# AFF ANSWERS

#### NOTE: HEG GOOD AND NATO GOOD ARE ANSWERS TO THE EMPIRE K

### Thesis – NOT an Empire

#### The US works with independent nation states and its model of global leadership is not like traditional empires

Ikenberry ‘04 (G John, 2004, Illusions of Empire: Defining the New American Order, Council on Foreign Relations, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20033908> (Accessed 7/14/22), G. John Ikenberry is Peter F. Krogh Professor of Geopolitics and Global Justice at Georgetown University and Transatlantic Fellow at the German Marshall Fund of the United States.) //**Doof**

The debate on empire is back. This is not surprising, as the United States dominates the world as no state ever has. It emerged from the Cold War the only superpower, and no geopolitical or ideological contenders are in sight. Europe is drawn inward, and Japan is stagnant. A half century after their occupation, the United States still provides security for Japan and Germany-the world's second- and third-largest economies. U.S. military bases and carrier battle groups ring the world. Russia is in a quasi-formal security partnership with the United States, and China has accommodated itself to U.S. dominance, at least for the moment. For the first time in the modern era, the world's most powerful state can operate on the global stage without the constraints of other great powers. We have entered the American unipolar age. The Bush administration's war on terrorism, invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq, expanded military budget, and controversial 2002 National Security Strategy have thrust American power into the light of day-and, in doing so, deeply unsettled much of the world. Worry about the implications of American uni polarity is the not-so-hidden subtext of recent U.S.-European tension and has figured prominently in recent presidential elections in Germany, Brazil, and South Korea. The most fundamental questions about the nature of global politics-who commands and who benefits-are now the subject of conversation among long-time allies and adversaries alike. Power is often muted or disguised, but when it is exposed and perceived as domination, it inevitably invites response. One recalls the comment of Georges Clemenceau, who as a young politician said of the settlement ending the Franco Prussian War, "Germany believes that the logic of her victory means domination, while we do not believe that the logic of our defeat is serfdom." At Versailles a half-century later, he would impose just as harsh a peace on a defeated Germany. The current debate over empire is an attempt to make sense of the new uni polar reality. The assertion that the United States is bent on empire is, of course, not new. The British writer and labor politician Harold Laski evoked the looming Amer ican empire in 1947 when he said that "America bestrides the world like a colossus; neither Rome at the height of its power nor Great Britain in the period of economic supremacy enjoyed an influence so direct, so profound, or so pervasive...." And in deed, Dean Acheson and other architects of the postwar order were great admirers of the British Empire. Later, during the Vietnam War, left-wing thinkers and revisionist historians traced the same deep-rooted impulse toward militarism and empire through the history of U.S. foreign policy. The dean of this school, William Appleton Williams, argued in The Tragedy of American Diplomacy that the nation's genuine idealism had been subverted by the imperial pursuit of power and capitalist greed. Today, the "American empire" is a term of approval and optimism for some and disparagement and danger for others. Neoconservatives celebrate the imperial exercise of U.S. power, which, in a modern version of Rudyard Kipling's "white man's burden," is a liberal force that promotes democracy and undercuts tyranny, terrorism, military aggression, and weapons proliferation. Critics who identify an emerging American empire, meanwhile, worry about its unacceptable financial costs, its corrosive effect on democracy, and the threat it poses to the institutions and alliances that have secured U.S. national interests since World War II. THE "E" WORD No one disagrees that U.S. power is extraordinary. It is the character and logic of U.S. domination that is at issue in the debate over empire. The United States is not just a superpower pursuing its interest; it is a producer of world order. Over the decades-with more support than resistance from other nations-it has fashioned a distinctively open and rule-based international order. Its dynamic bundle of oversized capacities, interests, and ideals constitutes an "American project" with unprecedented global reach. For better or worse, other states must come to terms with or work around this protean order. Scholars often characterize international relations as the interaction of sovereign states in an anarchic world. In the classic Westphalian world order, states hold a monopoly on the use of force in their own territory while order at the international level is maintained through the diffusion of power among states. Today's unipolar world turns the Westphalian image on its head. The United States possesses a near-monopoly on the use of force internationally; on the domestic level, meanwhile, the institutions and behaviors of states are increasingly open to global-that is, American-scrutiny. Since September 11th, the Bush administration's assertion of "contingent sovereignty" and the right of preemption have made this transformation abundantly clear. The rise of unipolarity and the simultaneous unbundling of state sovereignty is a new and volatile brew. But is the resulting political formation an empire? And if so, will the American empire suffer the fate of great empires of the past: ravaging the world with its ambitions and excesses until overextension, miscalculation, and mounting opposition hasten its collapse? The term "empire" refers to the political control by a dominant country of the domestic and foreign policies of weaker countries. The European colonial empires of the late nineteenth century were the most direct, formal kind. The Soviet "sphere of influence" in Eastern Europe entailed an equally coercive but less direct form of control. The British Empire included both direct colonial rule and "informal empire." If empire is defined loosely, as a hierarchical system of political relationships in which the most powerful state exercises decisive influence, then the United States today indeed qualifies. If the United States is an empire, how ever, it is like no other before it. To be sure, it has a long tradition of pursuing crude imperial policies, most notably in Latin America and the Middle East. But for most countries, the U.S.-led order is a negotiated system wherein the United States has sought participation by other states on terms that are mutually agreeable. This is true in three respects. First, the United States has provided public goods particularly the extension of security and the support for an open trade regime in exchange for the cooperation of other states. Second, power in the U.S. system is exercised through rules and institutions; power politics still exist, but arbitrary and indiscriminate power is reigned in. Finally, weaker states in the U.S.-led order are given "voice opportunities"-informal access to the policymaking processes of the United States and the intergovernmental institutions that make up the international system. It is these features of the post-194S international order that have led historians such as Charles Maier to talk about a "consensual empire" and Geir Lundestad to talk about an "empire of invitation." The American order is hierarchical and ultimately sustained by economic and military power, but it is put at the service of an expanding system of democracy and capitalism.Fundamentally, then, the debate over the new American empire hinges on how extensive and deeply rooted these characteristics are-and whether its assertion of power since September 11 constitutes a fundamental break with this liberal past. THE GLOBAL RACKET In The Sorrows of Empire, Chalmers Johnson advances the disturbing claim that the United States' Cold War-era military power and far-flung base system have, in the last decade, been consolidated in a new form of global imperial rule. The United States, according to Johnson has become "a military juggernaut intent on world domination." Driven by a triumphalist ideology, an exaggerated sense of threats, and a self serving military-industrial complex, this juggernaut is tightening its grip on much of the world. The Pentagon has replaced the State Department as the primary shaper of foreign policy. Military commanders in regional headquarters are modern-day proconsuls, warrior-diplomats who direct the United States' imperial reach. Johnson fears that this military empire will corrode democracy, bankrupt the nation, spark opposition, and ultimately end in a Soviet-style collapse. In this rendering, the American military empire is a novel form of domination. Johnson describes it as an "international protection racket: mutual defense treaties, military advisory groups, and military forces stationed in foreign countries to 'defend' against often poorly defined, overblown, or nonexistent threats." These arrangements create "satellites"-Ostensibly independent countries whose foreign relations revolve around the imperial state. Johnson argues that this variety of empire was pioneered during the Cold War by the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe and the United States in East Asia. Great empires of the past-the Romans and the Han Dynasty Chinese-ruled their domains with permanent military encampments that garrisoned conquered territory. The American empire is innovative because it is not based on the acquisition of territory; it is an empire of bases. Johnson's previous polemic, Blowback, asserted that post-1945 U.S. spheres of influence in East Asia and Latin America were as coercive and exploitative as their Soviet counterparts. The Sorrows of Empire continues this dubious line. Echoing 1960s revisionism, Johnson asserts that the United States' Cold War security system of alliances and bases was built on manufactured threats and driven by expansionary impulses. The United States was not acting in its own defense; it was exploiting opportunities