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#### Interpretation – the aff must increase restrictions on the introduction of armed forces into hostilities

#### “United States Armed Forces” only means personnel

Eric Lorber – January 2013, EXECUTIVE WARMAKING AUTHORITY AND OFFENSIVE CYBER OPERATIONS: CAN EXISTING LEGISLATION SUCCESSFULLY CONSTRAIN PRESIDENTIAL POWER?, J.D. Candidate, University of Pennsylvania Law School, Ph.D Candidate, Duke University Department of Political Science, JOURNAL OF CONSTITUTIONAL LAW Vol. 15:3 , https://www.law.upenn.edu/live/files/1773-lorber15upajconstl9612013

As discussed above, critical to the application of the War Powers Resolution—especially in the context of an offensive cyber operation—are the definitions of key terms, particularly “armed forces,” as the relevant provisions of the Act are only triggered if the President “introduc[es armed forces] into hostilities or into situations [of] imminent . . . hostilities,”172 or if such forces are introduced “into the territory, airspace, or waters of a foreign nation, while equipped for combat, except for deployments which relate solely to supply, replacement, repair, or training of such forces.”173 The requirements may also be triggered if the United States deploys armed forces “in numbers which substantially enlarge United States Armed Forces equipped for combat already located in a foreign nation.”174 As is evident, the definition of “armed forces” is crucial to deciphering whether the WPR applies in a particular circumstance to provide congressional leverage over executive actions. The definition of “hostilities,” which has garnered the majority of scholarly and political attention,175 particularly in the recent Libyan conflict,176 will be dealt with secondarily here because it only becomes important if “armed forces” exist in the situation. As is evident from a textual analysis,177 an examination of the legislative history,178 and the broad policy purposes behind the creation of the Act,179 “armed forces” refers to U.S. soldiers and members of the armed forces, not weapon systems or capabilities such as offensive cyber weapons. Section 1547 does not specifically define “armed forces,” but it states that “the term ‘introduction of United States Armed Forces’ includes the assignment of members of such armed forces to command, coordinate, participate in the movement of, or accompany the regular or irregular military forces of any foreign country or government.”180 While this definition pertains to the broader phrase “introduction of armed forces,” the clear implication is that only members of the armed forces count for the purposes of the definition under the WPR. Though not dispositive, the term “member” connotes a human individual who is part of an organization.181 Thus, it appears that the term “armed forces” means human members of the United States armed forces. However, there exist two potential complications with this reading. First, the language of the statute states that “the term ‘introduction of United States Armed Forces’ includes the assignment of members of such armed forces.”182 By using inclusionary—as opposed to exclusionary— language, one might argue that the term “armed forces” could include more than members. This argument is unconvincing however, given that a core principle of statutory interpretation, expressio unius, suggests that expression of one thing (i.e., members) implies the exclusion of others (such as nonmembers constituting armed forces).183 Second, the term “member” does not explicitly reference “humans,” and so could arguably refer to individual units and beings that are part of a larger whole (e.g., wolves can be members of a pack). As a result, though a textual analysis suggests that “armed forces” refers to human members of the armed forces, such a conclusion is not determinative.

#### Violation – the Aff includes weapons systems / other non-human capabilities

#### Vote Neg –

**Effects topical – impossible to predict infinite number of things they could add on to the plan**

#### Predictable limits – The United States has hundreds of different weapons systems that could be deployed by any of the 4 services across over 200 countries – These include nukes, which was its own entire topic 4 years ago

#### Ground – Deploying troops is the core question of the president’s war power because it puts troops in harm’s way – there’s no disadvantage to repositioning a forward-deployed systems

# Off

#### Targeted killing is just a symptom of larger Imperial ambitions – the continuance of Bush policies under Obama proves

ICL 02/22/13 (Workers Vanguard No. 1018, http://www.icl-fi.org/english/wv/1018/kill\_list.html)

Remote-Control Murder Guantánamo is not closed, but Obama is taking few prisoners. Over the last three years, his administration has carried out at least 239 covert drone strikes. The Air Force now trains more unmanned-systems operators than it does fighter and bomber pilots combined. The Bureau of Investigative Journalism estimates that CIA strikes in Pakistan between 2004 and 2013 have resulted in 3,468 deaths. In Somalia, the Bureau reports, up to 57 people described as civilians have been killed and in Yemen as many as 178. The key architect of the drone murder scheme is John Brennan, who is slated to be chief of the CIA, which directs many of the drone strikes. Brennan’s résumé, spanning a 25-year CIA career, includes working as a top agency official during the torture interrogations carried out under the Bush administration. On MSNBC’s Up with Chris Hayes last year, Jeremy Scahill described the village of al-Majalah in Yemen after the first strike there authorized by Obama. With 35 women and children killed, the U.S. tried to palm it off as the work of the Yemeni government. But, as Scahill said, “We know from the Wikileaks cables that David Petraeus conspired with the president of Yemen to lie to the world about who did that bombing. It’s murder—it’s mass murder—when you say, ‘We are going to bomb this area’ because we believe a terrorist is there” (Huffington Post, 3 June 2012). An editorial in the liberal Nation (6 June 2012) stated: “The drone strikes are inciting even more anti-American hatred in troubled places like Yemen as well as Pakistan…. It is hard to argue that they are making us safer when, for every suspect killed, one or more newly embittered militants emerge to take his place.” In other words, the Nation feels that Obama has broken his only real 2008 campaign promise, which was to be a more effective chief executive for blood-drenched U.S. imperialism. The carnage wreaked by the Obama administration gives the verdict on the reformists—International Socialist Organization, Workers World Party, Party for Socialism and Liberation, et al.—who pushed pro-Democratic “anybody but Bush” politics in protests over the Iraq war and cheered Bush’s replacement as a supposedly more benign Commander-in-Chief. In “9/11 in Retrospect” (Foreign Affairs, September-October 2011), Melvyn P. Leffler laid out that the Obama administration’s strategy has been in continuity with that of the Bush administration and, in fact, others going back to the dawn of the 20th century. The September 11 attacks, this bourgeois historian writes, “did not change the world or transform the long-term trajectory of U.S. grand strategy.” Rather, the U.S. “quest for supremacy” as well as “its preference for an open door and free markets, its concern with military supremacy, its readiness to act unilaterally when deemed necessary…all these remained, and remain, unchanged.” Wars, invasions, torture, executions, massacres of civilians, deployment of mercenaries, covert operations: all are integral to capitalism in its imperialist epoch, i.e., in its (prolonged) death agony. We wrote in “U.S. Imperialism’s Torture, Inc.” (WV No. 826, 14 May 2004): “Capitalist society was born in blood; modern imperialism continues the brutal practices of mass murder, torture and humiliation that accompany exploitation of labor and the ceaseless struggle between competing imperialist forces to dominate the world. From the Belgian Congo killing fields of King Leopold and the massacres in the Philippines by U.S. troops in the early days of its imperialist expansion to the first concentration camps, created by the Spanish in Cuba and a little later used by the British in South Africa in the Boer War, to Japanese imperialist atrocities in China and Nazi Germany’s Holocaust, imperialism has created a world in constant, cruel convulsions.” Decaying Capitalism and the Imperial Presidency The Obama administration’s assertion of the power to assassinate U.S. citizens is a dangerous but entirely logical extension of the police-state powers assumed by the government after the September 11 terrorist attacks. In 2003, the Spartacist League and Partisan Defense Committee submitted an amici curiae brief on behalf of Jose Padilla, a U.S. citizen arrested in Chicago in 2002 on trumped-up charges, declared an “enemy combatant” and disappeared into a Navy brig in South Carolina. Tortured by extreme sensory deprivation and other measures, Padilla was initially threatened with execution. In the end, a civilian show trial sentenced him to 17 years.

