1
00:00:00,000 --> 00:00:03,840

Donovan Miyasaki is an associate

professor in the Department of

2
00:00:03,840 --> 00:00:09,090

Philosophy. He earned his PhD in

philosophy at the University of Toronto

3
00:00:09,090 --> 00:00:12,620

and taught at the University of Toronto,

and the University of

4
00:00:12,620 --> 00:00:17,970

Wisconsin-Milwaukee before moving to

Wright State. He has published work on

5
00:00:17,970 --> 00:00:22,710

nineteenth and twentieth century

European thinkers, such as Hagel,

6
00:00:22,710 --> 00:00:30,300

Nietzsche, Freud, Heidegger, Beauvoir, and

Adorno on topics and aesthetics, ethics,

7

00:00:30,300 --> 00:00:35,820

and political philosophy. He is currently

completing a book on the political

8

00:00:35,820 --> 00:00:40,710

implications of Nietzsche's moral

philosophy in which he argues that

9

00:00:40,710 --> 00:00:47,899

Nietzsche's critique of morality

presupposition of freedom of the will

10

00:00:47,899 --> 00:00:53,070

necessitates establishing radically new

foundations for key political concepts

11

00:00:53,070 --> 00:00:59,579

such as freedom, justice, equality, and

democracy. He will speak about Nietzsche's

12

00:00:59,579 --> 00:01:07,619

case against political moralism. What I'd

like to do is give a admittedly very

13
00:01:07,619 --> 00:01:12,990
rough sketch of the key theme of the
book I've been completing on Nietzsche's

14
00:01:12,990 --> 00:01:18,119
political philosophy. The book is really
a critical reconstruction of his

15
00:01:18,119 --> 00:01:22,740
political philosophy. It's a reconstruction
because in many respects Nietzsche doesn't

16
00:01:22,740 --> 00:01:27,000
have a political philosophy, he doesn't
have an explicit systematic theory of

17
00:01:27,000 --> 00:01:32,790
politics, so in many ways we have to
piece it together. We have to infer from

18
00:01:32,790 --> 00:01:38,100

fragments of Nietzsche's thought about

politics what his political philosophy

19
00:01:38,100 --> 00:01:42,600
might be. It's also a critical

reconstruction because when we do this, I

20
00:01:42,600 --> 00:01:48,270
find that drawing from his core

philosophical commitments, they often

21
00:01:48,270 --> 00:01:53,340
entail conclusions very much at odds

with his expressed political sentiments.

22
00:01:53,340 --> 00:01:58,649
So what this means is it's a politics

inspired by Nietzsche, but at the end of

23
00:01:58,649 --> 00:02:02,670
the day it's one that he himself would

probably not like. That's not entirely a

24

00:02:02,670 --> 00:02:08,099

bad thing I don't think. So what I'd like

to do is start with sort of this core

25

00:02:08,099 --> 00:02:12,330

idea that Nietzsche is committed to and from

which everything else I think follows.

