

Dimitra-Anastasia
Saini
Io GEL Ioanninon

14
ΔΟΦ

Evil and murality are states of human nature that are closely combined and related to our history, society and of course consciousness. Even though we can't fully define any of these states, we have reached a level of understanding them, and we deal with them on our every day lives.

Now, is the world truly evil or corrupted as Rousseau believes? Can we actually avoid totalitarianism as Arendt thinks? And why should we, in a world that murality fades away be ethical at all?

One could simply say that ethical praxis makes us happy. This probably sounds egoistic but feelings, and I can surely relate, are an important fact when it comes to take decisions. It's the love we give and the love we take that give that little something that is changing –and hopefully- makes our lives even better.

Rousseau would say that to be truly ethical, or maybe a-ethical, we should go back to what he calls "state of nature". In today's society, being simply ethical would not mean much for him, because we, people, have reached the maximum level of alienation which we can't overcome and our will to be ethical is not actually true. We *tend to be* ethical in order to make sure that everyone around us **thinks** that we are kind- virtue is blooming in our souls- and come to like us. The other way around, if we cannot-as Rousseau realistically believes- go back to this pre-social level of the "natural state", we should (and here comes the Social Contract) reach a society based on freedom, where amour de soi (where one cares for himself but just so she will survive and not cause any harm to others) will take the place of amour propre (the selfishness, the love-of-self but in a harmful way). To get to that, we should actually, in our free and pure will, be ethical.

Kant suggests not to use others as mere means but as ends. That is ethical (we, as modern, civilized people cannot deny it) and also sounds pretty religious. Pitié, is the word that Rousseau suggests for "being in someone else's shoes". Treat others as you want to be treated. Even if we are not naturally born kind or virtuous, we tend to help and feel the way anyone that is related to us feels- as animals also do. And that is very important because it provides us with a society that even if corrupted or full of wrongdoing, actually has the power to overcome vice and defend its people. So, maybe we don't ought to be ethical but –even if we want it or not- nature has its mechanisms to be sure we will do "the right thing".

And murality is a way for today's society to get better. "Zoon politicon" as Arendt states we **want to** live in a society, so, in order not only to survive (animal laborans) but to actually act and create (homo faber) we use murality as a foundation in which we can bloom, become better, reach the top of human creation. We cannot be globally in a war, we cannot put down freedom if ourselves, our happiness and our tendency to creation are strong enough. But, is it?

Egoistically, we want to be happy. We want to give in order to, hopefully, one day receive. We care for others when we have nothing special to lose. For Rousseau, as long as what we truly are is not the same as what we seem to be, we cannot be ethical, we care for the way the others stare or gaze us. But to reach his ideal society, to be true again, true with others, close to nature we ought to be ethical.

Arts and Science will fully provide us with what is best when morality will be a part of them and their ends. Terrorism won't do a step farther if in a society of free, thinking people ethical act is an unbreakable piece. May the world be permeated by evil, no matter how we define it, but being ethical is a crucial decision that has to do not only with our survival but with the enrichment of our society itself, which is essential for us, whether if it brings all kinds of opacity, alienation, Arendt's estrangement and isolation. For many – as Socrates- being ethical, living by the state of law, was a way of life. For others, as Kant, there was no other option but acting and wanting our acts to apply as a universal law. That is genuinely ethical, or seems to me like (Rousseau would surely disagree).

Medea did not believe there was any other possible way for her to take what was hers. But what if she happily had wished them a "loving life", attended the wedding and then had walked -as peacefully as possible- away with her children by the hand? Then, back to her father, begged for forgiveness (you know how irritating little brothers are sometimes) and dedicate her life on white magic, singing and dancing? Would this world be any better? Could she actually do something even close to this? Was she happy at the end?