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Counterinterpretation: The affirmative should defend the resolution as a counterfactual statement.

CLAIMS ABOUT “SHOULD” ARE OVERDETERMINED. IT INDICATES A NEED FOR POLICY ACTION IN PROPOSITION. WE MEET THAT.

**Trapp & Hanson ‘5** Robert Trapp is a Professor of Rhetoric at Willamette University in Salem, Oregon, U.S.A. Christine Hanson is the Press Assistant for United States Senator Bill Nelson (Democrat of Florida) and is a lecturer at George Washington University, “Debating Comparative Propositions of Policy,” Volume 5, Issue 4 June 2005 - IDEA: International Debate Education ... http://www.idebate.org/magazine/files/Magazine436a366e4843f.pdf

Merely by convention, some teachers and writers have insisted that the word “should” is a necessary and a suﬃcient indicator of a policy proposition. This convention, however, is arbitrary and does not mirror ordinary language usage. The term “should” is one of many terms that can signal a logical requirement for a plan of action.

Aff turns predicatability –

A. The negative’s silencing move is identical to Reagan’s – we need to be able to contest interpretive frames in order to have democratic debate. Their model is a top-down orientation that encourages knowledge specialization – this fails to institutionalize change – that’s Nader.

B. Counterfactuals key to avoid extinction – key to historical contingency, only way we can submit the status quo to critical analysis and avoid catastrophe – that’s Sovacool and Laird.

C. Limiting energy to squo possibilities reifies technological determinism and ensures lock-in – this CROWDSDOUT counterfactual analysis

D. Politics is ceded now – Reagan prioritized business interests over DEBATE – that’s Sovacool

E. scenario planning turns engagement – presentist scenario planning prevents coherent political action because we must deal with energy market fear-mongering – also means their education claims are suspect

ERROR REPLICATION – dividing past counterfactual from the present crushes decisionmaking

**Johnson & Sherman ‘90** Marcia K. Johnson is a Sterling Professor of Psychology at Yale University. Steven J. Sherman is Chancellor's Professor of Psychological and Brain Sciences at Indiana University, Bloomington. “Constructing and Reconstructing the Past and the Future in the Present,” in E.T. Higgins & R.M. Sorrentino (Eds) HANDBOOK OF MOTIVATION AND COGNITATION, p. 510

Counterfactuals are thus important in determining affective reactions to actual events and to judgments of responsibility and causality. (Perhaps one reason why we are more angered by betrayals by people we trust than by people we do not trust is that we can so easily imagine trusted people as behaving otherwise.) More than this, counter factual generation is important because it affects the ways in which we think about the past and about the future. Without considering alternatives to reality, we must accept the past as having been inevitable and must believe that the future will be no different from the past. The generation of counterfactuals gives us flexibility in thinking about possible futures and prepares us better for those futures. Along these lines, Taylor and Schneider (1989) have proposed a theory of coping that focuses on the mental simulation of past, future, and hypothetical events. Such event simulation serves problem-solving and emotion-regulating functions for stressors by increasing the perceived validity of the imagined experiences, providing a framework for organizing experience, and providing a mechanism for mustering helpful emotions. In this way, counterfactual generation and the mental simulation of events can help in coping with ongoing, anticipated, or past stressful events. It is thus clear that after-the-fact counterfactual reasoning affects feelings and judgments about the past, the present, and the future. Before-the-fact reasoning, in the form of expectancies, hopes, and wishes, likewise affects these feelings and judgments, as we have seen.

Historical grounding – Extend Nader – the specialized knowledge accumulation in their model is terrible and precludes a holistic understanding of history

Presentist education non-unique – we are the only way to spur CREATIVITY through political change

Limits cause lock-in – Historical analysis of solar energy policy must be able to CHALLENGE existing frameworks of policy formation and their presentist orientation – only direct contestation of existing frames avoids depoliticization
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IMPORTANCE OF THE CASE The broad importance of energy to all aspects of life in industrial societies needs little discussion. Energy is part of every major technological activity, from agriculture and manufacturing to transportation and telecommunications. The roots of energy policy stem from the U.S. government's deep involvements in energy technologies, resources, and markets, an involvement that goes back over a century and shows no indication of disappearing.30 The government has been and continues to be involved in the research and planning for future energy resources. The Cold War powerfully influenced federal government R8cD priorities, and energy, especially nuclear energy, technologies figured prominently in those programs.31 The Cold War influence went beyond picking R&C.D priorities. As Stuart W. Leslie has argued, the military security orientation of such programs led technology and science policy in particular directions, emphasizing state-ofthe-art high performance often at the expense of technologies that could have important applications in the civilian economy.32 Such planning for the future seemed an immediate and pressing matter during most of the 1970s. It seems less so today, although there is no reason that it should. Planning for the future should not wait until a crisis strikes. Recent price increases remind us that the current low prices and ample supply of oil will not last indefinitely. A recent survey of studies of recoverable crude oil argues that world oil production is likely to peak somewhere between the years 2007 and 2014, and this conclusion does not assume any political events that will interrupt production.33 Energy could be a front-page issue again before long. Solar energy - or renewable energy, as such sources are usually called now - has the potential to be a major part of the world's energy sources as fossil fuels decline in production. As we will see, advocates have long depicted renewables as the resource that will enable the continuation of industrial civilization after the era of fossil fuels, and a recent spate of books and studies have updated and promoted that conclusion. Private analysts, solar and environmental advocates, government agencies such as the fomier Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, and some industry groups argue vigorously that renewable energy will be the cornerstone of future energy systems.34 Thus, understanding the history and dynamics of solar energy policy is important for understanding the possible changes in a technological system of great importance, now and in the future. Energy policy mostly focuses on existing sources of energy, their accompanying technological ensembles, and the conflicts of their associated regional economic and political interests. For example, the coal industry for years opposed increasing the quotas of imported residual fuel oil, typically used for home heating, into the United States, fearing that such imports would cut into their market share.35 In this type of conflict, well-established economic interests argue over policies that would affect their shares of wealth and income. The technologies and market structures involved are mature, the various interests have close, long-term relations to government agencies, and everyone acts as if they have a clear idea of which policies will advance their economic interests and which ones will not. In contrast, policy debates over solar energy are arguments over the shape of a large future technological system. Such policies necessarily confront immense uncertainties about interests and outcomes. This class of policies affects, in addition to energy, many of the most consequential technological systems of our time, including environmentally clean manufacturing, rapid changes in agriculture wrought by advances in biotechnology, and the linkages and developments in telecommunications and information technologies. Policies that governments adopt now will influence billions of dollars of investment in complex technological systems that will become constitutive parts of our society for years to come. The approach I take to this case thereby provides insights for analyzing some of these other issues. CRITIQUE OF THE POLICY-MAKING PROCESS Those who wish to challenge prevailing public policy must be able to challenge the sets of ideas that underlie the status quo. A democratic technology policy cannot content itself with giving citizens a set of cookie-cutter choices but must instead empower them to contest the underlying judgements and ideas that constitute those choices.36 Woodhouse and Collingridge stress that intelligent democratic processes must take into account the views of diverse partisans, lest unwise policies go unchallenged. Clearly, partisans who cannot challenge institutionalized ideas have very little scope for challenging policies in general. Hajer argues persuasively that substantial changes in policy require the dominance of new discourse coalitions, which entails institutionalizing new ideas.37 Langdon Winner addresses the problem that philosophical and other theoretical analyses seem to have little effect on the technologies that our societies produce, even when some actors in the system recognize that ethical and other normative issues will be greatly affected by the new technologies. Winner concludes that "the trouble is not that we lack good arguments and theories, but rather that modern politics simply does not provide appropriate roles and institutions in which the goal of defining the common good in technology policy is a legitimate project."38 This study takes Winner's critique seriously and asks why various technology policy processes, including those that provide channels through which advocates can participate, do not provide the deliberative institutions and roles that Winner calls for. In constructing technologies we do construct our future, and so our policies for the future, if they are to be democratic, require that citizens be able to challenge the institutionalized ideas that underlie the status quo.