26

00:02:12,330 --> 00:02:16,270

It's a

rather unpopular one. He is committed to

27

00:02:16,270 --> 00:02:21,310

the rejection of the concept of free

will, to the idea that human beings have

28

00:02:21,310 --> 00:02:26,920

this kind of individual deeper freedom

that allows us to control our choices,

29

00:02:26,920 --> 00:02:33,100

our character or thoughts independently

of external circumstances or

30

00:02:33,100 --> 00:02:38,830

independently of internal motivations,

and so the question becomes what becomes

31

00:02:38,830 --> 00:02:45,400

of politics if we give up free will? And

I think Nietzsche's answer is sort of

32

00:02:45,400 --> 00:02:51,640

twofold on the one hand, he thinks that

the way in which our political tradition

33

00:02:51,640 --> 00:02:59,440

has grounded itself in moral views and

in the concept of free will has led to a

34

00:02:59,440 --> 00:03:05,320

kind of error where politics at the end

of the day becomes a kind of morality in

35

00:03:05,320 --> 00:03:11,850

disguise and so the project of politics

has to first separate political

36

00:03:11,850 --> 00:03:18,340

philosophy from our commitment to these

concepts. A political philosophy must

37

00:03:18,340 --> 00:03:23,739

begin beyond good and evil in Nietzschian

language it has to be independent of

38

00:03:23,739 --> 00:03:29,140

assumptions about free will and

assumptions about moral truth. With this

39

00:03:29,140 --> 00:03:35,500

in mind, I want to start by contrasting

what I take to be the broad features of

40

00:03:35,500 --> 00:03:40,660

the Western political philosophical

tradition to Nietzsche's view. So

41

00:03:40,660 --> 00:03:45,160

starting with the Western philosophical

tradition. Broadly speaking in this

42

00:03:45,160 --> 00:03:50,170

tradition, politics is seen as sort of

the product of ethics. Ethics creates

43

00:03:50,170 --> 00:03:55,269

politics. In - and the reason for this is

that the starting point is the

44

00:03:55,269 --> 00:04:00,280

conception of free will and its roots in

rationality. Rationality is what gives me

45

00:04:00,280 --> 00:04:06,420

the ability to decide my choices by

reasons and therefore independently of

46

00:04:06,420 --> 00:04:11,650

circumstances and inclinations. In this

way, rationality gives us free will and

47

00:04:11,650 --> 00:04:16,330

that freedom is the basis of two things.

It's the basis of our individuality and

48

00:04:16,330 --> 00:04:22,840

it's the basis of our capacity for

morality. Our individuality because by

49

00:04:22,840 --> 00:04:26,650

being able to independently determine

our choices through reason,

50

00:04:26,650 --> 00:04:32,770

we can create a self-determined form of

the person, a self-hood that is our own

51

00:04:32,770 --> 00:04:39,009

making and morality because reason

enables me to recognize shared social

52

00:04:39,009 --> 00:04:44,039

goods. Shared social interests that

go beyond my own immediate self-interest.

53

00:04:44,039 --> 00:04:50,889

This in turn gives us the moral, rational,

free individual these individuals are

54

00:04:50,889 --> 00:04:55,960

the basis in this tradition for the

formation of politics. Politics is the

55

00:04:55,960 --> 00:05:01,449

free agreement of individuals in the

negotiation of their shared interest. In

56

00:05:01,449 --> 00:05:06,970

this way I think it is a a kind of

moralist politics. Politics is this

57

00:05:06,970 --> 00:05:13,750

practice of negotiating the moral shared

good in respect to the free individual

58

00:05:13,750 --> 00:05:21,630

self interest of the persons engaged in

this negotiation. So with that in mind,

59

00:05:21,630 --> 00:05:25,780

this political tradition what I'm

calling moralist politics then leads

60

00:05:25,780 --> 00:05:29,710

with a certain degree inevitability to a

certain way of thinking about the aim of

61

00:05:29,710 --> 00:05:35,190

politics. Broadly speaking it tends

towards a political aim of meritocracy,

62

00:05:35,190 --> 00:05:41,680

where the goal of politics is justice

understood as distribution of goods, of

63

00:05:41,680 --> 00:05:46,900

resources, also of rewards and

punishments, according to moral deserving-ness.

64

00:05:46,900 --> 00:05:51,940

It is the freedom of the

individual, their free consent to

65

00:05:51,940 --> 00:05:56,470

political organizations, to principles of

justice that then makes them morally

66

00:05:56,470 --> 00:06:00,880

responsible for their actions and

justices distribution according to that

67

00:06:00,880 --> 00:06:06,010

moral deserving-ness and secondly the

principle of this kind of politics tends

68

00:06:06,010 --> 00:06:10,990

towards. The protection of Liberty but

it's a very unique conception of Liberty

69

00:06:10,990 --> 00:06:17,289

that is predominantly negative in

definition. That is protection from

70

00:06:17,289 --> 00:06:22,780

interference with the personal sphere of

freedom. It tends towards the

71

00:06:22,780 --> 00:06:28,810

definition of the individual sphere of

the private where free choice is

72

00:06:28,810 --> 00:06:34,690

exercised and the drawing of a line

between free choice on my part and the

73

00:06:34,690 --> 00:06:38,300

boundary where it infringes upon free

choice on your part.

