Dachi De Graff

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5838-9440

Process Analyst and Junior Finance Officer at BRAMS Institute

(Research advisor – Teimuraz Buadze, PhD)

MORAL PHILOSOPHY AND AMERICA'S TELL-ALL CULTURE

1. Foundations of moral philosophy and human interaction

The foundational question of how we ought to treat one another has been a central theme in philosophical discourse for centuries. This inquiry is at the heart of moral philosophy,[1] which examines the ethical principles that shape our interactions and the complexities inherent to human existence. Ethics[2] fundamentally engages with vital questions about the meaning of life and the frameworks guiding our decisions.

To uncover the highest meaning in our lives and to structure our existence through moral principles, we must confront several pivotal philosophical questions. These include: What makes an action right or wrong? What do we mean when we assert that someone ought or ought not to do something? How should we live? And ultimately, how should we treat one another? Such fundamental questions have engaged philosophers for millennia, highlighting the timeless relevance of this field.

The significance of moral philosophy becomes particularly apparent when considering grave moral transgressions such as torture, murder, cruelty, slavery, rape, and theft. If we cannot articulate why these actions are deemed wrong, what justification

do we have for their prevention? Moral philosophy is essential as it provides rational foundations for our ethical beliefs, ensuring that morality is grounded in reasoned arguments rather than mere prejudice.

Moral philosophy provides invaluable insights for tackling contemporary ethical dilemmas.[3] It clarifies the implications of widely held moral beliefs and illustrates how these can be applied consistently in practice. When examining moral theories, three primary frameworks emerge:

1. Duty-based moral theory (deontological),[4] as advocated by Emmanuel Kant.[5]
2. Consequence-based moral theory, exemplified by utilitarianism (the best-known type of consequentialist ethical theory) and championed by Jeremy Bentham[6] and John Stuart Mill.[7]
3. Virtue-based moral theory, as articulated in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*.[8]

These competing frameworks provide distinct lenses through which to understand moral issues. In the following sections, I will outline the main features of these theories and subsequently illustrate their application through a real-life case study.

2. Kantian Ethics and Conflicting Duties: Priest Theodorus

Duty-based ethical theories assert that individuals possess specific obligations—actions deemed right or wrong regardless of their consequences. This framework distinguishes deontological ethics, particularly Kantian and Christian ethics, from consequentialist theories.[9] Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) posited that the only acceptable motive for moral action is a sense of duty,[10] contending that moral actions should stem from rational decision-making rather than emotions or self-interest.

A compelling illustration of the complexities inherent in duty-based ethics is the case of the Georgian Priest Theodorus of Kvelta[11] (d. 1609), who faced a profound moral dilemma when the Ottoman army threatened his homeland. In an effort to protect his sovereign and country, Theodorus lied about the whereabouts of King Luarsab II (1592-1622). While the Kantian ethical framework would categorise this act as immoral for violating the categorical imperative[12]—which mandates that one must always tell the truth—Theodorus's situation underscores a notable conflict between competing duties.

Kant argued that rational beings possess categorical, unconditional duties; truthfulness is one of them. However, these principles can struggle under conflicting obligations. In Theodorus's situation,[13] the duty to protect his country and its young leader[14] arguably superseded the obligation to tell the truth. Critics of Kant's emphasis on duty contend that this perspective neglects the ethical complexities inherent in such dilemmas.[15]

Kant's principle of universalizability asserts that individuals must base moral actions on maxims that everyone can consistently apply. One might view Father Theodorus's lie as an exception to this principle because it has life-saving ramifications. While Kant emphasised rational intent as the cornerstone of morality, Theodorus's predicament illustrates how emotional motivations and contextual factors significantly influence moral assessments.

In the Kantian framework, lying is categorically wrong because it violates the moral duty to tell the truth,[16] which is central to the Categorical Imperative. According to Kant, individuals must act in accordance with maxims that everyone can

apply universally; thus, lying to the enemy constitutes immoral behaviour, regardless of the underlying intentions.