Topicality is sufficient – resolution is the only predictable standard – any other violation is arbitrary and short-circuits the neg

Rigged debates – The framework constraints of 70s energy policy disguised the normative commitments of path choices. The artificial FRAMEWORK constraints empirically worked to RIG DEBATES
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J U.S. energy policy makers held remarkably consistent normative and technical ideas (sometimes called values and beliefs) about energy technologies lor over three decades. Both types of ideas shaped the problem frame that officials used in thinking about energy policy. Policy elites ^who thought about the future and about new energy sources conceptualized their problems in terms of economic benefits and national secu' rity. Notions of economic benefits changed over time, from the idea that energy should be chcap to promote maximum economic growth to more refined notions that energy markets ought to be efficient to get optimal economic performance. Nonetheless, both notions point to getting energy at the lowest possible price. Discussions of national security emphasized importing oil from sources that would not be interrupted by political acts. Precisely how policy makers expressed their values and beliefs depended on the contingent circumstances iu which they found themselves, but both sets of dominant ideas made for a problem definition that greatly disadvantaged solar advocates. Because of its high market prices, solar was hardpressed to compete with fossil fuels, and because of its diffuse nature, it did not fit into the existing energy production system the way nuclear power promised to do. Although policy makers began to include an assortment of environmental protection values into their frames, that did little to alter the situation^ ' In addition, normative and technical ideas interacted in complex ways, and the boundary between them was ambiguous and contested.1 For example, consider the apparently empirical notion held by a White House aide about the infeasibility of solar energy as a major energy " source. As cited in the previous chapter, this aide took from a discussion k. with Congressman Mike McCormack what the aide called a "Solar fact" , that getting one percent of rhe country's total energy from solar would require converting ten percent of all houses to solar, and would cost S70-105 billion.2 The aide called this a "fact," the most solidly empirical of appellations. And yet. contained within this alleged fact were a number of normative and questionable empirical assumptions. It assumed empirically that the price of solar systems would not go down much. It also assumed normatively that the United States should remain a very high-consumption society, which in itself contains assumptions about the technological possibilities for energy efficiency and rhe normative desirability of ever-increasing material consumption. Changes m any of these underlying ideas would change rhis apparently simple "fact." At a more aggregate level of policy discussions, the normative and empirical ideas became just as enmeshed. As I showed in Chapter 5, Nixon administration officials regarded high levels of energy consumption as normatively desirable, as indicators of a good and progressive society.' The empirical fact of high energy consumption became a normative standard. Thus the official energy policy frame made sustaining and enlarging that consumption more than just preserving the empirical status quo; growing energy consumption was a valued social goal, nor just an empirical fact. This problem frame stacked the odds against solar energy in normative as well as empirical terms. By this normative standard. the sorts of technological changes rhar would most cnhance solar energy's prospects, particularly large improvements in energy efficiency, look normatively undesirable, whatever their technical feasibility. Conventional energy policy analysts held these intertwined empirical and normative goals deeply, as shown by their bitter attacks on Amory Lovins when he challenged that problem frame, as detailed in Chapter J l or thirty-five years solar advocates presented their technologies that used a variety of renewable energy sources as a way to exploit a vast, inexhaustible, but diffuse, resource. Most of them for most of the period did not think that creating a solar society entailed significant social or political change. Hoyt Hottel, Maria Telkes, Farrington Daniels, and rhc other early solar pioneers of the 1940s and 1950s all soughr to make solar affordable, largely with the assumption rhat it would plug into the existing energy systems, replacing fossil fuels, and enabling socicty and polity to continue functioning as before, with greater security and, perhaps, less pollution. Most of them saw no contradiction in promoting research and development in both solar and nuclcar power, or solar and synthetic fuels, and their only complaint was that nuclcar got an unfairly large portion of federal subsidies. A few of them, such as Daniels and Eugene Ayers, sometimes hinted that a substantial changc in such a major technological system would affect more than how one heated a room or lit a lamp. Bur for most of these advocates, solar energy technology offered just another way of securing tlie status quo against the end of fossil fuels. They sought a new technological system to prevent the social changes that would accompany scarcity. By the 1970s a new type of solar advocate emerged. These activists came to the technology from a part of the environmental movement that believed that the fundamental structures of society and politics - those concerned with industrial and agricultural production, housing, settlemenr patterns, and transportation - were, in some deep sense, flawed.4 These ecological advocates did not simply want any and all solar technologies. They sought technologies that would reinforce and be more compatible with a qualitatively different society and politics, one in which ecological sustainability and local community self-reliance would displace increasing ecological damage, bureaucratic centralization, and anomic. For them, making a drastic change in the energy technology system would l>c akin to making a legislative change for all of society.5 Whether the technologies they sought would have given them the society that they desired is not the point here. Rather, the point is that their social goals and ideas about technology as a social force led them to a very different framing of the energy problem and solar's role in it. Within their problem frame, solar was not only a feasible solution to the energy problem, it was the only desirable solution, rhe only energy technology ensemble that would encourage and strengthen the sorr of society thar they desired. In their frame, issues such as high initial costs and an immature industry were problems to be solved, not barriers to policy. This shared meaning of solar energy technologies bound together ecological advocates as a social group and drove their choices, leading them to champion smaller, more decentralized solar technologies and to reject schemes like the solar-powered satellites." The problem frame that came out of this meaning led them to regard problems like costs as secondary considerations, just the opposite of conventional frames. Top-level policy makers never shared thar framing of the problem or the normative values that went with it. Their public pronouncements and written internal debates show no hint that they ever even considered rhis alternative problem frame and set of values. The presidents and their top aides - in every administration - talked about energy almost exclusively in economic and national security terms, with occasional references to narrowly construed environmental values. Even in rhc Carter administration, no oiK' outside of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) gave any sign that they even thought about some of the more radical alternatives, and they never committed them to paper, suggesting thar such ideas were nor welcome in policy deliberations. These facts suggest a new inrcrprctarion of solar energy policy, particularly its rapid rise and fall in the 1970s. The conventional explanations for energy policy and solar's failure to establish itself within ir do not explain all of the events recounted here. It was not enough that