74

00:06:38,300 --> 00:06:44,460

Together this leads to a certain way of

thinking about politics, which is at

75

00:06:44,460 --> 00:06:50,940

bottom of you in which the primary

activity of politics is speech. Politics

76

00:06:50,940 --> 00:06:56,760

is discourse, politics is debate, politics

is conversation towards consensus in the

77
00:06:56,760 --> 00:07:03,180
negotiation about individual self

interests. As speech, the principal goal

78
00:07:03,180 --> 00:07:09,690
is to protect legally the sphere of

public debate and discourse and the

79
00:07:09,690 --> 00:07:14,720
principal activity of politics is two

forms of persuasion. On the one hand

80
00:07:14,720 --> 00:07:21,030
education where we seek to rationally

educate and persuade one another to

81
00:07:21,030 --> 00:07:26,510
recognize our shared social interests, our true objective interest in

82
00:07:26,510 --> 00:07:34,350

cooperating with others, and then a kind

of edification, a moral persuasion of our

83

00:07:34,350 --> 00:07:39,060

fellow citizens to uphold and stand by

and take responsibility for their

84

00:07:39,060 --> 00:07:45,600

consent to these shared objective

interests. This picture of politics which

85

00:07:45,600 --> 00:07:53,520

in addition to having a potential for a

certain naivety, a sense of politics as

86

00:07:53,520 --> 00:07:58,770

persuading each other to be reasonable

and good also tends towards a kind of

87

00:07:58,770 --> 00:08:03,630

paradox when we encounter political

failure. When the discourse the the

88

00:08:03,630 --> 00:08:08,510

speech of politics fails to reach

consensus, when it fails to resolve

89

00:08:08,510 --> 00:08:13,440

political questions, when we find

ourselves in deep divisions and we seek

90

00:08:13,440 --> 00:08:18,810

the reasons why we're led to this split

and the split goes back to that split

91

00:08:18,810 --> 00:08:23,640

between freedom is reasons and freedom

as morality. On the one hand we can say

92

00:08:23,640 --> 00:08:30,060

the cause of the failure of politics is

ignorance. The project of educating one

93

00:08:30,060 --> 00:08:35,760

another to our shared interest has

failed. If that's the case however then

94

00:08:35,760 --> 00:08:39,690

the degree to which it's a product of

ignorance is also degree to which it is

95

00:08:39,690 --> 00:08:45,180

a matter of innocence. If we are acting

out of ignorance, if we are failing to

96

00:08:45,180 --> 00:08:48,810

recognize our social good out of

ignorance, then we are in some sense not

97

00:08:48,810 --> 00:08:54,430

at fault. On the other hand,

the opposite pole, we can - we can

98

00:08:54,430 --> 00:08:59,980

imagine that political failure has its

roots in bad will, in freedom not as lack

99

00:08:59,980 --> 00:09:05,890

of knowledge, lack of reason, but freedom

as just obstinacy. I choose not to uphold

100

00:09:05,890 --> 00:09:12,340

the social good. I recognize it but I use

my free will not to follow it. Now if we

101

00:09:12,340 --> 00:09:17,220

look at look at it that way, we then have

a different problem. Rather than

102

00:09:17,220 --> 00:09:21,550

exonerating it, treating it as a matter

of ignorance and therefore innocence, we

103

00:09:21,550 --> 00:09:28,420

instead see political failure as rooted

in a kind of bad will and the degree to

104

00:09:28,420 --> 00:09:34,680

which it's rooted in freely held bad

will, it is politically irreparable. I

105

00:09:34,680 --> 00:09:41,980

cannot politically affect the free will

of a person to choose evil. So between

106
00:09:41,980 --> 00:09:47,770
ignorance and evil we can either blame
nor understand how political failure can

107
00:09:47,770 --> 00:09:51,970
be repaired. This is I think a double
bind of the moralistic approach to

108
00:09:51,970 --> 00:09:57,430
politics. So in contrast to this, a very
rough picture of Nietzsche's sort of

109
00:09:57,430 --> 00:10:05,530
alternative view. If on the traditional
view ethics creates politics, the

110
00:10:05,530 --> 00:10:09,070
individual - the ethical individual
creates politics on Nietzsche's view it's the

111
00:10:09,070 --> 00:10:14,680

reverse. Politics creates ethics. This is

based in his picture of the origin of

112
00:10:14,680 --> 00:10:22,270
morality. He basically suggests that the

material conditions of particular

113
00:10:22,270 --> 00:10:28,600
people's or populations survival, their

well-being, their material flourishing.