to build an empire. The Soviet Union and the United States, according to this argument, were more alike than different: both militarized their societies and foreign policies and expanded outward, establishing imperial rule through "hub and spoke" systems of client states and political dependencies. In Johnson's view, the end of the Cold War represented both an opportunity and a crisis for U.S. global rule-an opportunity because the Soviet sphere of influence was now open for imperial expansion, a crisis because the fall of the Soviet Union ended the justification for the global system of naval bases, airfields, army garrisons, espionage listening posts, and strategic enclaves. Only with the terrorist attacks of September 11th was this crisis resolved. Bush suddenly had an excuse to expand U.S. military domination. September 11 also allowed the United States to remove the fig leaf of alliance partnership. Washington could now disentangle itself from international commitments, treaties, and law and launch direct imperial rule. Unfortunately, Johnson offers no coherent theory of why the United States seeks empire. At one point, he suggests that the American military empire is founded on "a vast complex of interests, commitments, and projects." The empire of bases has become institutionalized in the military establishment and has taken on a life of its own. There is no discussion, however, of the forces within U.S. politics that resist or reject empire. As a result, Johnson finds imperialism everywhere and in everything the United States does, in its embrace of open markets and global economic integration as much as in its pursuit of narrow economic gains. Johnson also offers little beyond passing mention about the societies presumed to be under Washington's thumb. Domination and exploitation are, of course, not always self-evident. Military pacts and security partnerships are clearly part of the structure of U.S. global power, and they often rein force fragile and corrupt governments in order to project U.S. influence. But countries can also use security ties with the United States to their own advantage. Japan may be a subordinate security part ner, but the U.S.-Japan alliance also allows Tokyo to forgo a costly buildup of military capacity that would destabilize East Asia. Moreover, countries do have other options: they can, and often do, escape U.S. domination simply by asking the United States to leave. The Philippines did so, and South Korea may be next. The variety and complexity of U.S. security ties with other states makes Johnson's simplistic view of military hegemony misleading. In fact, the U.S. alliance system remarkably intact after half a century-has helped create a stable, open political space. Cooperative security is not just an instrument of U.S. domination; it is also a tool of political architecture. But Johnson neglects the broader complex of U.S.-supported multilateral rules and institutions that give depth and complexity to the international order. Ultimately, it is not clear what the United States could do-short of retreating into its borders or ceasing to exist-that would save it from Johnson's condemnation. PAX AMERICANA In Colossus, Niall Ferguson argues that the United States is indeed an empire and has been for a long time. To Ferguson, however, it is a liberal empire that upholds rules and institutions and underwrites public goods by maintaining peace, ensuring freedom of the seas and skies, and managing a system of international trade and finance. The United States is the imperfect but natural inheritor of the British system of global governance; it is open and integrative and inclined toward informal rule. Accordingly, Ferguson's worry is not that the world will get too much American empire but that it will not get enough. U.S. leaders, for all their benign intent, have unusually short attention spans and tend to go "wobbly." In Ferguson's view, the United States shares many characteristics with past empires. Like Rome, it has remarkably open citizenship. "Purple Hearts and U.S. citizenship were conferred simultaneously on a number of the soldiers serving in Iraq last year, just as service in the legions was once a route to becoming a civis romanus," Ferguson writes. "Indeed, with the classical architecture of its capital and the republican structure of its constitution, the United States is perhaps more like a 'new Rome' than any previous empire-albeit a Rome in which the Senate has thus far retained its grip on would-be emperors." The spread of America's language, ideas, and culture also invites comparison to Rome at its zenith. But Ferguson is even more taken by parallels with the British Empire. U.S. presidents, from Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt, and John F. Kennedy to Ronald Reagan, Bill Clinton, and George W. Bush, have put their power work promoting the great liberal ideals of economic openness, democracy, limited government, human dignity, and the rule of law-a "strategy of openness" that is remarkably similar, Ferguson argues, to the aspirations of the British Empire in the second half of the nineteenth century. After all, it was a young Winston Churchill who argued that the aim of British imperialism was to "give peace to warring tribes, to administer justice where all was violence, to strike the chains off the slave, to draw the richness from the soil, to place the earliest seeds of commerce and learning, to increase in whole peoples their capacities for pleasure and diminish their chances of pain.... " Most of Colossus retells the familiar story of the rise of U.S. global dominance as an exercise in liberal empire. What is distinctive about American imperialism, according to Ferguson, is that it has been pursued in the name of anti-imperialism. For each phase of U.S. history, Ferguson nicely illuminates the tensions between republican ideals and the exercise of global power and shows how those tensions are often resolved. The Cold War-and George Kennan's doctrine of containment-provides the ultimate example of this fusion of anti-imperialism and hard power. Security, openness, democratic community, political commitment, and the mobilization of U.S. power went together. The core of U.S. global rule involved the enforcement of rules of economic openness, but the United States was also willing to act forcefully to integrate countries into the liberal order. Ferguson's most interesting claim is that the world needs more of this liberal American empire. This argument stems in part from the uncontroversial claim that the current international order needs enlightened leadership and that only Washington can provide it. (Ferguson holds little hope that Europe will ever overcome its preoccupation with the internal contradictions of its enlargement.) It is especially the wider system of sovereign but failed states that needs imperial supervision by Washington. In vast swatches of Africa, Asia, and the Middle East national self determination has led to much grief. Ferguson argues without qualification that "the experiment with political independence-especially in Africa-has been a disaster for most poor countries." To Ferguson, the extension of liberal empire into these regions (even involving some form of colonial rule) is necessary. What precisely these imperial arrangements would look like, however, remains unclear. When Ferguson says that he is "fundamentally in favor of empire," he is to some extent pulling a conceptual sleight of hand. What Ferguson means by "liberal empire" scholars have previously called "liberal hegemony": a hierarchical order that is still very different from traditional forms of empire. By virtue of its power, the liberal hegemon can act on its long-term interests rather than squabble over short-term gains with other states; it can identify its own national interests with the openness and stability of the larger system. The United States thus shapes and dominates the international order while guaranteeing a flow of benefits to other governments that earns their acquiescence. In contrast to empire, this negotiated order depends on agreement over the rules of the system between the leading state and everyone else. In this way, the norms and institutions that have developed around U.S. hegemony both limit the actual coercive exercise of U.S. power and draw other states into the management of the system. Ferguson's case for the virtues of American empire hinges on his claim that in the aftermath of the Soviet Union's collapse, the world could have gone one of two ways: international order organized around independent nations or an American imperium. He maintains that a world of decentralized, competing states, many of which are not democracies, would result in chaos. This may be true; he is certainly right that stability and open markets are not easily sustained without the support of powerful states. But the notion of liberal empire conflates very different types of U.S.-led order. One in which Washington coerces other states into obedience is very different from a system of multilateral rules and close partnerships. The challenges of peace and economic development that Ferguson identifies are best pursued by advanced democracies working together. Ultimately, such a cooperative order would require that Washington transcend the atavistic habits of empire rather than pursue a more complete realization of it. In the end, Ferguson finds invoking the image of empire useful for political reasons. Unlike the British, Americans do not believe that they operate an empire. As a result, the United States makes a flighty and impatient imperial power (in contrast to the British, who acquired a cultural mentality for global rule). Ferguson thinks that speaking honestly about the reality of American empire will foster understanding of its duties and obligations. Yet precisely the opposite is true. The United States does not need to view the world as its Raj and deploy a colonial service to the vast periphery; it needs to find ways to exercise its power in sustained, legitimate ways, working with others and developing more complex forms of cooperative international governance. It is also extremely doubtful that the American people would accept such a massive imperial undertaking: last September, as soon as President Bush revealed the price tag for occupying Iraq, public support plummeted immediately.