solar was expensive and its future costs were uncertain. That could bosaid of all future energy technologies, including nuclcar energy. And it f. was not enough that the Reagan administration was ideologically hostile to solar energy. Solar advocates began losing their battles for support while President Carter was still 111 officc, and the ideological explanation „ begs the question of why Reagan and his people evinced such hostility to solar energy. The association of solar energy with the ecological wing of the solar movement was a phenomenon of the 1970s, not what one mighr have predicted in the 1950s or 1960s. Perhaps most importantly, the events analyzed here require us to reexamine the pluralist account of solar energy policy. Pluralism must, to explain events adequately, incorporate the importance of ideas, normative and empirical, being institutionalized into official problem framesy SOLAR ADVOCATES' LIMITED INFLUENCE ON POLICY ("Standard notions of American pluralism claim that any organized interest group can influence public policy by mobilizing rhe appropriate polit- / ical resources, such as votes, money, public opinion, and the like. From ^ this perspective one can evaluate a group's influence or effectiveness by ^ the extent to which it gets those policy outcomes that it desires. By thar measure, rhe solar movement, particularly the ecological wing of it, ^ appeared very powerful and effective for a brief period in the late 1970s. '' The question is why it both rose and then fell with such speed. The advocates pushing solar energy did not suddenly lose public support or their ability to argue their case.\* Instead, the values that ecological advocates / asstxiatcd with solar energy and the solar movement were in stark contrast to the conceptualization of the energy policy problem by top-level , decision makers. The official problem frame, and the values thar drove it, did not change, despite the considerable efforts of the solar movement to argue for an alternative. Thus the history of solar energy policy presents anomalies to pluralism. Prior to rhc energy crisis, prominent scientists, engineers, and businessmen advocated for solar energy, beginning after World War II and continuing for over twenty years. Wcll-placcd wirhin the rcchnical, government, and business community, these advocates should have been influential among important policy analysts and makers. On numerous occasions they were able to make their case to legislative and executivebranch officials, including some cabinet secretaries, members of the House and Senate, and, in a few instances, ro the president via his top aides. Many of the advocates spoke with the authority of impeccable technical credentials, exemplified by Farrington Daniels, a veteran of the Manhattan Project, member of the National Academy of Sciences, and president of the American Chemical Society. By the middle 1950s such advocacy became formalized with the creation of the Association for Applied Solar Energy (later becoming the International Solar Energy Society and the American Solar Energy Society), broadening solar's constituency to include business people, bankers, and so on. So why were these groups not more successful? Part of the explanation certainly lies in unfortunate contingent circumstances, such as President Truman's firing Interior Secretary Julius Krug only weeks after Krug had decided to launch a very large solar energy research program. Part of the explanation lies in unpropitious structural circumstances, such as the steady drclinc in energy prices in rhe 1950s and 1960s. And parr of the explanation lies in traditional interest group analysis. Solar energy did not have the same level of business, scientific, military, or congressional support that nuclear power enjoyed. But these factors do not constitute an adequate explanation. To develop a better one 1 have focused on recent policy literature that argues for the importance of ideas, both empirical and normative, in shaping and changing public policy. The case study itself - the history of solar energy policy - demonstrates the importance of ideas, particularly the importance of institutionalizing new problem frames and rhc technical and normative ideas that go with them. Absent institutionalizing new ideas, substantial, sustained changes in policy remain unlikely. Prior to the energy crisis, most energy policy concerned disputes between diffcrcnr fuels and rhc different regions of rhc country thar produced and consumed them. With policy makers accepting a problem frame based in such disputes, solar energy had little to offer cxccpr as a possible alternative in the distant future. However, since analysts and policy makers expected future energy demand to be immense, it seemed that future alternatives needed to produce large quantities of bulk energy, a task for which most people considered nuclear power to be better equipped. Policy advisors did frequently note that the governmenr underfunded solar R&D, especially compared to nuclear power, bur, absent a pressing crisis, nuclear s better fir wirh existing problem frames, along with its greater political resources, kept the subsidies flowing, while solar only got research targeted to auxiliary goals, such as NASA's funding for the development of photovoltaics for use on its satellites. The beginnings of the energy crisis in 1970-1971 coincided with the rise of institutionalized environmental protection values in the form of new legislation and the Environmental Protection Agency to implement that legislation. Those ideas had some effect on energy policy, but not enough to put solar energy at ccntcr stage. Nonetheless, Presidents Nixon and l ord began pouring money into all alternative forms of energy. including solar, quickly increasing solar R&I) budgets, sometimes as a response to Congressional initiatives. That said, the definition of the energy problem, the way it was framed, as discussed at length in earlier chapters, changed little, merely acquiring a sense of urgency from the energy crisis. Solar energy policy in the Carter administration shows the difference between successfully pressuring for a policy and successfully institutionalizing a new set of beliefs and values associated with some technology. Those years marked the time when the solar movement was the closest it ever came to being a mainstream movement, claiming to provide a feasible solution to an urgent problem. At rhc very time that solar technologies were commanding increasing resources, the ecological wing ol the solar movement became increasingly influential in policy circles. The Solar Lobby and related groups began to form a very effective pressure group for solar energy, and they clearly got most of what rhev wanted out of Carter's solar Domestic Policy Review process. But ir is equally clear that high-level policy makers never took the advocates' values or framing of the problem seriously. The advocates' political and social issues were never part of official discourse or debate. Even advocates' particular conceptions of environmental concerns never penetrated discussions in the White House. Policy makers simply never accepted, at least not in writing or in policy, the notion that the environmental problems related to energy suggested a deeper critique of existing energy, social, and political systems.

There’s still ground – solar bad, incentives bad or USfg is a bad starting point are offense if they’re impacted in terms of the efficacy of our counterfactual

And, this ground is better – there is more predictable literature analyzing past policies – presentist debate makes unpredictability inevitable as terrible, one-round new affirmatives that purposefully dodge the core of the topic – Hindsight bias is a negative argument – it’s guaranteed uniqueness for disads and Historical justifications for or explanations of history AS IT HAPPENED instead of counterfactually are more plentiful

We solve limits – infinite number of future policies, only a few VITAL historical decisionpoints

COUNTERFACTUALS ARE INEVITABLE AND INCREASE NEG GROUND – policy, economics and the law requires counterfactuals and there’s historical and empirical data on our aff

**Scott ’95** David K. Scott is a Professor of Communication Studies at Northeastern State University. “Debating Historical Propositions,” http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/detail?accno=ED383004