#### Imperialist domination empirically outweighs visible war and makes extinction inevitable

Eckhardt 90 (William, Lentz Peace Research Laboratory of St. Louis, JOURNAL OF PEACE RESEARCH, February 1990, p. 15-16)

Modern Western Civilization used war as well as peace to gain the whole world as a domain to benefit itself at the expense of others: The expansion of the culture and institutions of modern civilization from its centers in Europe was made possible by imperialistic war… It is true missionaries and traders had their share in the work of expanding world civilization, but always with the support, immediate or in the background, of armies and navies (pp. 251-252). The importance of dominance as a primary motive in civilized war in general was also emphasized for modern war in particular: '[Dominance] is probably the most important single element in the causation of major modern wars' (p. 85). European empires were thrown up all over the world in this process of benefiting some at the expense of others, which was characterized by armed violence contributing to structural violence: 'World-empire is built by conquest and maintained by force… Empires are primarily organizations of violence' (pp. 965, 969). 'The struggle for empire has greatly increased the disparity between states with respect to the political control of resources, since there can never be enough imperial territory to provide for all' (p. 1190). This 'disparity between states', not to mention the disparity within states, both of which take the form of racial differences in life expectancies, **has** killed 15-20 times as many people in the 20th century as have wars and revolutions (Eckhardt & Kohler, 1980; Eckhardt, 1983c). When this structural violence of 'disparity between states' created by civilization is taken into account, then the violent nature of civilization becomes much more apparent. Wright concluded that 'Probably at least 10 per cent of deaths in modern civilization can be attributed directly or indirectly to war… The trend of war has been toward greater cost, both absolutely and relative to population… The proportion of the population dying as a direct consequence of battle has tended to increase' (pp. 246, 247). So far as structural violence has constituted about one-third of all deaths in the 20th century (Eckhardt & Kohler, 1980; Eckhardt, 1983c), and so far as structural violence was a function of armed violence, past and present, then Wright's estimate was very conservative indeed. Assuming that war is some function of civilization, then civilization is responsible for one-third of 20th century deaths. This is surely self-destruction carried to a high level of efficiency. The structural situation has been improving throughout the 20th century, however, so that structural violence caused 'only' 20% of all deaths in 1980 (Eckhardt, 1983c). There is obviously room for more improvement. To be sure, armed violence in the form of revolution has been directed toward the reduction of structural violence, even as armed violence in the form of imperialism has been directed toward its maintenance. But imperial violence came first**, in the sense of creating structural violence,** before revolutionary violence emerged to reduce it. It is in this sense that structural violence was basically, fundamentally, and primarily a function of armed violence in its imperial form. The atomic age has ushered in the possibility, and some would say the probability, of killing not only some of us for the benefit of others, nor even of killing all of us to no one's benefit, but of putting an end to life itself! This is surely carrying self-destruction to some infinite power beyond all human comprehension. It's too much, or superfluous, as the Existentialists might say. Why we should care is a mystery. But, if we do, then the need for civilized peoples to respond to the ethical challenge is very urgent indeed. Life itself may depend upon our choice.

#### Vote negative to question the epistemological foundations of empire. US neo-imperialism sustains itself by controlling the boundaries of knowledge. Only exposing the epistemic violence of imperialism and addressing the needs of the oppressed can solve.

McLaren and Kincheloe in 5 (Peter Professor of Education, Graduate School of Education and Information Studies @ UCLA and Joe, professor and Canada Research Chair at the Faculty of Education, McGill University in Montreal, Quebec, Canada. The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research, Third Edition, Eds Norman Denzin and Yvonna Lincoln)

