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====A. Interpretation - Engagement is the use of particular means to influence the political behavior of a state – economic means are trade promotion and aid in the form loans or grants====

Resnik, 1 – Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University (Evan, Journal of International Affairs, "Defining Engagement" v54, n2, political science complete)

A REFINED DEFINITION OF ENGAGEMENT

In order to establish a more effective framework for dealing with unsavory regimes, I propose that we define engagement as the attempt to influence the political behavior of a target state through the comprehensive establishment and enhancement of contacts with that state across multiple issue-areas (i.e. diplomatic, military, economic, cultural). The following is a brief list of the specific forms that such contacts might include:

DIPLOMATIC CONTACTS

Extension of diplomatic recognition; normalization of diplomatic relations

Promotion of target-state membership in international institutions and regimes

Summit meetings and other visits by the head of state and other senior government officials of sender state to target state and vice-versa

MILITARY CONTACTS

Visits of senior military officials of the sender state to the target state and vice-versa

Arms transfers

Military aid and cooperation

Military exchange and training programs

Confidence and security-building measures

Intelligence sharing

ECONOMIC CONTACTS

Trade agreements and promotion

Foreign economic and humanitarian aid in the form of loans and/or grants

CULTURAL CONTACTS

Cultural treaties

Inauguration of travel and tourism links

Sport, artistic and academic exchanges(n25)

Engagement is an iterated process in which the sender and target state develop a relationship of increasing interdependence, culminating in the endpoint of "normalized relations" characterized by a high level of interactions across multiple domains. Engagement is a quintessential exchange relationship: the target state wants the prestige and material resources that would accrue to it from increased contacts with the sender state, while the sender state seeks to modify the domestic and/or foreign policy behavior of the target state. This deductive logic could adopt a number of different forms or strategies when deployed in practice.(n26) For instance, individual contacts can be established by the sender state at either a low or a high level of conditionality.(n27) Additionally, the sender state can achieve its objectives using engagement through any one of the following causal processes: by directly modifying the behavior of the target regime; by manipulating or reinforcing the target states~’ domestic balance of political power between competing factions that advocate divergent policies; or by shifting preferences at the grassroots level in the hope that this will precipitate political change from below within the target state.

This definition implies that three necessary conditions must hold for engagement to constitute an effective foreign policy instrument. First, the overall magnitude of contacts between the sender and target states must initially be low. If two states are already bound by dense contacts in multiple domains (i.e., are already in a highly interdependent relationship), engagement loses its impact as an effective policy tool. Hence, one could not reasonably invoke the possibility of the US engaging Canada or Japan in order to effect a change in either country~’s political behavior. Second, the material or prestige needs of the target state must be significant, as engagement derives its power from the promise that it can fulfill those needs. The greater the needs of the target state, the more amenable to engagement it is likely to be. For example, North Korea~’s receptivity to engagement by the US dramatically increased in the wake of the demise of its chief patron, the Soviet Union, and the near-total collapse of its national economy.(n28)

Third, the target state must perceive the engager and the international order it represents as a potential source of the material or prestige resources it desires. This means that autarkic, revolutionary and unlimited regimes which eschew the norms and institutions of the prevailing order, such as Stalin~’s Soviet Union or Hitler~’s Germany, will not be seduced by the potential benefits of engagement.

This reformulated conceptualization avoids the pitfalls of prevailing scholarly conceptions of engagement. It considers the policy as a set of means rather than ends, does not delimit the types of states that can either engage or be engaged, explicitly encompasses contacts in multiple issue-areas, allows for the existence of multiple objectives in any given instance of engagement and, as will be shown below, permits the elucidation of multiple types of positive sanctions.

====B. Violation – The THA would increase NON-Economic ties—====

\*\*DOS ~’13\*\*. US Department of State. "U.S.-Mexico Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement" Office of the Spokesperson. May 2013 ~~[http://www.state.gov/r/pa/prs/ps/2013/05/208650.htm~~]~~[MG~~]

U.S.-Mexico Transboundary Hydrocarbons Agreement Fact Sheet Office of the Spokesperson Washington, DC May 2, 2013 In 2012, the United States and Mexico signed an agreement concerning the development of oil and gas reservoirs that cross the international maritime boundary between the two countries in the Gulf of Mexico. The Agreement is designed to enhance energy security in North America and support our shared interest to exercise responsible stewardship of the Gulf of Mexico. It is built on a commitment to the safe, efficient, and equitable development of transboundary reservoirs with the highest degree of safety and environmental standards. Mexico is consistently one of the top three exporters of petroleum to the United States. The United States is Mexico~’s largest supplier of refined oil products, mostly coming from U.S. Gulf Coast refineries. Former Secretary Clinton and then Mexican Foreign Secretary Espinosa signed the Agreement in Los Cabos in February, 2012. Mexico ratified the agreement in April 2012. The Agreement establishes a framework that promotes unitization of maritime transboundary reservoirs. Upon entry into force, the current moratorium on oil exploration and production along the boundary in the Western Gap portion of the Gulf of Mexico will end. Mexican law currently prohibits Petroleos Mexicanos (PEMEX) from jointly developing resources with leaseholders on the U.S. side of the boundary. Mexico opened the door to such cooperation in a 2008 energy reform law, but only if the cooperation takes place pursuant to an international agreement governing transboundary reservoirs. The Agreement takes advantage of this opportunity. The Agreement facilitates the formation of voluntary arrangements – unitization agreements – between U.S. leaseholders and Pemex for the joint exploration and development of transboundary reservoirs. It also provides appropriate incentives to encourage the formation of such arrangements if a reservoir is proven to be transboundary and a unitization agreement is not formed. Ultimately, the Agreement provides that development may proceed in an equitable manner that protects each nation~’s interests. The Agreement provides for ongoing cooperation between the two governments related to safety and the environment, and also provides for joint inspection teams to ensure compliance with applicable laws and regulations. Both governments will review and approve all unitization agreements governing the exploration and development of transboundary reservoirs under the Agreement, providing for approval of all safety and environmental measures. Both the U.S. House of Representatives and the Senate have introduced bills that would approve the Transboundary Agreement and give the Secretary of the Interior the necessary authorization to implement the agreement. The Administration looks forward to speedy passage of the authorizing legislation. Effect of the Agreement The Agreement will enable U.S. companies to explore new business opportunities and carry out collaborative projects with the Mexican national oil company PEMEX. It is expected the Agreement will unlock areas for exploration and exploitation along the boundary within U.S. jurisdiction by providing the legal certainty companies need to invest, potentially providing increased revenues and energy security benefits that would result from increases in production. This agreement will make nearly 1.5 million acres of the Outer Continental Shelf more attractive to U.S. operators. The Department of the Interior~’s Bureau of Ocean Energy Management (BOEM) estimates that this area contains as much as 172 million barrels of oil and 304 billion cubic feet of natural gas. The Transboundary Agreement will also help mitigate the safety and environmental risks that would result from unilateral exploration and exploitation along the boundary.

====C. Voting issue – ====

1. limits – they explode the topic – blurring the lines between economic and other forms of engagement makes any positive interaction with another country topical. It~’s impossible to predict or prepare

2. negative ground – the economic limit is vital to critiques of economics, trade disads, and non-economic counterplans

====3. Precision – it~’s key to effective policy analysis====

Resnik, 1 – Assistant Professor of Political Science at Yeshiva University (Evan, Journal of International Affairs, "Defining Engagement" v54, n2, political science complete)

In matters of national security, establishing a clear definition of terms is a precondition for effective policymaking. Decisionmakers who invoke critical terms in an erratic, ad hoc fashion risk alienating their constituencies. They also risk exacerbating misperceptions and hostility among those the policies target. Scholars who commit the same error undercut their ability to conduct valuable empirical research. Hence, if scholars and policymakers fail rigorously to define "engagement," they undermine the ability to build an effective foreign policy.¶ The refined definition I propose as a substitute for existing descriptions of engagement is different in two important ways: First, it clarifies the menu of choices available for policymakers by allowing engagement to be distinguished from related approaches such as appeasement, containment and isolation. Second, it lays the groundwork for systematic and objective research on historical cases of engagement in order to discern the conditions under which it can be used effectively. Such research will, in turn, help policymakers acquire the information necessary to better manage the rogue states of the 21st century.

=Politics DA Budget=

====Debt ceiling will pass – Obama political strength and Dem unity means the GOP will cave====

Bolton, 9/14/13 (Alexander, The Hill, "Confident Democrats want separate showdowns on shutdown and debt limit" Read more: http://thehill.com/homenews/senate/322247-confident-democrats-want-separate-showdowns-on-shutdown-and-debt-limit~~%23ixzz2g92IX3s7

Democrats, however, want to force the GOP to debate these issues successively.¶ "We~’re not negotiating on the debt ceiling. We think we have the high ground in both of those fights," said a senior Senate Democratic aide.¶ The Senate Democratic strategy over the next several weeks will be to stand pat and refuse to make any significant concessions in exchange for funding the government or raising the debt ceiling.¶ "If push comes to shove on debt ceiling, I~’m virtually certain they~’ll blink," said Sen. Charles Schumer (N.Y.), the third-ranking member of the Senate Democratic leadership. "They know they shouldn~’t be playing havoc with the markets."¶ Schumer said Republicans are on stronger political ground if there~’s a government shutdown, but warned "even on that one, they~’re on weak ground because the public sort of is finally smelling that these guys are for obstructing."

====Increasing economic engagement splits Congressional Democrats and consumes political capital====

\*\*Magnus, ~’9\*\*

John R. Magnus, trade lawyer in Washington, DC, is President of TradeWins LLC and Of Counsel

at Miller %26 Chevalier Chartered, ~’9

3. Votes: Will the new government allow any major trade-liberalizing items to come to a vote in the first two years? Conventional wisdom holds that trade votes are bad for the Democratic party — they split the caucus, demoralize stakeholders, and generally spell trouble for the party~’s political majority. Many regard allowing trade initiatives to reach the front of the legislative queue as a blunder of the early Clinton administration. A precious period of unified government was squandered when it could, the argument goes, have been used to enact important Democratic priorities. And then it might have lasted longer — the 1994 Republican takeover could have been averted%21 Although questionable in several particulars, this narrative is present in the minds of many Democrats in and out of government today, and they are determined to manage the new period of unified government differently. There will be a strong temptation to use President Obama~’s political capital exclusively for initiatives favored by a strong majority of Democrats, to keep trade-liberalizing measures (and related items like Trade Promotion Authority) off the voting agenda for months or even years, and to limit any congressional trade votes to matters like adjustment assistance and enforcement. But, of course, foreign policy concerns, and business community desires, will pull in the opposite direction.

====It disrupts Obama~’s attempt to prioritize the debt ceiling by consuming political capital====

Frumin, 9/21/13 – reporter for MSNBC (Aliyah, "Bright prospects on foreign agenda; domestic in chaos" [[http://tv.msnbc.com/2013/09/21/bright-prospects-for-obama-on-foreign-agenda-domestic-in-chaos/-http://tv.msnbc.com/2013/09/21/bright-prospects-for-obama-on-foreign-agenda-domestic-in-chaos/]])

Conservative strategist Keith Appell said having a full plate is just part of being president and his legacy is at risk because his number one priority of improving the economy has not been significantly addressed.¶ Fixing the economy, he said, could arguable be pegged to how much political capital he has on the issues Obama is currently facing (Syria, Iran, debt ceiling, gun control). "But certainly, if you~’re talking about legacy, unless there is an overwhelming foreign policy situation like the Cold War, then it~’s all about the economy."¶ But Jeanne Zaino, a professor of political science at Iona College and of political campaign management at New York University said "Every time Obama tries to refocus on the economy, there~’s these enormous crises that break out. You can just imagine how frustrating that can be and how it~’s been difficult for him to prioritize."¶ "It~’s not only the amount he has on his plate. It~’s that he doesn~’t~’ have the ability to get anything done without Congress," she added.