Based on the temporal frame of these hypothetical resolutions, affirmative and negatives burdens change. For the Vietnam resolution, the affirmative would be bounded by the historical policies followed by the Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon administrations. Claims could be empirical or probabilistic. Empirical claims would be verifiable in terms of historical data. Probabilistic claims would be speculative in nature. Negative claims could point to "actual" disadvantages stemming from the affirmative policy. Additional negative claims could speculate on policy alternatives. For example, the affirmative could argue the "domino theory" that all countries in southeast Asia would have fallen to the communists if not for US intervention. This claim is an example of a counterfactual conditional. This proposition takes the generic form "If it had been the case that C (or not C), it would have been the case that E (or not E)" (Fearon, 1991, p. 169). Debating historical propositions would entail extensive use of counterfactual logic. Historical analysis inherently involves a level of counterfactual reasoning. Murphy (1969) argues that "counterfactuals were an essential method of historians; these were by their nature (are) unverifiable propositions" (p. 15). The fact that they are unverifiable has led to criticism of counterfactuals as a form of logic. Thus, standards need to be applied in the assessment of counterfactual scenarios. Standards for Debating Historical Propositions? It should be noted that counterfactuals are a common model of logic. Their use transcends both specialized and general argumentative fields. Counterfactuals are commonly used in a variety of scholarly disciplines. Fearon (1991) states that "scholars in comparative politics and international relations routinely evaluate causal hypotheses by discussing or simply referring to counterfactual cases in which a hypothesized causal factor is supposed to have been absent" (p. 169). Conterfactual reasoning is common in legal argumentation. Counterfactual thinking is related to plaintiff compensation. In this context, "jurors are presented alternative event scenarios by the opposing parties" (Bothwell & Duhon, 1994, p. 705). Research indicates that there was a significant relationship between counterfactual thinking and plaintiff compensation (Miller & McFarland, 1986; Bothwell & Duhon, 1994). Counterfactuals are common to the study of economics. Murphy (1969) argues: that we cannot judge any economic policy without counterfactuals, we cannot estimate consumer surplus, we cannot calculate the effects of a tax or a subsidy, the removal of international trade barriers, indeed we cannot judge any recommendation to change the status-quo unless we consider the alternative state of affairs. (p. 18) Counterfactuals are also common in generalized fields of argumentation. Landman and Manis (1992) found "that personally relevant counterfactual thought is commonly engaged in by people outside the laboratory" (p. 476). Roese (1994) argues that "the ability to imagine alternative, or counterfactual, versions of actual events appears to be a pervasive, perhaps even essential, feature of human consciousness" (p. 805). Given the widespread use of counterfactuals, evaluation of counterfactuals can be extrapolated from existing standards. Meyer and Conrad (1957) argue that even though "counterfactuals cannot be directly tested, it is possible to consider the statement within a valid deductive system, independently of the acknowledged falsity of the conditional clause" (p. 540). Such a derivation is clearly an intuitive one and is not a matter of formal logic (Murphy, 1969).

Theory not the team – they only have offense to our INTERPRETATION of a topical plan

Structural limits – DoE creation and solvency advocates check counterfactual explosion

## Nietzsche

Tech determinism turns the alt – cedes agency to technological progress and makes value contingent upon sweet new tech

#### A Politics of contingency is key to successfully actualize Nietzsche’s philosophy

Newman 2000

Saul, Postdoctoral Fellow at Macquarie University, Doctorate in Political Science from the University of New South Wales, "Anarchism and the Politics of Ressentiment," Theory & Event, 4:3

Rather than having an external enemy -- like the State -- in opposition to which one's political identity is formed, we must work on ourselves. As political subjects we must overcome ressentiment by transforming our relationship with power. One can only do this, according to Nietzsche, through eternal return. To affirm eternal return is to acknowledge and indeed positively affirm the continual 'return' of same life with its harsh realities. Because it is an active willing of nihilism, it is at the same time a transcendence of nihilism. Perhaps in the same way, eternal return refers to power. We must acknowledge and affirm the 'return' of power, the fact that it will always be with us. To overcome ressentiment we must, in other words, will power. We must affirm a will to power -- in the form of creative, life-affirming values, according to Nietzsche.[56] This is to accept the notion of 'self-overcoming'.[57] To 'overcome' oneself in this sense, would mean an overcoming of the essentialist identities and categories that limit us. As Foucault has shown, we are constructed as essential political subjects in ways that that dominate us -- this is what he calls subjectification.[58] We hide behind essentialist identities that deny power, and produce through this denial, a Manichean politics of absolute opposition that only reflects and reaffirms the very domination it claims to oppose. This we have seen in the case of anarchism. In order to avoid this Manichean logic, anarchism must no longer rely on essentialist identities and concepts, and instead positively affirm the eternal return of power. This is not a grim realization but rather a 'happy positivism'. It is characterized by political strategies aimed at minimizing the possibilities of domination, and increasing the possibilities for freedom. If one rejects essentialist identities, what is one left with? Can one have a notion of radical politics and resistance without an essential subject? One might, however, ask the opposite question: how can radical politics continue without 'overcoming' essentialist identities, without, in Nietzsche's terms, 'overcoming' man? Nietzsche says: "The most cautious people ask today: 'How may man still be preserved?' Zarathustra, however, asks as the sole and first one to do so: 'How shall man be overcome?'"[59] I would argue that anarchism would be greatly enhanced as a political and ethical philosophy if it eschewed essentialist categories, leaving itself open to different and contingent identities -- a post-anarchism. To affirm difference and contingency would be to become a philosophy of the strong, rather than the weak. Nietzsche exhorts us to 'live dangerously', to do away with certainties, to break with essences and structures, and to embrace uncertainty. "Build your cities on the slopes of Vesuvius! Send your ships into unchartered seas!" he says.[60] The politics of resistance against domination must take place in a world without guarantees. To remain open to difference and contingency, to affirm the eternal return of power, would be to become what Nietzsche calls the superman or Overman. The overman is man 'overcome' -- the overcoming of man: "God has died: now we desire -- that the Superman shall live."[61] For Nietzsche the Superman replaces God and Man -- it comes to redeem a humanity crippled by nihilism, joyously affirming power and eternal return. However I would like to propose a somewhat gentler, more ironic version of the Superman for radical politics. Ernesto Laclau speaks of "a hero of a new type who still has not been created by our culture, but one whose creation is absolutely necessary if our time is going to live up to its most radical and exhilarating possibilities."[62] Perhaps anarchism could become a new 'heroic' philosophy, which is no longer reactive but, rather, creates values. For instance, the ethic of mutual care and assistance propounded by Kropotkin could perhaps be utilized in the construction of new forms of collective action and identities. Kropotkin looked at the development of collective groups based on cooperation -- trade unions, associations of all kinds, friendly societies and clubs, etc.[63] As we have seen, he believed this to be the unfolding of an essential natural principle. However, perhaps one could develop this collectivist impulse without circumscribing it in essentialist ideas about human nature. Collective action does not need a principle of human essence to justify it. Rather it is the contingency of identity -- its openness to difference, to singularity, to individuality and collectivity -- that is itself ethical. So the anarchist ethics of mutual aid may be taken from its essentialist foundations and applied to a non-essentialist, constitutively open idea of collective political identity. An alternative conception of collective action may for instance, be developed from a re-articulation of the relationship between equality and freedom. To anarchism's great credit it rejected the liberal conviction that equality and freedom act as limits upon each other and are ultimately irreconcilable concepts. For anarchists, equality and freedom are inextricably related impulses, and one cannot conceive of one without the other. For Bakunin: I am free only when all human beings surrounding me -- men and women alike -- are equally free. The freedom of others, far from limiting or negating my liberty, is on the contrary its necessary condition and confirmation. I become free in the true sense only by virtue of the liberty of others, so much so that the greater the number of free people surrounding me the deeper and greater and more extensive their liberty, the deeper and larger becomes my liberty.[64] The inter-relatedness of equality and liberty may form the basis of a new collective ethos, which refuses to see individual freedom and collective equality as limits on each other -- which refuses to sacrifice difference in the name of universality, and universality in the name of difference. Foucault's anti-strategic ethics may be seen as an example of this idea. In his defence of collective movements like the Iranian revolution, Foucault said that the anti-strategic ethics he adopts is "to be respectful when something singular arises, to be intransigent when power offends against the universal."[65] This anti-strategic approach condemns universalism when it is disdainful of the particular, and condemns particularism when it is at the expense of the universal. Similarly, a new ethics of collective action would condemn collectivity when it is at the expense of difference and singularity, and condemn difference when it is at the expense of collectivity. It is an approach that allows one to combine individual difference and collective equality in a way which is not dialectical but which retains a certain positive and life-affirming antagonism between them. It would imply a notion of respect for difference, without encroaching on the freedom of others to be different -- an equality of freedom of difference. Post-anarchist collective action would, in other words, be based on a commitment to respect and recognize autonomy, difference and openness within collectivity. Furthermore, perhaps one could envisage a form of political community or collective identity that did not restrict difference. The question of community is central to radical politics, including anarchism. One cannot talk about collective action without at least posing the question of community. For Nietzsche, most modern radical aspirations towards community were a manifestation of the 'herd' mentality. However it may be possible to construct a ressentiment-free notion of community from Nietzsche's own concept of power. For Nietzsche, active power is the individual's instinctive discharge of his forces and capacities which produces in him an enhanced sensation of power, while reactive power, as we have seen, needs an external object to act on and define itself in opposition to.[66] Perhaps one could imagine a form of community based on active power. For Nietzsche this enhanced feeling of power may be derived from assistance and benevolence towards others, from enhancing the feeling of power of others.[67] Like the ethics of mutual aid, a community based on will to power may be composed of a series of inter-subjective relations that involve helping and caring for people without dominating them and denying difference. This openness to difference and self-transformation, and the ethic of care, may be the defining characteristics of the post-anarchist democratic community. This would be a community of active power -- a community of 'masters' rather than 'slaves'.[68] It would be a community that sought to overcome itself -- continually transforming itself and revelling in the knowledge of its power to do so. Post-anarchism may be seen, then, as a series of politico-ethical strategies against domination, without essentialist guarantees and Manichean structures that condition and restrict classical anarchism. It would affirm the contingency of values and identities, including its own, and affirm, rather than deny, will to power. It would be, in other words, an anarchism without ressentiment.