### Thesis – Empire = Wrong

#### Empire fails to account for 9/11 and events afterwards, making it useless in a contemporary context.

Moore ‘03 (David, Hardt and Negri's Empire and Real Empire: The Terrors of 9-11 and After, <https://acme-journal.org/index.php/acme/article/download/689/553/> (Accessed 7/14/22) Economic History and Development Studies Programme, University of Natal, Durban, South Africa 4041.) //**Doof**

Are We All New Yorkers? It is ironic for Empire readers that the horror of 9-11 happened in the centre of the empire so vividly portrayed in that book. The Twin Towers symbolised everything Empire discussed. From the earth-encompassing power of finance capital, to internet capitalism’s connection and compression of space and time, and to the cosmopolitan nature of the workers there, the towers were the epitome of everything Empire loved and hated about the world today. Antonio Negri said ‘we are all New Yorkers’ in an interview after 9-11 (Cocco and Lazarrato 2002) and it is clear that the book he and Michael Hardt produced really does see the whole world as if it was New York. For Hardt and Negri, the global ‘multitude’ is composed of urban (and urbane) citizens whose autonomy and hybridity make institutions such as states, and ideologies such as religions, evaporate into the mists of the immaterial labour that now drive the world. The multitude’s labour is impossible to measure, so all of its members have equal value (cf. Resnick and Wolff 2001; Dyer-Witherford 2001) and they all really want the same thing. Be they waiters in the Greenwich Village cafés, analysts for the currency speculators on Wall Street, or professors at Columbia University – or at similar sites in New York’s image anywhere in the world – sometime soon they will all oppose capitalist exploitation and national oppression, replacing them with the joys of being a communist. The kind of resistance that brought the Twin Towers down, however, forces the irony to take an awkward and bitter twist. Al-Queda hardly represents the postmodern enemies of post-imperialism envisaged (for the most part) in Empire. Empire’s sweep is so vast and so fast that religion, nationalism and any of the other forces inspiring Osama bin-Laden and his many followers are in the dustbin. When these forces revisit the postmodern world their aspirations are ‘incommunicable’ (Hardt and Negri 2000, 54, Hardt and Negri 2001a; Negri 2002): it is as if they have arisen from the dead. Contrary to Empire, however, they dealt New York and – more importantly but also almost erased from the book – the state within which the city is ensconced a blow that catalysed a form of empire Hardt and Negri thought had disappeared. A ‘one state beats all’ form of imperial power has arisen from the ashes of Twin Towers. It is now wreaking terror in places such as Afghanistan and Iraq and chilling the hearts of European politicians and United Nations multilateralists – and it inspired 15 million members of the ‘multitude’ to demonstrate. But the people who guided their passenger-packed planes into the Twin Towers were not ‘New Yorkers’ in the mold of Hardt and Negri’s multitude. Nor were most of those in Iraq on whom bombs rained and American troops shot in March and April 2003. Neither are the Americans who supported the campaign. The actions, beliefs and structures of the world in the post 9-11 era are significantly different from those inscribed in Hardt and Negri’s Empire – as is the etiology of the event. There are three ways to assess Empire’s inability to foresee the world in the wake of 9-11. I list and analyse them in reverse order of theoretical priority (indicated in the abstract) because the spectacle of such an event as 9-11 demands that in this instance the ‘epiphenomenal’ comes first (Campbell 2001). Firstly, the act of terrorism that destroyed the Twin Towers and killed the approximately 3,000 people within it must be analysed in terms of the way in which Hardt and Negri understand the nature of resistance to global capitalism (or, in their lexicon, ‘the informational mode of production’). Their uncertainty about the agents and strategies of resistance lends ambiguity to their thinking about 9-11 and similar events. Secondly, the importance of the ‘state’ as a structure within both core and peripheral components of global society must be re-stated and theorised in the light of Empire’s elision of that task. The contradictions inherent in state formation in the third world combined with those of the construction and maintenance of American empire in the current global conjuncture create both the terror of ‘resistance’ from below and ‘régime change’ from above. Hardt and Negri tend to wish these complexities away in their construction of a world full of libertarian flows of desire and capital. The ‘terror from above’ that has been visited on Afghanistan and Iraq in the wake of 9-11 suggests the increasing dominance of American state power qua state power, instead of the erasure of such authority as predicted in Empire. Thirdly – and most critically in terms of structural fundamentals – it is necessary to undertake a foundational ‘political economy’ critique deconstructing Hardt and Negri’s assessment of the nature of the global capitalist system. Their hasty ironing out of the fundamentally uneven development of the global complex of state-society formations is simply unsustainable when one gets down to the ‘nitty-gritty’ of political economy. Empire smoothes out all of the contradictions of ‘third world’ development in spite of itself. This myopia regarding the underdeveloped world is at the root of Hardt and Negri’s too exuberant celebration of global cyber-capitalism – and thus also at the centre of their erasure of the state and their misunderstanding of the resistanceterror nexus. This essay will thus reposition empire on the ‘real world’ rather than the ethereal one created in Empire – while acknowledging that much of the required rethinking has been inspired by the simultaneously frustrating and stimulating book.

### Turn – Anthro

#### Turn - Empire’s concept of biopower is anthropocentric and reductionist.

Youatt ‘08 (R, August 2008, Counting Species: Biopower and the Global Biodiversity Census, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30302207> (Accessed 7/14/2022), Department of Political Science Reed College Environmental Values Vol. 17 No. 3) //**Doof**