In this context, it is important to note that we understand a social theory as a map or a guide to the social sphere. In a research context, it does not determine how we see the world but helps us devise questions and strategies for exploring it. A critical social theory is concerned in particular with issues of power and justice and the ways that the economy; matters of race, class, and gender; ideologies; discourses; education; religion and other social institutions; and cultural dynamics interact to construct a social system (Beck-Gernsheim, Butler, & Puigvert, 2003; Flccha, Gomez, & Puigvert, 2003). Thus, in this context we seek to provide a view of an evolving criticality or a reconceptualized critical theory. Critical theory is never static; it is always evolving, changing in light of both new theoretical insights and new problems and social circumstances. The list of concepts elucidating our articulation of critical theory indicates a criticality informed by a variety of discourses emerging after the work of the Frankfurt School Indeed, some of the theoretical discourses, while referring to themselves as critical, directly call into question some of the work of Horkheimer, Adorno, and Marcuse. Thus, diverse theoretical traditions have informed our understanding of criticality and have demanded understanding of diverse forms of oppression including class, race, gender, sexual, cultural, religious, colonial, and ability-related concerns. The evolving notion of criticality we present is informed by, while critiquing, the post-discourses—for example, postmodernism, poststructuralism, and postcolonialism. In this context, critical theorists become detectives of new theoretical insights, perpetually searching for new and interconnected ways of understanding power and oppression and the ways they shape everyday life and human experience. In this context, criticality and the research it supports are always evolving, always encountering new ways to irritate dominant forms of power, to provide more evocative and compelling insights. Operating in this way, an evolving criticality is always vulnerable to exclusion from the domain of approved modes of research. The forms of social change it supports always position it in some places as an outsider, an awkward detective always interested in uncovering social structures, discourses, ideologies, and epistemologies that prop up both the status quo and a variety of forms of privilege. In the epistemological domain, white, male, class elitist, heterosexist, imperial, and colonial privilege often operates by asserting the power to claim objectivity and neutrality. Indeed, the owners of such privilege often own the "franchise" on reason and rationality. Proponents of an evolving criticality possess a variety of tools to expose such oppressive power politics. Such proponents assert that critical theory is well-served by drawing upon numerous liberatory discourses and including diverse groups of marginalized peoples and their allies in the nonhierarchical aggregation of critical analysts {Bello, 2003; Clark, 2002; Humphries, 1997). In the present era, emerging forms of neocolonialism and neo-imperialism in the United States move critical theorists to examine the wavs American power operates under the cover of establishing democracies all over the world. Advocates of an evolving criticality argue—as we do in more detail later in this chapter—that such neocolonial power must be exposed so it can be opposed in the United States and around the world. The American Empires justification in the name of freedom for undermining democratically elected governments from Iran (Kincheloe, 2004), Chile, Nicaragua, and Venezuela to Liberia (when its real purpose is to acquire geopolitical advantage for future military assaults, economic leverage in international markets, and access to natural resources) must be exposed by critical-ists for what it is—a rank imperialist sham (McLaren, 2003a, 2003b; McLaren & Jaramillo, 2002; McLaren & Martin, 2003). Critical researchers need to view their work in the context of living and working in a nation-state with the most powerful military-industrial complex in history that is shamefully using the terrorist attacks of September 11 to advance a ruthless imperialist agenda fueled by capitalist accumulation by means of the rule of force (McLaren & Farahmandpur,2003). Chomsky (2003), for instance, has accused the U.S. government of the "supreme crime" of preventive war (in the case of its invasion of Iraq, the use of military force to destroy an invented or imagined threat) of the type that was condemned at Kuremburg. Others, like historian Arthur Schlesinger (cited in Chomsky, 2003), have likened the invasion of Iraq to Japan's "day of infamy'' that is, to the policy that imperial Japan employed at the time of Pearl Harbor. David G. Smith (2003) argues that such imperial dynamics are supported by particular epistemological forms. The United States is an epistemological empire based on a notion of truth that undermines the knowledges produced by those outside the good graces and benevolent authority of the empire. Thus, in the 21 st century, critical theorists must develop sophisticated ways to address not only the brute material relations of class rule linked to the mode and relations of capitalist production and imperialist conquest (whether through direct military intervention or indirectly through the creation of client states) but also the epistemological violence that helps discipline the world Smith refers to this violence as a form of "information warfare" that spreads deliberate falsehoods about countries such as Iraq and Iran. U.S. corporate and governmental agents become more sophisticated in the use of such episto-weaponry with every day that passes. Obviously, an evolving criticality does not promiscuously choose theoretical discourses to add to the bricolage of critical theories. It is highly suspicious—as we detail later—of theories that fail to understand the malevolent workings of power, that fail to critique the blinders of Eurocentrism, that cultivate an elitism of insiders and outsiders, and that fail to discern a global system of inequity supported by diverse forms of ideology and violence. It is uninterested in any theory—no matter how fashionable—that does not directly address the needs of victims of oppression and the suffering they must endure. The following is an elastic, ever-evolving set of concepts included in our evolving notion of criticality. With theoretical innovations and shifting Zeitgeists, they evolve. The points that are deemed most important in one time period pale in relation to different points in a new era. <P306-307>

# Case

## Ontology

#### Their aff abandons logic. Objects are objects but they don’t have encounters or talk and rocks aren’t people because they’re rocks

Wolfendale 12

<http://speculations.squarespace.com/storage/Noumenons%20New%20Clothes_Pt1_Wolfendale.pdf>

I'm in the process of finishing my PhD at the University of Warwick. I have a broad base of philosophical interests that span both the analytic (e.g., inferentialist philosophy of language) and continental traditions (e.g., deleuzian process metaphysics). I do not see myself as 'bridging' the divide between traditions as much as simply doing my best to act as if it isn't there. My current interests focus upon the methodological interface between the philosophy of rationality and metaphysics. In this I am heavily influenced by both Kant and Sellars, but I draw many of my resources from the post-Kantian work of Heidegger and the post-Sellarsian work of Brandom. My ultimate goal is to elaborate a systematic transcendental approach to the philosophy of rationality (which I call fundamental deontology) which can then be used as the basis for the critical delimitation of metaphysics as an a posteriori form of inquiry continuous with empirical science.

What all this reveals is that Harman’s reading cannot be an interpretation of the substance of Heidegger’s ideas, even one that Heidegger himself would disagree with. It is possible to read thinkers against themselves, but this requires that there is some essential element present in their work that the work itself fails to live up to.33 The element that Harman tries to unearth in Heidegger’s tool-analysis simply isn’t there.34 The only reason he can propose to extend the intentional relation between Dasein and its tools to cover all interactions between entities is that he has stripped this relation of everything that makes it recognisably Heideggerian. He has excised the structure of projective understanding wholesale, and thereby completely abandoned the semantic and epistemological framework within which the encounter with the tool is described. This becomes clear once we ask the question: just what would it be for a screen door to encounter a knife as a knife?35 To say that this is for it to be affected by it in a way that is common to all knives is to say nothing that warrants using the word “encounter” in an intentional sense. The screen door has nothing that could qualify it as having anything like an awareness of generality. There is no hermeneutic “as” circumscribing its engagements with things. This leaves us saying that what it is for a screen door to interact with a knife qua knife is for it to be affected in the way that knives affect screen doors. This is an empty tautology unworthy of metaphysical scrutiny.36

#### absent any criteria for epistemology, their metaphysics isn’t falsifiable

Wolfendale 12

<http://speculations.squarespace.com/storage/Noumenons%20New%20Clothes_Pt1_Wolfendale.pdf>

I'm in the process of finishing my PhD at the University of Warwick. I have a broad base of philosophical interests that span both the analytic (e.g., inferentialist philosophy of language) and continental traditions (e.g., deleuzian process metaphysics). I do not see myself as 'bridging' the divide between traditions as much as simply doing my best to act as if it isn't there. My current interests focus upon the methodological interface between the philosophy of rationality and metaphysics. In this I am heavily influenced by both Kant and Sellars, but I draw many of my resources from the post-Kantian work of Heidegger and the post-Sellarsian work of Brandom. My ultimate goal is to elaborate a systematic transcendental approach to the philosophy of rationality (which I call fundamental deontology) which can then be used as the basis for the critical delimitation of metaphysics as an a posteriori form of inquiry continuous with empirical science.

Even more worryingly perhaps, we are left wondering why me must affirm the reality of discreteness at all, rather than some singular Apeiron underlying a plurality of discrete appearances. Harman’s own analysis of appearance cannot but dissolve the “glaringly obvious fact” of discreteness that he himself held up against Heidegger’s purported holism. His radical dissociation of the individuation of sensual objects from the individuation of real objects precludes appealing to apparent discreteness to prove real discreteness, and thereby undermines his seemingly radical individualism. If we cannot know anything about the criteria of individuation of real objects, then we are left with the real possibility that there might just be one.

#### Just because tools have some unknown things doesn’t dispute our common-sense understanding of them as tools

Wolfendale 12

<http://speculations.squarespace.com/storage/Noumenons%20New%20Clothes_Pt1_Wolfendale.pdf>

I'm in the process of finishing my PhD at the University of Warwick. I have a broad base of philosophical interests that span both the analytic (e.g., inferentialist philosophy of language) and continental traditions (e.g., deleuzian process metaphysics). I do not see myself as 'bridging' the divide between traditions as much as simply doing my best to act as if it isn't there. My current interests focus upon the methodological interface between the philosophy of rationality and metaphysics. In this I am heavily influenced by both Kant and Sellars, but I draw many of my resources from the post-Kantian work of Heidegger and the post-Sellarsian work of Brandom. My ultimate goal is to elaborate a systematic transcendental approach to the philosophy of rationality (which I call fundamental deontology) which can then be used as the basis for the critical delimitation of metaphysics as an a posteriori form of inquiry continuous with empirical science.