#### Our examination of the interplay of historical events and resistance to suffering is fundamental to celebrating life – refusal denies our being-in-the-world and creates misery
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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!’ 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.
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We now turn to the heart of the matter, the role of "external goods" in the good human life. And here we encounter a rather large surprise. There is no philosopher in the modern Western tradition who is more emphatic than Nietzsche is about the central importance of the body, and about the fact that we are bodily creatures. Again and again he charges Christian and Platonist moralities with making a false separation between our spiritual and our physical nature; against them, he insists that we are physical through and through. The surprise is that, having said so much and with such urgency, he really is very loathe to draw the conclusion that is naturally suggested by his position: that human beings need worldly goods in order to function. In all of Nietzsche's rather abstract and romantic praise of solitude and asceticism, we find no grasp of the simple truth that a hungry person cannot think well; that a person who lacks shelter, basic health care, and the basic necessities of life, is not likely to become a great philosopher or artist, no matter what her innate equipment. The solitude Nietzsche describes is comfortable bourgeois solitude, whatever its pains and loneli- ness. Who are his ascetic philosophers? "Heraclitus, Plato. Descartes, Spi- noza, Leibniz, Kant, Schopenhauer"—none a poor person, none a person who had to perform menial labor in order to survive. And because Nietzsche does not grasp the simple fact that if our abilities are physical abilities they have physical necessary conditions, he does not understand what the democratic and socialist movements of his day were all about. The pro-pity tradition, from Homer on, understood that one functions badly if one is hungry, that one thinks badly if one has to labor all day in work that does not involve the fully human use of one's faculties. I have suggested that such thoughts were made by Rousseau the basis for the modern development of democratic-socialist thinking. Since Nietzsche does not get the basic idea, he docs not see what socialism is trying to do. Since he probably never saw or knew an acutely hungry person, or a person performing hard physical labor, he never asked how human self-command is affected by such forms of life. And thus he can proceed as if it does not matter how people live front day to day, how they get their food. Who provides basic welfare support for Zarathustra? What are the "higher men" doing all the day long? The reader docs not know and the author does not seem to care. Now Nietzsche himself obviously was not a happy man. He was lonely, in bad health, scorned by many of his contemporaries. And yet, there still is a distinction to be drawn between the sort of vulnerability that Nietzsche's life contained and the sort we find if we examine the lives of truly impov- erished and hungry people. We might say. simplifying things a bit, that there are two sorts of vulnerability: what we might call bourgeois vulnerabil- ity—for example, the pains of solitude, loneliness, bad reputation, some ill health, pains that are painful enough but still compatible with thinking and doing philosophy—and what we might call basic vulnerability, which is a deprivation of resources so central to human functioning that thought and character are themselves impaired or not developed. Nietzsche, focuv ing on the first son of vulnerability, holds that it is not so bad; it may even be good for the philosopher.\*® The second sort. I claim, he simply ne- glects—believing, apparently, that even a beggar can be a Stoic hero, if only socialism does not inspire him with weakness.5"

#### We control uniqueness – meaning isn’t doomed, it’s just transient – we should stop suffering when we can

Mitchell Smolkin, doctor who specializes in depression, Understanding Pain, 1989 p75-79

