CREATIVE FUTURES CONSPIRACIES
A matrix and some maxims for radical social re-imagination

Anthony Weston

The scene

No serious problem can be solved in the same terms in which it is posed. Albert Einstein supposedly said it, everyone quotes it … and then for the most part we try to solve the same old problems in the same old ways, more or less, anyway. The only visible solution to the massive problems of the car is apparently … another kind of car? Hybrid, hydrogen, whatever. Or maybe another kind of transportation (really getting adventurous, eh?) The only answer to climate change apparently is just facing it – a struggle in itself, and not just for other people – and then … what? Eloquent, passionate, seemingly forward-looking voices mostly just tell us to cut back, hunker down, trim our sails (like McKibben, 2011). The only solution to free-lance suicide-bombing terrorism apparently is … state terrorism, as in the decade-long American drone-bombing campaign against supposed prospective suicide bombers in Yemen and Afghanistan.

What else is there? Well, what else is there? What if changing these “terms” themselves were a serious question that might actually have answers – our task being to find to extend and diversify our thinking far enough to find them, rather than just bemoaning the impossibility of new kinds of answers without any serious or skillful exploration of their possibility? What if the solution to the massive problems of the car is to redesign cities so that transportation as such, anyway faster than bikes, becomes mostly unnecessary? What if instead of trying to raising New Orleans’s dikes even farther, the city embraced the waters, started to turn into Venice? What if there are radically unsettling but irresistibly constructive kinds of Deeds of resistance and symbolic action that quite precisely do not involve blowing people up?

We do not think such thoughts today, or if we do, in dreamy moments, we keep them carefully to ourselves. In the larger public discussion, we certainly do not have any (final, best, even really half-decent) answers. Not even close. At least, it’s unlikely, when the answers we do have, even if somewhat ambitious, are also so thoroughly shaped by recent or long-standing struggles. Single-payer medical systems are probably better than halfway-measures like today’s thoroughly compromised Obamacare in the United States, for example, and certainly better than just shrugging aside the needs of 30 million or so otherwise uninsured Americans (not that “insurance” is exactly unproblematic either) but they are still so
20th century: bureaucratic, centralized, professionalized. How else could medical and public-health resources be not just “provided” (for there is another thing: the consumer model of the citizen or individual is also so 20th century) but undertaken as a form both of self-care and care for each other, likely organized on a decentralized, community basis? It’s been done, or approximated, elsewhere in the world (Bishai and Schleiff, 2020). Why mightn’t America take that as a model?

I want to suggest that there are elegant and audacious alternatives not yet even on our maps. At the very least, without actively, creatively, and thoroughly exploring alternative possibilities – and seeking to devise truly venturesome ones, two or five big steps out – how could we possibly be entitled to claim that we know that we are stuck, that there are no other options?

But radical social re-imagination takes work. Specifically, it takes methods, shared, known and embraced by all, deliberately and explicitly put to use – even and perhaps especially among activists and the most committed. Specific ways to silhouette and make fluid what usually seems so given and fixed that we do not even notice it. Better ways to remodel all manner of systems into new and as yet unimagined shapes. This is not easy. Truly productive, radical, creative process as a whole is a major challenge, and it takes a kind of discipline as well. But I have found that it is thoroughly unappreciated, even and sometimes especially among radicals. Maybe it is because we think that we already have the answers … so that what we really need is just (“just”!?) the social pressure and political power, battle-ready, to enforce changes we are quite certain we need and want. But no, I say: that is a recipe for more of the same: more power politics, more zero-sum, self-certain battles back and forth across all-too-familiar turf. And lately, it seems, losing ground for the left. What we desperately need – first – are the new big ideas, the next big things, ideas off the usual scales, that can reshape or even leapfrog the familiar battles themselves. You never change things by fighting the existing reality, insisted Buckminster Fuller. To change something, build a new model that makes the existing model obsolete. Yes … but how?

A modest proposal

What then must we do? We can envision the task in rough outline. First, somehow, we must make much more of a project of generating original, breakthrough ideas: new, unexpected, entirely different ways of looking at familiar problems, first and dramatic steps “out of the box.” Then, shape these breakthrough ideas into a viable program, something we can imagine actually making happen – something detailed and worked-out enough to be viable and effective, while still remaining original and inspiring. Finally, poise these programs at social “tipping points” (Gladwell, 2002). An effective program must make the most of the flow of change as it is already happening. The program must be contagious (another exactly right Gladwell term). It must offer itself in the right way at the right moment to the right people.