====That takes Obama off-message – it undermines his strategy of constant pressure on the GOP and makes a deal impossible====

Milbank, 9/27/13 – Washington Post Opinion Writer (Dana, "Obama should pivot to Dubya~’s playbook" Washington Post, [[http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/dana-milbank-obama-should-try-pivoting-to-george-bushs-playbook/2013/09/27/c72469f0-278a-11e3-ad0d-b7c8d2a594b9\_story.html-http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/dana-milbank-obama-should-try-pivoting-to-george-bushs-playbook/2013/09/27/c72469f0-278a-11e3-ad0d-b7c8d2a594b9\_story.html]])

If President Obama can stick to his guns, he will win his October standoff with Republicans.¶ That~’s an awfully big "if."¶ This president has been consistently inconsistent, predictably unpredictable and reliably erratic. Consider the events of Thursday morning:¶ Obama gave a rousing speech in suburban Washington, in defense of Obamacare, on the eve of its implementation. "We~’re now only five days away from finishing the job," he told the crowd.¶ But before he had even left the room, his administration let slip that it was delaying by a month the sign-up for the health-care exchanges for small businesses. It wasn~’t a huge deal, but it was enough to trample on the message the president had just delivered.¶ Throughout his presidency, Obama has had great difficulty delivering a consistent message. Supporters plead for him to take a position — any position — and stick with it. His shifting policy on confronting Syria was the most prominent of his vacillations, but his allies have seen a similar approach to the Guantanamo Bay prison, counterterrorism and climate change. Even on issues such as gun control and immigration where his views have been consistent, Obama has been inconsistent in promoting his message. Allies are reluctant to take risky stands, because they fear that Obama will change his mind and leave them standing alone.¶ Now come the budget showdowns, which could define the rest of his presidency. Republican leaders are trying to shift the party~’s emphasis from the fight over a government shutdown to the fight over the debt-limit increase, where they have more support. A new Bloomberg poll found that Americans, by a 2-to-1 margin, disagree with Obama~’s view that Congress should raise the debt limit without any conditions.¶ But Obama has a path to victory. That poll also found that Americans think lawmakers should stop trying to repeal Obamacare. And that was before House Republicans dramatically overplayed their hand by suggesting that they~’ll allow the nation to default if Obama doesn~’t agree to their laundry list of demands, including suspending Obamacare, repealing banking reforms, building a new oil pipeline, easing environmental regulations, limiting malpractice lawsuits and restricting access to Medicare.¶ To beat the Republicans, Obama might follow the example of a Republican, George W. Bush. Whatever you think of what he did, he knew how to get it done: by simplifying his message and repeating it, ad nauseam, until he got the result he was after.¶ Obama instead tends to give a speech and move along to the next topic. This is why he is forever making "pivots" back to the economy, or to health care. But the way to pressure Congress is to be President One Note.¶ In the debt-limit fight, Obama already has his note: He will not negotiate over the full faith and credit of the United States. That~’s as good a theme as any; it matters less what the message is than that he delivers it consistently.¶ The idea, White House officials explained to me, is to avoid getting into a back-and-forth over taxes, spending and entitlement programs. "We~’re right on the merits, but I don~’t think we want to argue on the merits," one said. "Our argument is not that our argument is better than theirs; it~’s that theirs is stupid."¶ This is a clean message: Republicans are threatening to tank the economy — through a shutdown or, more likely, through a default on the debt — and Obama isn~’t going to negotiate with these hostage-takers.¶ Happily for Obama, Republicans are helping him to make the case by being publicly belligerent. After this week~’s 21-hour speech on the Senate floor by Sen. Ted Cruz (R-Tex.), the publicity-seeking Texan and Sen. Mike Lee (R-Utah) objected to a bipartisan request to move a vote from Friday to Thursday to give House Republicans more time to craft legislation avoiding a shutdown. On the Senate floor, Sen. Bob Corker (R-Tenn.) accused them of objecting because they had sent out e-mails encouraging their supporters to tune in to the vote on Friday. The Post~’s Ed O~’Keefe caught Cruz "appearing to snicker" as his colleague spoke — more smug teenager than legislator.¶ Even if his opponents are making things easier for him, Obama still needs to stick to his message. As in Syria, the president has drawn a "red line" by saying he won~’t negotiate with those who would put the United States into default. If he retreats, he will embolden his opponents and demoralize his supporters.

====Failure to reach a deal guarantees government shutdown. ====

Farry, 11

~~[Yanira, Junior Editor – Veterans Today, Military %26 Foreign Affairs Journal, "GOP-Tea Party Play Chicken With U.S. Credit, Courting Catastrophe," 1/19, http://www.veteranstoday.com/2011/01/19/gop-tea-party-play-chicken-with-u-s-credit-courting-catastrophe/~~]

SHUTTING DOWN GOVERNMENT: If the debt limit is reached, the government is forced to move to a purely cash-flow budget, paying bills with only the tax revenue that comes in. Interest payments on the debt would get paid first, but what is the order of payment after that? Government activities that could fail to be funded range from Social Security and Medicare to military actions in Iraq and Afghanistan. In 1995-96, when House Republicans, led by then-House Speaker Newt Gingrich, refused to raise the debt ceiling for a short time, it caused "two temporary shutdowns of all ~’nonessential~’ federal government activities, including a cessation of toxic waste cleanups, disease control activities, and a suspension of many law enforcement and drug control operations," ultimately costing the U.S. taxpayer more than %24800 million. The Clinton Treasury Department was required to employ some creative accounting — "including a temporary use of retirement funds for former government employees" — to stave off even worse outcomes. Analysts at Deutsche Bank have found that such efforts would not work as well today, and the government would "not be able to stave off a government shutdown (or possible suspension of bond payments) for long" if the debt ceiling isn~’t raised. But still, some Republicans, such as former Minnesota governor Tim Pawlenty (R), have said this is the route Congress should choose. As Austan Goolsbee, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers put it, "If we get to the point where we damage the full faith and credit of the United States, that would be the first default in history caused purely by insanity."

====That causes cyberattacks. ====

Sideman, 11

~~[Alysha, Federal Computer Week Contributor, "Agencies must determine computer security teams in face of potential federal shutdown" 2/23, http://fcw.com/Articles/2011/02/23/Agencies-must-determine-computer-security-teams-in-face-of-shutdown.aspx?Page=1~~]

With the WikiLeaks hacks and other threats to cybersecurity present, guarding against cyberattacks has become a significant part of governing — especially because most government agencies have moved to online systems. As a potential government shutdown comes closer, agencies must face new questions about defining "essential" computer personnel. Cyber threats weren~’t as significant during the 1995 furlough as they are today, reports NextGov. The publication adds that agencies need to buck up and be organized. In late January, government officials, NATO and the European Union banded together in Brussels to formulate a plan to battle cyber bandits, according to Defense Systems. Leaders there agreed that existing cybersecurity measures were incomplete and decided to fast-track a new plan for cyber incident response. Meanwhile, observers are wondering whether the U.S. government has a plan to deal with cyberattacks in the case of a shutdown. The lists of essential computer security personnel drawn up 15 years ago are irrelevant today, computer specialists told NextGov. In 1995, the only agencies concerned about cybersecurity were entities such as the FBI and CIA. Today, before any potential government shutdown happens, a plan of essential IT personnel should be determined, the specialists add. Agencies should be figuring out which systems will need daily surveillance and strategic defense, as well as evaluating the job descriptions of the people operating in those systems, former federal executives told NextGov. Hord Tipton, a former Interior Department CIO, agrees. "If they haven~’t done it, there~’s going to be a mad scramble, and there~’s going to be a hole in the system," he told the site. All government departments are supposed to have contingency plans on deck that spell out essential systems and the employees associated with them, according to federal rules. Meanwhile, some experts say determining which IT workers are essential depends more on the length of the shutdown. Jeffrey Wheatman, a security and privacy analyst with the Gartner research group, tells NextGov that a shutdown lasting a couple of weeks "would require incident response personnel, network administrators and staff who monitor firewall logs for potential intrusions." If a shutdown lasted a month or longer, more employees would need to report, he said, adding: "New threats could emerge during that time frame, which demands people with strategy-oriented job functions to devise new lines of defense." Employees who are deemed "essential" are critical to national security. Cyber warfare or holes in cybersecurity can threaten a nation~’s infrastructure. In particular, the electric grid, the nation~’s military assets, financial sector and telecommunications networks can be vulnerable in the face of an attack, reports Federal Computer Week.

====Cyber-attacks cause retaliatory nuclear war====

Tilford, 12 – Graduate of the U.S. Army Airborne School at Fort Benning, GA (Robert, "Cyber attackers could shut down the electric grid for the entire east coast" 7/27/12, http://www.examiner.com/article/cyber-attackers-could-easily-shut-down-the-electric-grid-for-the-entire-east-coa)

To make matters worse a cyber attack that can take out a civilian power grid, for example could also cripple the U.S. military.¶The senator notes that is that the same power grids that supply cities and towns, stores and gas stations, cell towers and heart monitors also power "every military base in our country."¶ "Although bases would be prepared to weather a short power outage with backup diesel generators, within hours, not days, fuel supplies would run out", he said.¶ Which means military command and control centers could go dark.¶Radar systems that detect air threats to our country would shut Down completely.¶ "Communication between commanders and their troops would also go silent. And many weapons systems would be left without either fuel or electric power", said Senator Grassley.¶ "So in a few short hours or days, the mightiest military in the world would be left scrambling to maintain base functions", he said.¶ We contacted the Pentagon and officials confirmed the threat of a cyber attack is something very real.¶ Top national security officials—including the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, the Director of the National Security Agency, the Secretary of Defense, and the CIA Director— have said, "preventing a cyber attack and improving the nation~~~’s electric grids is among the most urgent priorities of our country" (source: Congressional Record).¶ So how serious is the Pentagon taking all this?¶Enough to start, or end a war over it, for sure (see video: Pentagon declares war on cyber attacks A cyber attack today against the US could very well be seen as an "Act of War" and could be met with a "full scale" US military response.¶ That could include the use of "nuclear weapons", if authorized by the President.

=China CP=

Text: The People~’s Republic of China should implement an agreement between China and Mexico concerning Transboundary Hydrocarbon Reservoirs in the Gulf of Mexico.

====The CP competes and solves the case – China offers a unique model of economic engagement. ====

\*\*Hsiang 09\*\* (Antonio C. Hsiang, Associate Professor at Chihlee Institute of Technology in Taiwan China Rising in Latin America: More Opportunities than Challenges" Journal of Emerging Knowledge on Emerging Markets, Volume 1 issue 1 November 2009)-Karla

Because "many Latin American countries no longer look to Washington leadership," the so- called Washington Consensus "has lost traction".28 As a global rising power, China offers an alternative model for Latin America~’s development. Even though China has been hurt by the 2008 financial crisis, "its economic and financial powers have been strengthened relative to those of the West. China~’s global influence will thus increase, and Beijing will be able to undertake political and economic initiatives to increase it further." 29 In fact, "Washington seemed to adopt a Chinese-style solution to its escalating financial problems: greater state intervention to restrict the movement of capital."30 Thus, Beijing~’s emergence as a global economic power is seen throughout Latin America as offering an alternative from the Washington Consensus model for economic development. The "Beijing Consensus" is the brainchild of Joshua Cooper Ramo, a former senior editor and foreign editor of Time magazine and later a partner at Kissinger Associates, the consulting firm of former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. According to Ramo, the Beijing Consensus has three features. The first is a commitment to innovation and constant experimentation in reforms. The second, a rejection of per capita GDP as the only measure of progress, as sustainability and equality also count. And the third, a commitment to self- determination. Less developed countries should therefore ensure their own financial integrity and keep great powers in check. 31 The Beijing Consensus has evolved to describe a plethora of alternative plans for economic development in the underdeveloped world. Ramo argues that China and India, who "most pointedly" ignored the World Bank and the IMF-championed Washington Consensus, "now have records that speak for themselves." 32 Consequently, the so-called the "Beijing Consensus" has been attracting attention in Latin America because of "China~’s distinctive development model, . . . ~~[which~~] posits far more state intervention in the economy and a greater concern with political stability and strong government to guide the development process." 33

=Death Bad=

Death is bad, and nonexistence is worse – deprivation account

\*\*Kagan 12\*\* – Professor of Philosophy @ Yale

Shelly, professor of philosophy at Yale University, "Is Death Bad for You?" 5/13/12, http://chronicle.com/article/article-content/131818/

In thinking about this question, it is important to be clear about what we~’re asking. In particular, we are not asking whether or how the process of dying can be bad. For I take it to be quite uncontroversial—and not at all puzzling—that the process of dying can be a painful one. But it needn~’t be. I might, after all, die peacefully in my sleep. Similarly, of course, the prospect of dying can be unpleasant. But that makes sense only if we consider death itself to be bad. Yet how can sheer nonexistence be bad? Maybe nonexistence is bad for me, not in an intrinsic way, like pain, and not in an instrumental way, like unemployment leading to poverty, which in turn leads to pain and suffering, but in a comparative way—what economists call opportunity costs. Death is bad for me in the comparative sense, because when I~’m dead I lack life—more particularly, the good things in life. That explanation of death~’s badness is known as the deprivation account. Despite the overall plausibility of the deprivation account, though, it~’s not all smooth sailing. For one thing, if something is true, it seems as though there~’s got to be a time when it~’s true. Yet if death is bad for me, when is it bad for me? Not now. I~’m not dead now. What about when I~’m dead? But then, I won~’t exist. As the ancient Greek philosopher Epicurus wrote: "So death, the most terrifying of ills, is nothing to us, since so long as we exist, death is not with us; but when death comes, then we do not exist. It does not then concern either the living or the dead, since for the former it is not, and the latter are no more." If death has no time at which it~’s bad for me, then maybe it~’s not bad for me. Or perhaps we should challenge the assumption that all facts are datable. Could there be some facts that aren~’t? Suppose that on Monday I shoot John. I wound him with the bullet that comes out of my gun, but he bleeds slowly, and doesn~’t die until Wednesday. Meanwhile, on Tuesday, I have a heart attack and die. I killed John, but when? No answer seems satisfactory%21 So maybe there are undatable facts, and death~’s being bad for me is one of them. Alternatively, if all facts can be dated, we need to say when death is bad for me. So perhaps we should just insist that death is bad for me when I~’m dead. But that, of course, returns us to the earlier puzzle. How could death be bad for me when I don~’t exist? Isn~’t it true that something can be bad for you only if you exist? Call this idea the existence requirement. Should we just reject the existence requirement? Admittedly, in typical cases—involving pain, blindness, losing your job, and so on—things are bad for you while you exist. But maybe sometimes you don~’t even need to exist for something to be bad for you. Arguably, the comparative bads of deprivation are like that. Unfortunately, rejecting the existence requirement has some implications that are hard to swallow. For if nonexistence can be bad for somebody even though that person doesn~’t exist, then nonexistence could be bad for somebody who never exists. It can be bad for somebody who is a merely possible person, someone who could have existed but never actually gets born. It~’s hard to think about somebody like that. But let~’s try, and let~’s call him Larry. Now, how many of us feel sorry for Larry? Probably nobody. But if we give up on the existence requirement, we no longer have any grounds for withholding our sympathy from Larry. I~’ve got it bad. I~’m going to die. But Larry~’s got it worse: He never gets any life at all. Moreover, there are a lot of merely possible people. How many? Well, very roughly, given the current generation of seven billion people, there are approximately three million billion billion billion different possible offspring—almost all of whom will never exist%21 If you go to three generations, you end up with more possible people than there are particles in the known universe, and almost none of those people get to be born.

