

| |
|---------------|
| Sxoli Moraiti |
| Vasiliki |
| Poula |

Evil and ethicality have been two notions that dominate in the philosophical quests. Their coexistence – or the dominance of one? – in our world has been a debatable issue for centuries and perhaps there is no unique, objective, universal approach to the justification of ethicality in a world dominated by sperms of evil or even the mere existence of it. Why should one promote ethical traits when living in a situation full of evil. This question will be the springboard for the current essay.

Evil is an abstract notion including many different types, sources, causes and effects according to each philosopher. Being moral is equally a multidimensional matter. We will try to connect and combine different theories in order to conclude to a final reasoning, from which more questions will erupt. First of all, we will enlight some philosophical models linked to evil and morality. More precisely, we will examine the cases of Immanuel Kant, John Sturat Mill, Euripides and Plato. Then, we will continue with an analysis of the concern based on a general overview of the issue, combining all elements presented

Morality and ethicality is the vehicle via which an individual or an entity gets rid of evil. If the world is already full of evil, why should one be ethical? The answer seems simple: in order to promote a model of behaviour that resists to the general evil, thus he/she will engage hiself in a small – scale revolution instead of adopting evil as well.

Is this world permeated by evil? Kant would definietly answer positively. He was the supporter of the categorical imperative, which encourages people primordially to act as if their principle on which their action is based (maxims) would be transformed into a universal moral law and then he ellaborates on that, adding that one should always act and never use others or himsel as means, but as ends, as goals. He belives that will is what defines our actions and he discriminates will as the experimental will, affected by factors of our surroundings and then there is the “clear” will, which is only influenced by our personal choises. The second “type” of will is what is considered by him as “free”and based on that theory (where he finds two main elements sourcing from the autonomy of this will: the ultimate freedom and the strict obedience) he creates the categorical imperative.

In a world, where we tend to set constraints and prerequisites for every activity and act based on a personal axe, one could never become a general lawsetter. Kant thinks that if these imperatives do not motivate our actions, there the individual who acts is not logical and Kant’s Logic is the ultimate value for every society. In order not to perpetuate the vicious cycle of evil, we should all adopt his theory. Only then, the world would be cleansed by personal interests, personal conflicts and other negative attitudes that co-shape the notion of evil and thus, we would avoid evil.

In the question about the level of evil that this world has reached, Mill would definietly suggest that the margins are very tight. His theory of Utilitarianism

h.

a wide idea and Mill tried to discriminate it into more limited categories, suggesting general rules of behaviour and not just personally standardized actions.

Modern era is again an embodiment of evil, since the large majority of people do not act based on the general good, but think narrowly in their terms. Why should one serve the general good and thus, save this world from evil? Because utility is a notion that we dogmatically perceive as positive (such as health, for instance) and the consequences of our actions are facts and can be examined (such as whether it rains or not, as Kant says). If we try to augment the levels of utility, according to Kant, we can achieve it through the multiplication of the number of people that actually receive the positive effect of the actions.

Further more, we will advocate the reasoning of Euripides. He may have been reknown as a creator of drama scripts, but he has also been characterized as a stage's philosopher. Reading between the lines of his scripts can lead to the discovery of many innovative ideas and arising concerns, exercising criticism to the existing principles and norms. Via his play "Medea", he supports that society is what dehumanizes its very members. He creates his main character, Medea, who is the embodiment of the ultimate "Other", as a woman, a barbaric, a witch and a murderer of her own children, showing attitudes pushed to the limits. At the same time, though, he adds to her an heroic tone and brings the reader or the spectator to a very difficult position where he has to decide whether he can empathise with her or not.

Euripides is presenting the scale of evil that marriage and patriarchy (thus, society back to his day) could cause. And he implies the concern of being moral in such a world, he provided us with the food for thought. Being moral in his case is probably being well – equipped to affront these negative norms. Not destroy the norms, but upgrade them, ameliorate them, adapt them. And why this is something that demands to be done? Because the reproduction of these well – established stereotypes oppress and marginalise all individuals. This oppression needs to cease, since only then, we will have the ability – as a humanity – to prove ourselves in the best way possible and be true to ourselves.

Last but not least, we will focus on Plato. Plato believes in the World of Idea(s), as the holistic model, as the perfected system of our "realistic" world, which can be considered as an illusion. He divides the goods into spiritual and material, and underlines the significance and the superiority of the first ones as eternal and as the ones that should lead our journey in life. A notion that is included in the principle of "Agathon" is the existence of Justice. In an ideal platonic Republic, justice serves the interests of civilians and their interests coincide with the interests of the city. The maintenance of justice through the inner guidance of laws is an ultimate goal. Being unjust is worse than receiving injustice, since an unjust person has not realized the importance of Justice and is influenced by hedonisms and material goods of a lower level.

Injustice is presented by Plato – through "Gorgias", a dialogue between Socrates and his students – as the birthing force of many different types of evil. The weakness of the spirit (as interpreted through injustice) is considered to be the worse of all types of weaknesses (financial weakness and physical weakness). Why an individual should make an effort and maintain justice and adhere to the laws even if

he/she is entoured by injustice and thus, evil? The answer is given by the philosopher. The "quality" of life of each and everyone of us is restricted not only by what kind of goals we set for ourselves, but also by what kind of means we engage. One should try to remain obedient to the laws, and remain subjective to them (even he finds them unjust), so that Justice is served.

We have very briefly synchronised our way of thinking with the reasoning of four great thinkers. Philosophers are inavoidably in continuous "communication" with the period in history during which they write, its needs, its demands... The question remains though, why should one be ethical in a world defined by evil?

The answer can be interpreted in multiple ways; it is influenced by the way one defines ethical, by the way one defines evil... Are these terms contadictory? Are they both of vital importance in order for both of them to be developped? We have examined cases where one has the will and the desire to actually be ethical. He/she is able to sacrifice some elements of his comfort zone in order to act as if the entire world would be follow his path, often by acting against some of the inner positive feelings of human nature, such as love or philanthropy,. Then, one desires to maximize the general utility sometimes by decreasing his/her personal happiness, to chage desirably the social norms, despite the fact that he will need to redefine and reconsider his (often comfortable) priorities and finally, to respect the laws and the justice, even if he is constantly being a victim of injust behaviour by others.

James Rachels writes about ethical egoism and even if he finally considers it inethical, he states that it is a model that many people opt for. What if one is disappointed to the extent and to the degree, that he does not have any willingness to offer morality and ethicality to a world who is bombarding him with evil? Does he become part of the chain, part of the problem. Maybe he, individually, is not that concerned... Others may find some ethical theories extremely strict to follow.

Why being ethical is fundamnetal? This is the very first question we should set to ourselves. Probably we will need to dive back into the birth of humanity and search the racines and the roots of every problematic situation ever provoked. It is a painful and demanding procedure for both the individuals and social entities. The results of such a quest may be surprising and from this point, new concerns may arise.