114
00:10:28,600 --> 00:10:34,960
That is the source of their political

structure and their social morality. So

115
00:10:34,960 --> 00:10:40,210
material conditions produce people's and

produce social moralities. In turn, in

116
00:10:40,210 --> 00:10:45,370
Nietzsche's view, social moralities are

then used to produce individuals.

117

00:10:45,370 --> 00:10:51,520

Individuals are sort of late invention

of civilization. It's through the process

118

00:10:51,520 --> 00:10:55,690

of social training and education that

social moralities are then internalized

119

00:10:55,690 --> 00:11:01,089

in the individual producing a kind of

relative, self-determination the

120

00:11:01,089 --> 00:11:04,880

internalized morality of society gives

me a certain degree

121

00:11:04,880 --> 00:11:09,680

of relative independence from external

authority. But it is at the end of the

122

00:11:09,680 --> 00:11:14,270

day internalized social morality and so

it's from Nietzsche's point of view our

123

00:11:14,270 --> 00:11:18,860

kind of illusion of freedom. It's not

truly free will. For this reason

124

00:11:18,860 --> 00:11:23,690

Nietzsche is suspicious of all morality

because he worries that it perpetuates

125

00:11:23,690 --> 00:11:29,180

the subjugation of individuals. Even to

the degree that I become independent of

126

00:11:29,180 --> 00:11:35,360

authority, I am repeating the morality

that I have internalized and this is

127

00:11:35,360 --> 00:11:39,950

problematic not only because it tells us

the individual isn't free and rational

128

00:11:39,950 --> 00:11:45,470

in the decision and negotiation of its

interests, but it also tells us that

129

00:11:45,470 --> 00:11:53,540

individuals - individual values, character

and and motivations often carry over the

130

00:11:53,540 --> 00:11:58,100

values of social orders long after the

material conditions that produce them

131

00:11:58,100 --> 00:12:05,000

are no longer relevant. So in that way we

can say the needs and prejudices of the

132

00:12:05,000 --> 00:12:10,460

past are carried on in the individual

under the illusion of freedom. So with

133

00:12:10,460 --> 00:12:16,370

that in mind, what we have is a situation

where politics produces individuals

134

00:12:16,370 --> 00:12:20,120

rather than individuals producing

politics. So rather than thinking of

135
00:12:20,120 --> 00:12:24,170
politics is the negotiation of free

individual self interests, we have to

136
00:12:24,170 --> 00:12:29,890
reverse this and think of it as the

negotiation for the production of

137
00:12:29,890 --> 00:12:35,360
individuals and their interests. We have

to ask what kind of individuals should

138
00:12:35,360 --> 00:12:41,060
we produce? This changes the question of

politics rather than the question who

139
00:12:41,060 --> 00:12:47,480
are we truly and what do we collectively

socially want? Nietzsche and politics

140
00:12:47,480 --> 00:12:55,610

asks who have we been made to be and who

do we want to become? This is a complete

141

00:12:55,610 --> 00:12:59,570