The prospect of lying to protect one's homeland raises critical questions about conflicting duties. Although the duty to uphold the truth is paramount, the obligation to defend the country can also carry equal weight. The Kantian theoretical structure does not readily reconcile these conflicts, as it prioritises adherence to moral laws over contingent circumstances.

Kantian ethical theory, especially his concept of universalizability,[17] faces criticism for being insufficient in guiding moral decision-making. Critics argue that while Kant provides a framework for moral judgements, it often fails to offer practical solutions for those confronting conflicting duties, such as choosing between telling the truth[18] and protecting someone. This dilemma resonates with the choice to lie to save one's king from an enemy.

Critics also contend that Kant's theory neglects compassion as an emotional factor, which many consider integral to moral actions. The invading forces likely relied on the expectation that a Georgian priest would uphold duty-based ethics when compelled to reveal the route to the royal residence. Kant's lack of emphasis on consequences renders his framework inadequate for evaluating the morality of actions.

In practical terms, many might argue that in cases of extreme necessity—such as defending one's homeland—lying could be justified as a means to fulfil a higher moral duty. Yet, according to strict Kantian principles, even noble intentions cannot outweigh the obligation to remain truthful. This reality underscores a fundamental limitation in Kantian ethics when faced with complex, real-world moral dilemmas.

3. Understanding consequentialism through the example of George V the Brilliant

Consequence-based moral theory refers to ethical frameworks that evaluate the moral rightness or wrongness of an action based on its consequences.[19] This approach prioritises the outcomes of actions rather than the intentions behind them. A consequentialist would assess an act of lying by examining the outcomes it generates. For instance, in the case of Priest Theodorus, his decision to mislead the invading army about the whereabouts of the Georgian king can be interpreted as morally justified because it ultimately saved the lives of Luarsab II and numerous others.

The most prominent type of consequentialist ethical theory is utilitarianism,[20] which maintains that the ultimate goal of human activity is to maximise happiness. This perspective is rooted in hedonism, suggesting that pleasure or happiness constitutes the highest good. Utilitarianism defines 'good' as that which generates the greatest total happiness, a principle known as the Greatest Happiness Principle or the Principle of Utility.[21] Its foundations lie in the works of influential philosophers such as Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806–1873).

Utilitarianism adeptly addresses complex moral dilemmas that resonate throughout history. A noteworthy example is the reign of King George V of Georgia (1286-1346).[22] Faced with rebellious noblemen threatening royal authority and central governance, King George V took drastic measures to eliminate his most formidable opponents. He convened a royal meeting at Mount Cold (Mta Tsivi), where he executed noblemen from the Georgian regions of Kakheti and Hereti, as well as from Armenia, who opposed him.[23] While this extreme action is morally questionable by many standards, its utilitarian justification rests on the belief that it secured greater stability and happiness for the kingdom in the long run. The subsequent unification of the

kingdom under the legal code *Dzeglisdeba*, proposed by the King,[24] established peace and prosperity, leading the grateful people of Georgia to bestow upon him the title of George the Brilliant.[25]

Despite its compelling approach, utilitarianism faces significant challenges. Particularly, evaluating and comparing the well-being of different individuals is inherently complicated. Who can determine whether the immense pleasure of a sadist outweighs the suffering of their victim? Such dilemmas highlight the practical difficulties of applying utilitarian principles in real-world situations.

Although King George V stabilised his kingdom, his harsh methods instilled fear among recalcitrant noblemen seeking independence and political freedom, actions that ultimately undermined the unity and strength of Georgia. In this context, the rebellious nobility can be likened to sadists, while the country and its people assume the role of victims. Thus, the royal endeavour to protect these victims from the 'sadists' was ultimately righteous.

Consequentialism stands in stark contrast to deontological frameworks, such as Kantian ethics, which assert that some actions, like killing, are intrinsically wrong regardless of potential benefits. From a Kantian perspective, truthfulness is an absolute moral duty. In contrast, a consequentialist evaluates the morality of actions—such as the king's executions—solely based on their outcomes.