I propose that we embrace precisely this challenge as a meta-level creative-futures project. That is: let us take the development of generative contexts for radical new progressive ideas as a social design challenge. What follows is a proposal along these lines. It is certainly not the only possible on-the-ground design – there must be many – but it is, arguably, at least one such structure.

A Creative Futures Conspiracy (CFC) will be, first of all, a small group of people posed a broadly defined social problem. Experts on brainstorming tell us that original conceptual breakthroughs are most ready to be expected neither from a single person working alone nor from a larger but necessarily more amorphous and harder-to-focus group. Ideas come best and develop fastest when they can bounce around a small coterie of people, probably a
dozen or less, themselves as creatively labile, adventurous, and varied as may be, who (moreover) at least somewhat know and trust each other and thus readily can fall to work together (Kaptein, 2015).

Besides, thinking at the margins – in unfamiliar keys, beyond and to some degree “against” the culture as it stands – takes a certain venturesomeness and courage that is emboldened by company. This is one reason I like the term “conspiracy,” despite some unsavory overtones: it pays to remember that the literal meaning of “conspiracy” is just *breathing together*.

Next, the co-conspirators need both creativity and certain kinds of expertise. As thinkers and “social inventors,” they need to be able to think in flexible, supple, susceptible, and free-flowing ways. Obviously, also they also need to be technically able and deeply informed in the subject or field at hand. Best would be if they had a number of fields of semi-expertise, rather than just one. This would make for more fertile connections, give the group some depth across a range of probable topics, and might also mitigate over-commitment to a single area of expertise. In short, eager and clever polymaths, jacks-of-all trades.

The co-conspirators should not be primarily critics or cynics or pessimists. For sure, a critical or even “deconstructive” edge is a useful, sometimes necessary precondition: by this, I mean at least a kind of thinking that can reveal how thoroughly socially constructed and therefore contingent our seemingly “given” conceptual frameworks and social arrangements really are (Gunkel, 2021). But the genuine promise of this critical move – again so familiarly 20th century – is often betrayed by the thinnest of follow-ups. Creative co-conspirators (I say!) will give their chief attention to the re-construction of genuinely better alternatives in the new space of freedom that critical and broadly deconstructive moves create. They emphatically intend to be for something visionary, as well as worked-out and systematic – intellectually and politically risky as that may be – rather than primarily just against something … which is safer, for sure, but also far less useful and so far behind the leading edge as to barely be able to glimpse it fleetingly in the distance. Why open up a negative space of freedom and then leave it to who-knows-what others to evolve new forms within it?

Finally, again, to ensure that something *happens* with the new ideas, the co-conspirators should be proximate to key social tipping points. The CFCs need to bring together at least some people who from the start have connections – who are already somewhat insiders, natural pollinators: people who already are change-makers in the field, or who could readily become change-makers armed with some transformative and electrifying ideas. This doesn’t mean that they must be the nominal decision-makers at the top of an organization or institution. They could equally well be middle-level people who actually make organizational or technological change, or innovators at the margins, or, outside of large enterprises or institutions, first-rate independent filmmakers or community organizers or start-up entrepreneurs or maybe even the occasional edgy academic (tenured and then gone rogue rather than even more timid … rare, but it does happen).

I envision the co-conspirators coming together for the specific and sole purpose of social creativity. The work must be focused, intense, single-minded, and total. The expansive possibilities in a given problem area are not going to emerge very fully in the midst of a life with a dozen other things going on at the same time. An extended time set apart is crucial. Moreover, I believe that they should work in a *place* set apart as well – in a kind of temporary isolation – to make for sharper focus. The group dynamic and mutual trust could be enhanced by some ongoing, shared physical and possibly strenuous challenge: say, a backpacking trip or a sailing voyage crewed by the co-conspirators themselves (“outer” adventures animating the “inner”!). Something invigorating, anyway; something physical to break up and contrast with the intense mental effort that will occupy the rest of their time; and – just possibly – something
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a bit “on the edge,” some adventure in which exertion is necessary and success is not guaranteed … just like the Conspiracy itself. In my own experience, at least, it is adventures of this sort that build mutual trust and enable intellectual and imaginative adventurousness to flower together.