This break is subtle, and does not become completely apparent until a few pages later, when he explicitly substitutes the word “rely” for “use.”39 The examples that Harman focuses on are indicative of this shift. Gone is the emphasis upon equipment actively deployed toward a goal (e.g., hammers, cars, signals, etc.), to be replaced with a focus upon “equipment” necessary to passively sustain a given state (e.g., ventilators, gravity, oxygen, etc.). It is not that Heidegger is not concerned with some examples of this kind—sustaining a state is as eligible a goal as achieving one—but rather that Harman narrows the scope of the analysis by collapsing active use into passive reliance, while simultaneously expanding its scope to include cases of dependence that lack anything that could be construed as awareness of the thing depended upon. This move both enables execution to take on the role of persistence we saw earlier, and facilitates the universalisation of intentionality to encompass all objects and the flaying of Heidegger’s account of intentionality that accompanies it. We can already see the pretence of phenomenology slipping here. Harman has subtly shifted the focus of his analysis from our practical comportment toward things to our causal dependence upon them. We are invited to conclude that phenomenological description is apt to describe my relation to my internal organs, the geological strata that I stand upon, or the delicate balance of environmental factors necessary for life on earth in a manner analogous to my relation to the various socially delineated props I passively engage in carrying out everyday tasks. Harman balances this shift upon a delicate ambiguity in the sense in which encounters with things can be “unconscious” or “unthematic.”40 It consists in misunderstanding what Heidegger calls circumspection (Umsicht). Heidegger’s concern with this sort of “unthematic” understanding was to provide a phenomenological analysis of comportments that lacked a specific kind of awareness, rather than lacking awareness as such. He would not consider my relation to my internal organs to be an intentional relation unless it consisted in some implicit grasp of general ways in which they are involved within practical activities, either as obstacles (e.g. an awareness of my fickle digestive system) or resources (e.g., the metabolic control some yogic masters have achieved), or some explicit grasp of their general modal features (e.g., the theoretical understanding of a biologist or surgeon). Harman essentially substitutes Heidegger’s concern with the “unconscious” encounter as awareness without attention, for a concern with it as dependence without awareness. Bearing all this in mind, we can turn to the first step in Harman’s analysis. This is his claim that what we encounter in relying upon equipment is its causal capacity to produce the specific effect that we rely upon. This is his first characterisation of the execution that constitutes the reality of the tool, and he vehemently opposes it to the idea that the tool consists in the ways humans expect to use it: “Equipment is not effective ‘because people use it;’ on the contrary, it can only be used because it is capable of an effect, of inflicting some kind of blow on reality. In short, the tool isn’t ‘used’—it is.”41 On the face of it, this is a perfectly good inference—successful reliance upon a thing demands that it possess the causal capacity to produce the effect relied upon—but the way it is introduced and used by Harman is questionable precisely insofar as it is metaphysical rather than phenomenological. Harman is already straying into metaphysics in describing the thing as consisting in this capacity, rather than simply possessing it, and he will stray further when he fleshes out his characterisation of this capacity qua execution. He does not linger in this register though. He rapidly returns to phenomenology when he insists upon the invisibility of this capacity.42 However, invisibility is apparent only insofar as we focus upon precisely those un-Heideggerian cases that Harman has smuggled in. This paradoxical revelation of invisibility essentially consists in our discovery that we really have no awareness of those things we depend upon without awareness—at least that is, until we turn our phenomenological gaze upon them. This has no force whatsoever, because there is no correlation between dependence and awareness either way. Prima facie, it is entirely possible for me to be aware or not aware of the things I depend on, to varying degrees.43

#### Considerations for any ethical system necessarily presuppose a human benchmark to refer back to. Two impacts: either human-centric value is inevitable and they don’t solve, or their value schema is a backdoor anthropomorphic method of asserting value without warrant.

Hayward 97 [PhD, Department of Politics at Edinburgh University, “Anthropocentrism: a Misunderstood Problem”, Environmental Values]

But if the project of overcoming speciesism can be pursued with some expectation of success, this is not the case with the overcoming of anthropocentrism. What makes anthropocentrism unavoidable is a limitation of a quite different sort, one which cannot be overcome even in principle because it involves a non-contingent limitation on moral thinking as such. While overcoming speciesism involves a commitment to the pursuit of knowledge of relevant similarities and differences between humans and other species, the criteria of relevance will always have an ineliminable element of anthropocentrism about them. Speciesism is the arbitrary refusal to extend moral consideration to relevantly similar cases; the ineliminable element of anthropocentrism is marked by the impossibility of giving meaningful moral consideration to cases which bear no similarity to any aspect of human cases. The emphasis is on the ‘meaningful’ here: for in the abstract one could of course declare that some feature of the nonhuman world was morally valuable, despite meeting no determinate criterion of value already recognised by any human, but because the new value is completely unrelated to any existing value it will remain radically indeterminate as a guide to action. If the ultimate point of an ethic is to yield a determinate guide to human action, then, the human reference is ineliminable even when extending moral concern to nonhumans. So my argument is that one cannot know if any judgement is speciesist if one has no benchmark against which to test arbitrariness; and, more specifically, if we are concerned to avoid speciesism of humans then one must have standards of comparison between them and others. Thus features of humans remain the benchmark. As long as the valuer is a human, the very selection of criteria of value will be limited by this fact. It is this fact which precludes the possibility of a radically nonanthropocentric value scheme, if by that is meant the adoption of a set of values which are supposed to be completely unrelated to any existing human values. Any attempt to construct a radically non-anthropocentric value scheme is liable not only to be arbitrary – because founded on no certain knowledge – but also to be more insidiously anthropocentric in projecting certain values, which as a matter of fact are selected by a human, onto nonhuman beings without certain warrant for doing so. This, of course, is the error of anthropomorphism, and will inevitably, I believe, be committed in any attempt to expunge anthropocentrism altogether

#### It is better to accept the inevitability of human-centric value; claims to transcend that system of value do more to reinforce unstated premises of human value, making the challenging of speciesist behavior more difficult

Hayward 97 [PhD, Department of Politics at Edinburgh University, “Anthropocentrism: a Misunderstood Problem”, Environmental Values]