Driven both by the global loss of biodiversity and by the lack of knowledge about the vast majority of species that are being lost, conservation biologists and some of their allies in the environmental movement have called for and started a massive global census of biodiversity.1 Most prominently, E.O. Wilson has proposed a new mobilisation of scientific resources to complete a global survey of species.2 The identification of biodiversity ʻhotspotsʼ is the first step in a cascade of biodiversity investigation, Wilson hopes, which will culminate in a full inventory of global biodiversity and of the places where it is being lost. With complete information about the global population of biological species, Wilson is optimistic that we can undertake more refined conservation measures and ultimately move towards greater sustainability. In this article, I take the position that the global biodiversity census is as much about power and political life and the boundaries between nature and society as it is about scientific information gathering for conservationist ends. Drawing on Foucaultʼs concept of biopower, I suggest that the biodiversity census provokes us to think about the ways that biological nonhumans are embroiled in, and challenge, the technologies of power that see life itself as a political object. To the extent that the ʻactionʼ in the biodiversity census seems to rest largely with the human scientists who do the categorising, naming, counting, and labelling of nonhuman species, one analytic stance towards **this scientific practice is an anthropocentric one.** Here, the focus is on considering the field of social power in which scientific efforts take place, and asking questions about the discourses, resources and networks that make a biodiversity census plausible and possible. But **what if nonhumans can be legitimately considered to be active participants** in the field of biopower, just as human subjects who are censused are? Can nonhumans be sites of resistance to biopower, and disrupt its governing impulses? I argue that it is possible, and indeed necessary in the context of biodiversity, to extend the idea of biopower to include nonhumans as participants. Like human subjects, nonhumans are regulated and rationalised in matrices of knowledge and science, through which they are readied as productive resources for capitalism and mined as repositories of genetic information. Nonhuman participation in an ecological field of biopower also involves being part of an array of authority in environmental discourses, with effects for both humans and nonhumans, and constructing new possibilities for biosocial collectives. However, because nonhumans generally lack the capacity to be self-regulating subjects but are nonetheless necessary authorities in figuring biodiversity truth discourses, I suggest that they hold a different kind of place in biopower than self-regulating human subjects do. More specifically, because nonhumans constitutionally (rather than intentionally) refuse to internalise the meanings of human language, they are able to resist becoming self-regulating subjects to a significant extent, relying instead on their own semiotic interpretations of the environment and acting accordingly: for example, through migrating, reproduc- ing, consuming resources and filling ecological niches in unexpected ways, biotic nonhumans are constantly challenging the normalising will of biopower. At the same time, because environmental interventions to save species come to be justified on the grounds of global environmental well-being, the health and continued existence of nonhumans becomes an increasing imperative. In spite of the fact the biodiversity census may extend the reach of an ecologically unfriendly capitalism, I conclude that it will, on balance, reap important ecological goods in hybridising political practice and acknowledging extra-human locations of power. The article proceeds as follows. I start in Section 1 by reviewing the global biodiversity census proposal. In section 2, I consider how scientific power is extended through the census and what sources of power it draws on to do so. The science of censusing nonhumans requires a significant mobilisation of social power – financial, technological, institutional and discursive – in order to succeed. But because knowledge projects like demography have effects and techniques that reach beyond these sources of social power into life itself, I suggest that we cannot fully explain the importance of the biodiversity census through these means. In section 3, therefore, I extend Foucaultʼs concept of biopower into the nonhuman world as a means to explain the productive power and regulatory qualities of the census. Because the subjects of the biodiversity census are mostly nonhuman, however, I also consider how the concept of biopower mutates in light of their participation. 1. THE GLOBAL BIODIVERSITY CENSUS PROPOSAL Spurred by the problem of a major extinction event in which we do not even know what or how much is being lost, the basic knowledge-problem that the global biodiversity census is aimed at addressing is counting and describing all the species that currently exist in the world. According to the United Nations Environmental Programʼs (UNEP) Global Biodiversity Assessment, the best ecological estimates of extant species range from 3.5 million all the way to 111.5 million species, with the most likely figure at around 13.5 million.3 Only 1.75 million of those species are currently identified and described, however, or about 13 per cent.4 Each year, only 13,000 new species are formally described, a snailʼs pace given the magnitude of the task.5 Even when species have been described, the data often remains limited. Some species may have become extinct since being identified. May et al., for example, estimate that about 40 per cent of identified beetle species are known from a single examination in a single locality, sometimes an observation made decades ago.6 E.O. Wilsonʼs census proposal includes training and deploying a cadre of thousands of specialists in systematics, taxonomy and classification. He calculates that given 40 years of productive classification work per scientist, at the pace of ten species identified per year, approximately 25,000 professional lifetimes are needed, a number which ʻfalls well short of the number of enlisted men in the standing armed forces of Mongolia, not to mention the trade and retail personnel of Hinds County, Mississippiʼ.7 In the perfectly rational system that he hopes for, each expert would be assigned to a specific classificatory activity. While there are currently only three people in the world who are sufficiently expert in classifying termites, for example, Wilson would up their number proportionally to match the fact that termites comprise ten per cent of the total biomass of tropical regions. Wilson also champions investment in new computer technology that can combine scanning-electron microscopes with image-recognition software. Its goal would be to process and identify species instantly and to flag new specimens as they are passed through. The data held in the GenBank project, a computer database aimed at collecting information on all known DNA and RNA sequences, could be folded into this process. Given the massive numbers of species and the difficulty of resource mobilisation, other proposals suggest sampling procedures to get representative data on the global biopopulation. For example, Terry Erwin suggests that we aim for ʻmassive but achievable biotic inventoriesʼ that give us a relative fix on biodiversity.8 While it may not achieve Wilsonʼs goal of describing all species, targeting specific taxa and sampling certain species would have the effect of rationalising what is currently an ad hoc process. In the face of an ever larger human population, the United States census now makes limited use of representative sampling procedures, which its proponents argue make it more accurate than a large-scale but flawed collection of data about every individual.9 A global biodiversity census would aim to do the same. Some of the questions that surround the biodiversity census are scientific ones, such as concerns over the basic species concepts it employs and the problems of scale involved in identifying micro-species like bacteria.10 Given that the activities of science are not self-contained but always embedded in social relations, additional kinds of questions need to be asked, however. Yet little scholarly attention has been paid to what this biodiversity censusing effort means in political or social terms. Political ecologists have usefully inquired into the general effects of biodiversity discourses and the ways in which they are intertwined with regimes of power and governmentality,11 but they have not asked whether there is anything specific about the language and practice of censusing nonhuman bio-entities that is politically important. Environmental ethicists seem to have ignored the ethical dimensions of the topic altogether.12 Anthropologists and ethnobotanists have looked increasingly at the relationship between biological and cultural diversity, finding strong geographical and evolutionary correlations between the two and suggesting that a broader biocultural value linking nature and humans might be found in diversity complexes.13 However, they have not inquired into the importance of censusing as a technique by which the differences in biocultures might be constituted. Political scientists have written extensively and insightfully about the practice and effects of censusing human populations,14 but have not taken up how censusing nonhumans relates to political questions about power. The rest of the article aims to fill some of these gaps, particularly with respect to questions of how power functions in contemporary environmental science and politics. 2. THE BIODIVERSITY CENSUS AND THE SOCIAL POWER OF SCIENTISTS Taken as a socially-embedded activity, the production of successful scientific knowledge necessarily requires mobilisation of economic resources, expansion of institutional power, and discursive legitimation.15 Successful science, in other words, must be socially forged. This point does not suggest that the status of scientific truth-claims is fully dependent on social interests; rather, the point is that thinking about a scientific activity like the biodiversity census requires attending not only to activities of classification and arguments over species concepts, but also to how those activities are made possible in the first place. In short, what kind of social power does the biodiversity census draw on, depend on and reproduce? What makes the use of a biodiversity census seem intuitively obvious as the right tool to address biodiversity loss? Here, I consider two forms of social power, both crucial to the census project. First, I ask what financial and institutional resources are necessary to allow agenda-setting power and the capacity to steer future resources in advantageous ways.16 Second, I suggest the allure of the census rests partly on the way that biodiversity scientists are able to tap into discursive power, particularly the seductive power of discourses like panopticism and discovery.17 I consider these forms of power in turn. The institutional push for a global biodiversity census is centred in the United States, where it has harnessed major sources of funding, including the National Science Foundation (a $14 million fund for ʻplanetary biodiversity inventoriesʼ), the Packard Foundation and Harvard University. It has created a network of scientific-political organisations mainly based in the United States and Europe dedicated to censusing different parts of the natural world and promoting the ʻcompletion of the Linnaean enterpriseʼ18 into a ʻCatalogue of Lifeʼ – the Census of Marine Life, NatureServe, the Global Taxonomy Initiative of the Convention on Biodiversity, Species 2000 and the All-Species Foundation. There has been increased funding for the academic fields of taxonomy and bioinformatics.19 New professional lives have opened up around these resources – ʻeach species merits careers of scientific study and celebration by historians and poetsʼ, as Wilson puts it.20 The biodiversity census makes these possible first through the act of species identification and then through the subsequent study of species behaviour, ecological roles and potential uses for humanity. The key institutions of the global biodiversity census are organised around information and communications technologies, which worm their way right into the names and missions of the organisations involved. The Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) and the Integrated Taxonomic Information System (ITIS) (in partnership with US federal agencies including the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)) are two of the global clearinghouses for establishing quality specieslevel data, aiming to be ʻopen portalsʼ of biodiversity data.21 GBIFʼs mission is to ʻdevelop methods for sustainably using biodiversity … [by] rapidly, openly, and freely delivering primary data about biodiversity to everyone in the global community, using digital technologiesʼ.22 The political intent is universal access, while its method of delivery is technological. The universally-wired nature of ʻtheʼ global community is taken for granted, even as a global digital divide and the barriers of expertise suggest that no such community exists. One critical role that information technology plays in organising the global biodiversity