Some suffering may be inevitable – but extreme suffering is unjustified

\*\*Edelglass, 6\*\* (William, Department of Philosophy, Colby College in Maine, "Levinas on Suffering and Compassion," Sophia, Volume 45, Issue 2, October 2006, pg. 43-59, SpringerLink, pdf, Tashma)

According to Levinas~’s phenomenology, mild discomfort can be mastered by consciousness. But, as suffering increases and overwhelms the subject, it becomes a pure passivity, meaningless and evil. Suffering that leaves the subject without resources, Levinas consistently emphasizes, is characterized by an excessive passivity. It is a submission without a synthesizing act of consciousness. Our senses in their receptivity to the world, phenomenologists insist, are still acting, constituting meaning, forming the material content of sensation. As a content of consciousness, suffering lends itself to phenomenological description, not unlike other sensations of vision, hearing, or touch. And yet, according to Levinas~’s phenomenology, suffering cannot be grasped, it is ~’unassumable,~’ and this elusiveness is its ~’content~’ (US91). Suffering is outside the intending capacity of consciousness or the apperceptive synthesizing activity of the Kantian ~’I think.~’ Levinas thus speaks of the ambiguity of suffering as a consciousness of the refusal of order and this refusal itself. In suffering, Levinas argues, the refusal of meaning is itself a sensible quality: ~’In the guise of "experienced" content, the way in which, with a consciousness, the unbearable is precisely not borne, the manner of this not-being-borne; which, paradoxically, is itself a sensation or a datum~’ (US92). Beyond the ambiguity of patience - the hope and activity of passivity that masters itself- Levinas insists, there is suffering in which even the exertion of the will as hope is no longer possible. Such suffering is an undergoing without initiative, a bearing of the world, a pure passivity not associated with an activity that senses pain as an object. Thus, the very content of suffering is passivity: ~’passivity - that is, a modality - signifies as a quiddity~’ (US92). The passivity of suffering does not derive simply from a great intensity; the essence of suffering is disproportionate to our senses, an excess beyond the measure of our faculties. Because suffering is a pure passivity, lived as the breach of the totality we constitute through intending acts, Levinas argues, even suffering that is chosen cannot be meaningfully systematized within a coherent whole. Suffering is a rupture and disturbance of meaning because it suffocates the subject and destroys the capacity for systematically assimilating the world. 9 Pain isolates itself in consciousness, overwhelming consciousness with its insistence. Suffering, then, is an absurdity, ~’an absurdity breaking out on the ground of signification.~’1~~ This absurdity is the eidetic character of suffering Levinas seeks to draw out in his phenomenology. Suffering often appears justified, from the biological need for sensibility to pain, to the various ways in which suffering is employed in character formation, the concerns of practical life, a community~’s desire for justice, and the needs of the state. Implicit in Levinas~’s texts is the insistence that the analysis of these sufferings calls for a distinction between the use of pain as a tool, a practice performed on the Other~’s body for a particular end, and the acknowledgement of the Other~’s lived pain. A consequence of Levinas~’s phenomenology is the idea that instrumental justifications of extreme suffering necessarily are insensible to the unbearable pain they seek to legitimize. Strictly speaking, then, suffering is meaningless and cannot be comprehended or justified by rational argument. Meaningless, and therefore unjustifiable, Levinas insists, suffering is evil. Suffering, according to Levinas~’s phenomenology, is an exception to the subject~’s mastery of being; in suffering the subject endures the overwhelming of freedom by alterity. The will that revels in the autonomous grasping of the world, in suffering finds itself grasped by the world. The in-itself of the will loses its capacity to exert itself and submits to the will of what is beyond its grasp. Contrary to Heidegger, it is not the anxiety before my own death which threatens the will and the self. For, Levinas argues, death, announced in suffering, is in a future always beyond the present. Instead of death, it is the pure passivity of suffering that menaces the freedom of the will. The will endures pain ~’as a tyranny,~’ the work of a ~’You,~’ a malicious other who perpetrates violence (TI239). This tyranny, Levinas argues, ~’is more radical than sin, for it threatens the will in its very structure as a will, in its dignity as origin and identity~’ (TI237). Because suffering is unjustifiable, it is a tyranny breaking open my world of totality and meaning ~’for nothing.~’ The gratuitous and extreme suffering that destroys the capacity for flourishing human activity is generally addressed by thinkers in European traditions in the context of metaphysical questions of evil (is evil a positive substance or deviation from the Good?), or problems of philosophical anthropology (is evil chosen or is it a result of ignorance?). For these traditions it is evil, not suffering, that is the great scandal, for they consider suffering to be evil only when it is both severe and unjustified.

Death exists, Lanza has no evidence to the contrary and he monumentally misinterprets quantum physics

Orac, 10 - Orac is the nom de blog of a humble pseudonymous surgeon/scientist , Orac~’s "real" identity is more or less an open secret among some parts of the blogosphere, but he nonetheless keeps using the Orac pseudonym because he doesn~’t want his blog to be the first thing that comes up when patients Google his "real" name. Note from DH – some research turned up who he actually is – despite it not being on his blog - David Gorski is an associate professor of medicine at the Department of Surgery in the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School ("[[Dr. Robert Lanza and "biocentrism": Time to get out the paper bag again-http://scienceblogs.com/insolence/2010/06/dr\_lanza\_and\_biocentrism\_time\_to\_get\_out.php]]," 6/15 [[http://scienceblogs.com/insolence/2010/06/dr\_lanza\_and\_biocentrism\_time\_to\_get\_out.php-http://scienceblogs.com/insolence/2010/06/dr\_lanza\_and\_biocentrism\_time\_to\_get\_out.php]] [[)-http://scienceblogs.com/insolence/2010/06/dr\_lanza\_and\_biocentrism\_time\_to\_get\_out.php0]]

Here~’s what I mean. Get a load of the introduction to Lanza~’s post:

What happens when we die? Do we rot into the ground, or do we go to heaven (or hell, if we~’ve been bad)? Experiments suggest the answer is simpler than anyone thought. Without the glue of consciousness, time essentially reboots.

Oh, no%21 I think I know what~’s coming. It~’s going to be a bunch "universal consciousness" nonesense similar to the sort that Deepak Chopra loves so much. Time "reboots"? How on earth would he know? What "experiments" have shown that this is likely to be true? Inquiring minds want to know%21 So I donned my Doctor Doom mask, complete with a new feature (a clothespin to hold my nose), and I dove into this mass of woo-ey-ness to find out what this fantastic evidence is. Let~’s read a long:

The mystery of life and death can~’t be examined by visiting the Galapagos or looking through a microscope. It lies deeper. It involves our very selves. We awake in the present. There are stairs below us that we appear to have climbed; there are stairs above us that go upward into the unknown future. But the mind stands at the door by which we entered and gives us the memories by which we go about our day. Everything is ordered and predictable. We~’re like cuckoo birds who appear through a door each morning. We fancy there~’s a clockwork set in motion at the beginning of time.

But if you remove everything from space, what~’s left? Nothing. The same applies for time — you can~’t put it in a jar. You can~’t see through the bone surrounding your brain (everything you experience is information in your mind). Biocentrism tells us space and time aren~’t objects — they~’re the mind~’s tools for putting everything together.

Deep. So deep that I immediately regretted not donning my hip boots as I waded into the intellectual equivalent of the muck and worse. Dr. Lanza takes a trivial fact, namely that we humans can only experience the universe and time through our senses, and boards the crazy train with it. You think I~’m being too harsh? Think again. Lanza piles woo upon woo, stealing liberally from Deepak Chopra and other masters of "quantum consciousness" to argue not just that the senses are the only way that human beings can experience the universe but that human beings create the universe through their consciousness. In Lanza~’s view, when we die, our universe dies with us and then reboots. Seriously. You can~’t make stuff like this up. He also regurgitates arguments that would make Deepak Chopra blush in the service of this concept:

In fact, it was Einstein~’s theory of relativity that showed that space and time are indeed relative to the observer. Quantum theory ended the classical view that particles exist if we don~’t perceive them. But if the world is observer-created, we shouldn~’t be surprised that it~’s destroyed with each of us. Nor should we be surprised that space and time vanish, and with them all Newtonian conceptions of order and prediction.

Yes, Einstein showed that time is relative to the observer, but he~’s probably doing backflips in his grave at this abuse of his theory. Just because the passage of time changes depending on your frame of references, slowing down as you approach the speed of light, does not mean that time is meaningless or that it "reboots" when you die. Quantum theory did not end the view that particles exist if we don~’t perceive them. At least, I never learned that when I took quantum mechanics, both in my physics classes and my physical chemistry classes.

I have to wonder if Lanza is confusing the Heisenberg uncertainty principle, which states that position and momentum, cannot simultaneously be known to arbitrary precision by an observer. In other wors, the more precisely one property of an object or particle is measured, the less precisely the other can be known. Or perhaps he~’s riffing on the paradox of Schrödinger~’s cat, which illustrates the principle of superposition in quantum theory. Basically this is a thought experiment in which we place a living cat in a steel chamber with device containing a vial of hydrocyanic acid. In the chamber, there~’s also a very small amount of a radioactive substance. If even a single atom of the substance decays during the test period, a mechanism will trip a hammer, which will then break the vial and kill the cat. Because the observer cannot know whether an atom has decayed, the observer can~’t know whether the vial has been broken and thus can~’t know whether the cat is alive or dead. Since we can~’t know, the cat is both alive and dead, which is analogous to a quantum superposition of states. It~’s only when the box is opened and observe the cat that the superposition is lost and the cat becomes either alive or dead. This is sometimes called the observer~’s paradox, where the observation affects an outcome and the outcome does~’t exist until the measurement is made.

More specifically, there is no single outcome until it is observed. None of which means that the cat doesn~’t exist if we~’re not observing it, which is what Lanza seems to be "arguing." I really did think I was reading Deepak Chopra%21 Oh, wait%21 I could have been%21 Chopra and Lanza teamed up back in December. Like a fusion reaction, putting them together resulted in a [[nuclear fusion explosion of woo-http://www.theness.com/neurologicablog/?p=1357]]. In any case, his sole "evidence" for his amazing concepts? An anecdote about using a steel trap to capture a woodchuck and a man who told him to capture dragonflies and then later made him a metal dragonfly.

I kid you not.

Still, Dr. Lanza goes far beyond this. Apparently he has come up with a whole new theory of woo. I know, I know. I shouldn~’t use that word for this. You~’re right. So I~’ll call it a hypothesis of woo, namely "biocentrism." In brief, this idea claims that life has primacy in the structure of the universe and that therefore biology is the most important science. Basically, in biocentrism, life creates the universe rather than the other way around, and, according to biocentrism, current theories of how the physical world works don~’t work and can~’t work until they account for consciousness and that which manifests it, namely life. Of course, Lanza~’s written a book about his ideas, but the shorter version (albeit still Orac-length wordy) explanation of biocentrism was posted last year on MSNBC.com in the form of an article entitled å. It~’s completely a "theory of everything." With woo. As I read it, there were parts where I once again had a hard time identifying whether I was reading Deepak Chopra or Robert Lanza:

Consciousness is not just an issue for biologists; it~’s a problem for physics. There is nothing in modern physics that explains how a group of molecules in a brain creates consciousness. The beauty of a sunset, the taste of a delicious meal, these are all mysteries to science — which can sometimes pin down where in the brain the sensations arise, but not how and why there is any subjective personal experience to begin with. And, what~’s worse, nothing in science can explain how consciousness arose from matter. Our understanding of this most basic phenomenon is virtually nil. Interestingly, most models of physics do not even recognize this as a problem.