The aim of overcoming anthropocentrism is intelligible if it is understood in terms of improving knowledge about the place of humans in the world; and this includes improving our knowledge about what constitutes the good of nonhuman beings. This kind of knowledge is significantly added to by objectivating science. There may also be a role for other kinds of knowledge – for instance, kinds characterised by empathetic imagining of how it might be like to be a member of another species (Cassano,1989); but here one must always be cautious about unwittingly projecting human perceptions on to beings whose actual perceptions may be radically different, since this would be to reintroduce just the sort of error that characterises ontological anthropocentrism. The need for caution is all the clearer when it comes to attempting to gain a non-anthropocentric perspective in ethics. Indeed, it may be that anthropocentrism in ethics, when properly understood, is actually less harmful than harbouring the aim of overcoming it. At any rate, a number of the considerations advanced in this article would tend to suggest this view. I have noted: that the ethical impulse which is expressed as the aim of overcoming anthropocentrism is very imperfectly expressed in such terms; that there are some things about ‘anthropocentrism’ which are unavoidable, and others even to be applauded; furthermore, the things which are to condemned are not appropriately called ‘anthropocentrism’ at all; that the mistaken rejection of anthropocentrism misrepresents the fact that harms to nonhumans, as well as harm to some groups of humans, are caused not by humanity in general but by specific humans with their own vested interests. For these reasons, I suggest that discussions of environmental values would be better conducted without reference to the equivocal notion of anthropocentrism.

#### Anti-anthropocentric rhetoric reinforces a more dominant frame of human value because they reify ideological opposition to respect for non-human life

Hayward 97 [PhD, Department of Politics at Edinburgh University, “Anthropocentrism: a Misunderstood Problem”, Environmental Values]

Anthropocentrism, widely used as a term of criticism in environmental ethics and politics, is something of a misnomer: for while anthropocentrism can intelligibly be criticised as an ontological error, attempts to conceive of it as an ethical error often involve conceptual confusion. I point out that there is no need for this confusion because a more appropriate vocabulary to refer to the defects the ethical ‘anti-anthropocentrists’ have in mind already exists. My argument is not just about semantics, though, but engages directly with the politics of environmental concern: blanket condemnations of ‘anthropocentrism’ not only condemn some legitimate human concerns, they also allow ideological retorts to the effect that criticisms of anthropocentrism amount to misanthropy. My argument, therefore, is that a more nuanced understanding of the problem of anthropocentrism allows not only a more coherent conceptualisation of environmental ethics but also a more effective politics. The article has five main sections. The first notes the paradox that the clearest instances of overcoming anthropocentrism involve precisely the sort of objectivating knowledge which many ecological critics see as itself archetypically anthropocentric. The second section then notes some ways in which anthropocentrism is not objectionable. In the third section, the defects associated with anthropocentrism in ethics are then examined: I argue, though, that these are better understood as instances of speciesism and human chauvinism. In order to explain why it is unhelpful to call these defects anthropocentrism, I note in section four that there is an ineliminable element of anthropocentrism in any ethic at all, and in the fifth section that the defects do not typically involve a concern with human interests as such anyway. Because of this last point, I also argue, the rhetoric of anti-anthropocentrism is not only conceptually unsatisfactory, it is counterproductive in practice.

## Solvency

**Enforcing the war powers resolution fails**

**Nokov 13**

Julie **Nokov, University of Albany, 2013,** The Supreme Court and The Presidency: Struggles for Supremacy, p. 317

Since the passage of the passage of the War Powers Resolution, presidents have largely complied with reporting requirements, but no president has acknowledged the constitutionality of the resolution's limits on troop deployments without congressional approval. Those seeking to limit the executive's exercise of war powers have found it nearly impossible to identify plaintiffs with standing, and when such plaintiffs have been found, the courts have largely evaded deciding the suits on other grounds.

**Empirically proven, statutory restrictions are flimsy**

**Barron and Lederman 8**

(∗¶ Professor of Law, Harvard Law School. ¶ ∗∗ Visiting Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center. These articles grew out of a ¶ conversation that we began in 2004 with a group of our former colleagues from the Office of Legal Counsel, including Walter Dellinger, Vicki Jackson, Dawn Johnsen, Neil Kinkopf, Trevor ¶ Morrison, Randy Moss, Beth Nolan, Nina Pillard, Jeff Powell, Richard Shiffrin, Chris Schroeder, ¶ and Michael Small. WTHE COMMANDER IN CHIEF AT THE LOWEST EBB — **¶** FRAMING THE PROBLEM, DOCTRINE, **¶** AND ORIGINAL UNDERSTANDING <http://harvardlawreview.org/media/pdf/barron_lederman.pdf> //kjl)

As much as the Court’s own doctrine suggests that the conventional scholarly template has been overly dismissive of the congressional role in regulating the conduct of war, recent actions of the executive branch demonstrate beyond question how partial an account of ¶ war powers the legislative abdication paradigm provides.Far from ¶ acting on the assumption that Congress has been silent, or even that it ¶ has been hopelessly ambiguous, the Bush Administration has claimed ¶ the constitutional power to defy a number of extant statutory restrictions on executive war powers that would otherwise cabin the Commander in Chief’s discretion. ¶ The Bush Administration’s argument is rooted in an intuition that ¶ the Commander in Chief Clause affords the President a core of indefeasible authority to control the conduct of a war once it is under-way.

**Empirically proven for war**

**Barron and Lederman 8**

(∗¶ Professor of Law, Harvard Law School. ¶ ∗∗ Visiting Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center. These articles grew out of a ¶ conversation that we began in 2004 with a group of our former colleagues from the Office of Legal Counsel, including Walter Dellinger, Vicki Jackson, Dawn Johnsen, Neil Kinkopf, Trevor ¶ Morrison, Randy Moss, Beth Nolan, Nina Pillard, Jeff Powell, Richard Shiffrin, Chris Schroeder, ¶ and Michael Small. WTHE COMMANDER IN CHIEF AT THE LOWEST EBB — **¶** FRAMING THE PROBLEM, DOCTRINE, **¶** AND ORIGINAL UNDERSTANDING <http://harvardlawreview.org/media/pdf/barron_lederman.pdf> //kjl)