census is in its ability to suggest a panoptic biological future.23 ʻImagine an electronic page for each species of organism on Earthʼ, Wilson asks us, ʻavailable everywhere by single access on commandʼ.24 Genealogically related to projects like Diderotʼs Encylopedie, the modern ʻEncyclopedia of Lifeʼ is the endpoint and ultimate goal of the censusing project, organised in a technology that claims to outrun space and time. The rhetoric of ʻachievingʼ a global biodiversity census also taps into complex Western narratives of discovery and conquest of nature (ironically, since the conservation agenda of the census is aimed in part at preserving the wildness of nature). This rhetoric also draws on the position of social power held by the modern sciences to reveal the unknown to human publics. Wilson exhorts supporters of the census to have ʻfaith in the sprint to the finish of the global censusʼ, promising that ʻunknown microorganisms ... will be revealedʼ and that ʻnever again, with fuller knowledge of such extent, need we overlook so many golden opportunities in the living world around usʼ.25 Similarly, the All-Species Foundation tells us that the global biodiversity census ʻoffers an unsurpassable adventure: the exploration of a little-known planetʼ.26 Finally, the discursive power of the census is connected to economic life, in the way that it renders nonhuman agents ready for postmodern capitalism as semiotic constructions (as in genetic codes for bioprospectors or images in nature videos).27 As Arturo Escobar argues, whereas ʻnatureʼ marked modern capitalismʼs attitude towards the nonhuman, ʻbiodiversityʼ is a term of postmodern capitalism, in the way that it readies nonhuman nature for semiotic use rather than material use.28 Indeed, postmodern capitalism may protect nature materially even as it commodifies it semiotically, as in the case of protecting the Amazon rainforest for its pharmaceutical potentials.29 Yet, as Escobar argues, ʻonce the semiotic conquest of nature is completed, the sustainable and rational use of the environment becomes imperativeʼ.30 That is, once biodiversity discourses help conserve an area as a biodiversity reserve which is made valuable in terms of code-commodity, it also becomes part of a political system of global environmental governance that continues to manage it for capitalism. Thus, conservation biologists have mobilised an expanding pool of financial and institutional resources, drawing in part on the seductive qualities of the dream of panopticism and the historical glory of exploration. To the extent that the agenda of global environmental governance is steered by their expertise, consensus and public statements,31 they have also garnered increased authority in speaking about matters of conservation, ecotourism and economic development. While these forms of social power (institutional, financial, technological, discursive) explain some of what is at stake in the biodiversity census, I want to suggest that the power of a global biodiversity census also rests in its hybridising force. It introduces nonhumans into the discursive heart of an otherwise anthropocentric modern human politics, economy and knowledge that has generally denied that nonhumans have formed a part of these projects.32 It creates a framework through which humans interact with, pattern and position the diversity of natural nonhumans. Understanding the importance of the biodiversity census therefore extends questions of power past its traditional human context into an ecological context. The important questions, then, are: for whom does this extended politics and power work?33 What happens to anthropocentric understandings of power upon the participation of nonhumans in the process? Does the (re)introduction of nonhumans tell us anything about the ʻwhereabouts of powerʼ, to use John Allenʼs phrase?34 Can power be nearly everywhere, or does it have a specifically local character in relations between things and thus an uneven distribution? To answer these questions, I turn to the idea of Foucaultian biopower, which considers how power works at the micro-levels of individual life, in relation to the more traditional forms of power considered thus far. 3. BIOPOWER AND THE CENSUS In this section, I start by considering how human censuses are understood to relate to politics and governing institutions, specifically through the Foucaultian idea of biopower. Because biopower is concerned with the ways that techniques like censusing operate on the terrain of ʻlife itselfʼ, it is particularly suited to thinking about the biodiversity census, which similarly involves a strategy for administering and rationalising life in ways that reach into nonhuman biological life as such.35 The consideration of censusing nonhuman life through the lens of biopower involves a basic trade-off. On one hand, the **extension of biopower into nonhuman realms raises the spectre of a more subtle, but nonetheless corrosive, form of human power over the natural world.** On the other hand, because power and resistance are always co-existent, nonhumans may disrupt the functioning of environmental governance in new and distinct ways. Specifically, biopower faces difficulty in creating self-regulating nonhuman subjects who internalise conditions of subjection. 3.1 Self-regulating subjects and the justification of power In contrast to absolute power commanded by the Hobbesian sovereign to ʻtake life or to let liveʼ, Michel Foucault argues that the modern form of biopower which replaced it in the nineteenth century was a regulatory and disciplinary form of power that involved ʻthe administration of bodies and the calculated management of lifeʼ.36 Biopower organised and administered life, through a variety of techniques or methods of power that dragged human life itself into the grid of power-knowledge. Institutions such as universities, public health agencies and the army, and regulatory forms of knowledge, such as demography and modern medicine, not only analysed life-processes but permeated them as well. Yet it was not just the use of these techniques or the presence of these institutions that characterised nineteenth-century biopower. Two parallel political shifts made biopower distinct from sovereign power. The first shift was that the right of the sovereign to have power over life and death was no longer justified based on protecting the sovereign from external threat (as in conscription in cases of war) or internal threat (as in the death penalty). Rather, the power over life and death was now justified in terms of the population itself, in modern democratic language. When war was waged, it was not to protect the sovereign, but in the name of the people and their continued existence. The justification for biopowerʼs interventions into the details of life – reproductive health, the ways in which we die, normalising vaccinations – was similarly made in the name of the population. One effect of this shift, Foucault notes, is that the death penalty became more difficult to sustain logically: ʻhow could power exercise its highest prerogatives by putting people to death, when its main role was to ensure, sustain, and multiply life, to put this life in order?ʼ37 In other words, the justifications for powerʼs activities have social effects that exceed the justifications themselves. What effect, then, will extending ʻprotecting lifeʼ to ʻprotecting biodiversityʼ have, if we consider the biodiversity census as an extended example of the logic of biopower? Part of the answer is that direct resource exploitation becomes more difficult, since power over life/death of animals, plants, insects or trees can no longer be justified by needs of the human population/sovereign to fight natural necessity with all its might.38 Ecological biopower thus involves both broader social trends like the rise of modern ecological consciousness and the emergence of conservationist ethics as part of it structural logic. At the same time, what becomes easier is both the management and regulation of nonhuman biological life by humans and the direct intervention in, and mutation of, biological and ecological life-processes, all in the name of bio- or eco-systemic ʻhealthʼ. Here, biopower can be understood as a logic of eco-governance that simultaneously subverts the resource-driven agenda of modern capital by trying to conserve material nature1 and enables and rationalises an entirely new form of intervention in life itself. The ecological sciences, on this reading, are one of the crucial institutions through which interventions into life are enacted, and the biodiversity census is one of its primary power-knowledge techniques. Thinking about biopower as involving nonhumans also has the consequence of changing the population in whose name powerʼs exercise is justified. If the idea of biopower adequately describes the intrusion of scientific, economic and regulatory techniques into the lives of nonhumans, then administering nonhuman life must be justified in the name of an expanded population as well – in this case, in the name of a global ecological population of species (and their genes), guided by an ethic of preserving and fostering biodiversity. In sum, in the name of planetary health (a metaphorical extension of modern biopowerʼs concern with human public health to a planetary scale), a new population is configured into which biopower intervenes, one explicitly composed of human and nonhuman members participating in ecosystemic communities. The second, parallel shift that Foucault notes was involved in the move from sovereign to regulatory power was that there was an unsettling effect on the practice of governing. Unlike sovereign power, regulatory biopower had the imperative to promote life, to ʻoptimise forces, aptitudes, and life in generalʼ, and its ʻhighest function was perhaps no longer to kill, but to invest life through and throughʼ.39 Yet, crucially, it had to do so in ways that did not make the population more difficult to govern.40 In other words, however life was politically managed, it had to be done in ways that ensured governability. This aspect of biopower was aimed at producing self-regulating subjects who internalised the qualities that promoted life but did not fundamentally disrupt social functioning. Self-regulating subjects were both efficient for power (since subjects did powerʼs work for it) and governable. Yet in this respect, the movement of nonhuman entities into the population in whose name biopower acts represents a potential location of freedom, or at least resistance, precisely because many nonhumans are constitutionally incapable of being self-regulating subjects who can internalise the conditions of subjection in biopowerʼs own terms. Nonhumans do not ʻknowʼ that they are a species or a member of a specific phylum, in those terms, or that they have a particular gene-sequence; rather, they have their own frameworks of understanding the moments of interaction with scientists and modes of environmental experience that guide their actions. In this respect, biotic nonhumans differ from the human subjects of biopower, who, as Foucaultʼs analysis suggests, become self-regulating subjects partly in virtue of the way that their consciousness is structured by biopower – by its language, its categories, and the techniques of self-making. When one looks at the minority of bio-entities that could be made partially self-regulating – genetically modified crops, pet clones, lab-grown tissue replacement, gene therapy and pre-selection, regulated game preserves in which species are fenced in or are trained to learn the boundaries of safe haven from human predators – they form a small fraction of the bio-population. Even in those cases, moreover, there are significant doubts over whether they can be made into self-regulating subjects in the same sense as humans. Their ability to accede to and internalise the normalising effects of power is limited by their biological constitution. Though they have varying kinds of subjective experience, they cannot be said to have the self-reflexive kind of subjectivity that humans do. Whereas human subjectivity is marked by the dual ability to be a distinct Self in contrast to the environment and to have the reflexive thought that ʻI am a Selfʼ, nonhumans are generally limited to the former possibility. If biopower cannot make most nonhumans into self-regulating subjects, then their governability rests solely on whether they can be controlled indirectly through the patterned grids of scientific prediction. Yet as groups and individuals, biological nonhumans routinely confound predictability, within their own kinds of subjectivities. They respond to ecological change by unexpectedly shifting migration patterns and locations. They expand in unanticipated ways into ecological niches that humans open directly (e.g., suburbs as feeding grounds for raccoons; rabbits introduced in Australia for hunting who subsequently overran the countryside; garbage dumps as sources of food for omnivorous bears) and indirectly (e.g., red-tailed deer population explosions in New England upon the over-hunting of deer-predators, causing substantial economic damage and fatal car accidents). Some species mutate at evolutionary speeds that far exceed those of humans (e.g., pesticide resistant strains of bugs or penicillin-resistant viruses). They sometimes form new relations with other species to the detriment of humans (e.g., birds as carriers of Asian bird flu). They remake ecosystems into new stabilities and undermine others. In short, while the lack of subjectivity and reflexivity in nonhuman populations is usually read as a source of acquiescence to human interrogation, it seems to also have an opposite effect, in that it constitutes them as ready sources of resistance and disruption to the desires of biopower to establish governable populations. Foucault says of biopower: ʻit is not that life has been totally integrated into techniques that govern and administer it; it constantly escapes themʼ.41 Nonhuman agents effect some of the very same escapes simply by living. Life itself escapes biopower. 