of his political reflections.

Faced with the promise of decolonization, Césaire conjugated concrete acts with political imagination in ways that displaced conventional opposi- tions between aesthetics and politics, realism and utopia, pragmatism and principle. Such efforts were animated by what I have been calling radical lit- eralism and utopian realism and which he called inflection and poetic knowledge. He regarded freedom as a problem whose institutional solution was not self-evident and could only be situational. His interventions demon- strated the nonnecessary relationship between colonial emancipation, popu- lar sovereignty, and self-determination, on the one hand, and territorial state sovereignty and national liberation, on the other. He pursued cosmopolitan aims concretely through transcultural practices and by attempting to invent new political forms through which to ground plural and postnational demo- cratic arrangements.

We should recognize that Césaire formulated a critique not of Western civilization from the standpoint of African or Antillean culture but of modern Western racism, imperialism, and capitalism from the standpoint of Antil- lean and African historical situations and experiences. More generally, it was a critique of an alienated and alienating modernity from the standpoint of embodied and poetic ways of being, knowing, and relating (to self, others, and world). Above all, Césaire recognized residues of, and resources for, more just, human, and integrated ways of living together within Antillean, African, and European texts, traditions, forms, histories, and conditions. In his view, Antilleans—as culturally particular actors, imperial subjects, New World denizens, moderns, and humans—were their rightful heirs. He was con- cerned less with defining culturally authentic concepts, spaces, and arrange- ments for Antilleans (apart from Europe or uncontaminated by modernity) than with overcoming imperialism, in solidarity with other struggling peo- ples, in order to establish less alienated forms of human life globally.

Remembering Césaire’s insistence that modern currents of radicalism were shared legacies and common property may help us to rethink inherited assumptions about the relation between territory, ethnicity, consciousness, and interest (Buck-Morss 2009, 2010). They invite us to deterritorialize social thought and to decolonize intellectual history. This is a matter not of valoriz- ing non-European forms of knowledge, as important as such a move certainly is, but of questioning the presumptive boundaries of “Europe” itself—by rec- ognizing the larger scales on which modern social thought was forged and of appreciating that colonial societies produced self-reflexive thinkers concerned with large-scale processes and future prospects. We can thereby recognize Césaire as a situated postwar thinker of the postwar world, one of whose pri- mary aims was to place into question the very categories “France,” “Europe,” and “the West” by way of an immanent critique of late imperial politics. He envisioned postnational arrangements through which humanity could attempt to overcome the alienating antinomies that had impoverished the quality of life in overseas colonies and European metropoles. His situated humanism and concrete cosmopolitanism should thus be placed in a constel- lation of modern emancipatory thinking oriented toward worldwide human freedom that included antiracist, anti-imperial, internationalist, and socialist thinkers from a range of traditions: black Atlantic, First Internationalist, global anarchist, Western Marxist, Marxist humanist, Third Worldist.