CFCs will need skilled facilitation and reliable follow-through. In the gatherings themselves, needed is someone whose job is to attend to the process: to keep the work on track and in focus and at the same time not to let the process settle too readily (to keep pushing: “What else could be done?,” “What’s the next step?”). Thus CFCs will seek something sharply different from and far more ambitious than the usual “exchange of views” that characterize even the most well-focused groups like workshops and salons and other intentional conversation structures. When the task is to uncover and evolve genuine new possibilities, outside the range of what anyone in the group might imagine at the beginning, then one’s opening views hardly matter – they may even be impediments. The real task is to go farther together. And that takes a special and unfamiliar set of skills (even to most cultural innovators). Hence, the need for creative facilitation. But there is existing expertise of this type (Owen, 2008).

A variety of small centers might be the best way to organize and support specific CFCs, maximizing suppleness, diversity, and responsiveness. Staff will need to identify the most essential problem areas for creative attention and identify potential conspirators, as well as potential sites or adventures. Certain very visible figures would be natural co-conspirators, but such types may also be less available and possibly also less creatively flexible, less effective co-conspirators, than a multitude of others who are not well known but who are also doing cutting-edge imaginative work – of course, finding them will be harder. The change-projects that emerge from the CFCs, meantime, should be powerful from the start: dramatic, easy to comprehend, dramatically compelling even in the hearing; specifically targeted; tailored by and for the sorts of social designers who are, willy-nilly as it may be, the ones who are already change-makers.

Nonetheless, the originating Center will also need to keep promoting and publicizing them. Many should eventually spin off their own organizational structures – their own further promoters – while others might even become cultural memes, ideas, or practices that irresistibly spread everywhere and inform innumerable other projects. The Centers can be multiple and probably mostly unobtrusive, but still essential to the “seeding” of change processes.

Maxims

Radically creative thinking, again, needs not just such a matrix but also, crucially, methods.

Here, then, are nine proposed maxims for the work of the CFCs. Or actually for any creative thinking, but they are especially salient and powerful in such dedicated group work. They represent a bare sampling, for sure, but I hope it will at least suggest how very far they – we! – might be able to go.

Jump right in

Hopelessness and pessimism can readily become self-fulfilling prophecies. CFCs are not going to find new and off-the-scale ideas if they consume themselves in handwringing and barely try to look beyond. So, the first imperative is simply to try. Head straight into the problems regardless.

Tired of inept or by-design unrepresentative local governments? People have simply organized their own, for example circulating petitions proposing new neighborhood representatives and
offering themselves as candidates while also inviting others. Duties are proposed: keeping people informed, organizing neighborhood forums and support groups, and liaison with (other) elected officials (Albury, 1992, p. 138).

**What is this?** Are people actually creating new governments alongside the problematic or incomplete structures already in place (see also Wisconsin Democracy Campaign, 2005)? But this is, as the slogan goes, what democracy actually looks like. It might be a hugely uphill fight … or not, it might also be the easiest thing in the world, but in any case, it could open an intriguing and potentially powerful front in the continuing struggle for real democracy. Again: why wait?

Going farther: why couldn’t something similar be done on a global scale? That is, do-it-yourself world government? Today, for the first time ever, person-to-person contact is possible worldwide. Why couldn’t it be used to build worldwide political organizations based on direct connection between people, and even making a whole new representative structure out of “virtual districts”? Or as permaculturist Bill Mollison proposes, between “nations,” in a completely re-imagined kind of “United Nations” in which a “nation” is defined by a shared ethic and culture, many of which already exist, as Mollison points out, thinking especially of environmental and Earth-centered groups and meetings such as “global seed exchanges, gardening forums, and regional groups … alternative economic summits, bioregional congresses, garden and farm design groups …” A concept of a global nation is, he says, “very well developed in such groups…” What remains is to unify them: “to meet together, to count… numbers, and to recognize each other’s rights” (Mollison, 1988, p. 508).

And what else might a dedicated CFC (best, and hardest, with participants from across the political spectra, also) be able to brainstorm along these lines? There is only one way to find out.

**Seek a positive vision**

Again: the essential project is re-construction, not deconstruction or critique. We must not orient ourselves wholly or mainly against the problems or the powers-that-be of the moment; CFCs’ task is to come out emphatically, visibly, and clear-headedly for something widely and readily compelling … even, dare I add, beautiful.