For Camus, the absurdity of the human condition consists in the incongruity between what humans naturally desire, and the reality of the world. Humans naturally desire not to be injured and killed. They desire to understand life and to find meaning in living. They desire to feel at home in the universe. Despite these natural needs, [humanity] man is confronted with a silent universe that does not answer human questions about meaning. He is surrounded by irrational destructiveness, and by the spectre of suffering and pain hurtling out of the void capriciously at human recipients with no regard for their relative merits. Man is estranged from a universe which seems so antagonistic to his natural needs. He feels homeless, in exile, a stranger in his own land. He [Humanity] hears his “nights and days filled always, everywhere with the eternal cry of human pain.”56 Man has been “sentenced, for an unknown crime to an indeterminate period of punishment. And while a good many people adapted themselves to confinement and carried out their humdrum lives as before, there were others who rebelled, and whose one idea was to break loose from the prison house.” Like Ivan Karamozov (Bk V, Chap 4), Camus refuses to accept the idea that future goods such as Divine salvation or eternal happiness “can compensate for a single moment of human suffering,”57 or a child’s tears. Both Ivan Karamozov and Camus believe that “if evil is essential to Divine creation, then creation is unacceptable.” They wish to replace “the reign of grace by the reign of justice.”58 They both assert that no good man would accept salvation on these terms. “There is no possible salvation for the man who feels real compassion,” because he would side with the damned and for their sake reject eternity.59 What is to be gained by rebellion, what are its dangers, and how does one avoid merely “beating the sea with rods” in a nihilistic orgy? With great perceptiveness, Camus discusses these issues in The Rebel. He begins by outlining the entire history of nihilistic rebellion. He admits that once God is declared dead and life meaningless, there is the tendency to rebel in anger by engaging in irrational acts of violence and destruction. Andre Breton has written that the simplest surrealistic act consists “in going out in the Street, revolver in hand, and shooting at random into the crowd.”6° Camus cites “the struggle between the will to be and the desire for annihilation, between the yes and the no, which we have discovered again and again at every stage of rebellion.”61 Citing numerous historical examples, he continually warns against this degeneration of rebellion into crime and murder. Another danger of rebellion which Camus discusses is the sub- stitution of human gods and concepts of salvation for the dead God. This error is more subtle than shooting at random into the crowd, but leads to much more killing and human suffering than the nihilist sniper. Camus criticizes “Nietzsche, at least in his theory of super-humanity, and Marx before him, with his classless society, [who] both replace The Beyond by the Later On.”62 In this respect, these thinkers have not abandoned the notion that history marches toward redemption in which some messianic goal will be realized. Camus urges moderation in the quest for distant goals. He writes, “the absolute is not attained nor, above all, created through history. Politics is not religion, or if it is, then it is nothing but the inquisition.”63 He contrasts rebellion, which he applauds with revolution which leads to murder in the name of vague future goals. “Revolution consists in loving[those] a man who does not yet exist,” and in murdering [those] men who do exist.64 “He who dedicates himself to this history, dedicates himself to nothing, and in his turn is nothing.”65 In The Plague, the character Tarrou renounces his revolutionary past. He states, For many years I’ve been ashamed, mortally ashamed of having been, even with the best intentions, even at many removes, a murderer in my turn. . . All I maintain is that on this earth there are pestilences and there are victims, and its up to us, so far as possible, not to join forces with the pestil- ences.66 Though obviously attuned to the dangers of rebellion, he insists that “these consequences are in no way due to rebellion itself, or at least they occur to the extent that the rebel forgets his original purpose.”67 What is the original purpose that has been forgotten? Rebellion begins because the rebel denounces the lack of justice in the world. He denounces the idea that the end, whether it be the coming of the messianic age, or the revo- lution, or eternal bliss, justifies means which involve so much suffering. Once injustice and suffering are denounced, [people] man needs to exert all his effort against injustice and in solidarity with the sufferers in the world. Killing existing men for a questionable future good, would not be a rational method of exhibi ting solidarity with the sufferers. Nor would solidarity be shown by stoical acceptance of the status quo. Camus urges his rebels to renounce murder completely and work for justice and for a decrease in suffering. Like Dr. Rieux in The Plague, one should take the victim’s side and “share with his fellow citizens the only certitude they have in common—love, exile, suffering.”68 What can be accomplished through rebellion? Camus’ goals are modest. He realizes that the rebel is doomed to “a never ending defeat,”69 in that death, finitude and suffering will always conquer him. He realizes that after [humanity] man has mastered everything in creation that can be mastered and rectified everything that can be rectified, children will still die unjustly even in a perfect society. Even by his greatest effort man can only purpose to diminish arithmetically the sufferings of the world. But the injustice and the suffering will remain and, no matter how limited they are, they will not cease to be an outrage.7° However, there are ephemeral victories and rewards for the rebel. He [One] who dedicates [oneself] himself for the duration of his life to the house he builds, to the dignity of [hu]mankind, dedicates himself the earth and reaps from it the harvest that sows its seed and sustains the world again and again. Those whose desires are limited to man and his humble yet formidable love, should enter, if only now and then, into their reward. They know that if there is one thing one can always yearn for and sometimes attain, it is human love. Society must be arranged to limit injustice and suffering as much as possible so that each individual has the leisure and freedom to pursue his own search for meaning. Future utopias must be renounced, and “history can no longer be presented as an object of worship.”74 “It is time to forsake our age and its adolescent furies,” and to aim for what is possible—more justice, solidarity, and love among [people] men. The rebel must “reject divinity in order to share in the struggles and destiny of all men.”75 Redemption is impossible. Human dignity and love can intermittently be achieved with struggle and constant vigilance against the plague bacillus that “never dies or disappears for good. .. [but can] rouse up its rats again and send them forth to die in a happy city.”76

#### Altruism is evolutionary, not social

Martin A. Nowak 11, Professor of Biology and of Mathematics at Harvard University and Director of Harvard's Program for Evolutionary Dynamics, SuperCooperators, googlebooks

Scientists from a wide range of disciplines have attempted for more than a century to explain how cooperation, altruism, and self-sacrifice arose in our dog-eat-dog world. Darwin himself was troubled by selfless behavior. Yet in his great works, the problem of cooperation was a sideshow, a detail that had to be explained away. That attitude prevails among many biologists even today.

In stark contrast, I believe that our ability to cooperate goes hand in hand with succeeding in the struggle to survive, as surmised more than a century ago by Peter Kropotkin (1842-1921), the Russian prince and anarchist communist who believed that a society freed from the shackles of government would thrive on communal enterprise. In Mutual Aid (1902), Kropotkin wrote: “Besides the law of Mutual Struggle there is in Nature the law of Mutual Aid, which, for the success of the struggle for life, and especially for the progressive evolution of the species, is far more important than the law of mutual contest. This suggestion…was, in reality, nothing but a further development of the ideas expressed by Darwin himself.”

I have spent more than two decades cooperating with many great minds to solve the mystery of how natural selection can lead to mutual aid, so that competition turns into cooperation. I have introduced some new ideas to this well-explored field and refined this mix with my own specialty, which relies on blending mathematics and biology. My studies show that cooperation is entirely compatible with the hard-boiled arithmetic of survival in an unremittingly cold-eyed and competitive environment. Based on mathematical insights, I have created idealized communities in a computer and charted the conditions in which cooperation can take hold and bloom. My confidence in what I have found has been bolstered by research on a wide range of species, from bugs to people. In light of all this work, I have now pinned down five basic mechanisms for cooperation. The way that we human beings collaborate is as clearly described by mathematics as the descent of the apple that once fell in Newton’s garden.