Utilitarianism asserts that the morality of an action depends on its outcomes. The action anticipated to produce the highest level of happiness—or the most favourable balance of happiness over unhappiness—is regarded as morally correct in that context. Utilitarianism operates within the realm of probable consequences due to the inherent challenges of accurately predicting the outcomes of specific actions. Both Bentham and Mill emphasised

that happiness is the ultimate goal of human actions. Therefore, King George V deserved the praise he received from both his subjects and future generations because he brought stability, peace, economic growth, and widespread happiness across the Kingdom of Georgia.

4. Reevaluating virtue-based moral theory

Virtue theory, presented in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*,[26] emphasises the importance of character and the individual's overall well-being. The key question it pose is, "How should we live?" The answer is straightforward: one must cultivate virtues to flourish as a human being.

Aristotle asserted that flourishing, or eudaimonia (Greek for 'true happiness'), is a universal human aspiration. Though frequently translated as "happiness," this term can be misleading; eudaimonia reflects a successful way of living, analogous to how certain practices enable a cherry tree to grow and bear fruit. According to Aristotle, virtuous living is essential for attaining a well-rounded and fulfilling life. Virtues are not merely habitual behaviours but involve a nuanced understanding of appropriate responses to varying situations. A virtuous individual, exhibiting generosity, should feel and act in alignment with that virtue based on the context.

Aristotle emphasises that true virtue arises from the harmonious integration of all virtues, forming a cohesive character that can effectively respond to various ethical challenges. Figures like Martin Luther King Jr. epitomise this principle, embodying courage, nonviolence, and empathy in their quest for moral progress.[27] Similarly, Nelson Mandela's fight against apartheid serves as a powerful illustration of virtue in practice.[28] His unwavering commitment to reconciliation over

retribution exemplified courage and integrity. Mandela's emphasis on collective responsibility reflected the importance of cultivating a multifaceted ethical character in navigating complex societal challenges.

The *Declaration of Independence* (1776) vividly illustrates the application of virtue-based moral theory. The Founding Fathers demonstrated virtues of integrity, intellectual curiosity, and a commitment to liberty, which were essential in shaping the ideals of democracy and personal freedom. Thomas Jefferson encapsulated Enlightenment ideals regarding human rights and governance, embodying the virtues of vision and aspiration in his drafting of the *Declaration of Independence*.[29] His concept extended beyond political change; it aimed for a society grounded in equality and justice. Benjamin Franklin exemplified the virtue of pragmatism.[30] He understood the importance of collaboration and diplomacy in achieving collective goals, working tirelessly to unite the colonies against British oppression.[31] The intertwining of their virtues ultimately laid the groundwork for a democratic society that prioritises individual rights and social responsibility.

Virtue theory grapples with a significant challenge in defining behaviours that qualify as virtues. The absence of consensus among theorists raises concerns about biases; personal preferences may be mistakenly labelled as virtues while those holding opposing views often label them as vices. Thus, while virtue theory presents a compelling framework for understanding ethics and moral character, it necessitates critical engagement to address its limitations. As societies evolve, so too must our understanding of virtue, ensuring that it remains relevant and responsive to contemporary ethical dilemmas. In essence, a nuanced approach that considers the integration of multiple virtues alongside the influence of context will foster more robust moral reasoning in our increasingly complex and dynamic world.

5. Moral accountability and the tell-all attitude among celebrities

Each of the three fundamental types of ethical theories outlined previously holds significant weight in contemporary ethical discourse. The application of these theories to real-world moral dilemmas constitutes applied ethics. A pressing issue within this arena is the concept of moral accountability, particularly as it relates to what has been termed performative morality. It is essential to recognise that diverse cultures approach ethical dilemmas in different ways. Throughout history, various nationalities have employed distinct perspectives to tackle similar moral issues.

In the context of virtue ethics, a tell-all attitude—where individuals publicly confess wrongdoing—can be explored through the lenses of moral accountability, courage, and authenticity. However, this behaviour invites scrutiny; some perceive it as performative morality or moral exhibitionism, where the focus shifts from genuine remorse to the act of confession itself.