sort of reversal of the picture of

politics. It works not on the level of

142

00:12:59,570 --> 00:13:04,040

the individual but so to speak on the

level of the social factories that

143

00:13:04,040 --> 00:13:09,470

produce them. In this way the aims

dramatically change. For Nietzsche, the

144

00:13:09,470 --> 00:13:14,210

aim of politics isn't just distribution

of goods according to moral deserving-ness,

145

00:13:14,210 --> 00:13:18,270

but instead, the enhancement of

humanity

146

00:13:18,270 --> 00:13:21,930

which he describes in terms of his

language of the will to power a

147

00:13:21,930 --> 00:13:27,110

frightening term that really at the end

of the day only means human capabilities

148

00:13:27,110 --> 00:13:33,930

particularly are active ability to

engage challenges and resistances. More

149

00:13:33,930 --> 00:13:38,400

broadly in the spirit of contemporary

political philosophers like Martha

150

00:13:38,400 --> 00:13:43,680

Nussbaum and Amartya Sen I would call

this the enhancement of human basic

151

00:13:43,680 --> 00:13:49,170

capabilities. If that is the aim then

distribution is subordinated to the aim

152

00:13:49,170 --> 00:13:54,000

of promoting human capacity generally

and consequently the principle of

153

00:13:54,000 --> 00:13:58,740

liberty that's implied is dramatically

different. It's not primarily a negative

154

00:13:58,740 --> 00:14:03,900

principle of non-interference. The

protection of my individual freedom of

155

00:14:03,900 --> 00:14:07,800

will and my ability to take

opportunities to exercise that freedom

156

00:14:07,800 --> 00:14:13,380

of will but instead in light of the aim

of actively promoting the capabilities

157

00:14:13,380 --> 00:14:19,020

of human beings, we have a positive right

to the material and social conditions

158

00:14:19,020 --> 00:14:24,210

necessary for the development of

capabilities. This is a dramatically

159

00:14:24,210 --> 00:14:28,590

different way of thinking about liberty

and from this we then end up with a very

160

00:14:28,590 --> 00:14:34,130

different picture of the methodology of

politics. Politics is no longer

161

00:14:34,130 --> 00:14:40,080

fundamentally an activity of speech.

Politics is not a sphere of discourse,

162

00:14:40,080 --> 00:14:45,720

deliberation, debate, and consensus. The

abandonment of the thesis of free will

163

00:14:45,720 --> 00:14:51,780

tells us that picture is over optimistic,

in the ability of the

164
00:14:51,780 --> 00:14:58,740
individual to be rationally persuaded
towards both truth and moral obligation

165
00:14:58,740 --> 00:15:04,440
is perhaps over emphasized in that
tradition. Instead, politics is not speech

166
00:15:04,440 --> 00:15:10,830
but structural change. Its changed first
and foremost to the material conditions

167
00:15:10,830 --> 00:15:17,790
that give rise to peoples, the material
conditions of survival of flourishing, of

168
00:15:17,790 --> 00:15:23,520
well-being that produce the particular
moralities and social orders of peoples