These mechanisms tell us much about the way the world works. They reveal, for example, that your big brain evolved to cope with gossip, not the other way around; that your guts have cone-like glands to fend off that potentially deadly breakdown of cellular cooperation that we know as cancer; that you are more generous if you sense that you are being watched (even if you are not); that the fewer friends you have, the more strongly your fate is bound to theirs; genes may not be that selfish, after all; if you are a cooperator, you will find yourself surrounded by other cooperators so that what you reap is what you sow; no matter what we do, empires will always decline and fall; and to succeed in life, you need to work together – pursuing the struggle for existence, if you like – just as much as you strive to win the struggle for existence. In this way, the quest to understand cooperation has enabled us to capture the essence of all kinds of living, breathing, red-blooded evolving processes.

Cooperation – not competition – underpins innovation. To spur creativity, and to encourage people to come up with original ideas, you need to use the lure of the carrot, not fear of the stick. Cooperation is the architect of creativity throughout evolution, from cells to multi-cellular creates to anthills to villages to cities. Without cooperation there can neither construction nor complexity in evolution.

I can derive everyday insights – as well as many unexpected ones – from mathematical and evolutionary models of cooperation. While the idea that the trajectory of spears, cannonballs, and planets can be traced out by equations is familiar, I find it extraordinary that we can also use mathematics to map out the trajectory of evolution. And, of course, it is one thing to know how to foster cooperation but it is quite another to explain why an action helps us get along with each other and to what extent. The mathematical exploration of these mechanisms enables us to do this with profound understanding and with precision too. This is proof, as if we need it, that math is universal.

In the following chapters I will explain the origins of each mechanism of cooperation and interweave this train of thought with my own intellectual journey, one that began in Vienna and then continued to Oxford, Princeton, and now Harvard. En route, I have had the honor to cooperate with many brilliant scientists and mathematicians. Two of them proved particularly inspirational: Karl Sigmund and Robert May, for reasons that will become clear. I have also had to enlist the help of computer programs, students willing to play games, and various funding bodies, from foundations to philanthropists. It is a lovely and intoxicating thought that a high degree of cooperation is required to understand cooperation. And to further underline this powerful idea, this book is also a feat of cooperation between Roger Highfield and myself.

The implications of this new understanding of cooperation are profound. Previously, there were only two basic principles of evolution – mutation and selection – where the former generates genetic diversity and the latter picks the individuals that are best suited to a given environment. For us to understand the creative aspects of evolution, we must now accept that cooperation is the third principle. For selection you need mutation and, in the same way, for cooperation you need both selection and mutation. From cooperation can emerge the constructive side of evolution, from genes to organisms to language and complex social behaviors. Cooperation is the master architect of evolution.

No link – they assume we lament Reagan’s solar reversal and use that as emotional fuel for a new revolution – that’s not our argument – RATHER we analyze the implications of reversing key decisions on energy politics to create new tactics and understandings of energy.

Prefer the specificity of our evidence – even if politics in the abstract should be ahistorical, energy debates are stagnant because of a refusal to examine the institutional history that frames them

Energy counterfactuals key to contest technological Darwinism and progressivism

Madrigal 11

Powering the Dream

Alexis Madrigal is a senior editor at The Atlantic, where he oversees the Technology channel. He's the author of Powering the Dream: The History and Promise of Green Technology.

f~As my research continued. 1 found the s.x imllion wmumms o. u.c prairies, the California wave motor era/.: of the 1890s, the dectric cars of the early 1900s. the solar home boom of mid-century, the worlds hrst megawatt wind turbine, which went online in 1941, the oil company ij contribution to photovoltalcs, decades-old algal biodiesel programs, and the huge solar farm of the Reagan years. Hie history was long and deep, but criminally obscure. Its under' standable; victors don't only write the history in military battles. The popular view of technology is that the best one wins. We assume that alternatives did not exist or that, if they did, they were obviously and irreversibly inferior to the options that were chosen. Recent historians of technology have pounded away at this way of thinking. One of the best. Imperial College of London's David Edgerton, has a simple remedy for fixing this cognitive blind spot: Forget calling all these humin-made objects and systems technology and call them "things" instead. "Thinking about the use of things, rather than of technology, connects us directly with the world we know rather than the strange world in which "technology' lives," Edgerton wrote in h.s superb history. The Shock of the Old/ Furthermore, things don't have to be radically better to beat out other things. Many technologies persist, even if they aren't dominant. "The paper-clip is ubiquitous not bccause it is an earth-shatteringly important technology." Edgerton pointed out. "There are many ways of holding paper together: pin it, staple it, punch holes and secure it with Treasury tags,' use Sellotapc, put it in a ring-bind or other sort of folder, or bind it into a book. We use paper-clips so much because they arc, for many uses, marginally better than the alternatives, and we know this.\*5 Another example we're all familiar with is the ubiquity of Microsoft Word. There are dozens of ways to do word processing. During PCs' early march into businesses and homes, there were all kinds of software programs for typing, formatting, saving, sending, and printing documents. They all pretty much worked. Then, Microsoft Office—for a variety of business, not technical reasons—began to gain market share.4 For example, it often came preinstalled on new PCs, which already ran Microsoft-made operating sys terns. Microsoft competed fiercely and won. but few believe "the best technology" won. Word worked, and Microsoft was a strong force in the market, but it wasn't as if there were no alternatives.1 Microsoft Word and Excel became the de facto standard for exchanging files between users, thereby also increasing the momentum of their product. Using Microsoft Word simply became easier than completing the series of tiny actions necessary to convert some other word processor's native output into a file that Microsoft Word could read. Economists describe this process as "the network effect." and it's associated with all kinds of positive feedbacks as success breeds success." Historians sometimes call the broader version of this phenomenon "technological momentum."7 Its effect is to transform a series of marginal choices ("What the hell, maybe I will use Word, not WordPerfect") into market dominance. If we run a lot of energy technologies through the paper clip and Microsoft Word filters, we find many of the same patterns. Because energy technologies tend to require a lot of concrete and steel and money, momentum is even more important. A decision made at a particular moment for particular reasons will have repercussions for decades; after all, the Hoover Dam is now almost seventy-five years old. That's whv the solar hot water heater and the rest of the projects in this hook aren't mere curiosities. They got researched and built for a reason. Some people, at some time, thought they were a viable alternative to the systems in place. We have to go back to that moment when someone picked Word or a gasoline-powered car and ask. Why was that choice made? Political scientist Langdon Winner faulted a predecessor of green technology, the "small is beautiful" school of appropriate technology, for a "grievous" historical amnesia. "Those active in the held." he wrote, "were willing to procecd as if history and existing institutional technical realities did not matter." This book is an attempt to answer the qucs tions that Winner thinks an insurgent technological group has to address if they want to make their revolution: One ought to be able to discover points at which developments in a given field took an unfortunate turn, points at which the choices produced an undesirable instrumental regime. One could, for example, survey the range of discoveries, inventions, industries, and large-scale systems that have arisen during the past century and notice which paths in modem technology have been selected. One might then attempt to answer such questions as, Why did the developments proceed as they did? Were there any real alternatives? Why weren't those alternatives selected at the time? How could any such alternatives be reclaimed now?" The next section delves into the alternative energy technologies that existed over the last ce Jtury. We'll find good ideas that were dropped and bad ideas that were probably better forgotten. We'll see mad inventors trying to navigate the choppy seas of fossil fuel prices, bad luck, dirty dealing, a lack of government support, societal shifts, competing new energy technologies, and a host of other factors. Despite being tossed about, many of them succeeded in creating real alternatives that merely lacked funding and scale, not technical sophistication. The bottom line is that we've missed chances to have a cleaner energy system, and if we don't heed the lessons of the past, wc could blow this opportu nity. too. In 1900 people could use the sun to heat the water for a shower. They could drive across New York City in an electric taxicab. Even if these cabs did not work perfectly, they existed before most people even had a single light bulb in their home. In 1945 a person could have purchased a solar house or gone to see the one-megawatt wind turbine. During the 1970s one could have visited the Solar Energy Research Institute and. ten years later, seen the massive solar fields of the Mojave Desert. Green technology has been a viable set of technologies for more than one hundred years but, regardless, supplies little of America's cnergy. What happened? What might have been? Let's find out. /