Moral accountability refers to the responsibility an individual bears for their actions. A confession signifies an acknowledgement of wrongdoing, coupled with a desire to make amends. Courage is another vital aspect; within virtue ethics, the ability to admit one's faults and seek forgiveness is considered courageous, often requiring the confrontation of social stigma and personal guilt. Authenticity plays a critical role in the sincerity of the confession. A genuine admission reflects true remorse and a commitment to change, rather than merely serving as a tactic for public approval.

Conversely, performative morality describes situations where public confessions appear motivated more by societal recognition than by genuine moral reflection. Critics argue that

such actions may reflect a greater concern for personal image than for ethical behaviour.

The modern American tell-all attitude is a phenomenon that can sometimes justify wrongdoing when publicly confessed to. While we can articulate sound reasons for our moral beliefs, morality in American society often seems vulnerable to the influence of prejudice. Public opinion can be swayed by the prevailing biases of the moment, revealing that morality can sometimes be more a reflection of prejudice than a steadfast principle. This fluidity in moral judgement underscores the need for careful analysis of real-world examples to unravel the complexities of moral accountability, thereby demonstrating that our ethical beliefs are not always grounded in objective reasoning but frequently influenced by societal biases.

* * *

When Julia Roberts, a prominent American actress, pursued a relationship with Danny Moder, effectively "buying" him from another woman,[32] she faced substantial public criticism. Initially, many condemned her actions. However, over time, this incident became a popular subject for jokes on late-night shows and in stand-up comedy across the United States. The couple married in 2002, keeping their ceremony private. Today, most people pay little attention to them, primarily because they have chosen to maintain a low profile and focus on their family happiness.[33]

* * *

In 2005, the film *Mr. & Mrs. Smith*[34] premiered, starring Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie, igniting a scandal over their reported romantic involvement. Public opinion swiftly condemned them for betraying Jennifer Aniston, Pitt's then-wife. Yet few recognised that Pitt and Aniston faced personal issues long before their separation, which occurred ahead of filming.[35]

Aniston's subsequent tell-all interview,[36] filled with emotional appeals and tears, intensified the negative sentiment towards Jolie. This moment marked a significant milestone in the modern American tell-all attitude, as public outrage became so severe that Jolie felt compelled to escape to other continents until the fury subsided.

When Pitt and Jolie married in a private French ceremony in 2014, the intense scrutiny surrounding their relationship overshadowed the complexities of Aniston's experience. This dynamic illustrates how momentary biases often drive public sentiment instead of the truth. Ultimately, the American media celebrated the Jolie-Pitt family as an ideal of happiness, revealing the public's fondness for happy endings and their tendency to seek out fresh headlines.

* * *

When Kristen Stewart, the star of *Twilight*,[37] publicly apologised[38] for her infidelity towards Robert Pattinson,[39] her English co-star and boyfriend at the time, few voiced disapproval. Following revelations of her brief affair with *Snow White and the Huntsman* director Rupert Sanders—prompted by compromising photos that surfaced in July 2012—Stewart issued a heartfelt statement expressing deep remorse.[40] She stated that she was "deeply sorry" for the "momentary indiscretion" that jeopardised her relationship with Pattinson, whom she affectionately referred to as "the person I love and respect the most."

After her public apology,[41] Stewart received an outpouring of national sympathy and support across North American media, including social platforms. This reaction prompted a heartbroken Pattinson to flee to England, abandoning his flourishing American career to escape the unwarranted backlash from Kristen Stewart's fans. They somehow thought it morally correct to blame the foreigner because he could not grasp the importance of expressing

her emotions publicly. Surprisingly, even the Pattison family, especially Robert's sisters, Lizzy and Victoria,[42] eceived criticism for not being understanding enough towards the young American actress. Meanwhile, Mrs Sanders, a mother of two, garnered little sympathy, despite enduring the collapse of her marriage.