169
00:15:23,520 --> 00:15:28,890

and to the social structures and social

conditions that enable those moralities

170

00:15:28,890 --> 00:15:34,400

to be internalized in the form of

individual subjectivity and in this way

171

00:15:34,400 --> 00:15:38,810

we then see the methodology for

achieving this must be radically

172

00:15:38,810 --> 00:15:43,700

different. It's not this optimistic hope

that education and edification and more

173

00:15:43,700 --> 00:15:48,140

discourse and more debate will

eventually solve political problems but

174

00:15:48,140 --> 00:15:52,160

instead it recognizes that the

individual is a product of social orders

175

00:15:52,160 --> 00:15:57,080

and moralities and so all reasoning is

motivated reasoning. Changes to

176

00:15:57,080 --> 00:16:01,520

individuals aren't done by persuading

them to become reasonable but changing

177

00:16:01,520 --> 00:16:05,960

the conditions that produce their

incentives toward certain moral

178

00:16:05,960 --> 00:16:10,610

motivations and certain social

motivations. In that respect it's a kind

179

00:16:10,610 --> 00:16:16,850

of use of motivated - motivated reasoning

rather than a war against it and

180

00:16:16,850 --> 00:16:23,300

likewise it considers the project of

politics not as resolving ideological

181

00:16:23,300 --> 00:16:30,200

disputes among factions and groups but

instead treating the material and social

182

00:16:30,200 --> 00:16:35,510

conditions that divide us into factions

in groups by producing conditions of

183

00:16:35,510 --> 00:16:40,340

shared well-being and shared flourishing,

you instead produce and actual people

184

00:16:40,340 --> 00:16:46,580

rather than an ideological consensus

among divergent people so that is sort

185

00:16:46,580 --> 00:16:51,080

of a very broad outline depicture

and if if he's right about this it

186

00:16:51,080 --> 00:16:56,720

should resolve that earlier paradox. If

the problem is the political failure of

187

00:16:56,720 --> 00:17:02,240

consensus is either ignorance or evil if

it's ignorance it's innocent and we

188

00:17:02,240 --> 00:17:06,620

can't blame, if it's evil it's irreparable

there's nothing politics can do. The

189

00:17:06,620 --> 00:17:09,980

Nietzschean picture tells us it is

ignorance but it's ignorance not about

190

00:17:09,980 --> 00:17:14,150

individuals, it's ignorance about

conditions. It's not the ignorance of

191

00:17:14,150 --> 00:17:17,870

individuals or the bad will of

individuals, but the bad conditions that

192

00:17:17,870 --> 00:17:22,100

produce them. That are the source of

political failure and presumably the

193

00:17:22,100 --> 00:17:27,040

source of political solutions, so I'll stop there. That's the gist of it.

194

00:17:28,410 --> 00:17:34,530

Does he do more criticizing of the

current condition or what is the

195

00:17:34,530 --> 00:17:42,390

positive aspect of this sort of anecdote, solution I mean

we spoke about forming subjectivity and

196

00:17:42,390 --> 00:17:47,580

human capacity, are there - I mean -

education edification consensus our

197

00:17:47,580 --> 00:17:54,630

motto for him, what are and then is there

a level of which education edification and consensus

198

00:17:54,630 --> 00:18:00,240

will work for him and then the

follow up is if his conditions are in place,

199

00:18:00,240 --> 00:18:09,210

if his anecdote works,do we have to do well on his account? The - Nietzsche's own

200

00:18:09,210 --> 00:18:14,490

positive model is one that is distinct

from the sort of groundwork of political

201

00:18:15,930 --> 00:18:21,060

theory that I'm outlining here and so in

fact I think that's one of the ways in

202

00:18:21,060 --> 00:18:23,060

which this is a critical reconstruction. I think his positive solution fails, and

203

00:18:25,470 --> 00:18:31,170

it fails on his own terms. In brief, his

solution is aristocratic political

204

00:18:31,170 --> 00:18:36,030

structures. He believes that you have to

devote all of the resources of a society

205

00:18:36,030 --> 00:18:43,440

to a to an elite group of people whose

capacities are maximized, and I think

206

00:18:43,440 --> 00:18:49,680

this fails on its own terms but so that's

his solution.Do those - does that category of

207

00:18:49,680 --> 00:18:57,510

of people have free will? No. At the end of the day,

individuals are entirely the products of

208

00:18:57,510 --> 00:19:03,570

social orders for nature. There is no

free will. There is only stronger

209

00:19:03,570 --> 00:19:07,830

feelings of freedom. There's a kind of

epi phenomenal kind of Liberty at stake

210

00:19:07,830 --> 00:19:11,250

and that's what Nietzsche is trying to

promote. This idea of the the increase -

211

00:19:11,250 --> 00:19:17,760

the enhancement of human capacity is not

an abstract valorisation of ability. On

212

00:19:17,760 --> 00:19:21,930

the contrary, the will to power is the

feeling of freedom that he associates

213

00:19:21,930 --> 00:19:26,400

with enhanced capacity, so it's for the

sake of that feeling of freedom that we

214

00:19:26,400 --> 00:19:32,040

are enhancing here, but it's a

purely a feeling, like it's not real and even

215

00:19:32,040 --> 00:19:36,140

our capacity - our ability to bring it

about is entirely fortuitous, it's not

216

00:19:36,140 --> 00:19:41,040

something - it's not something that can be

in a deep sense changed. We either

217

00:19:41,040 --> 00:19:43,980

succeed, or we don't.