## 2ac at: Ted

No link – their links assume an endorsement of present policy by the USfg – we’re a descriptive statement about past policy that allows us to resist technocracy

Their politics is authoritarian and depoliticizing – it forecloses certain political strategies in favor of top-down, imposed out-lefting that pretends the state doesn’t exist – this empirically failed in the 60s and 70s with energy decentralization

Permutation do both – \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ - it improves the alternatives political stance – any reactivation of agency needs to be coupled with a recognition of contingency – we have to consider the system and figure out how it was constructed

#### Recognizing contradictory ideas in the context of technological determinism improves communication and discussion to break down technoscience

Rosales 2009

Janna Metcalfe, thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy Department and Centre for the Study of Religion University of Toronto, “WHEN THE “TWILIGHT OF JUSTICE” MEETS THE “DAWN OF NANOTECHNOLOGY”: A CRITIQUE OF TRANSHUMANISM AND THE TECHNOLOGICAL IMPERATIVE IN THE LIGHT OF GEORGE GRANT’S MORAL PHILOSOPHY,” https://exams.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/17824/6/Rosales\_Janna\_M\_200906\_PhD\_thesis.pdf

For those who cannot give up that transcendental framework, the contradiction between the good and the triumph of the will lives itself out in the kinds of visceral “nerveracking situations of justice” (Grant, 1984/1998, pp. 440-441) from which we make sense of being, whether that entails taking a stance on reproductive ethics, euthanasia, nuclear energy, cybernetics, eugenics, germ-line genetic engineering, or molecular manufacturing. While one may be tempted to seek definitive resolutions to ethical dilemmas or to gloss over evidence of contradictions when deliberating over the issues, the efforts of both Grant and Simone Weil demonstrate that trying to pay due credit to contradictory ideas is not necessarily “evidence of a discreditable intellectual weakness” (Forbes, 2007, p. 201). Sometimes reality shows us incompatible truths that no amount of intellectual refinement or methodical reasoning can dispel; in this case the point is not to skim over or hide the inconsistencies, but rather, in the true spirit of a dialectical approach, to identify both complementarity and irreducible differences between ideas. To recognize contradictory ideas, as Weil (1956) insists, is to “experience the fact that we are not All” (p. 411). This too is an experience with otherness, one that is better apprehended through love rather than a logic that simply seeks consistency. As I stated in chapter 1, Grant considered the dialectical method to be grounded in eros, in that to know a thing is also to love it. I think nanoethics can benefit from this interpretation of the dialectical approach because currently the terms of engagement are set up more as a struggle between opponents, where there are debates to be won and lost, whether between Drexler and Smalley, Kurzweil and Joy, Hughes and Kass, transhumanists and bioconservatives. Too much emphasis on out-arguing one’s opponent and refuting contradictions closes down on channels of communication and excludes more constructive ways to frame the discussion. As a case in point, Langdon Winner (1986) observes that our debates about technology, society, and the environment often take a narrow view of what constitutes an acceptable discussion, usually drawing on concepts of efficiency and risk to define the parameters (p. x). What Grant does is bring challenging concepts to the table as a way to lift us out of an exclusively technoscientific mindset.

Political engagement is key – utopian visions crushed solar and just resulted in nihilist apocalypse mongering

Madrigal 11

Powering the Dream

Alexis Madrigal is a senior editor at The Atlantic, where he oversees the Technology channel. He's the author of Powering the Dream: The History and Promise of Green Technology.

But what if there is a global problem that requires nearly all the worlds citizens to work together? What happens if we need to cut global carbon emissions by something like 80 percent? What happens if, to preserve the biodiversity of the world, wc need to beat existing technologies in countries without democratically elected governments? Even with the same ecologically sane frame of reference, the most impactful actions of the 1970s and this decade may be quite different. One MIT study calculated that no American, no matter how abstemious their lifestyle, could reduce their carbon footprint below 8.5 tons or their total energy usage below 130 gigajoules.vs Even if you beg for vegetarian scraps from town to town, societal things like roads, police service, fire departments, libraries, the courts, and the military are all carried out on your behalf. And those things require energy. To reduce the carbon footprint of the country—which is more than twice the global average—society as a whole has to change.

For that to happen, the presentation of a real alternative is necessary. In truth, the solar transcendcntalists were too caught up with the Bomb induced apocalyptophilia of the time to present such a unified vision of a different society. Instead of organizing politically or socially, they were learning the "survival" skills that they almost seemed to darkly hope they would need in the postcivilization future. DeKomc held that It is not, however, within the scope of this book to explore the almost insurmountable problems to be solved before our societycould be expected to function within an ecologically sane frame of reference. Indeed, it is the authors opinion that the last meaningful chance for a societal change in this direction was passed sometime just before World War II. At any rate, survival is now an individual responsibility, and it is to individual solutions that this book addresses itself."4

However, most solar transcendentalists drifted away from their intense stances on energy. Some returned to "straight society" whereas others looked for transcendence without the sun. Jim DeKorne moved on to "life's greatest challenge: the souls Gnostic commitment to the Great Work of transformation—the impossibly perilous journey through the infinite maze of hyperspace" He wrote a book on psychedelic shamanism and moved to Hawaii.,T By 1979 one contemporary historian observed that "Numerous 1960s activists had moved from protest politics to self-awareness." Though some remained active fighting nuclear power, increasingly "looking inward seemed more fulfilling than changing the world."\*® Societal change by individual example had given way to a broader navel-gazing that left energy out of the picture. By the time Bill Clinton was elected president, it seemed all that remained of the solar transcendentalist movement was the popular memory of lukewarm solar hot water-heated showers and a few odd pieces of architecture.