Unlike Anniston-Pitt divorce circumstances, the Stewart-Pattinson story elicited drastically different public feedback, placing blame on the victim of the infidelity for the turmoil that followed. The situation exemplified how public sentiment can often skew certain narratives, allowing Stewart to emerge relatively unscathed while Pattinson bore the brunt of the fallout. These incidents highlight the complexities of celebrity relationships and the nature of public opinion, which often tend to favour the first individual to adopt a tell-all stance. Regardless of fault, the initial speaker frequently emerges as a victim, garnering a disproportionate public sympathy and support.

* * *

The appeal of the tell-all attitude has recently diminished. In March 2021, when Prince Harry and Meghan Markle conducted their controversial TV interview with Oprah Winfrey,[43] they received both supportive and critical feedback. Although they initially captivated public interest by sharing their side of the story,[44] the couple garnered far less sympathy than anticipated, as their reliance on this approach diminished the credibility of their assertions. Despite having supporters, they now struggle to engage an audience in 2023.

The Sussexes may no longer be the "hot ticket" for media executives or the public,[45] as interest in their narrative wanes. Their multimillion-pound deal with Spotify and Archewell Audio concluded after just one series of Meghan's podcast, *Archetypes*. Much like the myth of King Midas, what Meghan Markle touches

tends to glitter like gold but quickly fades, failing to bring lasting happiness to the Sussexes.

From a moral philosophy perspective, their ongoing saga serves as a poignant example of how not to treat people, urging a search for more constructive ways to resolve familial issues. Gradually, the American public is losing interest and growing weary of the repetitive nature of their story, which starkly contrasts with the expected "happily ever after." The media audience becomes fatigued by the endless complaints, eagerly awaiting a resolution that leads to a positive outcome.

6. Conclusion

While moral philosophy continuously offers valuable insights into navigating moral issues, the question of 'how we should treat others' often shifts the ethical approach from context to context. This fluidity significantly influences the prejudices that the general public employs when judging the moral or immoral actions of others, whether in condemnation or support.

There are instances when public sentiment suddenly shifts, leading some individuals to tolerate a previously condemned immoral act and treat the perpetrator as a victim. In such cases, the emphasis often falls on societal expectations, which can lead to criticism of those who fail to provide adequate support to the individual in question. This dynamic perpetuates a complex interplay between moral accountability and the social interpretation of morality, illustrating that ethical understanding is not static; instead, prevailing cultural narratives and biases shape it at any given moment.

The resultant discrepancies in public sentiment underscore the importance of critically examining these shifts in perception,

as they reveal the intricate relationships between morality, social support, and public judgement.

ლიტერატურა ▢ References

1. Hume, David (2006). *Moral philosophy*. Hackett Publishing Co., Inc.
2. Malik, Kenan (2015). *The quest for a moral compass: A global history of ethics*. Atlantic Books.
3. Cohen, Martin (2003). *101 ethical dilemmas*. Routledge.
4. Nadare, Maia (2021). *Deontology through the international media law*. Tbilisi: Publishing House Universal (In Georgian).
5. Denis, Lara (Ed.) (2017). *Kant: The metaphysics of morals* (Mary Gregor, Trans.; 2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
6. Bentham, Jeremy (2019). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. Anodos Books.
7. Mill, John Stuart, and Jeremy Bentham (2004). *Utilitarianism and other essays*. Edited by Alan Ryan, London: Penguin Books.
8. Bartlett, Robert C., and Susan D. Collins (Trans.) (2011). *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics* (Penguin Classics). University of Chicago Press.
9. Wood, Allen W. (2008). *Kantian ethics* (1st Kindle ed.). Cambridge University Press, pp. 259-273.
10. Kant's moral philosophy (2004, February 23). In: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Retrieved from <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/kant-moral/>
11. აკოფაშვილი გ. (1979). საქართველოს ისტორიის ნარკვევები. ის: ქართული საბჭოთა ენციკლოპედია. ტომი 4, თბილისი, გვ. 633 (თევდორე კველთელი). Retrieved from <https://georgianencyclopedia.ge/pdf/4.pdf>
12. Wood, Allen W. (2008). *Kantian ethics* (1st Kindle ed.). Cambridge University Press, pp. 67-78.
13. წმინდა მოწამე თევდორე მღვდელი (კველთელი). შეადგინა და თარგმნა რუსუდან ბუაჩიძემ. პორტალი „მართლმადიდებელი". Retrieved from <https://orthodoxy.ge/tveni/ivnisi/08-mgvdeli_tevdore.htm>
14. გოგებაშვილი იაკობ (2023). თავდადებული მღვდელი თევდორე. Retrieved from <https://poetry.ge/pages/iakob-gogebashvili/prose/k-iakob-gogebashvilis-istoriuli-motxroba-tavdadebuli-mgvdeli-tevdore>
15. Wood, Allen W. (2008). *Kantian ethics* (1st Kindle ed.). Cambridge University Press, pp. 24-40.
16. Kant, Immanuel (2019). *Groundwork for the metaphysics of morals* (Christopher Bennett, Joe Saunders, and Robert Stern, Trans.). Oxford University Press.