Progressives are often cast as anti-business, and sometimes our economic ideas really are limited to a mere rejection. But why settle for that? Few progressive critics of business are actually just for overthrowing the whole. But we typically don’t highlight what we are for, except (at best) by reflex. The time-honored temptation on the left: to slide into self-certain rhetorical rejection with only the foggiest ideas about alternatives. Reverse figure and ground, I say! Foreground and celebrate what we are for, and practically: more small-scale enterprises; more community oversight; more effectively harnessing capitalism’s colossal dynamic energy (a description that even Marx himself uses admiringly in *Communist Manifesto*) within a more socially constructive framework. There’s the most effective critique for you. The limits and outrageous failures of the status quo emerge by contrast to what else is possible – which is often not even far from reach.

**Build a whole vision**

Creative future visions must work on the level of *system* design. The alternative must work as whole. For example, it is not good visioning a radically green economy if large numbers of people cannot support themselves within it. We need to go on to conceive enough new
and manifestly more rewarding work within it, and/or reconceive work and self-support too, likely starting by systematically rethinking the consumer model itself.

Or again: it is not enough to imagine cities with fewer or no cars. How are people supposed to get to work or buy groceries? But we could take this as a creative prompt, not as a dead end. Like: what if work and groceries are closer at hand… or can come to them? “Sprawl” might not only end but be energetically reversed (Register, 2006). Imagine thorough-going and inventive suburban infill, for one thing, and the emergence of new walkable city centers (for work, for company, for fun, for groceries …) in what used to be massive P-lot-girded suburban malls (which, did you notice, are already going down?). Gardens, soccer fields, bikeways, cafés where streets and freeways and parking ramps used to be, in short, a “whole vision” of a life far more delightful for all.

Flip expected associations

We're rarely aware of our own self-imposed mental limits. Many of the most effective off-the-shelf creativity methods (of which there are actually many) are therefore indirect: their aim is to wrangle our ideas into unexpected and provocative re-arrangements – to jump the tracks or break out of the box or get out of the usual mental ruts (De Bono, 1993). Up front, therefore, these methods often feel forced, awkward, and even silly. This is a crucial point: they should! Remember again: the very point is to prod or provoke ourselves beyond our usual assumptions and pre-judgment. Of course, they will not feel like what we have learned to consider serious or responsible or professional thinking. Nonetheless, precisely this is a sign of promise – something to welcome.

Here is one such method: transpose constituent ideas, for example, by reversing expected relationships and thinking opposites. An expected way to improve things is by speeding them up. A reversal, then, would be to think about how to usefully slow things down. From fast food to slow food, for example – and behold, there is the germ of the idea that has blossomed into the Slow Food movement today, already claiming 80,000 members in 100 countries, devoted to biodiversity issues, new types of food-growing, and recovering the sheer pleasures of eating (Slow Food International, 2021).

So, what else can go slow, now? Slow travel … slow education … slow politics? “Raw” ideas, the creativity experts call these: we can work them out. How about, ironically, slow time? Stewart Brand of Whole Earth Catalog fame proposes massive, iconic clocks that tick once a day and chime once a century (Brand, 2000). A means of cultivating “cultural attention-lengthening,” he calls them … opening up in turn the possibility of others: he also proposes “Ten Thousand Year Libraries” that consciously collect for civilizational memory (what if the library at Alexandria had been — backed up?) and embedding records of who and what caused global warming deep in melting glaciers. And again, we might ask: what else? what next?

Just breaking the usual associations with certain words can put us quickly into a whirl of new ideas. Americans allow “Homeland Security” to be reduced to long TSA lines and universal paranoia … but what if we actually did think about how to protect and enrich “homelands,” everywhere? Even progressives speak fearfully of “attacks on our soil,” meaning terrorism at home, forgetting how aggressively “our soil” – the actual, physical, living soil – is under intense attack already under the regime of industrial agriculture (Berry, 2015). Organic farming, watershed and wildland preservation, clean energy, de-automobilizing cities – there’s “Homeland Security” for you! Not to mention the great philosophical secret of the martial arts: that we are only truly “secure” when our erstwhile enemies no longer desire to attack
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us. So what if the USA’s primary interventions abroad were medical or educational or, who knows, musical or ecological or even philosophical?