Of course, consciousness is a fascinating scientific question. However, its existence does not mean that the mind somehow creates the universe. It does not mean that space and time are products of consciousness and do not exist outside of the observer, which is what Lanza argues. Because our understanding of consciousness is not comprehensive does not give Lanza a legitimate opening to hang whatever pseudoscience he wants to drop on it. Not that it stops Lanza from [[bringing up one of the hoariest canards-http://www.msnbc.msn.com/id/31393080/ns/technology\_and\_science-science/page/5/]] favored by creationists everywhere, the Anthropic Principle:

The world appears to be designed for life, not just at the microscope scale of the atom, but at the level of the universe itself. Scientists have discovered that the universe has a long list of traits that make it appear as if everything it contains — from atoms to stars — was tailor-made just for us. If the Big Bang had been one part in a million more powerful, it would have rushed out too fast for the galaxies and life to develop. Result: no us. If the strong nuclear force were decreased two percent, atomic nuclei wouldn~’t hold together, and plain-vanilla hydrogen would be the only kind of atom in the universe. If the gravitational force were decreased by a hair, stars — including the sun — would not ignite. In fact, all of the universe~’s forces and constants are just perfectly set up for atomic interactions, the existence of atoms and elements, planets, liquid water and life. Tweak any of them and you never existed. Many are calling this revelation the "Goldilocks Principle," because the cosmos is not "too this" or "too that," but rather "just right" for life.

Of course, creationists invoke the anthropic principle in order to argue that "God did it," that the reason life exists couldn~’t have been due to random events billions of years ago but rather must be because a "creator" or, of course, "intelligent designer" must have "designed" the conditions that would allow life to arise. Lanza takes a different view, heaping scorn on the "God did it" use of the anthropic principle favored by creationists but putting in its place—well, let Dr. Lanza tell the tale:

At the moment, there are only four explanations for this mystery. One is to argue for incredible coincidence. Another is to say, "God did that," which explains nothing even if it is true. The third is to invoke the anthropic principle~’s reasoning that we must find these conditions if we are alive, because, what else could we find? The final option is biocentrism pure and simple, which explains how the universe is created by life. Obviously, no universe that doesn~’t allow for life could possibly exist; the universe and its parameters simply reflect the spatio-temporal logic of animal existence.

Note the very same argument from incredulity favored by creationists. Life couldn~’t have possibly arisen by chance%21 But Dr. Lanza can~’t settle for the "God did it" option, and he doesn~’t like a more careful consideration of the anthropic principle. The weak, or planetary, anthropic principle is simply a statement of the obvious, namely that the particular universe in which we find ourselves possesses the characteristics necessary for our planet to exist and for life, including human life, to flourish here. This is pretty obvious and requires no great insight. The "strong," or cosmological, anthropic principle goes beyond that and posits that every aspect of the universe, its physics, its physical constants like the gravitational constant, are custom-designed to lead to human beings. It~’s sometimes stated something like this: Because the universe is compatible with the existence of human beings, the dynamics of the initial conditions of the universe and the elementary particles that existed then must have been such that they influenced the fundamental physical laws of the universe in such a way as to result in human beings.

So if God didn~’t do it as far as leading to the evolution of human beings, then what did? Well, the usual explanation is that we wouldn~’t be here if the laws of the universe weren~’t such that they allowed us to exist. Not to Lanza. Lanza explains this not through God or gods or "designers" but rather by making each and every one of us a god who creates our own universe in our consciousness. Sure it~’s a fun (and, most of all, ego-gratifying idea), but it has no basis in science.

Basically, in order to put each and every person (and in particular himself) at the center of his own personal universe that exists because his consciousness exists, that dies when he dies, and that "reboots" again after death, Lanza abuses the cosmological anthropic principle to claim not that we wouldn~’t exist if some creator or "designer" hadn~’t designed the universe so that we would come to exist but rather to claim that we created the universe. It~’s like the Strangers creating and modifying the city of [[Dark City-http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dark\_City\_(1998\_film)]] at will, only Lanza doesn~’t think this is science fiction. In the end, this is simply a variation of Deepak Chopra~’s quantum consciousness woo, but with a twist. Chopra argues that the universe creates consciousness and that we are the manifestation of that "cosmic consciousness," our own consciousness sharing in that of the universe. In contrast, Lanza reverses things. Our consciousnesses are prime.

Their k is irrational—we don~’t know enough about death to choose it as an option—defer to the side of caution because our impact is extinction—if we~’re wrong, we can always kill ourselves later. If they~’re wrong, the world is gone forever

Lanza~’s qualifications mean nothing – he~’s a stem-cell biologist and he doesn~’t understand physics – people aren~’t particles, they are unique organizations of particles that can~’t be replicated and every death matters

Myers, 9 - biologist and associate professor at the [[University of Minnesota-http://www.morris.umn.edu/]] (PZ, "The dead are dead", 12/10, [[http://scienceblogs.com/pharyngula/2009/12/the\_dead\_are\_dead.php-http://scienceblogs.com/pharyngula/2009/12/the\_dead\_are\_dead.php]])

Lanza has respectable credentials as a stem cell biologist, but he~’s also the author of one of those all-encompassing, total-explanation-of-the-universe, crackpot theories, which is his, and which belongs entirely to him, called "biocentrism." We know this because his tag line in the article is "Robert Lanza, MD is considered one of the leading scientists in the world. He is the author of "Biocentrism," a book that lays out his theory of everything." I~’ve noticed that leading scientists tend not to have to introduce themselves by declaring that they are a leading scientist, but that~’s another issue.

Lanza recently lost a sister in an accident, and most of his article seems to be a kind of emotional denial, that this tragedy cannot have happened and his sister really is alive and well somewhere. I feel for him — I~’ve also lost a sister, and wish I could see her again — but this is not a reason to believe death doesn~’t happen. I~’ve stubbed my toe and wished with some urgency that it hadn~’t happened, but the universe is never obliging about erasing my mistakes.

But then Lanza goes on to babble about quantum physics and many-worlds theory.

Although individual bodies are destined to self-destruct, the alive feeling - the ~’Who am I?~’- is just a 20-watt fountain of energy operating in the brain. But this energy doesn~’t go away at death. One of the surest axioms of science is that energy never dies; it can neither be created nor destroyed. But does this energy transcend from one world to the other?

Consider an experiment that was recently published in the journal Science showing that scientists could retroactively change something that had happened in the past. Particles had to decide how to behave when they hit a beam splitter. Later on, the experimenter could turn a second switch on or off. It turns out that what the observer decided at that point, determined what the particle did in the past. Regardless of the choice you, the observer, make, it is you who will experience the outcomes that will result. The linkages between these various histories and universes transcend our ordinary classical ideas of space and time. Think of the 20-watts of energy as simply holo-projecting either this or that result onto a screen. Whether you turn the second beam splitter on or off, it~’s still the same battery or agent responsible for the projection.

I have heard that first argument so many times, and it is facile and dishonest. We are not just "energy". We are a pattern of energy and matter, a very specific and precise arrangement of molecules in movement. That can be destroyed. When you~’ve built a pretty sand castle and the tide comes in and washes it away, the grains of sand are still all there, but what you~’ve lost is the arrangement that you worked to generate, and which you appreciated. Reducing a complex functional order to nothing but the constituent parts is an insult to the work. If I were to walk into the Louvre and set fire to the Mona Lisa, and afterwards take a drive down to Chartres and blow up the cathedral, would anyone defend my actions by saying, "well, science says matter and energy cannot be created or destroyed, therefore, Rabid Myers did no harm, and we~’ll all just enjoy viewing the ashes and rubble from now on"? No. That~’s crazy talk.

We also wouldn~’t be arguing that the painting and the architecture have transcended this universe to enter another, nor would such a pointless claim ameliorate our loss in this universe.

The rest of his argument is quantum gobbledy-gook. The behavior of subatomic particles is not a good guide to what to expect of the behavior of large bodies. A photon may have no rest mass, but I can~’t use this fact to justify my grand new weight loss plan; quantum tunnelling does not imply that I can ignore doors when I amble about my house. People are not particles%21 We are the product of the aggregate behavior of the many particles that constitute our bodies, and you cannot ignore the importance of these higher-order relationships when talking about our fate.

The rational atheist view is simpler, clearer, and I think, more true. Lanza~’s sister is dead, and so is mine; that means the features of their independent existence that were so precious to us, that made them interesting, thinking, behaving human beings, have ceased to exist. The 20-watts of energy are dissipating as heat, and can~’t be brought back. They are lost to us, and someday we will end, too.

We should feel grief. Pretending that they have ~’transcended~’ into some novel quantum mechanical state in which their consciousness persists, or that they are shaking hands with some anthropomorphic spiritual myth in never-never land, does a disservice to ourselves. The pain is real. Don~’t deny it. Use it to look at the ones you love who still live and see what you can do to make our existence now a little better, and perhaps a little more conducive to keeping our energies patterned usefully a little longer.

Reject Lanza~’s model of consciousness – it~’s non-falsifiable and shouldn~’t even be considered science

\*\*Wadhawan %26 Kamal 9\*\* – Vinod K., Fellow at the Babha Atomic Research Center in Mumbai, %26 Aijta, December 14, 2009, "Biocentrism Demystified: A Response to Deepak Chopra and Robert Lanza~’s Notion of a Conscious Universe," online: http://nirmukta.com/2009/12/14/biocentrism-demystified-a-response-to-deepak-chopra-and-robert-lanzas-notion-of-a-conscious-universe/

In the first case Lanza seems to state that motion is logically impossible (which is a pre-relativistic view of the paradox) and in the next case he mentions that uncertainty is present in the system (a post-relativistic model of motion). In both cases, however, Lanza~’s conclusion is the same - biocentrism is true for time. No matter what the facts about the nature of time, Lanza concludes that time is not real. His model is unfalsifiable and therefore cannot be a part of science. What Lanza doesn~’t let on is that Einstein~’s special-relativity theory removes the possibility of absolute time, not of time itself. Zeno~’s Arrow paradox is resolved by replacing the idea of absolute time with Einstein~’s relativistic coupling of space and time. Space-time has an uncertainty in quantum mechanics, but it is not nonexistent. The idea of time as a series of sequential events that we perceive and put together in our heads is an experiential version of time. This is the way we have evolved to perceive time. This experiential version of time seems absolute, because we evolved to perceive it that way. However, in reality time is relative. This is a fundamental fact of modern physics. Time does exist outside of the observer, but allows us only a narrow perception of its true nature.

Death precedes all other impacts – it ontologically destroys the subject and prevents any alternative way of knowing the world

Paterson, 03 - Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island (Craig, "A Life Not Worth Living?", Studies in Christian Ethics, http://sce.sagepub.com)

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ~’primitive evil~’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81

In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

Lanza~’s argument is non-falsifiable pseudoscience – human consciousness hasn~’t created reality – it exists independently of consciousness

Wadhawan, 9 - Raja Ramanna Fellow at the[[ Bhabha Atomic Research Centre-http://www.barc.ernet.in/]], Mumbai and an Associate Editor of the journal [[PHASE TRANSITIONS-http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=t713647403]]. (Vinod, [[Biocentrism Demystified: A Response to Deepak Chopra and Robert Lanza~’s Notion of a Conscious Universe-http://nirmukta.com/2009/12/14/biocentrism-demystified-a-response-to-deepak-chopra-and-robert-lanzas-notion-of-a-conscious-universe/]] 12/14, [[http://nirmukta.com/2009/12/14/biocentrism-demystified-a-response-to-deepak-chopra-and-robert-lanzas-notion-of-a-conscious-universe/-http://nirmukta.com/2009/12/14/biocentrism-demystified-a-response-to-deepak-chopra-and-robert-lanzas-notion-of-a-conscious-universe/]])

The impulse to see human life as central to the existence of the universe is manifested in the mystical traditions of practically all cultures. It is so fundamental to the way pre-scientific people viewed reality that it may be, to a certain extent, ingrained in the way our psyche has evolved, like the need for meaning and the idea of a supernatural God. As science and reason dismantle the idea of the centrality of human life in the functioning of the objective universe, the emotional impulse has been to resort to finer and finer misinterpretations of the science involved. Mystical thinkers use these misrepresentations of science to paint over the gaps in our scientific understanding of the universe, belittling, in the process, science and its greatest heroes.

In their [[recent article-http://www.huffingtonpost.com/deepak-chopra/evolution-reigns-but-darw\_b\_309586.html]] in The Huffington Post, biologist Robert Lanza and mystic Deepak Chopra put forward

their idea that the universe is itself a product of our consciousness, and not the other way around as scientists have been telling us. In essence, these authors are re-inventing idealism, an ancient philosophical concept that fell out of favour with the advent of the scientific revolution. According to the idealists, the mind creates all of reality. Many ancient Eastern and Western philosophical schools subscribe to this idealistic notion of the nature of reality. In the modern context, idealism has been supplemented with a brand of quantum mysticism and relabeled as biocentrism. According to Chopra and Lanza, this idea makes Darwin~’s theory of the biological evolution and diversification of life insignificant. Both these men, although they come from different backgrounds, have independently expressed these ideas before with some popular success. In the article under discussion their different styles converge to present a uniquely mystical and bizarre worldview, which we wish to debunk here.