38 The infamous 2002 Office of Legal Counsel (OLC) memorandum on torture, for example, defends the President’s discretion to use ¶ whatever interrogation methods he deems appropriate to “best prevail ¶ against the enemy”39 in just this way. In explaining why “Congress ¶ lacks authority under Article I to set the terms and conditions under ¶ which the President may exercise his authority as Commander in Chief ¶ to control the conduct of operations during a war,”40 OLC offered a ¶ simple logical argument predicated on what it assumed to be a wellsettled view that tactical battlefield judgments — paradigmatically, the ¶ decision whether to start an attack from the left flank or the right — ¶ are for the President alone to make. OLC explained: Congress can no more interfere with the President’s conduct of the interrogation of enemy combatants than it can dictate strategic or tactical decisions on the battlefield. Just as statutes that order the President to conduct warfare in a certain manner or for specific goals would be ¶ unconstitutional, so too are laws that seek to prevent the President from ¶ gaining the intelligence he believes necessary to prevent attacks upon the ¶ United States.41¶ The precise list of executive actions encompassed by this reasoning ¶ is not self-evident, nor has the Administration attempted to specify ¶ them comprehensively. But the category plainly goes beyond judgments involving where and when to launch attacks within a combat ¶ zone during an otherwise authorized military engagement. It appears ¶ to subsume, in the Administration’s view, a panoply of judgments regarding how best to engage the enemy, ranging from detention and interrogation to surveillance and trial. Indeed, the theory is that there is ¶ no meaningful legal distinction between the case of a classic tactical ¶ judgment on the battlefield, such as when and where to send troops ¶ into battle, and the sorts of tactical decisions that the war on terrorism ¶ brings to the foreThe Bush Administration has applied this robust conception of the ¶ Commander in Chief’s preclusive power on several fronts. Indeed, ¶ virtually all of the major legal flashpoints in the war on terrorism have ¶ concerned, to one degree or another, the question of the President’s ¶ constitutional authority as Commander in Chief to override existing ¶ legislative constraints on his conduct of military operations. Viewed ¶ together, these assertions of preclusive power do much to undermine ¶ the notion that the congressional abdication paradigm is a useful construct for understanding contemporary war powers. For as supine as ¶ Congress is thought to be, the President has not believed it to be so ¶ completely in his sway that he could ask it to remove existing restrictions on his preferred means of prosecuting the current conflict. And ¶ thus, as the following examples demonstrate, the Administration has ¶ repeatedly asserted — and often quite publicly — a right to act in defiance of congressional limitations in a range of areas.

**Administration call restriction of force unconstitutional when they want – Iran proves**

**Barron and Lederman 8**

(∗¶ Professor of Law, Harvard Law School. ¶ ∗∗ Visiting Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center. These articles grew out of a ¶ conversation that we began in 2004 with a group of our former colleagues from the Office of Legal Counsel, including Walter Dellinger, Vicki Jackson, Dawn Johnsen, Neil Kinkopf, Trevor ¶ Morrison, Randy Moss, Beth Nolan, Nina Pillard, Jeff Powell, Richard Shiffrin, Chris Schroeder, ¶ and Michael Small. WTHE COMMANDER IN CHIEF AT THE LOWEST EBB — **¶** FRAMING THE PROBLEM, DOCTRINE, **¶** AND ORIGINAL UNDERSTANDING <http://harvardlawreview.org/media/pdf/barron_lederman.pdf> //kjl)

5. Further Assertions of the Preclusive Commander in Chief Power.¶ — In light of the Bush Administration’s theory of preclusive Commander in Chief authority, and its consistent invocation of that argument across so many distinct areas, there are probably other examples ¶ as well. Because any further OLC documents containing arguments in ¶ support of such statutory noncompliance are not public, we do not ¶ know the extent of the phenomenon. On dozens of occasions, however, ¶ the President has invoked his power as Commander in Chief in issuing ¶ signing statements objecting to statutory enactments, suggesting that ¶ he will not fully comply with such laws in some circumstances, in particular when they cut too close to his chosen means of conducting a ¶ military campaign.66 Moreover, the President, as we have noted, has ¶ invoked a Commander in Chief objection in vetoing a bill purporting ¶ to regulate the use of troops in Iraq.67 The Administration has further ¶ indicated that any statutory restrictions Congress might approve on ¶ the use of force against Iran would be unconstitutional.68 These recent ¶ assertions give practical effect to the expansive and uncompromising ¶ constitutional theory of preclusive executive war powers first enunciated in the OLC memorandum drafted two weeks after the attacks of ¶ September 11.¶ 69

#### President circumvents the plan

#### ) Signing Statements

Kelley 13

Christopher S. **Kelley, et al, Political Science Professor-University of Miami, 2013,** The Presidential Leadership Dilemma: Between the Constitution and a Political Party, ed. J. Azari, L. Brown & Z. Nwokora, p. 164

For example, Cooper's work finds that presidents employ the constitutional signing statement to circumvent policy made by Congress or refuse to execute provisions the president deems unconstitutional. Kelley and Marshall argue that the presidential signing statement can be designed to serve many important and varied purposes depending on the president's political needs. Part of their importance results by providing the president with a *last move* advantage in bargaining with Congress. From this perspective, the signing statement represents a final play in sequence of bargaining interactions between the president and Congress. This allows the president to affect aspects of the policy that he wasn't able to change in prior bargaining--empowering the president with a unilateral "upper hand" to shape policy toward his preferred position or to defend and expand presidential prerogatives. Berry adds to this line of work by demonstrating that presidents issue constitutional signing statements to defend against congressional attempts to constrain presidential policy discretion through legislative veto provisions embedded in statutory legislation.

#### Secrecy means Congress would be ineffective—no solvency

Stephen Dycus—1AC Author—10, Professor, Vermont Law School, 8/11/10, “Congress’s Role in Cyber Warfare,” <http://jnslp.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/08/11_Dycus.pdf>

The National Security Act of 1947 23 showed Congress’s determination to exert some control over this nation’s intelligence apparatus. That determination was strengthened after the disclosure of widespread intelligence abuses by the CIA and other agencies.24¶ In 1991, in response to the Iran-Contra Affair, Congress adopted a measure directing the President to keep the congressional intelligence committees “fully and currently informed of the intelligence activities of the United States, including any significant anticipated intelligence activity.”25 The term “intelligence activity” expressly includes “covert actions,”26 which additionally require a written finding by the President that they are “necessary to support identifiable foreign policy objectives of the United States and [are] important to the national security of the United States.”27 Intelligence activities are also understood to include “all activities that elements of the Intelligence Community are authorized to conduct pursuant to [Executive Order No. 12,333],” the executive charter for such activities.28 The “intelligence community” includes the Office of the Director of National Intelligence, CIA, NSA, other Defense Department intelligence components, and other federal intelligence elements,29 which are authorized to engage in, inter alia, intelligence collection and analysis and “activities to protect against international terrorism . . . and other hostile activities directed against the United States by foreign powers, organizations, persons, and their agents.”30 This broad mandate certainly encompasses many U.S. efforts to defend against cyber attack and to employ cyber weapons offensively. By this definition, most preparations for and conduct of cyber warfare should be reported to the intelligence committees as “intelligence activities.” It is significant that the reporting requirement in the 1991 law is not limited to agencies within the intelligence community. ¶ Yet this legislation provides no guarantee that Congress will receive the information it needs to play a meaningful role in the development or execution of cyber warfare policy. It is not known, for example, precisely what it means for the intelligence committees to be “fully and currently” informed, what kinds of intelligence activities are regarded as “significant” enough to report, or who decides.31 Other sections of the 1991 law call on all agencies involved in intelligence activities, not just the President, to keep the intelligence committees informed about those activities, but only “[t]o the extent consistent with due regard for the protection from unauthorized disclosure of classified information relating to sensitive intelligence sources and methods or other exceptionally sensitive matters.”32 The “due regard for” language might be invoked to keep Congress in the dark. ¶ Under the 1991 law, “covert actions,” those with respect to which “it is intended that the role of the United States Government will not be apparent or acknowledged publicly,”33 need only be reported to a small group of legislators known as the “Gang of Eight,”34 and then only in a “timely fashion,” a term not defined by statute.35 Characterization of U.S. planning and execution of electronic warfare as “covert” could enable reporting to the smaller group, making it more difficult for Congress to play a significant role.36 Moreover, any reporting might be delayed indefinitely.37