Oh, and just what might a “Christian school” mean besides social conservatism and evolution denial?

Again, these are not just rhetorical questions. Asking them is a method. Simple but potentially radical: take the words seriously.

Bracketing expected solutions

Bracketing expected solutions is another means of forcing out-of-the-box thinking. Brainstorming with my students, I may set a rule that no group can put forward an idea that they have heard before—in fact, that is even much like an idea that they have heard before. They need to devise something entirely new, rather than remake or tweak something familiar. It clears the decks…and more: it forces people to think in new directions. My students are dumbfounded by the very idea—for all of maybe five seconds—and then, they take to it with gusto. They immediately see it as a dare, and young people—and creative people—like dares!

Vulnerable cities like New Orleans (and London and Dhaka and Tokyo and …) are on the edge of rising seas: waters rising, some cities actually sinking. What else can be done but raise the dikes and floodgates? Well, seriously: what else can be done … that people are not talking about yet? Maybe, relocate (and maybe hyper-shrink) the city? Or, put it up on stilts (“Crude,” “raw” ideas … but not crazy, are they, in the long run?) How about … embracing the water? Come to think of it (which is what we are really doing, isn’t it: helping ourselves and others come to think of things?), there is the model of Venice, one of Earth’s most beautiful cities, built in the water.

Or yet again: what about a city that floats? Waters go up, so does the city—what’s the problem? It turns out that Buckminster Fuller, Paolo Soleri, and other architect-visionaries have already designed floating cities, half a century ago, others are doing so now and even the UN is involved today, and there are already ancient floating neighborhoods in Brunei and Peru’s Lake Titicaca as well as modern ones in Victoria, Copenhagen, and elsewhere (Brandon, 2021). Who knew? But now, once again, there is something to work with. CFCs can go farther …

Exaggerate and extrapolate

When processes or trends seem to be inching along, imagine instead going miles. Radically widen the imaginative horizon. Look for big steps: think dramatically farther down the road, off the scale. Make your first imaginative step a big one, in short: then walk back if you need to. Much better than trying to budge your inventiveness slowly forward.

So: don’t ask how to trim the workweek by just another hour or two. Go an order of magnitude farther. Cut it in half, maybe. Economist/historian Juliet Schor famously pointed out that since productivity per worker has more than doubled since the 1950s in most industrialized countries, the gains could have been used to halve the workweek rather than increase income (Schor, 1993). And productivity is still increasing, with surveys consistently showing that many workers would prefer reducing work time to increasing income. Meantime, job expectations after the pandemic are thoroughly scrambled. We could even be at a point when the fabled Work Ethic itself may be in for large-scale rethinking. Join the fun!
The largest mass action in the history of the planet – massive demonstrations against the US invasion of Iraq – was organized around the world on the Web in the space of a week. This already is an amazing and suggestive fact. But suppose it was only the beginning? How much farther could we extrapolate? Again, as suggested above, what if we tried to use the Internet to build ongoing worldwide political organizations – based on direct contact between people, and thus ultimately alternative to the UN as well as to the nation-state itself?

Many students around the world already take part in Model UN simulations. So what would it take for a global Model UN to actually become a UN – that is, to become more than a simulation? How big a step would it really be? Gamer friends of mine extrapolate a world government from, believe it or not, global online gaming communities. Couldn’t such a gaming community morph into an actual state? A smashing plot for a novel, at least, but couldn’t it also be more? States have arisen from stranger roots: merchants’ associations, beer-hall conspiracies, religious sects, trade unions …

Oh, and this just in: If state and land don’t have to be geographically distinct, could we also begin to visualize a totally new approach to ongoing struggles between two peoples (or, remembering Mollison, “nations”?) in the same land? Don’t immediately declare that it’s impossible. The creative prompt is the other way around: to ask how it could be possible. How would we know that anything really isn’t possible until we put some serious creativity into thinking about it?

**Look to leapfrog**

Sometimes, the best strategy is to leapfrog an entire problematic situation. It is not a matter of tinkering with the problem we’ve got or fighting over incremental improvements, but of creating a new system – finally taking seriously the adage that “no serious problem can be solved in the same terms in which it is posed.”