2. Biocentrism Misinterprets Several Scientifically Testable Truths

The scientific background to the biocentrism idea is described in Robert Lanza~’s book Biocentrism: How Life and Consciousness Are the Keys to Understanding the True Nature of the Universe, in which Lanza proposes that biology and not physics is the key to understanding the universe. Vital to his proposal is the idea that the universe does not really exist unless it is being observed by a conscious observer. To support this idea, Lanza makes a series of claims:

(a) Lanza questions the conventional idea that space and time exist as objective properties of the universe. In doing this, he argues that space and time are products of human consciousness and do not exist outside of the observer. Indeed, Lanza concludes that everything we perceive is created by the act of perception.

The intent behind this argument is to help consolidate the view that subjective experience is all there is. However, if you dig into what Lanza says it becomes clear that he is positioning the relativistic nature of reality to make it seem incongruous with its objective existence. His reasoning relies on a subtle muddling of the concepts of subjectivity and objectivity. Take, for example, his argument [[here-http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-lanza/biocentrism-the-new-face\_b\_231622.html]]:

"Consider the color and brightness of everything you see ~’out there.~’ On its own, light doesn~’t have any color or brightness at all. The unquestionable reality is that nothing remotely resembling what you see could be present without your consciousness. Consider the weather: We step outside and see a blue sky - but the cells in our brain could easily be changed so we ~’see~’ red or green instead. We think it feels hot and humid, but to a tropical frog it would feel cold and dry. In any case, you get the point. This logic applies to virtually everything."

There is only some partial truth to Lanza~’s claims. Color is an experiential truth - that is, it is a descriptive phenomenon that lies outside of objective reality. No physicist will deny this. However, the physical properties of light that are responsible for color are characteristics of the natural universe. Therefore, the sensory experience of color is subjective, but the properties of light responsible for that sensory experience are objectively true. The mind does not create the natural phenomenon itself; it creates a subjective experience or a representation of the phenomenon.

Similarly, temperature perception may vary from species to species, since it is a subjective experience, but the property of matter that causes this subjective experience is objectively real; temperature is determined by the average kinetic energy of the molecules of matter, and there is nothing subjective about that. Give a thermometer to a human and to an ass: they would both record the same value for the temperature at a chosen spot of measurement.

The idea that ~’color~’ is a fact of the natural universe has been described by G. E. Moore as a naturalistic fallacy. Also, the idea that color is created by an intelligent creator is a supernaturalistic fallacy. It can be said that the idea that color is created objectively in the universe by the subjective consciousness of the observer is an anthropic fallacy. The correct view is that ~’color~’ is the subjective sensory perception by the observer of a certain property of the universe that the observer is a part of.

Time and space receive similar treatment as color and heat in Lanza~’s biocentrism. Lanza reaches the conclusion that time does not exist outside the observer by conflating absolute time (which does not exist) with objective time (which does). In 2007 Lanza [[made his argument-http://www.theamericanscholar.org/sp07/newtheory-lanza.html]] using an ancient mathematical riddle known as Zeno~’s Arrow paradox. In essence, Zeno~’s Arrow paradox involves motion in space-time. Lanza says:

"Even time itself is not exempted from biocentrism. Our sense of the forward motion of time is really the result of an infinite number of decisions that only seem to be a smooth continuous path. At each moment we are at the edge of a paradox known as The Arrow, first described 2,500 years ago by the philosopher Zeno of Elea. Starting logically with the premise that nothing can be in two places at once, he reasoned that an arrow is only in one place during any given instance of its flight. But if it is in only one place, it must be at rest. The arrow must then be at rest at every moment of its flight. Logically, motion is impossible. But is motion impossible? Or rather, is this analogy proof that the forward motion of time is not a feature of the external world but a projection of something within us? Time is not an absolute reality but an aspect of our consciousness."

In a [[more recent article-http://www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-lanza/biocentrism-the-new-face\_b\_231622.html]] Lanza brings up the implications of special relativity on Zeno~’s Arrow paradox. He writes:

"Consider a film of an archery tournament. An archer shoots an arrow and the camera follows its trajectory. Suddenly the projector stops on a single frame — you stare at the image of an arrow in mid-flight. The pause enables you to know the position of the arrow with great accuracy, but it~’s going nowhere; its velocity is no longer known. This is the fuzziness described by in the uncertainty principle: sharpness in one parameter induces blurriness in the other. All of this makes perfect sense from a biocentric perspective. Everything we perceive is actively being reconstructed inside our heads. Time is simply the summation of the ~’frames~’ occurring inside the mind. But change doesn~’t mean there is an actual invisible matrix called "time" in which changes occur. That is just our own way of making sense of things."

In the first case Lanza seems to state that motion is logically impossible (which is a pre-relativistic view of the paradox) and in the next case he mentions that uncertainty is present in the system (a post-relativistic model of motion). In both cases, however, Lanza~’s conclusion is the same - biocentrism is true for time. No matter what the facts about the nature of time, Lanza concludes that time is not real. His model is unfalsifiable and therefore cannot be a part of science. What Lanza doesn~’t let on is that Einstein~’s special-relativity theory removes the possibility of absolute time, not of time itself. Zeno~’s Arrow paradox is resolved by replacing the idea of absolute time with Einstein~’s relativistic coupling of space and time. Space-time has an uncertainty in quantum mechanics, but it is not nonexistent. The idea of time as a series of sequential events that we perceive and put together in our heads is an experiential version of time. This is the way we have evolved to perceive time. This experiential version of time seems absolute, because we evolved to perceive it that way. However, in reality time is relative. This is a fundamental fact of modern physics. Time does exist outside of the observer, but allows us only a narrow perception of its true nature.

Space is the other property of the universe that Lanza attempts to describe as purely a product of consciousness. He says "Wave your hand through the air. If you take everything away, what~’s left? The answer is nothing. So why do we pretend space is a thing". Again, Einstein~’s theory of special relativity provides us with objective predictions that we can look for, such as the bending of space-time. Such events have been observed and verified multiple times. Space is a ~’thing~’ as far as the objective universe is concerned.

Lanza says "Space and time are simply the mind~’s tools for putting everything together." This is true , but there is a difference between being the  ~’mind~’s tools~’ and being created by the mind itself. In the first instance the conscious perception of space and time is an experiential trick that the mind uses to make sense of the objective universe, and in the other space and time are actual physical manifestations of the mind. The former is tested and true while the latter is an idealistic notion that is not supported by science. The experiential conception of space and time is different from objective space and time that comprise the universe. This difference is similar to how color is different from photon frequency. The former is subjective while the latter is objective.

Can Lanza deny all the evidence that, whereas we humans emerged on the scene very recently, our Earth and the solar system and the universe at large have been there all along? What about all the objective evidence that life forms have emerged and evolved to greater and greater complexity, resulting in the emergence of humans at a certain stage in the evolutionary history of the Earth? What about all the fossil evidence for how biological and other forms of complexity have been evolving? How can humans arrogate to themselves the power to create objective reality?

Much of Lanza~’s idealism arises from a distrust/incomprehension of mathematics. He writes:

"In order to account for why space and time were relative to the observer, Einstein assigned tortuous mathematical properties to an invisible, intangible entity that cannot be seen or touched. This folly continues with the advent of quantum mechanics."

Why should the laws of Nature ~’bother~’ about whether you can touch something or not? The laws of Nature have been there long before Lanza appeared on the scene. Since he cannot visualize how the mathematics describes an objective universe outside of experience, Lanza announces that reality itself does not exist unless created by the act of observation. Some cheek%21
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=Death Bad =

Even if our politics is impossible, it is still good. Our struggle is necessary to celebrating life. The alternative denies our potential to affirm life and condemns others to unnecessary suffering.

May ~’5 (Todd May, prof @ Clemson. "To change the world, to celebrate life," Philosophy %26 Social Criticism 2005 Vol 31 nos 5–6 pp. 517–531)