17. Ibid.
18. Wood, Allen W. (2008). *Kantian ethics* (1st Kindle ed.). Cambridge University Press, pp. 158-169.
19. Bentham, Jeremy (2019) *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. Anodos Books, pp. 23-40.
20. Mill, John Stuart, and Jeremy Bentham (2004). *Utilitarianism and other essays*. Edited by Alan Ryan, London: Penguin Books.
21. Bentham, Jeremy (2019). *An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. Anodos Books, pp. 7-14.
22. ლორთქიფანიძე მარიამ, მეტრეველი როინ (2007). საქართველოს მეფეები. თბილისი: „ნეკერი“.
23. კეკელია ვლადიმერ (2015). საქართველოს ილუსტრირებული ისტორია. ტომი 10 – გიორგი ბრწყინვალე. თბილისი: „პალიტრა L“.
24. ჯავახიშვილი ივანე (2012). ქართველი ერის ისტორია ხუთ ტომად. ტომი III. თბილისი: „პალიტრა L“.
25. გოგებაშვილი იაკობ (2023). გიორგი ბრწყინვალე. Retrieved from <https://burusi.wordpress.com/2009/09/29/giorgi-brckinvale/>
26. Bartlett, Robert C., and Susan D. Collins (Trans.) (2011). *Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics* (Penguin Classics). University of Chicago Press.
27. King, Martin Luther, Jr. (2010). *Stride toward freedom: The Montgomery story*. Edited with an introduction by Clayborne Carson, Boston: Beacon Press.
28. Mandela, Nelson (1995). *Long walk to freedom: The autobiography of Nelson Mandela*. Back Bay Books.
29. Founding Fathers (2021). *The Constitution of the United States of America. The Declaration of Independence. The Bill of Rights* (Kindle ed.).
30. Campbell, James (2009). The pragmatist in Franklin. In: Carla Mulford (Ed.). *The Cambridge Companion to Benjamin Franklin*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 104–116.
31. Campbell, James (1995). The Pragmatism of Benjamin Franklin. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, *31*(4), 745–792. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40320571>
32. NJeri, Esther (2023, April 28). Julia Roberts paid off Danny Moder's wife who called her 'husband stealer,' sources claim. *Amo Mama News*. Retrieved from <https://news.amomama.com/403927-julia-roberts-paid-off-danny-moders-wife-1.html#google_vignette>
33. Mauch, Ally (2020, July 4). Julia Roberts celebrates 18th wedding anniversary with husband Danny Moder: 'Heck yes'. *People*. Retrieved from <https://ca.sports.yahoo.com/news/julia-roberts-celebrates-18th-wedding-184539249.html>
34. *Mr. and Mrs. Smith* (2005). Directed by Doug Liman, Regency Enterprises; 20th Century Fox.