So I think that gets to your

218

00:19:43,980 --> 00:19:48,299

wonder about if he succeeds, is this

freedom.No, it's luck I think - I think

219

00:19:48,299 --> 00:19:56,159

Scott was next. I mean sorry, I mean Eric. So I mean

like my superficial reaction is just Nietzschians need to

220

00:19:56,159 --> 00:20:02,519

go back and read Aristotle,

but I guess I get a sense that um, I think

221

00:20:02,519 --> 00:20:05,759

you may have answered part of my

question why Nietzsche wouldn't like this,

222

00:20:05,759 --> 00:20:10,500

because oh boy I think you're saying is

that you would like to resist this

223

00:20:10,500 --> 00:20:15,360

natural drift that often happens in societies that are so completely focused on

224

00:20:15,360 --> 00:20:19,559

human perfection of human ability, then you

get wonderful places like Athens

225

00:20:19,559 --> 00:20:25,769

and Florence, would you agree that if you're 1 of 100

people in the world if you're not and I

226

00:20:25,769 --> 00:20:29,519

think what you're trying to do - correct me

if I'm wrong - it is to try to ameliorate

227

00:20:29,519 --> 00:20:33,929

that by by suggesting that it is

compatible with what we think of the

228

00:20:33,929 --> 00:20:40,409

enlightenment

corrective to that poll towards

229

00:20:40,409 --> 00:20:45,960

human perfectionism. Well there's - there's

two sides to it. One, I think the language

230

00:20:45,960 --> 00:20:48,929

of perfectionism's interesting here

because Nietzsche can be read as a

231

00:20:48,929 --> 00:20:53,519

perfectionist but back to the point I

was making to Jud, this idea of

232

00:20:53,519 --> 00:21:00,750

enhancement is entirely on the level of

the phenomenology of freedom. Enhancement

233

00:21:00,750 --> 00:21:04,889

is just the attempt to increase our

experience of the feeling of freedom in

234

00:21:04,889 --> 00:21:09,059

part because this is part of a larger

project Nietzsche has of creating the

235

00:21:09,059 --> 00:21:15,210

possibility of the true affirmation of

human existence and so enhancing humans

236

00:21:15,210 --> 00:21:20,820

abilities to affirm their own experience

of suffering and challenges and

237

00:21:20,820 --> 00:21:26,490

obstacles is the reason for enhancement.

Not enhancement for its own sake. So if I

238

00:21:26,490 --> 00:21:30,450

have a conception of human perfection,

sort of an ancient or medieval

239

00:21:30,450 --> 00:21:33,600

conception of human perfection which is

just the full realization of human

240

00:21:33,600 --> 00:21:38,669

potential. This is kind of arbitrary from

Nietzsche's perspective. Why? Why is that

241

00:21:38,669 --> 00:21:44,159

perfect? Why should we be perfect and it

doesn't really work on his grounds. It

242

00:21:44,159 --> 00:21:50,369

requires an entirely separate ethical

framework to justify it. The other

243

00:21:50,369 --> 00:21:56,799

question which I've already forgotten,

Oh, it had to do with why why I'm insisting

244

00:21:56,799 --> 00:22:00,369

Nietzsche's own solution doesn't work. This

is because at the end of the day

245

00:22:00,369 --> 00:22:05,080

Nietzsche's picture of an aristocratic

ideal ultimately under mat - undermines

246

00:22:05,080 --> 00:22:10,029

itself. He's deeply worried about the

tendency of morality to produce this

247

00:22:10,029 --> 00:22:14,950

kind of resentment against difference,

resentments against inequality or

248

00:22:14,950 --> 00:22:21,399

resentment against superiority of any

kind but the aristocratic models he - he

249

00:22:21,399 --> 00:22:26,409

is nostalgic for are more or less

machines to produce that kind of

250

00:22:26,409 --> 00:22:31,419

morality and resentment. So he's

basically repeating the mistake of the

251

00:22:31,419 --> 00:22:40,299

historical cultures he's admiring. Ava.

Yeah, so in politics of structural change,

252

00:22:40,299 --> 00:22:46,899

that sounds good, how do you do that without

speech and persuasion? If structural change is

253

00:22:46,899 --> 00:22:53,830

opposed to speech and persuasion,I don't see

how you can not have speech and persuasion. Yeah, you can't not

254

00:22:53,830 --> 00:22:58,239

have it. It's a question of priority and

and I think it's important also to

255

00:22:58,239 --> 00:23:03,399

recognize just how deeply cynical Nietzsche

is about about freedom and also just

256

00:23:03,399 --> 00:23:08,259

about rat - rationality in general. So we

have speech and persuasion, but that goes

257

00:23:08,259 --> 00:23:12,509

to the the next point that we are using

motivated reasoning. We are in effect

258

00:23:12,509 --> 00:23:17,950

engineering people to be receptive to

the kinds of arguments we want to make.