To change the world and to celebrate life. This, as the theologian Harvey Cox saw, is the struggle within us. It is a struggle in which one cannot choose sides; or better, a struggle in which one must choose both sides. The abandonment of one for the sake of the other can lead only to disaster or callousness. Forsaking the celebration of life for the sake of changing the world is the path of the sad revolutionary. In his preface to Anti-Oedipus, Foucault writes that one does not have to be sad in order to he revolutionarv. The matter is more urgent than that, however. One cannot be both sad and revolutionary lacking a sense of the wondrous that is already here, among us, one who is bent upon changing the world can only become solemn or bitter. He or she is focused only on the future; the present is what is to be overcome. The vision of what is not but must come to be overwhelms all else, and the point of change itself becomes lost. The history of the left in the 20th century offers numerous examples of this, and the disaster that attends to it should be evident to all of us by now. The alternative is surely not to shift one~’s allegiance to the pure celebration of life, although there are many who have chosen this path. It is at best blindness not to see the misery that envelops so many of our fellow humans, to say nothing of what happens to sentient nonhuman creatures. The attempt to jettison world-changing for an uncritical assent to the world as it is requires a self-deception that I assume would be anathema for those of us who have studied Foucault. Indeed, it is anathema for all of us who awaken each day to an America whose expansive boldness is matched only by an equally expansive disregard for those we place in harm~’s way. This is the struggle, then. The one between the desire for life celebration and the desire for world-changing. The struggle between reveling in the contingent and fragile joys that constitute our world and wresting it from its intolerability. I am sure it is a struggle that is not foreign to anyone who is reading this. I am sure as well that the stakes for choosing one side over another that I have recalled here are obvious to everyone. The question then becomes one of how to choose both sides at once. III Maybe it happens this way. You walk into a small meeting room at the back of a local bookstore. There are eight or ten people milling about. They~’re dressed in dark clothes, nothing fancy, and one or two of them have earrings or dreadlocks. They vary in age. You don~’t know any of them. You~’ve never seen them before. Several of them seem to know one another. They are affectionate, hugging, letting a hand linger on a shoulder or an elbow. A younger man, tall and thin, with an open face and a blue baseball cap bearing no logo, glides into the room. Two others, a man and a woman, shout, ~’Tim%21~’ and he glides over to them and hugs them, one at a time. They tell him how glad they are that he could make it, and he says that he just got back into town and heard about the meeting. You stand a little off to the side. Nobody has taken a seat at the rectangle of folding tables yet. You don~’t want to be the first to sit down. Tim looks around the room and smiles. Several other people filter in. You~’re not quite sure where to put your hands so you slide them into your jean pockets. You hunch your shoulders. Tim~’s arrival has made you feel more of an outsider. But then he sees you. He edges his way around several others and walks up to you and introduces himself. You respond. Tim asks and you tell him that this is your first time at a meeting like this. He doesn~’t ask about politics but about where you~’re from. He tells you he has a friend in that neighborhood and do you know . . . ? Then several things happen that you only vaguely notice because you~’re talking with Tim. People start to sit down at the rectangle of tables. One of them pulls out a legal pad with notes on it. She sits at the head of the rectangle; or rather, when she sits down there, it becomes the head. And there~’s something you don~’t notice at all. You are more relaxed, your shoulders have stopped hunching, and when you sit down the seat feels familiar. The woman at the head of the table looks around. She smiles; her eyes linger over you and a couple of others that you take to be new faces, like yours. She says, ~’Maybe we should begin.~’ IV I can offer only a suggestion of an answer here today. It is a suggestion that brings together some thoughts from the late writings of Maurice Merleau-Ponty with those of Foucault, in order to sketch not even a framework for thought, but the mere outlines of a framework. It is not a framework that would seek to find the unconscious of each in the writings of the other. Neither thinker finishes or accomplishes the other. (Often, for example regarding methodology, they do not even agree.) Rather, it is a framework that requires both of them, from their very different angles, in order to be able to think it. My goal in constructing the outlines of this framework is largely philosophical. That is to say, the suggestion I would like to make here is not one for resolving for each of us the struggle of life-celebration and world-changing, but of offering a way to conceive ourselves that allows us to embrace both sides of this battle at the same time. Given the thinkers I have chosen as reference points, it will be no surprise when I say that that conception runs through the body. Let me start with Merleau-Ponty. In his last writings, particularly in The Visible and the Invisible, he offers a conception of the body that is neither at odds nor even entangled with the world, but is of the very world itself. His concept of the flesh introduces a point of contact that is also a point of undifferentiation. The flesh, Merleau-Ponty writes, ~’is the coiling over of the visible upon the seeing body, of the tangible upon the touching body, which is attested in particular when the body sees itself, touches itself seeing and touching the things, such that, as tangible it descends among them~’.2 We must recall this economy of the flesh before we turn to Foucault. There is, for Merleau-Ponty, a single Being. Our world is of that Being, and we are of our world. We are not something that confronts the world from outside, but are born into it and do not leave it. This does not mean that we cannot remove ourselves from the immediacy of its grasp. What it means is that to remove ourselves from that immediacy is neither the breaking of a bond nor the discovery of an original dichotomy or dualism. What is remarkable about human beings is precisely our capacity to confront the world, to reflect upon it, understand it, and change it, while still being of a piece with it. To grasp this remarkable character, it is perhaps worth recalling Gilles Deleuze~’s concept of the fold. The world is not composed of different parts; there is no transcendent, whether of God or of subjectivity. The world is one. As Deleuze sometimes says, being is univocal. This oneness is not, however, inert or inanimate. Among other things, it can fold over on itself, creating spaces that are at once insides and outsides, at once different from and continuous with one another. The flesh is a fold of Being in this sense. It is of the world, and yet encounters it as if from a perceptual or cognitive distance. It is a visibility that sees, a tangible that touches, an audible that hears. Merleau- Ponty writes: There is vision, touch when a certain visible, a certain tangible, turns back upon the whole of the visible, the whole of the tangible, of which it is a part, or when suddenly it finds itself surrounded by them, or when between it and them, and through their commerce, is formed a Visibility, a Tangible in itself, which belong properly neither to the body qua fact nor to the world qua fact . . . and which therefore form a couple, a couple more real than either of them.3 For Merleau-Ponty, thought and reflection do not attach themselves to this flesh from beyond it, but arise through it. As our body is of this world, our thought is of our bodies, its language of a piece with the world it addresses. ~’~~[I~~]f we were to make completely explicit the architectonics of the human body, its ontological framework, and how it sees itself and hears itself, we would see the possibilities of language already given in it.~’4 This conception of the body as flesh of the world is not foreign to Foucault, although of course the terms Merleau-Ponty uses are not his. We might read Foucault~’s politics as starting from here, inaugurated at the point of undifferentiation between body and world. The crucial addition he would make is that that point of undifferentiation is not historically inert. The body/world nexus is inscribed in a history that leaves its traces on both at the same time, and that crosses the border of the flesh and reaches the language that arises from it, and the thought that language expresses. How does this work?V Maybe it doesn~’t happen that way. Maybe it happens another way. Maybe you walk into a room at a local community center. The room is large, but there aren~’t many people, at least yet. There~’s a rectangular table in the center, and everyone is sitting around it. A couple of people look up as you walk in. They nod slightly. You nod back, even more slightly. At the head of the table is someone with a legal pad. She does not look up. She is reading the notes on the pad, making occasional marks with the pen in her right hand. Other people come in and take places at the table. One or two of them open laptop computers and look for an outlet. Eventually, the table fills up and people start sitting in chairs behind the table. Your feel as though you~’re in an inner circle where you don~’t belong. You wonder whether you should give up your chair and go sit on the outside with the others who are just coming in now. Maybe people notice you, think you don~’t belong there. At this moment you~’d like to leave. You begin to feel at once large and small, visually intrusive and an object of scrutiny. You don~’t move because maybe this is OK after all. You just don~’t know. The room is quiet. A couple of people cough. Then the woman seated at the head of the table looks up. She scans the room as if taking attendance. She says, ~’Maybe we should begin.~’ VI Merleau-Ponty~’s discussion of the body as flesh is an ontological one. Although he does not see the body as remote from its historical inscription, his discussion does not incorporate the role such inscription plays. For a body to be of the world is also for it to be temporal, to be encrusted in the continuous emerging of the world over time. And this emerging is not abstract; rather, it is concrete. The body/world nexus evolves during particular historical periods. This fold of the flesh, this body, is not nowhere and at any time. It is there, then; or it is here, now. A body is entangled within a web of specific events and relations that, precisely because it is of this world, are inescapably a part of that body~’s destiny. As Merleau-Ponty tells us in Phenomenology of Perception, ~’our open and personal existence rests on an initial foundation of acquired and stabilized existence. But it could not be otherwise, if we are temporality, since the dialectic of acquisition and future is what constitutes time.~’5 The medium for the body~’s insertion into a particular net of events and relations is that of social practices. Our bodies are not first and foremost creatures of the state or the economy, no more than they are atomized wholes distinct from the world they inhabit. Or better, they are creatures of the state and the economy inasmuch as those appear through social practices, through the everyday practices that are the ether of our lives. Social practices are the sedimentation of history at the level of the body. When I teach, when I write this article, when I run a race or teach one of my children how to ride a bicycle, my body is oriented in particular ways, conforming to or rejecting particular norms, responding to the constraints and restraints of those practices as they have evolved in interaction with other practices over time. Through its engagement in these practices, my body has taken on a history that is not of my making but is nevertheless part of my inheritance. It is precisely because, as Merleau-Ponty has written, the body and the world are not separate things but rather in a chiasmic relation that we can think this inheritance. And it is because of Foucault~’s histories that we can recognize that this inheritance is granted through specific social practices. And of course, as Foucault has taught us, social practices are where the power is. It is not, or not simply, at the level of the state or the modes of production where power arises. It is, as he sometimes puts it, at the capillaries. One of the lessons of Discipline and Punish is that, if the soul is the prison of the body, this is because the body is inserted into a set of practices that create for it a soul. These practices are not merely the choices of an individual whose thought surveys the world from above, but instead the fate of a body that is of a particular world at a particular time and place. Moreover, these practices are not merely in service to a power that exists outside of them; they are mechanisms of power in their own right. It is not because Jeremy Bentham disliked the prison population that the Panopticon became a grid for thinking about penal institutions. It is instead because the evolution of penal practices at that time created an opening for the economy of visibility that the Panopticon represented. When Foucault writes that . . . the soul has a reality, it is produced permanently around, on, within the body by the functioning of a power that is exercised on those punished – and, in a more general way, on those one supervises, trains and corrects, over madmen, children at home and at school, the colonized, over those who are stuck at a machine and supervised for the rest of their lives6 his claim is informed by four other ones that lie behind it: that bodies are of a piece with the world, that the body/world nexus is a temporal one, that the medium of that corporeal temporality is the practices a body is engaged in, and that that medium is political as well as social. The last three claims are, of course, of the framework of Foucault~’s thought. The first one is the ontological scaffolding provided by Merleau-Ponty. And it is by means of all four that we can begin to conceive things so as to be able to choose both world-changing and lifecelebrating at the same time. VII It could happen yet another way. Increasingly, it does. There is no meeting. There are no tables and no legal pads. Nobody sits down in a room together, at least nobody sits down at a place you know about. There may not even be a leaflet. Maybe you just got an email that was forwarded by someone you know slightly and who thought you might be interested. At the bottom there~’s a link, in case you want to unsubscribe. If you don~’t unsubscribe you get more notices, with petitions to sign or times and places for rallies or teach-ins or marches. Maybe there~’s also a link for feedback or a list for virtual conversations or suggestions. If you show up, it~’s not to something you put together but to something that was already in place before you arrived. How did you decide on this rally or teach-in? You sat in front of your computer screen, stared at it, pondering. Maybe you emailed somebody you know, asking for their advice. Is it worth going? If it~’s on campus you probably did. It matters who will see you, whether you have tenure, how much you~’ve published. There are no Tims here. You~’ve decided to go. If it~’s a teach-in, you~’ve got plausible deniability; you~’re just there as an observer. If it~’s a rally, you can stand to the side. But maybe you won~’t do that. The issue is too important. You don~’t know the people who will be there, but you will stand among them, walk among them. You will be with them, in some way. Bodies at the same time and place. You agree on the issue, but it~’s a virtual agreement, one that does not come through gestures or words but through sharing the same values and the same internet connections. As you march, as you stand there, nearly shoulder to shoulder with others of like mind, you~’re already somewhere else, telling this story to someone you know, trying to get them to understand the feeling of solidarity that you are projecting back into this moment. You say to yourself that maybe you should have brought a friend along. There are many ways to conceive the bond between world-changing and life-celebrating. Let me isolate two: one that runs from Merleau-Ponty to Foucault, from the body~’s chiasmic relation with the world to the politics of its practices; and the other one running back in the opposite direction. The ontology Merleau-Ponty offers in his late work is one of wonder. Abandoning the sterile philosophical debates about the relation of mind and body, subject and object, about the relation of reason to that which is not reason, or the problem of other minds, his ontology forges a unity of body and world that puts us in immediate contact with all of its aspects. No longer are we to be thought the self-enclosed creatures of the philosophical tradition. We are now in touch with the world, because we are of it. Art, for example, does not appeal solely to our minds; its beauty is not merely a matter of the convergence of our faculties. We are moved by art, often literally moved, because our bodies and the work of art share the same world. As Merleau-Ponty says, ~’I would be at great pains to say where is the painting I am looking at. For I do not look at it as I do a thing; I do not fix it in its place. My gaze wanders in it as in the halos of Being. It is more accurate to say that I see according to it, or with it, than that I see it.~’7 It is only because my body is a fold of this world that art can affect me so. But this affection is also a vulnerability. As my look can happen according to a work of art, so it can happen according to a social practice. And even more so in proportion as that social practice and its effects are suffused through the world in which I carry on my life, the world my body navigates throughout the day, every day. I do not have a chance to look according to a painting by Cezanne very often; but I do encounter the effects of normalization as it has filtered through the practices of my employment, of my students~’ upbringing, and of my family~’s expectations of themselves and one another. The vulnerability of the body, then, is at once its exposure to beauty and its opening to what is intolerable. We might also see things from the other end, starting from politics and ending at the body. I take it that this is what Foucault suggests when he talks about bodies and pleasures at the end of the first volume of the History of Sexuality. If we are a product of our practices and the conception of ourselves and the world that those practices have fostered, so to change our practices is to experiment in new possibilities both for living and, inseparably, for conceiving the world. To experiment in sexuality is not to see where the desire that lies at the core of our being may lead us; that is simply the continuation of our oppression by other means. Rather, it is to construct practices where what is at issue is no longer desire but something else, something that might go by the name of bodies and pleasures. In doing so, we not only act differently, we think differently, both about ourselves and about the world those selves are inseparable from. And because these experiments are practices of our bodies, and because our bodies are encrusted in the world, these experiments become not merely acts of political resistance but new folds in the body/ world nexus. To construct new practices is to appeal to aspects or possibilities of the world that have been previously closed to us. It is to offer novel, and perhaps more tolerable, engagements in the chiasm of body and world. Thus we might say of politics what Merleau-Ponty has said of painting, that we see according to it. Here, I take it, is where the idea of freedom in Foucault lies. For Foucault, freedom is not a metaphysical condition. It does not lie in the nature of being human, nor is it a warping, an atomic swerve, in the web of causal relations in which we find ourselves. To seek our freedom in a space apart from our encrustation in the world is not so much to liberate ourselves from its influence as to build our own private prison. Foucault once said: There~’s an optimism that consists in saying that things couldn~’t be better. My optimism would consist rather in saying that so many things can be changed, fragile as they are, bound up more with circumstances than with necessities, more arbitrary than self-evident, more a matter of complex, but temporary, historical circumstances than with inevitable anthropological constraints . . .8 That is where to discover our freedom. And what happens from there? From the meetings, from the rallies, from the petitions and the teach-ins? What happens next? There is, after all, always a next. If you win this time – end aid to the contras, divest from apartheid South Africa, force debt-forgiveness by technologically advanced countries – there is always more to do. There is the de-unionization of workers, there are gay rights, there is Burma, there are the Palestinians, the Tibetans. There will always be Tibetans, even if they aren~’t in Tibet, even if they aren~’t Asian. But is that the only question: Next? Or is that just the question we focus on? What~’s the next move in this campaign, what~’s the next campaign? Isn~’t there more going on than that? After all, engaging in political organizing is a practice, or a group of practices. It contributes to making you who you are. It~’s where the power is, and where your life is, and where the intersection of your life and those of others (many of whom you will never meet, even if it~’s for their sake that you~’re involved) and the buildings and streets of your town is. This moment when you are seeking to change the world, whether by making a suggestion in a meeting or singing at a rally or marching in silence or asking for a signature on a petition, is not a moment in which you don~’t exist. It~’s not a moment of yours that you sacrifice for others so that it no longer belongs to you. It remains a moment of your life, sedimenting in you to make you what you will become, emerging out of a past that is yours as well. What will you make of it, this moment? How will you be with others, those others around you who also do not cease to exist when they begin to organize or to protest or to resist? The illusion is to think that this has nothing to do with you. You~’ve made a decision to participate in world-changing. Will that be all there is to it? Will it seem to you a simple sacrifice, for this small period of time, of who you are for the sake of others? Are you, for this moment, a political ascetic? Asceticism like that is dangerous. Freedom lies not in our distance from the world but in the historically fragile and contingent ways we are folded into it, just as we ourselves are folds of it. If we take Merleau-Ponty~’s Being not as a rigid foundation or a truth behind appearances but as the historical folding and refolding of a univocity, then our freedom lies in the possibility of other foldings. Merleau-Ponty is not insensitive to this point. His elusive concept of the invisible seems to gesture in this direction. Of painting, he writes: the proper essence of the visible is to have a layer of invisibility in the strict sense, which it makes present as a certain absence . . . There is that which reaches the eye directly, the frontal properties of the visible; but there is also that which reaches it from below . . . and that which reaches it from above . . . where it no longer participates in the heaviness of origins but in free accomplishments.9 Elsewhere, in The Visible and the Invisible, he says: if . . . the surface of the visible, is doubled up over its whole extension with an invisible reserve; and if, finally, in our flesh as the flesh of things, the actual, empirical, ontic visible, by a sort of folding back, invagination, or padding, exhibits a visibility, a possibility that is not the shadow of the actual but its principle . . . an interior horizon and an exterior horizon between which the actual visible is a partitioning and which, nonetheless, open indefinitely only upon other visibles . . .10 What are we to make of these references? We can, to be sure, see the hand of Heidegger in them. But we may also, and for present purposes more relevantly, see an intersection with Foucault~’s work on freedom. There is an ontology of freedom at work here, one that situates freedom not in the private reserve of an individual but in the unfinished character of any historical situation. There is more to our historical juncture, as there is to a painting, than appears to us on the surface of its visibility. The trick is to recognize this, and to take advantage of it, not only with our thoughts but with our lives. And that is why, in the end, there can be no such thing as a sad revolutionary. To seek to change the world is to offer a new form of life-celebration. It is to articulate a fresh way of being, which is at once a way of seeing, thinking, acting, and being acted upon. It is to fold Being once again upon itself, this time at a new point, to see what that might yield. There is, as Foucault often reminds us, no guarantee that this fold will not itself turn out to contain the intolerable. In a complex world with which we are inescapably entwined, a world we cannot view from above or outside, there is no certainty about the results of our experiments. Our politics are constructed from the same vulnerability that is the stuff of our art and our daily practices. But to refuse to experiment is to resign oneself to the intolerable; it is to abandon both the struggle to change the world and the opportunity to celebrate living within it. And to seek one aspect without the other – life-celebration without world-changing, world-changing without life-celebration – is to refuse to acknowledge the chiasm of body and world that is the wellspring of both. If we are to celebrate our lives, if we are to change our world, then perhaps the best place to begin to think is our bodies, which are the openings to celebration and to change, and perhaps the point at which the war within us that I spoke of earlier can be both waged and resolved. That is the fragile beauty that, in their different ways, both Merleau- Ponty and Foucault have placed before us. The question before us is whether, in our lives and in our politics, we can be worthy of it. So how might you be a political body, woven into the fabric of the world as a celebrator and as a changer? You went to the meeting, and then to the demonstration. How was it there? Were the bodies in harmony or in counterpoint? Did you sing with your feet, did your voice soar? Did your mind come alive? Did you see possibilities you had not seen before? Were there people whose words or clothes, or even the way they walked hand in hand (how long has it been since you~’ve walked hand in hand with someone out in public?) offer you a possibility, or make you feel alive as well as righteous? And how about those people off to the side, the ones on the sidewalk watching? Maybe they just stared, or maybe nodded as you went past. Or maybe some of them shouted at you to stop blocking the streets with your nonsense. Did you recoil within yourself, see yourself as in a mirror, or as the person at Sartre~’s keyhole who~’s just been caught? Did you feel superior to them, smug in your knowledge? Or did they, too, show you something you might learn from? Are they you at another moment, a moment in the past or in the future? Are they your parents that you have not explained to, sat down beside, or just shared a meal with? That one over there, the old man slightly stooped in the long overcoat: whom does he remind you of? What message might he have unwittingly brought for you? And why does it have to be a demonstration? You go to a few meetings, a few more demonstrations. You write some letters to legislators. You send an email to the President. And then more meetings. The next thing you know, you~’re involved in a political campaign. By then you may have stopped asking why. This is how it goes: demonstrations, meetings with legislators, internet contacts. Does it have to be like this? Are demonstrations and meetings your only means? Do they become, sooner or later, not only means but ends? And what kinds of ends? In some sense they should always be ends: a meeting is a celebration, after all. But there are other ends as well. You go to the meeting because that fulfills your obligation to your political conscience. Does it come to that? There are other means, other ends. Other means/ends. Some people ride bicycles, en masse, slowly through crowded urban streets. You want environmentalism? Then have it. The streets are beautiful with their tall corniced buildings and wide avenues. To ride a bike through these streets instead of hiding in the armor of a car would be exhilarating. If enough of you do it together it would make for a pleasant ride, as well as a little lived environmentalism. Would you want to call it a demonstration? Would it matter? There are others as well who do other things with their bodies, more dangerous things. Some people have gone to Palestine in order to put their bodies between the Palestinians and the Israeli soldiers and settlers who attack them. They lie down next to Palestinians in front of the bulldozers that would destroy homes or build a wall through a family~’s olive orchard. They feel the bodies of those they are in solidarity with. They smell the soil of Palestine as they lay there. Sometimes, they are harmed by it. A young woman, Rachel Corrie, was deliberately crushed by a US bulldozer operated by an Israeli soldier as she kneeled in front of a Palestinian home, hoping to stop its demolition. To do politics with one~’s body can be like this. To resist, to celebrate, is also to be vulnerable. The world that you embrace, the world of which you are a part, can kill you too. And so you experiment. You try this and you try that. You are a phenomenologist and a genealogist. You sense what is around you, attend to the way your body is encrusted in your political involvements. And you know that that sensing has its own history, a history that often escapes you even as it envelops you. There is always more to what you are, and to what you are involved in, than you can know. So you try to keep vigilant, seeking the possibilities without scorning the realities. It~’s a difficult balance. You can neglect it if you like. Many do. But your body is there, woven into the fabric of all the other bodies, animate and inanimate. Whether you like it or not, whether you recognize it or not. The only question is whether you will take up the world that you are of, or leave it to others, to those others who would be more than willing to take your world up for you.