3.2. Array of authorities A second component of biopower is ʻone or more truth discourses about the “vital” character of living human beings, and an array of authorities competent to speak that truthʼ.42 In the context of the nineteenth-century societies that Foucault was analysing, these truth discourses about living beings included fields like demography and medicine. In the context of twenty-first-century biopower, Paul Rabinow and Nikolas Rose suggest that they might be extended to include fields like genomics, cloning and reproduction.43 What is critical to the truth discourses surrounding these fields is that there be an array of authorities, like the human sciences, public health agencies or social theorists, that both problematise a certain issue and endeavor to intervene in the field raised by that problematisation. These authorities both render the issue socially visible and strive to rationalise solutions. Just as scientists play a central role as authorities in the truth discourses of human sciences, so too are they central to the truth discourses of biodiversity loss. The project of the biodiversity census involves conservation biologists as a critical part of the authorities competent to create a truth discourse around species loss and conservation, through the rationalisation of species into an ordered catalogue of nonhuman life. But the involvement of nonhumans in this truth discourse exceeds a simple presence as scientific objects, and raises questions about whether we can think of biopower as authoritative about nonhumans without any account of how nonhumans might themselves testify to those truth claims, resist them, or actively participate to some degree in the making of scientific knowledge. An alternative account of scientific practice that moves towards such a distributed model of authority comes from Bruno Latour and others involved in theorising an actor-network approach, in which human and nonhuman agents are seen as collaboratively involved in the construction of scientific truth claims.44 On this account, scientific authority depends in part on the (nonlinguistic) ʻtestimonyʼ of nonhumans who are marshalled by scientists to establish the veracity of scientific accounts.45 While it is still human scientists who problematise the field of biodiversity loss, then, the array of authorities competent to ʻspeakʼ the truth discourses surrounding that field is distributed among both human and nonhuman. This line of argument about authority has three consequences. First, it speaks to the question of the ʻwhereabouts of powerʼ. One of the criticisms of Foucaultʼs analytic of power is that once it is taken past a specific institutional site into the broader practices of governing, it seems to be everywhere and nowhere.46 In a broader sense, space and place themselves seem to disappear from power. In the case of biodiversity sciences, at least, extending the participants in the biopower formation to nonhumans gives power concrete locations – in the places where data is collected, in the laboratories where representative samples are brought under the microscope, and in the bodies of species who experience different life-possibilities and pathways because of the process of classification. What makes biodiversity discourses potent at all, in other words, is the marshalling of human and nonhuman authorities to its truth-claims in particular places and particular biological bodies. Second, the intrusion of nonhuman life into authority-generating processes like the biodiversity census disrupts the human subject at the centre of modern biopower by forcing a new set of constituents into the political field who cannot quite be captured by it in the same way. Because the biopower depends on the relative flourishing of life, biopower cannot speak and act authoritatively on behalf of the health of global biopopulations and simultaneously extinguish them. The necessity of nonhuman life for biopower both enables its extension and increases the living things that disrupt biopowerʼs desire for smooth governing. To return to Foucaultʼs analysis of the death penalty, if biopower (in contrast with sovereign power) complicated the state killing its own citizens, then so too should ecological biopower be seen to complicate the domination of nonhumans (in modern relations with nature), including the ongoing anthropogenic species extinction event. Finally, if the Latourian understanding of authority as distributed between both scientists and scientific objects is correct, this critique should also apply to humans, in the human sciences that Foucault was considering. The authority of scientific claims depends not only on scientists, academics and public servants, but on the very human subjects that make authoritative claims possible. Not only is resistance coexistent with power within human subjectivity, as Foucault claimed,47 but a more distributed kind of authority also resides in the practices of biopower, among the subjects who take part in its data collections, experiments and interventions. 3.3. Biosocial collectivities In Foucaultʼs historical analysis, the formation of biopower occurs within the context of the rise of the modern nation-state. Yet the biodiversity crisis, which I have been thinking of here in terms of an extension of human biopower into biodiversity-power, presents a political situation in which there is a veritable state of emergency (species loss), and yet there is no state in which to declare such a state of emergency. This observation is true in two senses. It is true, first, in a spatial sense, in that the biodiversity crisis is global, yet there is no global state in which such a crisis could effectively be addressed.48 While a layer of global environmental governance may be growing and even using environmental problems as a way through which its expansion is made plausible,49 it does not yet have the logical or practical means to resolve the wider problems of social justice and development involved in the biodiversity crisis.50 In a second sense, there is also no political formation that accepts the participation of nonhumans within its confines. The nation-state is a modern, secular and thoroughly human mode of organisation, one that is based around a community of humans who in turn decide what is right or good for themselves and their environment. Its reasoning is decidedly and openly anthropocentric, as ecologists who advance biodiversityʼs cause almost all accept as a necessary part of communicating the biodiversity crisis to human publics.51 Similarly, the discourses of global governance draw on a thin kind of global political community,52 but they do not grasp nonhumans as participants in their ideological vision. Global governance is hardly democratic with respect to humans, much less politically inclusive of nonhumans.53 Understood in this way, when global governance discourses address biodiversity loss, they do so either as the next logical step in the postcolonial mission (moving from ʻcivilisation, progress, poverty, [to] environmental sustainabilityʼ),54 or as simply another problem area for governance to address.55 In the context of biopower that I have been considering, what then is the effect of global biodiversity census without a global state? If the modern census was part of a power-knowledge formation that was both organised by and constitutive of the nation-state as part of biopower, then a global biodiversity census should have some transformative effects in constituting political forms. The hypothesis that I want to suggest is that a biodiversity census will help construct new ideas of a multi-layered and multi-species global community. As a way into this hypothesis, consider the effect of the modern human population census on ideas of community. Benedict Anderson, for example, argues that the modern census was integrally related to the creation of the categories necessary for the creation of postcolonial nation-states. Anderson argues that the ʻ(confusedly) classifying mind of the colonial stateʼ created identities through the census that might not have been recognised as such by those who were censused and classified.56 The census involved a ʻtotalising classificatory grid, which could be applied with endless flexibility to anything under the stateʼs real or contemplated controlʼ.57 Yet by undertaking this project, the conditions of postcolonial nationalism were shaped and forms of intelligibility were constructed (and imposed) that were not otherwise there. For present-day aspirants to statehood, a census remains an important marker of a consolidated national citizenry, as in the push for a Palestinian census as a way towards achieving a de facto Palestinian state.58 Similarly, then, a global biodiversity census might be understood as part of constructing a global biocitizenry and in forming a global ecopolitical community. Rabinow and Rose suggest that biopower must include ʻstrategies for intervention in the name of life or health, initially addressed to populations that may or may not be territorialised upon the nation, society or pre-given communities, but may also be specified in terms of emergent bio-social collectivitiesʼ.59 Like Foucault, Rabinow and Rose are concerned with human populations, but their use of ʻbio-social collectivitiesʼ that are not necessarily dependent on a territorial population suggests the possibility of forms of community that are not tied to the nation-state. If the nation-state is not necessarily the right analogy for biosocial collectivities of humans and nonhumans, then Michael Hardt and Antonio Negriʼs expansion of biopower past Foucaultʼs state-bound apparatuses of governing points towards how a de-territorialised collectivity might be theorised.60 If Foucaultʼs use of biopower was used in the concrete historical analysis of the transition in nineteenth-century Europe from the sovereign state of absolute power over life and death to one ʻin the name of the peopleʼ of disciplinary and regulatory power, Hardt and Negri push the historical analysis forward another step by drawing from Gilles Deleuze the idea of a transition from a Foucaultian disciplinary society to a society of control. Disciplinary society exists in relation to individual subjects, setting the parameters of what is normal and deviant, prescribing the rules of social behaviour, and constructing the boundaries of the social space in which its citizens rattle around. Power in disciplinary society is concentrated in institutions. By contrast, a society of control moves into the very interior of its subjects. It regulates not from outside but through its distribution and internalisation into ʻbrains and bodiesʼ.61 It is a form of power that exists in networked interiorities (i.e., the linked, self-regulating consciousness of subjects), not in external impositions, limits, sanctions or structurings. Power in a society of control is also unique in the way that it is able to make biopower its exclusive terrain of reference. For Hardt and Negri, it is also a more totalising form of power than disciplinary power – it ʻextends throughout the depths of the consciousness and bodies of the population – and at the same time across the entirety of social relationsʼ.62 It is such an organising power that Hardt and Negri see as globally operative in the social production of subjects. But Hardt and Negri are critical of the way in which the global society of control has been considered in a disembodied way. They argue that the abstractions of language, communication, and intellectual ideas have been given productive precedence over the material and corporeal. 63 In their neo-Marxist reading, the potential of a biopolitical analysis rests with its study at the level of labour, production and bodies. If Marxist analysis of modern capitalism understood **communication as external** or secondary to the material relations of production, **Hardt and Negri want to read it as internal** and immanent to production in postmodern capitalism. The semiotic reconfiguration of postmodern capital that Escobar suggests is thus the very productive activity in Hardt and Negriʼs framework, and biopower is a Foucaultian/Marxist hybrid.64 In such a framework, biodiversity is something produced, and the ʻthingsʼ of biodiversity – the individuals, the species, the communicative fabric of science around which knowledge of them is built, the development projects of which biodiversity is a component – are implicated in a global society of control. Like Foucaultʼs conceptualisation of power, Hardt and Negriʼs vision of biopower as a field or fabric of social and capitalist production is an image that makes us see a total matrix of power. Yet their relative exclusion of nonhumans is curious, since **there is a slew of nonhuman agents outside of that productive field**. There is a multitude of nonhumans, so to speak, that includes the ʻbacterial proletariatʼ, in E.O. Wilsonʼs colourful metaphor and the nomadic animal populations who routinely exceed national borders.