# 2NC

1. **The critique outweighs and turns the case – this is all our Eckhardt 90 evidence.**
   1. **Magnitude – 20 times as many people die from structural violence caused by imperialism as from visible acts of war itself.**
   2. **Timeframe and probability – This is an on-going genocide happening right now**
   3. **Critique turns the case because there’s never enough imperial territory for everyone. That makes violence inevitable, the alt solves the root cause while they merely apply a band-aid.**
   4. **Alt solves the case -** Extend McLaren and Kincheloe in 5 – epistemological questioning allows political agents to fracture the dominant narratives that justify universal violence. That means the alt can allow for a questioning of ontological framing that excludes the nonhuman other.
2. **Imperialism destroys value to life by breaking down society psychologically and colonizing the mind**

**Thiong’o 86** (Ngugi wa Thiong’o – Distinguished Professor of University of California, Irvine. “Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature”. 1986.)

The oppressed and the exploited of the earth maintain their defiance: liberty from theft. But the biggest weapon wielded and actually daily unleashed by imperialism against that collective defiance is the cultural bomb. The effect of a cultural bomb is to annihilate a people’s belief in their names, in their languages, in their environment, in their heritage of struggle, in their unity, in their capacities and ultimately in themselves. It makes them see their past as one wasteland of non-achievement and it makes them want to distance themselves from that wasteland. It makes them want to identify with that which is furthest removed from themselves; for instance, with other peoples’ languages rather than their own. It makes them identify with that which is decadent and reactionary, all those forces which would stop their own springs of life. It even plants serious doubts about the moral rightness of struggle. Possibilities of triumph or victory are seen as remote, ridiculous dreams. **The intended results are** despair, despondency and **a collective death-wish**. Amidst this wasteland which it has created, imperialism presents itself as the cure and demands that the dependant sing hymns of praise with the constant refrain: ‘Theft is holy’. Indeed, this refrain sums up the new creed of the neo-colonial bourgeoisie in many ‘independent’ African states.

1. Epistemology first – it determines the truths we can seek in the first place

Singer 89 (Joseph William, Associate Professor Boston University of Law, “Should Lawyers Care About Philosophy?” book review, Duke Law Journal, Vol 1989:1752)

**Spelman argues that the categories and forms of discourse we use,** the assumptions with which we approach the world, and the modes of analysis we employ have important consequences in channeling our attention in particular directions. The paradigms we adopt affect what we see and how we interpret it. They determine **to a large extent**, who we listen to and what we make of what we hear. They determine what questions we ask and the kinds of answers we seek. Investigation into such matters is important, **according to Spelman**, because the seemingly neutral and innocuous assumptions with which we approach the world may blot from our view facts we ourselves would consider to be important. **In this way**, we may unconsciously recreate or express forms of hierarchy that we intended to criticize. Self-reflection about such matters may enable us to ferret out the political effects of seemingly neutral premises. We should be on the lookout for ways in which our approaches to problems of illegitimate power relations reinforce those very relations. Good intentions do not immunize against the illegitimate exercise of power. **In fact**, a great impetus to the exercise of power is the inability to recognize that one is exercising it; when this happens, one need not worry about whether power is being used wisely. One goal of philosophic inquiry, therefore is to understand concretely where privilege lodges in our thought.

#### And, our impacts come first - Extend the last Hayward card from the 1nc – their ontological shift away from human-centeredness rejects legitimate human concerns like structural violence and war, without solving the problem. A human benchmark for thought is always inevitable. This means they ignore deeper problems without actually solving anything.

## FW

1. Our interpretation is that the role of the ballot is to question the epistemological foundations of empire. The plan doesn’t occur but the logic that supports knowledge-production within debate does. This is best

A. Ground –They should defend the entirety of the 1AC, not just select parts. It’s a question of the plan action as well as the advantages and epistemology that justifies it. The neg burden is only to prove that voting aff is undesirable.

B. Education – Imperialism critques radically transform our understanding of what it means to be political. Education cannot be reduced to mere policy action, it requires a direct understanding of the people laws are meant to target.

C. Predictability – They chose the 1AC. Links prove predictability, and any arbitrary interpretation about what we can and cannot defend is the most unpredictable.

1. **Prefer education to fairness: rules are created to re-enforce status quo power and privilege**

Delgado 92 (Law Prof at U. of Colorado, 1992 [Richard, “Shadowboxing: An Essay On Power,” In Cornell Law Review, May)

The debate on objective and subjective standards touches on these issues of world-making and the social construction of reality. Powerful actors, such as tobacco companies and male dates, want objective standards applied to them simply because these standards always, and already, reflect them and their culture. These actors have been in power; their subjectivity long ago was deemed "objective" and imposed on the world. n36 Now their ideas about meaning, action, and fairness are built into our culture, into our view of malefemale, doctor-patient, and manufacturer-consumer relations. It is no surprise, then, that judgment under an "objective" (or reasonable person) standard generally will favor the stronger party. This, however, is not always the case: Rules that too predictably and reliably favored the strong would be declared unprincipled. The stronger actor must be able to see his favorite principles as fair and [\*819] just -- ones that a reasonable society would rely upon in contested situations. n39 He must be able to depict the current standards as integral to justice, freedom, fairness, and administrability -- to everything short of the American Way itself (and maybe even that, since societies that regulate these relationships more closely are paternalistic, and verge on (shhh!) socialism).

1. **Understanding the oppression of imperialism is key for scholarly discussions**

Sachs ’03 [Aaron Sachs, “The Ultimate "Other": Post-Colonialism and Alexander Von Humboldt's Ecological Relationship with Nature”, History and Theory, December 2003, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3590683>]

There is no denying the value of the post-colonial critique and its relevance to all studies of travel and the environment. Post-colonialism, at its best, means recuperating the objects of the traveler's gaze. In a world so profoundly shaped-damaged, I would argue-by colonialism and imperialism, it is imperative that scholars focus on celebrating the colonized, on hearing the voices of "others." We must understand all the ways in which Western civilization has come to depend directly on forms of domination. Indeed, it makes perfect sense, as David Spurr has noted in The Rhetoric of Empire (1993), that "works once studied primarily as expressions of traditionally Western ideals are now also read as evidence of the manner in which such ideals have served in the historical process of colonization."16

## Perms

1. **Group the perms – they don’t get them, this is a debate about epistemology, their assumptions about the world are an intrinsic part of the 1AC, means any perm is severance which makes the aff a moving target and is a voter.**
2. **Perms can’t solve – that’s our** McLaren and Kincheloe 5 alt evidence. Any ideology which does not directly address the needs of the oppressed will be co-opted by government and corporate agents as part of their epistemic weaponry.
3. **Even if the aff is net-less imperialistic, it only serves to prop up a broken system. It’s no better than an alcoholic swearing off dark liquor.**
4. Don’t buy the link turn – it is a mystification tactic for public support to policy action

Falk in 2005 (Richard A. Falk “Demystifying Iraq?” CR: The New Centennial Review. Vol 5, Num 1. Pp 43-62. Spring 2005) Falk is a professor emeritus of International Law at Princeton University.