=Relations=

1. Our evidence is predictive and discusses the segregation of issues

Selee and Diaz-Cayeros 13 (Andrew and Alberto) "The Dynamics of US Mexico Relations" Mexico and the United States: the politics of partnership. 2013. Book

Yet positive factors favor prospects for more effective partnership and are likely to drive cooperation over time. First among these is the genuine interdependence of interests that underlies integration between the two countries. Everyday issues that need to be resolved – from the GM bailout to drug traffickinging to natural disasters and water shortages at the border – create a dynamic of constant engagement around highly concrete topics that policymakers on the two sides of the border need to address. Moreover, the growing complexity of the relationship means that even when disputes arise among the two countries~’ political leaders, progress continues along a number of other areas, driven by federal agencies, state, and local covernments, and nongovernmental actors. Increasingly, interactions between the two countries take place simultaneously along a wide number of different points of engagement, which are largely independent of each other and have their own particular dynamics. Progress on one does not necessarily augur progress on another; nor does failure in one area lead to failure in another. Nonetheless, progress in deepending engagement between the two countries will constantly be challenged by the persistent asymmetries that condition the relationship. The different in geopolitical realities of the two countries, the continuing intequality in average income between them and the dissimilar capacities of the two states are likely to continue to limit some efforts at greater cooperation. Recent tendencies have softened the impact of some of these asymmetries. Democraticization in Mexico has made the political systems of the two countries more similar. Increased economic and social exchanges have built ties that mitigate some of the most visible asymmetries and forced the two countries to seek solutions to shared problems. Public opinion studies show how far the two countries have gone in recognizing their mutual interest in working together despite their differences, with ordinary citizens generally far ahead of political elites. Over the long term, interdependence will force the two countries closer and complexity will allow the relationship to lay down even deeper roots along multiple points of engagement. However, asymmetry will continue to create frictions and provide a brake on progress in cooperation. The relationship between the United States and Mexico will continuiously deepen, but wil be a process fraught with tension. The countries have ceased to be distant neighbors but as yet they remain far away from being strategic partners whose relationship is guided by a common vision of mutually beneficial shared outcomes.

1. Interdependent networks

Gaytan 12 (José Alberto Gaytan; PhD @ the School of International Studies @ UMiami; Bachelor of Law @ University of Nuevo León; Director of Legal Services of IMSS. Mexican Migrant Farmworkers~’ Impact on South Florida: A Case Study in the Context of US–Mexican Relations~’)//L Shen

Mexico and the United States are two neighboring countries whose connections are complex, broad, multilayered, and intricate in a variety of areas and on a number of delicate issues. The relationship is created by flows of people, culture, technology, goods services, and labor between the two countries. The immigration issue is one of the most direct consequences of such geographical proximity between both countries. Indeed, Mexico is one of the main migratory countries in the world, and the vast majority of its migrants travel north to work or settle in the United States. In fact, according to a study conducted by the Pew Research Center for the People and the Press (PEW), Mexico is the main source of laborers to the United States. For example, as of 2010, there were 11.2 million illegal workers in this nation, and of that number, 58 percent come from Mexico. That is an estimated 6.5 million immigrants from south of the border who have established residence in the United States.7 This geographical proximity between both countries has created a deep and complex framework of interdependence. The full variety and nature of the issues that shape the character of this relationship probably do not exist in the contemporary history of other neighboring countries in the Western Hemisphere. For example, after Canada and China, Mexico is America~’s third-ranked trading partner, purchasing two-thirds of its imports from the United States while sending about two-thirds of its exports to the north. From 1993 to 2006, trade between the signatory nations has doubled, totaling 883 billion dollars within that period.

====New administration promises ====

\*\*Seelke ~’13\*\*

~~[Clare, Specialist in Latin American Affairs, "Mexico~’s New Administration: Priorities and Key Issues in US-Mexican Relations," Congressional Research Service, January 16, 2013~~]

[[http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42917.pdf-http://www.fas.org/sgp/crs/row/R42917.pdf]]

U.S.-Mexican relations grew closer during the Felipe Calderón Administration (2006-2012) as a ¶ result of the Mérida Initiative, a bilateral security effort for which Congress has provided %241.9 ¶ billion. Some Members of Congress may be concerned about whether bilateral relations, ¶ particularly security cooperation, may suffer now that the party controlling the presidency has ¶ changed. Although the transition from PAN to PRI rule is unlikely to result in seismic shifts in ¶ bilateral relations, a PRI government may emphasize economic issues more than security matters. ¶ President Peña Nieto has vowed to continue U.S.-Mexican security cooperation, albeit with a ¶ stronger emphasis on reducing violent crime in Mexico than on combating drug trafficking; what ¶ that cooperation will look like remains to be seen. He has also expressed support for increased ¶ bilateral and trilateral (with Canada) economic and energy cooperation.

\*\*====Expanding education partnership====\*\*

\*\*Baker ~’13 ~~[Celia, Journalist, "US-Mexico Education Partnership Announced," Deseret News, May 6, 2013~~]\*\*

[[http://www.deseretnews.com/article/865579517/US-Mexico-education-partnership-announced.html?pg=all-http://www.deseretnews.com/article/865579517/US-Mexico-education-partnership-announced.html?pg=all]]

\*\*U.S. President Barack \*\*Obama and\*\* Mexico~’s president, \*\*Pena Nieto\*\*, have \*\*announced a partnership to expand economic opportunities\*\* for citizens of both countries \*\*and to develop a 21st-century work force for mutual economic prosperity\*\*, according to a May 2 statement from the U.S. State Department. Through \*\*a new\*\* \*\*Forum on Higher Education\*\*, \*\*Innovation, and Research\*\*, the U.S. and Mexican governments \*\*will encourage broader access to quality post-secondary education for traditionally under-served groups\*\*, especially in the science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) fields. They will also expand educational exchanges and share best practices in higher education and innovation, the statement said. \*\*The forum~’s mission is to bring together government agency counterparts from Mexico and the U.S. to deepen cooperation on higher education, innovation and research\*\*. It will also draw on the expertise of the higher education communities in both countries, according to the State Department\*\*. More than 18,000 Mexican and U.S. university students study in each other~’s countries annually\*\*. The Mexico-U.S. Commission for Educational and Cultural Exchange (COMEXUS) oversees the Fulbright-Garcia Robles Scholarship Program, the flagship program in U.S.-Mexico academic exchanges. Under this program, more than 4,000 Mexicans and Americans have participated in bilateral exchange programs since 1990. \*\*The new Forum on Higher Education, Innovation, and Research plans to start meeting this year and bring together government, academic and civil society to develop a shared vision on educational cooperation\*\*, the Wall Street Journal~’s Washington Wire blog said. Obama traveled to Mexico City at Nieto~’s invitation for meetings that culminated in the announcement of the education initiative. The discussions also included economic interests and citizen security, but no security agreements were announced, The New York Times reported.\*\*

\*\*====Mexico trust level with US is high====\*\*

\*\*Shirk ~’13\*\*

\*\*~~[Jason, Associate professor of political science, "US-Mexico Relations Complicated, Conditioned by Drug War," a statement from Shirk in an interview with host Scott Simon, NPR, May 4, 2013~~]\*\*

[[http://www.npr.org/2013/05/04/181053775/u-s-mexico-relations-complicated-conditioned-by-drug-war-http://www.npr.org/2013/05/04/181053775/u-s-mexico-relations-complicated-conditioned-by-drug-war]]

\*\*In the last 12 years, \*\*and especially the last six years, have really been a high-water mark in U.S.-Mexico collaboration\*\*, particularly on security issues. \*\*Levels of trust are so high\*\* that we \*\*have had the opportunity to fly drones in Mexico\*\*, we have agents operating in direct collaboration with their Mexican counterparts, we~’ve seen record levels of extradition. So, \*\*the collaboration is at a much higher level of intensity than we~’ve ever seen before\*\* - or has been, at least over the last six years or so.\*\*

====Common interests====

\*\*O~’Neil ~’13- \*\*senior fellow for Latin America Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations

(Shannon K., a nonpartisan foreign-policy think tank and membership organization, March/April 2013, [[http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/138818/shannon-k-oneil/mexico-makes-it-http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/138818/shannon-k-oneil/mexico-makes-it]] "Mexico makes it")

Hidden behind the troubling headlines, however, is another, more hopeful Mexico — one undergoing rapid and widespread social, political, and economic transformation. Yes, Mexico continues to struggle with grave security threats, but it is also fostering a globally competitive marketplace, a growing middle class, and an increasingly influential pro-democracy voter base. In addition, Mexico~’s ties with the United States are changing. Common interests in energy, manufacturing, and security, as well as an overlapping community formed by millions of binational families, have made Mexico~’s path forward increasingly important to its northern neighbor.¶ For most of the past century, U.S.-Mexican relations were conducted at arm~’s length. That began to change, however, in the 1980s and, even more, after the 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) spurred greater bilateral economic engagement and cooperation. Mexico~’s democratic transition has further eased the wariness of some skeptics in Washington. Still, the U.S.-Mexican relationship is far from perfect. New bilateral policies are required, especially to facilitate the movement of people and goods across the U.S.-Mexican border. More important, the United States needs to start seeing Mexico as a partner instead of a problem.