### Alt Fails

#### The alt fails to solve, only incremental changes at the nation-state level can solve, while sweeping global reforms solving is nothing but a utopian pipe dream.

Fukuyama ‘04 (Francis, 7/25/2004, An Antidote To Empire, The New York Times, https://www.nytimes.com/2004/07/25/books/an-antidote-to-empire.html (Accessed 7/14/2022) Yoshihiro Francis Fukuyama is an American political scientist, political economist, and writer.) //**Doof**

Well before 9/11 and the Iraq war put the idea in everybody's mind, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri had popularized the notion of a modern empire. Four years ago, they argued in a widely discussed book -- titled, as it happens, ''Empire'' -- that the globe was ruled by a new imperial order, different from earlier ones, which were based on overt military domination. This one had no center; it was managed by the world's wealthy nation-states (particularly the United States), by multinational corporations and by international institutions like the World Trade Organization and the International Monetary Fund. This empire -- a k a globalization -- was exploitative, undemocratic and repressive, not only for developing countries but also for the excluded in the rich West. Hardt and Negri's new book, ''Multitude,'' argues that the antidote to empire is the realization of true democracy, ''the rule of everyone by everyone, a democracy without qualifiers.'' They say that the left needs to leave behind outdated concepts like the proletariat and the working class, which vastly oversimplify the gender/racial/ethnic/ class diversities of today's world. In their place they propose the term ''multitude,'' to capture the ''commonality and singularity'' of those who stand in opposition to the wealthy and powerful. This book -- which lurches from analyses of intellectual property rules for genetically engineered animals to discourses on Dostoyevsky and the myth of the golem -- deals with an imaginary problem and a real problem. Unfortunately, it provides us with an **imaginary solution to the real problem**. The imaginary problem stems from the authors' basic understanding of economics and politics, which remains at its core unreconstructedly Marxist. For them, there is no such thing as voluntary economic exchange, only coercive political hierarchy: any unequal division of rewards is prima facie evidence of exploitation. Private property is a form of theft. Globalization has no redeeming benefits whatsoever. (East Asia's rise from third- to first-world status in the last 50 years seems not to have registered on their mental map.) Similarly, democracy is not embodied in constitutions, political parties or elections, which are simply manipulated to benefit elites. The half of the country that votes Republican is evidently not part of the book's multitude. To all this Hardt and Negri add an extremely confused theory, their take on what Daniel Bell labeled postindustrial society, and what has more recently been called the ''knowledge economy.'' The ''immaterial labor'' of knowledge workers differs from labor in the industrial era, Hardt and Negri say, because it produces not objects but social relations. It is inherently communal, which implies that no one can legitimately appropriate it for private gain. Programmers at Microsoft may be surprised to discover that because they collaborate with one another, their programs belong to everybody. It's hard to know even how to engage this set of assertions. **Globalization is a complex phenomenon**; it produces winners and losers among rich and poor alike. But you would never learn about the complexities from reading ''Multitude.'' So let's move on to Hardt and Negri's real problem, which has to do with global governance. We have at this point in human history evolved fairly good democratic political institutions, but only at the level of the nation-state. With globalization -- and increased flows of information, goods, money and people across borders -- countries are now better able to help, but also to harm, one another. In the 1990's, the harm was felt primarily through financial shocks and job losses, and since 9/11 it has acquired a military dimension as well. As the authors state, ''one result of the current form of globalization is that certain national leaders, both elected and unelected, gain greater powers over populations outside their own nation-states.'' The United States is uniquely implicated in this charge because of its enormous military, economic and cultural power. What drove people around the world crazy about the Bush administration's unilateral approach to the Iraq war was its assertion that it was accountable to no one but American voters for what it did in distant parts of the globe. And since institutions like the United Nations are woefully ill equipped to deal with democratic legitimacy, this democracy deficit is a real and abiding challenge at the international level. The authors are conscious of the charge that they, like the Seattle anti-globalization protesters they celebrate, **don't have any real solutions** to these matters, so they spend some time discussing how to fix the present international institutions. Their problem is that any fixes are politically difficult if not impossible to bring about, and promise only marginal benefits. Democratic institutions that work at the nation-state level don't work at global levels. A true global democracy, in which all of the earth's billions of people actually vote, is **an impossible dream**, while existing proposals to modify the United Nations Security Council or change the balance of power between it and the General Assembly are political nonstarters. Making the World Bank and I.M.F. more transparent are worthy projects, but hardly solutions to the underlying issue of democratic accountability. The United States, meanwhile, has stood in the way of new institutions like the International Criminal Court. It is at this point that Hardt and Negri take leave of reality -- arriving at an imaginary solution to their real problem. They argue that instead of ''repeating old rituals and tired solutions'' we need to begin ''a new investigation in order to formulate a new science of society and politics.'' The woolliness of the subsequent analysis is hard to overstate. According to them, the fundamental obstacle to true democracy is not just the monopoly of legitimate force held by nation-states, but the dominance implied in virtually all hierarchies, which give certain individuals authority over others. The authors dress up Marx's old utopia of the withering away of the state in the contemporary language of chaos theory and biological systems, suggesting that hierarchies should be replaced with networks that reflect the diversity and commonality of the ''multitude.'' The difficulty with this line of reasoning is that there is a whole class of issues networks can't resolve. This is why hierarchies, from nation-states to corporations to university departments, persist, and why so many left-wing movements claiming to speak on behalf of the people have ended up monopolizing power. Indeed, the **powerlessness and poverty in today's world are due not to the excessive power of nation-states, but to their weakness.** The solution is not to undermine sovereignty but to **build stronger states** in the developing world. To illustrate, take the very different growth trajectories of East Asia and sub-Saharan Africa over the past generation. Two of the fastest growing economies in the world today happen to be in the two most populous countries, China and India; sub-Saharan Africa, by contrast, has tragically seen declining per capita incomes over the same period. At least part of this difference is the result of globalization: China and India have integrated themselves into the global economy, while sub-Saharan Africa is the one part of the world barely touched by globalization or multinational corporations. But this raises the question of why India and China have been able to take advantage of globalization, while Africa has not. The answer has largely to do with the fact that the former have strong, well-developed state institutions providing basic stability and public goods. They had only to get out of the way of private markets to trigger growth. By contrast, modern states were virtually unknown in most of sub-Saharan Africa before European colonialism, and the weakness of states in the region has been the source of its woes ever since. Any project, then, to fix the ills of ''empire'' has to begin with the strengthening, not the dismantling, of institutions at the nation-state level. This will not solve the problems of global governance, but surely any real advance here will come only through slow, patient innovation and the reform of international institutions. Hardt and Negri should remember the old insight of the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci, taken up later by the German Greens: progress is to be achieved not with utopian dreaming, but with a ''long march through institutions.''