Imagine, for example, a world not of more recycled crappy “Stuff” but no Stuff at all. Material goods are instead meant to be managed within the household or very local economy. Some goods barely “materialized” at all, while others are produced for maximum durability in their first use. Others are made of wholly and quickly compostable materials. So maybe we really want a world of less recycling, not more? (Weston 2012).

Or again, a transportation-free city, as suggested in the third maxim. Paolo Soleri and his followers have designed and even built prototypes – not to mention that foot-traffic-based cities (not even bicycles!) were the human norm for most of our history. Who says the possibilities of cities are exhausted? What if we’ve barely seen anything yet? But it won’t be by upgrading bus service or providing universal Wi-Fi or building more affordable housing, leaving everything else the same. Sometimes changing everything is easier.

**The problem could be the solution**

Any problem is a complex state of affairs that, however undesirable in certain terms, also creates new opportunities. Each new emergent issue or problem highlights resources and opens possibilities that were not on the board before.

Today, the coming of age conjures up deep fears of decline, dependence, and death. Still, even so, once again, couldn’t there be possibilities, resources, and even opportunities also in it – potentialities that we could make more of, if we acknowledge and embrace them straight on (Thomas, 2004)? For example: all manner of specific community needs that older people – skilled, experienced, patient, and (let’s hope) freed from the need to continue making a
Creative futures conspiracies

wage – are in especially good positions to meet. Sustaining historical memory, for one. Caring for the very young. How about visionary work – the traditional role of the old in many Indigenous cultures – for which even a degree of (ready for this?) memory loss may be … a boon? And thus, we might begin to imagine a thoroughly transformed society that celebrates and truly honors the aged, rather than shunting them aside and framing them, and age itself, as a problem, indeed really a disgrace. What if we could hardly wait to grow old? Really, what if?

Run through the open door

In my teaching, I have repeatedly seen that the single greatest contributor to my students’ sustained creativity – after they have a few methods, anyway – is persistence. Or to put the other way around: it seems to be way too easy to stop with the first halfway unusual idea that comes along. Whereas that should actually be just the beginning – just the first opening. No: run through that opening and keep going.

“Teach the controversy,” fundamentalists say. Put Creationism into school curricula, they argue, give it a fair shake, and look at challenges to Darwinism. The general strategy among us free-thinkers (yes?) is to bemoan and reject these moves as some kind of anti-science dogmatism or ignorance, and try to put it down and move on. But for a moment, let’s imagine looking in the other direction, and consider where persistent engagement might lead us instead. For academics, at least, critical, sustained, reality-based dialogue, with multiple views in play, is supposed to be our specialty. So maybe we should look at Creationism in our classes. There are at least a few useful challenges to Darwinism worth considering, after all – there are fundamental uncertainties and rethinkings and controversies within it, though these are often not aired too widely for fear that creationists will fasten onto them and misrepresent them – and meantime, there are plenty of very instructive problems with Creationism in its various (often mutually contending) forms too, along with very basic inferential problems, like the immediate leap from rejecting evolution to one extremely specific alternative story … whereas even if there is some creative force behind the diversity of lifeforms (and even if it is singular and godlike, etc., because who knows what else is possible?), why would it be the Christian God in particular, as opposed to, say, Allah or Vishnu or perhaps a trainee or teenaged God who since graduated to more professional-level work (seeing as there are a few imperfections here and there …)?

Meanwhile, how many creationists favor “teaching the controversy” regarding, say, militarism, or gay marriage, or alternative religions? So sanctimonious about intellectual openness and a fair shake, do Creationists give evolution a fair shake in their own schools? Do they put “Only a Theory” stickers in their Bibles? And when straight-on Creationism claims the stage, where are the Native American stories? Greek mythology? Let’s “teach the controversies” within Creationism … how fun would that be?

You see? There is some room to “run” with this, indeed.

Or again: Even acknowledging today’s profound threats and heartbreaking destruction, it is love and not fear that (I say) we mainly need to drive planet-saving moves so imperative now. Though ever more desperate warnings have been environmentalism’s specialty, it’s clear by now that we also desperately need to break the automatic association with “doom and gloom.” So imagine, then, a fundamentally celebratory environmentalism. What would it be like to run through that door?

Ah, but I think I’ll leave that one for an exercise for you, Dear Reader! And who knows, to a CFC or two, down the road. Sail the Galapagos, maybe, while you do it. Here as everywhere, there is a world to win, or remake, or invent – and why not with … panache?
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