There are sophisticated arguments abroad in the land at this time that look upon mystiﬁcation as a necessary and natural prerogative of all political leaders, including the wisest and most virtuous. These ideological arguments are often associated with political theories of leadership that draw sharp distinctions between the masses, who are supposedly unable to comprehend the subtleties and hidden nuances of benevolent governance, and elites, who are entrusted with the awesome responsibility of rulership that can only be fulﬁlled by reliance on special qualities of understanding and insight that concern truths and policy objectives too inﬂammatory to acknowledge. Especially in a democratically constituted society, the mobilization of support depends on ﬁnding a rationale for a preferred course of policy that the citizenry will accept, whether true or false. Another approach is to create the conditions via inculcated misperception that make what was previously unacceptable as a public rationale become acceptable. I believe that such a pattern of mystiﬁcation bears centrally on all aspects of the American approach to the Iraq War, including the pre-war buildup of support and the post-battleﬁeld occupation of that tormented country, and that, somewhat paradoxically, the dynamic of this war will remain incomprehensible without the oddly clarifying impact of mystiﬁcation. It should be evident that mystiﬁcation is something deeper and more sinister than putting the best face on a course of action that any government does to the extent possible, or hiring spin-doctors to give a controversial and unsuccessful ofﬁcial policy its maximum possible public appeal.

1. **The perm is just a tool to trick the public into believing real reforms are being made. This is especially harmful in academic contexts because of past co-option and proves the need for a rethinking by itself.**

Kennedy and Lucas in 5 (Liam and Scott, Dir. of the Clinton Institute for American Studies and dir. Of Center for US foreign policy, American Quarterly, Enduring Freedom: Public Diplomacy and U.S. Foreign Policy, 57(2), p. 310-311)

“Public diplomacy—which consists of systematic efforts to communicate not with foreign governments but with the people themselves—has a central role to play in the task of making the world safer for the just interests of the United States, its citizens, and its allies.”5 In the last few years, U.S. public diplomacy has undergone intensive reorganization and retooling as it takes on a more prominent propaganda role in the efforts to win the “hearts and minds” of foreign publics. This is not a new role, for the emergent ideas and activities of public diplomacy as the “soft power” wing of American foreign policy have notable historical prefigurations in U.S. international relations. In this essay we situate the history of the cold war paradigm of U.S. public diplomacy within the broader framework of “political warfare” that combines overt and covert forms of information management.6 However, there are distinctive features to the “new public diplomacy” within both domestic and international contexts of the contemporary American imperium. It operates in a conflicted space of power and value that is a crucial theater of strategic operations for the renewal of American hegemony within a transformed global order. We consider the relation of this new diplomacy to the broader pursuit of political warfare by the state in its efforts to transform material preponderance (in terms of financial, military, and information capital) into effective political outcomes across the globe. In a post-9/11 context, we argue, public diplomacy functions not simply as a tool of national security, but also as a component of U.S. efforts to manage the emerging formation of a neoliberal empire. The term “public diplomacy” was coined by academics at Tufts University in the mid-1960s to “describe the whole range of communications, information, and propaganda” under control of the U.S. government.7 As the term came into vogue, it effectively glossed (through the implication of both “public” and diplomatic intent) the political valence of both its invention and object of study through emphasis on its role as “an applied transnational science of human behaviour.”8 The origin of the term is a valuable reminder that academic knowledge production has itself been caught up in the historical foundations and contemporary conduct of U.S. public diplomacy, with the American university a long-established laboratory for the study of public opinion and of cross-cultural knowledge in service of the state.9 American studies, of course, has had a particularly dramatic entanglement with public diplomacy and the cold war contest for “hearts and minds,” and legacies of that entanglement still haunt the field imaginary today.10 We do not intend to directly revisit that history here, but we do contend that the current regeneration of public diplomacy by the U.S. government is an important topic for critical study by American studies scholars, in particular as they negotiate the “internationalization” of their field in the context of post- and transnational impulses, now conditioned by the new configurations of U.S. imperialism. In this essay we posit a need to retheorize the modes and meanings of public diplomacy in order to reconsider the ways in which the power of the American state is manifested in its operations beyond its national borders, and to examine the conditions of knowledge-formation and critical thinking shaped by the operations of this power. At issue is not so much the way in which American studies has been shaped internationally through diplomatic patronage (though this remains an important and underexamined issue) but rather the articulation of field identities in the expanding networks of international and transnational political cultures.

## Links

Use of science by the government is inherently imperialist

Gilmartin 94 (David, Journal of Asian studies, vol 4, p 1128, Nov 1994)

Most critical to the "science of empire," however, was the fact that it defined not simply a structure of domination, but also a distinctly colonial political system linking the colonial state and indigenous elites together in a common political order. The key to this order—and the "science of empire"—»-lay in the scientific appropriation of what might be called "local knowledge." Indigenous "local knowledge" (and the local power relations and forms of knowing that it embodied) of necessity occupied a critical place in the scientific structuring of colonial administration. Though "objedification" lay at the heart of colonial social science, the complete objectification of the ruled was impossible within the discourse of "scientific empire." The object of study in India was not simply a "society" of individuals controlled, in the words of Foucault, through "small techniques of notation, of registration, of constituting files, or arranging facts in columns and tables" (Foucault 1977:190), but an alien world of "communities" and "cultures." To know these, local information and local subjects were critical. Many historians have thus stressed the important interactive role played by indigenous informants, particularly colonial elites, in defining the scientific discourse that shaped the basic "colonial sociology" underlying British colonial power (e.g., Amin 1989, Freitag 1991). Power was hardly equal in this system, but the "science of empire" linked the state and Indian elites together in a common political structure. "Imperial science," with its command over environmentally transformative technologies such as irrigation, operated in India within this political framework. "Imperial science" suggested a colonized world that became, in many respects, a great laboratory in which the natural world was not only catalogued, studied, and observed, but also technologically manipulated in the name of commercial transformations on a great scale. But "imperial science"—however important in justifying colonial rule for Europeans—did not itself define a common political discourse in which the colonizer and the colonized were linked. The knowledge that produced these transformations was a universal, yet bounded field of expertise in which "local knowledge" (though potentially useful to the scientist) had no formal place. Critically, "imperial science" (and technology) was thus not, as a distinctive discourse, grounded in a context-specific political field in which the rulers and the ruled shared.