### Alt DA – Collapse Bad

#### Alternative produces a collapse of the international system

Hunt ‘07 (Michael H., The American Ascendancy: How the United States Gained & Wielded Global Dominance, p320-324, The University of North Carolina Press, Michael H. Hunt is Everett H. Emerson Professor of History Emeritus at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.) //**Doof**

While U.S. hegemony entails perplexities and burdens, an abandonment of hegemony may carry risks. Diminished U.S. leadership could prove dangerously disruptive of the international system and imperil the well-being of peoples everywhere, Americans included. A U.S. retreat could undermine an international economy that has generated impressive global abundance and peace beneficial to many. Simply consider the resources now available today (an annual worldwide output of $30 trillion at the end of the twentieth century) compared to fifty years earlier when it was a tenth that figure. Imagine what this amazing, unprecedented leap in global productivity has meant to health and welfare in all lands. Without U.S. leadership, so the defenders of hegemony claim, these gains might well have been limited, even nonexistent. A future of diminished abundance might prove distinctly unpleasant: greater discord among states and peoples leading to rising cultural intolerance, flaring nationalist fervor and rivalry, deepening international divisions, and fraying economic ties that would slow growth and press down longevity and health in wide swaths of the human population. This would be a world of narrower horizons, fewer choices, and less interaction among peoples and cultures. It would also be a world with diminished capacity for addressing mounting global problems. Advocates for maintaining U.S. dominance along current neoliberal lines hold the ideological high ground. The predominant version of American nationalism took a distinctly activist turn in the course of the twentieth century. From the 1890s to the 1920s the notion of the United States as a dynamic republic with the vision and energy to manage the world’s affairs began to come into its own. Republicans dedicated to an assertive policy along a broad front contributed to this shift in thinking. So too did Woodrow Wilson with his fervent support for the ideal of a progressive international society. In 1941 Henry Luce blended this set of nationalist ideas in his vision of an American century marked by the advance of political freedom, unhampered commerce, and general economic abundance. The most activist U.S. leaders after World War II drew from this creed, as appealing to visionary Wilsonians such as Harry Truman as to corporate-minded Republicans such as Ronald Reagan and the younger Bush. Over the past half century it has become an orthodoxy so potent in its appeal that challengers risk exile from membership in the foreign policy establishment and exclusion from government posts. Such is the allegiance commanded by the one true faith. Or as John Adams observed pungently, “Power always thinks it has a great Soul, and vast Views.”¹⁰ Even so, a good case can be made for a U.S. retreat from hegemony and toward a more modest and sustainable role in the world. A searching critique has no reason to linger on matters of style, particularly such easy targets as a policy governed by restless unilateralism or simplistic assumptions. Such a critique should instead turn to the hegemonic project itself. The place to begin a critical evaluation is with the tendency of the champions of hegemony to oversell the product. They point to its historical achievements to the neglect of the costs it has imposed on others. The leaders of the United States have managed hegemony with a lamentably heavy hand—with scant respect for human life and scant respect for human diversity. Millions died and many societies suffered profound disruption as a result of the U.S. interventions that dot the pages of this account. To those costs would have to be added an intolerance of views on markets and the state that diverge from U.S. preferences. As a result, U.S. pressure has in some cases blocked or disrupted socioeconomic and political experiments favored by others, especially in Latin America, Africa, and the Middle East. In other cases, an insistence on an American way has generated tensions with major states such as China or regions such as western Europe with divergent interests and values; that insistence has also strained ties with genuinely international organizations such as the UN. On virtually every front U.S. leaders have left themselves open to charges of hypocrisy—of ignoring if not violating the ideals of democracy and self-determination that they publicly profess. A look into the future reveals more grounds for doubts about the hegemonic project. Put simply, the time for U.S. hegemony may have passed. As the relative U.S. advantage in economic might and cultural appeal slips, attempts to exercise hegemony may prove increasingly counterproductive, doing more to further undermine than to confirm U.S. dominance. The U.S. economy labors under limits. Persistent structural problems include oil dependency, low domestic savings, and deep trade and federal budget deficits. The core U.S. cultural model—a faith in unending corporate-driven growth and the unending delights of consumerism—may be fading at least in the developed world. Western Europe and Japan have both drawn alongside the United States in their technological capacity, their income levels, their capital resources, and the depth and integration of their home markets. They need no longer look to the United States as a model in any of these areas. The consumer revolution led by Americans may have at least in these two regions run its course. Rising per capita income beyond a point (in the range of $15,000 in a fair sampling of countries recently surveyed) seems to produce no greater individual satisfaction while imposing costs captured not by conventional GDP data but by social GDP estimates.¹¹ In military affairs, the United States has retained, even increased, its dominance. But to what end? Its massive nuclear stockpile can be used only at the risk of profound and widespread moral revulsion and in some circumstances of devastating counterstrikes. Its high-tech forces may be the wonder of the world. But they are effective only against the most peripheral and isolated of states (in what one observer has dismissed as “theatrical micromilitarism”), and they have limited capacity to rebuild what they have destroyed.¹² The exercise of military might has proven a poor substitute for the intricacies of diplomatic negotiation, the trade-offs indispensable to international comity, and the long-term commitment of resources to economic development and human welfare. Finally, hegemony may hurt the hegemon. Evidence can be found in the privileging of corporate interests harmful to popular welfare, a fixation with military power that amounts to a national obsession, an increasingly infantilized and inert public, and the rise of an imperial presidency antithetical to genuine democracy. These trends validate a sharply critical view of foreign adventures that prevailed during the country’s first century. Proponents of republicanism claimed that crusades, even crusades conducted in the name of freedom, threatened freedom at home. The history of republican experiments across history showed that foreign entanglements and adventures created dangerous concentrations of political power within and undermined the very civic virtues on which the survival of any republic depended. Vindicating this republican fear is the rise of the imperial president and the concomitant atrophy of the democratic process. While most Americans today may not see hegemony through this anxious republican lens, many have voiced their discontent with the outward thrust of U.S. policy. Some express it in frustration and chagrin directed not against U.S. leaders but against a seemingly ungrateful, unyielding, dangerous world and call for scaling back international commitments. The most restive have contended that a more isolated, less burdened America would be better off— less vulnerable to attack, less dependent on fickle friends, less likely to get entangled in distant quarrels, and more secure in its homeland and its domestic liberties. Others refuse to go this far and instead put the blame squarely on U.S. leaders—political and corporate—whose free-market, environmental, and human rights policies have betrayed values as important at home as in the international community. Taken together, these critical reactions suggest a broad-based skepticism about hegemony. But the critics may be so fundamentally divided philosophically, politically, regionally, and socially that they cannot cobble together a common program to serve as an alternative to hegemony. A retreat from hegemony need not lead to isolationism. This myth about the nature of U.S. foreign relations in the past, which was constructed in the first place for the very purpose of justifying U.S. dominance, is likely to figure prominently in any defense of the status quo. But the notion of isolation is flawed as history and as a source of lessons. Today as earlier, the United States has a major stake in a productive, peaceful, and just global society. By extension, the United States has an obligation rooted in self-interest if not calculations of altruism and long-term human welfare to help mobilize a collective international response to the problems generated by that society. A retreat implies that the United States would act in world affairs not as the leader but as a leader, perhaps in some circumstances the first among equals. Engaging in a genuinely collaborative relationship with other states and taking international institutions and norms seriously may hold out the best hope of extending the considerable achievements of the previous fifty years and in the bargain maintaining U.S. influence and advancing U.S. well-being. The historical case for the efficacy of collaboration is compelling. The U.S. role after World War I calmed, for a time at least, the arms race, gave the Europeans a chance to sort out their monetary tangle, and sustained the turn-of-the-century drive to create humane standards of international conduct. The post–World War II record is even more striking. The achievements in setting norms (such as outlawing genocide), rehabilitating defeated Germany and Japan, and creating a framework for global prosperity were the result of collaboration richly repaid in international support and respect, not to mention enhanced U.S. security. This collaborative element helped not only to distinguish the U.S. from the Soviet side during the Cold War, but also to determine the outcome of a competition that was as much about systems and values as military might. International cooperation is not an illusion; it yields results far better than a course defined by narrow self-interest and pursued by brute force. Whatever the attractions of a more modest, collaborative internationalism, winning broad acceptance of such an approach faces serious difficulties. It requires that Americans think about their role in the world in a fresh, genuinely global way quite distinct from the cautious opportunism familiar from the first U.S. century and the rising assertiveness that has marked recent decades. It also requires a sensitivity to the intricacies of the global system and the cultural diversity of its parts. That sensitivity will not come easily to today’s body politic, which features a disengaged, ill-schooled public and a political class beholden to interest groups and trapped by shallow rhetoric and narrow, short-term calculations. Above all, the middle way offers nothing heroic to a country of individualists that may be dependent on civic nationalism as one of the few sources of collective identity. Indeed, calls for serious, long-term support for economic development programs, genuine respect for international norms, and tolerance for regional diversity collide with prevailing nationalist and neoliberal notions, which continue to inspire bold dreams of global transformation under the American aegis and in the American image. A retreat from hegemony would require a lot: a more cosmopolitan understanding of other cultures, a more sophisticated grasp of U.S. limits, a genuinely democratic electoral system responsive to popular preferences, and a better informed electorate able to think through those preferences. The fate of the current ascendancy with its hegemonic dimensions may well hang on how Americans measure up to these high standards and how rapidly structural problems eat away at the foundations of our hegemony. What the next page of the national story has to say may depend on how well we take into account the possibilities and constraints created by a history of burgeoning state power, strong nationalism, and intrusive global forces.