=xt no enviro collapse=

The insane amounts of abuse the environment has taken shows it won~’t collapse

Easterbrook 95, Distinguished Fellow, Fullbright Foundation (Gregg, A Moment on Earth pg 25)

IN THE AFTERMATH OF EVENTS SUCH AS LOVE CANAL OR THE Exxon Valdez oil spill, every reference to the environment is prefaced with the adjective "fragile." "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. The environment that contains them is close to indestructible. The living environment of Earth has survived ice ages; bombardments of cosmic radiation more deadly than atomic fallout; solar radiation more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution far worse than that made by any factory; reversals of the planet~’s magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents; transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream; 300-foot vacillations in sea levels; shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets bearing far more force than man~’s nuclear arsenals; and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still. Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of the industrial affronts of the dreaming ape. Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.

Tech solves —- their evidence is media alarmism

Stossel, Journalist, winner of the Peabody Award, anchors ABC News, 07 ~~[John, "Environmental Alarmists Have It Backwards",

http://www.realclearpolitics.com/articles/2007/04/how\_about\_economic\_progress\_da.html~~]

Watching the media coverage, you~’d think that the earth was in imminent danger — that human life itself was on the verge of extinction. Technology is fingered as the perp. Nothing could be further from the truth. John Semmens of Arizona~’s Laissez Faire Institute points out that Earth Day misses an important point. In the April issue of The Freeman magazine, Semmens says the environmental movement overlooks how hospitable the earth has become — thanks to technology. "The environmental alarmists have it backwards. If anything imperils the earth it is ignorant obstruction of science and progress. ... That technology provides the best option for serving human wants and conserving the environment should be evident in the progress made in environmental improvement in the United States. Virtually every measure shows that pollution is headed downward and that nature is making a comeback." (Carbon dioxide excepted, if it is really a pollutant.) Semmens describes his visit to historic Lexington and Concord in Massachusetts, an area "lush with trees and greenery." It wasn~’t always that way. In 1775, the land was cleared so it could be farmed. Today, technology makes farmers so efficient that only a fraction of the land is needed to produce much more food. As a result, "Massachusetts farmland has been allowed to revert back to forest." Human ingenuity and technology not only raised living standards, but also restored environmental amenities. How about a day to celebrate that? Yet, Semmens writes, the environmental movement is skeptical about technology and is attracted to three dubious principles: sustainable development, the precautionary principle, and stakeholder participation. The point of sustainable development, Semmens says, "is to minimize the use of nonrenewable natural resources so there will be more left for future generations." Sounds sensible — who is for "unsustainable" development? But as the great economist Julian Simon often pointed out, resources are manmade, not natural. Jed Clampett cheered when he found oil on his land because it made him rich enough to move to Beverly Hills. But his great-grandfather would have cursed the disgusting black gunk because Canadian geologist Abraham Gesner hadn~’t yet discovered that kerosene could be distilled from it. President Bush chides us for our "addiction to oil." But under current conditions, using oil makes perfect sense. Someday, if we let the free market operate, someone will find an energy source that works better than oil. Then richer future generations won~’t need oil. So why deprive ourselves and make ourselves poorer with needless regulation now? Anyway, it~’s not as if we~’re running out of oil. That~’s one of the myths I expose in my new book, "Myths, Lies and Downright Stupidity". If the price of a barrel of oil stays high, entrepreneurs will find better ways to suck oil out of the ground. At %2450 a barrel, it~’s even profitable to recover oil that~’s stuck in the tar sands in Alberta, Canada. Those tar sands alone contain enough oil to meet our needs for a hundred years. The precautionary principle, popular in Europe, is the idea that no new thing should be permitted until it has been proved harmless. Sounds good, except as Ron Bailey of Reason writes, it basically means, "Don~’t ever do anything for the first time." Stakeholder participation means that busybodies would be permitted to intrude on private transactions. Semmens~’s example is DDT, which for years would have saved children from deadly malaria, except that "~’stakeholders~’ from the environmental quarter have prevailed on governments to ban the trade in this product." The first victims of these principles are the poor. We rich Westerners can withstand a lot of policy foolishness. But people in the developing world live on the edge, so anything that retards economic progress — including measures to arrest global warming — will bring incredible hardship to the most vulnerable on the planet. If we care about human life, we should celebrate Economic Progress Day.

The fact that we are alive now is sufficient to prove that their evidence is just alarmism —- ZERO risk of cascading environmental collapse —- wealth and tech solve

Bailey, award-winning science correspondent for Reason magazine, testified before Congress, author of numerous books, member of the Society of Environmental Journalists and the American Society for Bioethics and Humanities, 2k ~~[ Ronald, "Earth Day, Then and Now

The planet~’s future has never looked better. Here~’s why.", http://reason.com/archives/2000/05/01/earth-day-then-and-now/4~~]

"I~’m scared," confessed Paul Ehrlich in the 1970 Earth Day issue of Look. "I have a 14 year old daughter whom I love very much. I know a lot of young people, and their world is being destroyed. My world is being destroyed. I~’m 37 and I~’d kind of like to live to be 67 in a reasonably pleasant world, and not die in some kind of holocaust in the next decade." Ehrlich didn~’t die in a holocaust, and the world is far more pleasant than he thought it would be. It is probably too much to hope that abashed humility will strike him and he~’ll desist in bedeviling the world with his dire and consistently wrong predictions. He~’s like a reverse Cassandra —Cassandra made true prophecies but no one would listen to her. Ehrlich makes false prophecies and everyone listens to him. There~’s much to celebrate on the 30th anniversary of Earth Day. Indeed, one of the chief things to get happy about is that the doomsters were so wrong. Civilization didn~’t collapse, hundreds of millions didn~’t die in famines, pesticides didn~’t cause epidemics of cancer, and the air and water didn~’t get dirtier in the industrialized countries. On the occasions when they admit things have gotten better, doomsters will claim whatever environmental progress has been made over the past 30 years is only a result of the warnings that they sounded. One of the more annoying characteristics of activists such as Ehrlich and Lester Brown is the way in which these prophets of doom get out ahead of a parade that has already started. When things get better, they claim that it~’s only because people heeded their warnings, not because of longstanding trends and increased efficiencies. As a result, there is always the danger that governments may actually enact their policies, thereby stifling technological progress and economic growth—and making the world worse off. Then the doomsters would be able to say "I told you so." So good or bad, they get to claim that they were right all along. What will Earth look like when Earth Day 60 rolls around in 2030? Here are my predictions: As the International Food Policy Research Institute projects, we will be able to feed the world~’s additional numbers and to provide them with a better diet. Because they are ultimately political in nature, poverty and malnutrition will not be eliminated, but economic growth will make many people in the developing world much better off. Technological improvements in agriculture will mean less soil erosion, better management of freshwater supplies, and higher productivity crops. Life expectancy in the developing world will likely increase from 65 years to 73 years, and probably more; in the First World, it will rise to more than 80 years. Metals and mineral prices will be even lower than they are today. The rate of deforestation in the developing world will continue to slow down and forest growth in the developed economies will increase. Meanwhile, as many developing countries become wealthier, they will start to pass through the environmental-transition thresholds for various pollutants, and their air and water quality will begin to improve. Certainly air and water quality in the United States, Europe, Japan, and other developed countries will be even better than it is today. Enormous progress will be made on the medical front, and diseases like AIDS and malaria may well be finally conquered. As for climate change, concern may be abating because the world~’s energy production mix is shifting toward natural gas and nuclear power. There is always the possibility that a technological breakthrough—say, cheap, efficient, non-polluting fuel cells—could radically reshape the energy sector. In any case a richer world will be much better able to cope with any environmental problems that might crop up. One final prediction, of which I~’m most absolutely certain: There will be a disproportionately influential group of doomsters predicting that the future—and the present—never looked so bleak.

Environment impacts are exaggerated

Gordon 95 – professor of mineral economics at Pennsylvania State University ~~[Gordon, Richard, "Ecorealism Exposed," Regulation, 1995, http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv18n3/reg18n3-readings.html

Easterbrook~’s argument is that although environmental problems deserve attention, the environmental movement has exaggerated the threats and ignored evidence of improvement. His discontent causes him to adopt and incessantly employ the pejoratively intended (and irritating) shorthand "enviros" to describe the leading environmental organizations and their admirers. He proposes-and overuses-an equally infelicitous alternative phrase, "ecorealism," that seems to mean that most environmental initiatives can be justifited by more moderate arguments. Given the mass, range, and defects of the book, any review of reasonable length must be selective. Easterbrook~’s critique begins with an overview of environmentalism from a global perspective. He then turns to a much longer (almost 500- page) survey of many specific environmental issues. The overview section is a shorter, more devastating criticism, but it is also more speculative than the survey of specific issues. In essence, the overview argument is that human impacts on the environment are minor, easily correctable influences on a world affected by far more powerful forces. That is a more penetrating criticism than typically appears in works expressing skepticism about environmentalism. Easterbrook notes that mankind~’s effects on nature long predate industrialization or the white colonization of America, but still have had only minor impacts. We are then reminded of the vast, often highly destructive changes that occur naturally and the recuperative power of natural systems.

Extinction genetically impossible and empirically disproven

Posner 2005 (Richard A., Judge U.S. Court of Appeals 7th Circuit, Professor Chicago School of Law, January 1, 2005, Skeptic, Altadena, CA, Catastrophe: Risk and Response, http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi\_0199-4150331/Catastrophe-the-dozen-most-significant.html~~%23abstract)

Yet the fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort, at least if the focus is on extinction events. There have been enormously destructive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but none has come close to destroying the entire human race. There is a biological reason. Natural selection favors germs of limited lethality; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race. The likelihood of a natural pandemic that would cause the extinction of the human race is probably even less today than in the past (except in prehistoric times, when people lived in small, scattered bands, which would have limited the spread of disease), despite wider human contacts that make it more difficult to localize an infectious disease. The reason is improvements in medical science. But the comfort is a small one. Pandemics can still impose enormous losses and resist prevention and cure: the lesson of the AIDS pandemic. And there is always a lust time. That the human race has not yet been destroyed by germs created or made more lethal by modern science, as distinct from completely natural disease agents such as the flu and AIDS viruses, is even less reassuring. We haven~’t had these products long enough to be able to infer survivability from our experience with them. A recent study suggests that as immunity to smallpox declines because people am no longer being vaccinated against it, monkeypox may evolve into "a successful human pathogen," (9) yet one that vaccination against smallpox would provide at least some protection against; and even before the discovery of the smallpox vaccine, smallpox did not wipe out the human race. What is new is the possibility that science, bypassing evolution, will enable monkeypox to be "juiced up" through gene splicing into a far more lethal pathogen than smallpox ever was.

Intervening actors solve—SARS proves.

Nishiura 05 (H Nishiura Bangkok School of Tropical Medicine, Mahidol University,Thailand , K Patanarapelert, M Sriprom, W Sarakorn, S Sriyab , Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Mahidol University and I Ming Tang Institute of Science and Technology for Research and Development, Mahidol University "EVIDENCE BASED PUBLIC HEALTH POLICY AND PRACTICE Modelling potential responses to severe acute respiratory syndrome in Japan: the role of initial attack size, precaution, and quarantine" http://www.hawaii.edu/hivandaids/Modelling\_Potential\_Responses\_to\_Sev ere\_Acute\_Respiratory\_Syndrome\_in\_Japan.pdf August 29, 2005)

There has been an intensive assessment of the different public health interventions that contributed substantially to the eventual curtailing of the epidemic in Hong Kong.27 It is well known that an effective strategy requires aggressive public health measures in combination with stringent hospital infection control practices that meet the recommendations of World Health Organisation.29 30 The SARS pandemic has shown that governments and public health officials need to consider the use of quarantine as a public health tool to prevent the spread of infectious diseases, particularly when other preventive interventions (for example, vaccines and antibiotics) are unavailable.31 From our study, it is shown that either 100% effective precautionary measures or quarantine would lead to decline in the incidence. Both of them reduce R0 in a linear way unlike the practice of isolation. The importance in the coverage should be therefore emphasised. Although recent studies with modelling14 15 provided us with dynamics of SARS including transmissibility as well as the impact of quarantine and isolation, the role of precautionary steps was not taken into consideration. Precautionary measures themselves are quite important especially in hospital settings because a high proportion of the SARS patients were healthcare workers as was pointed out.