On Danger and the Dangerous

Samuel Powell

2023-01-01

1 The issue

This discourse was partially inspired by Ryan Chapman's video essay on populism. At the end of the video, Chapman discusses whether populism is dangerous. He indicates that it has the capability to be dangerous, but also can work good if it's channeled correctly, or in order to correct a certain wrong. I am wondering about the definition of danger. If a thing is capable of causing harm, is it not already dangerous? The useage in this video seems to indicate a necessary prediliction or significant likelyhood of causing harm or damage. I'm kindof inherently put off by this mode of definition, which is sort of utilitarian (as opposed to Kantian), focused on outcomes. Obviously, danger inherently speaks to consequences or results, but how can we assign the status of 'dangerous' *a priori*? I think an element of uncontrolability or probability of harm is important, but that's what I'm trying to tease out here.

2 What I think

I sort of developed a theory or maxim reacently:

Everyone [you] should be as dangerous as you are responsible [humble, self-controlled] enough to handle
    This speaks to the power facet of dangerous, possibly ommitting the probabilty to cause harm for emphasis or clarity. This idea was inspired by a Jordan Peterson statement about the importance of writing as a skill, because it makes you 'dangerous'.