259

00:23:17,950 --> 00:23:22,539

From Nietzsche's perspective, all reasoning

is motivated and so when we engage in

260

00:23:22,539 --> 00:23:27,850

persuasion there is no distinction to be

made between non motivated reasoning and

261

00:23:27,850 --> 00:23:31,570

motivated reasoning, between true

rationality and merely apparent

262

00:23:31,570 --> 00:23:37,720

rationality, and so to some degree all -

all use of speech, all use of discourse,

263

00:23:37,720 --> 00:23:41,580

all use of these sorts of means of

politics have to take that into account.

264

00:23:41,580 --> 00:23:47,019

They can't work on this sort of this

optimistic picture of we will truly

265

00:23:47,019 --> 00:23:51,700

rationally persuade and at the end of

the day he thinks that our motives to be

266

00:23:51,700 --> 00:23:56,080

persuaded. Our motives towards certain

values rather than other values go back

267

00:23:56,080 --> 00:24:01,269

to what social morality we've

internalized and that social morality goes

268

00:24:01,269 --> 00:24:05,830

back to what material conditions of

well-being produce that morality. So

269

00:24:05,830 --> 00:24:09,490

how do I make people motivated towards

what I consider the right reasons? I

270

00:24:09,490 --> 00:24:13,630

actually have to change the conditions

of their life to give them the same

271

00:24:13,630 --> 00:24:18,510

conditions of good - of well being that I

have. So that they'll have a sort of

272

00:24:18,510 --> 00:24:24,130

self-interest in believing what I want

them to believe. This is, to be blunt,

273

00:24:24,130 --> 00:24:32,470

manipulation but without the contrast,

without the yeah. So, your [unintelligible] questions in here is

274

00:24:32,470 --> 00:24:39,880

really persuasive presentation, compels

me asked how you might see this work in

275

00:24:39,880 --> 00:24:43,990

our contemporary moment, right? Like now.

So in other words is when the question

276

00:24:43,990 --> 00:24:48,610

isn't so much free will and let the idea

of sort of material conditions as really engaging

277

00:24:48,610 --> 00:24:50,610

subjectivity in ways that we're just starting because we understand, how does this language allow us to

278

00:24:54,639 --> 00:25:01,240

think about maybe not free will, but like bad will , like the desire to not buy into this kind of -you know

279

00:25:01,240 --> 00:25:06,250

motivated reasoning that structures

individual for the status quo, you know I

280

00:25:06,250 --> 00:25:10,110

mean? Like I wonder if that's part of your quote project.

281

00:25:10,110 --> 00:25:16,390

Yeah, it's not part of the project but

the suggestion here is that even - even

282

00:25:16,390 --> 00:25:23,080

the distinction between good and bad

will, which the traditional approach to

283

00:25:23,080 --> 00:25:28,510

politics allows us to make is in some

sense a mistake. There are only different

284

00:25:28,510 --> 00:25:34,750

kinds of wills based in values rooted in

differing forms of life, and so to the

285

00:25:34,750 --> 00:25:39,010

degree politics fails it's not because

wills are bad but because wills are in

286

00:25:39,010 --> 00:25:43,720

conflict. They are the product of

different people's different moral

287

00:25:43,720 --> 00:25:48,610

communities and so the only political

solution is the production of singular

288

00:25:48,610 --> 00:25:52,720

moral communities and that goes to the

very roots of the social conditions that

289

00:25:52,720 --> 00:25:57,450

cause these fragmentary rural

communities. So in some sense it involves

290

00:25:57,450 --> 00:26:01,679

rejecting the concept of battery.[Unintelligible]

291

00:26:03,690 --> 00:26:09,520

Bad will for Nietzsche is I think a

counterproductive concept. It's - it's an

292

00:26:09,520 --> 00:26:14,140

attempt to morally blame people for

their political failings, whereas

293

00:26:14,140 --> 00:26:17,740

Nietzsche wants us to understand what

produces these people. We don't want to

294

00:26:17,740 --> 00:26:22,090

change minds but change persons. We don't

want to make people better, but make

295

00:26:22,090 --> 00:26:26,370

better people is a sort of way of thinking about it. Thank you. Thanks.