35. Parker, Heidi (2015, January 21). 'Nobody did anything wrong': Jennifer Aniston addresses her 2005 split from Brad Pitt and insists they 'wish wonderful things' for each other. *The Daily Mail*. Retrieved from <https://www.dailymail.co.uk/tvshowbiz/article-2920651/Jennifer-Aniston-addresses-2005-split-Brad-Pitt-insists-wish-wonderful-things-other.html>

36. Bennett, Leslie (2005, September). The unsinkable Jennifer Aniston. *Vanity Fair*. Retrieved from <https://archive.vanityfair.com/article/2005/9/the-unsinkable-jennifer-aniston>

37. *Twilight* (2008). Directed by Catherine Hardwicke, Summit Entertainment.

38. Ramsdale, Suzannah (2012, July 26). Kristen Stewart admits cheating on Robert Pattinson with public apology. *Marie Claire*. Retrieved from <https://www.marieclaire.co.uk/news/celebrity-news/kristen-stewart-admits-cheating-on-robert-pattinson-with-public-apology-145276>

39. AP (2012, July 26). Twilight star Kristen Stewart apologises to Robert Pattinson over Rupert Sanders affair. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/people/news/twilight-star-kristen-stewart-apologises-to-robert-pattinson-over-rupert-sanders-affair-7978620.html>

40. Dray, Kayleigh (2012, July 26). Kristen Stewart is confident that she can win back Robert Pattinson: 'I love you and I'm so sorry'. *Cosmopolitan*. Retrieved from <https://www.cosmopolitan.com/uk/entertainment/news/a16821/kristen-stewart-desperate-for-robert-pattinsons-forgiveness-after-affair-exposed/>

41. Selby, Jenn (2012, December 19). Kristen Stewart apologises for cheating scandal. *Glamour*. Retrieved from <https://www.glamourmagazine.co.uk/article/kristen-stewart-apologises-cheating-scandal>

42. Andrews, Amy (2012, October 9). Robert Pattinson's protective sisters furious that he gave Kristen Stewart a second chance. *IrishCentral*. Retrieved from <https://www.irishcentral.com/opinion/amyandrews/robert-pattinsons-protective-sisters-furious-that-he-gave-kristen-stewart-a-second-chance-173279441-238152941>

43. Bagwell, Matt (2021, March 8). Meghan and Harry: 12 biggest bombshells from the couple's explosive Oprah Winfrey interview. *HuffPost*. Retrieved from <https://www.huffingtonpost.co.uk/entry/meghan-markle-prince-harry-oprah-winfrey-interview-most-shocking-moments_uk_6045a6abc5b60208555fcf4d?origin=article-related-life>

44. BBC (2021, March 9). Meghan and Harry interview: Racism claims, duke 'let down' by dad, and duchess on Kate. *BBC News*. Retrieved from <https://www.bbc.com/news/uk-56316659>

45. Meyer-Funnell, Catherine (2023, July 21). Meghan and Harry no longer 'hot ticket' as public not interested in what they have to say. *The Express*. Retrieved from <https://www.express.co.uk/news/royal/1793592/meghan-markle-prince-harry-interest>

დაზი დე გრაფი
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5838-9440
ბრამსის ინსტიტუტის პროცესების
ანალიტიკოსი და უმცროსი ფინანსისტი
(ხელმძღვანელი – პროფ. თეიმურაზ ბუაძე)

მორალის ფილოსოფია და
საჯარო „აღსარების" კულტი აშშ-ში

(ანოტაცია)

საკვანძო სიტყვები: ზნეობა, ეთიკა, „აღსარება", უტილიტარიზმი,
კონსეკვენციალიზმი, ევდემონიზმი, მედიაგავლენა

ეთიკა განიხილავს ფუნდამენტურ საკითხებს იმის შესახებ, თუ როგორ უნდა მოვექცეთ ერთმანეთს, აყალიბებს ჩვენს ზნეობრივ პრინციპებსა და ურთიერთობებს.

ეთიკური საკითხების გასააზრებლად, განსხვავებულ თვალთახედვას გვთავაზობს მორალურ ფილოსოფიაში არსებული სამი ძირითადი მიმართულება:

1. მოვალეობაზე დაფუძნებული მორალური თეორია, რომელსაც ემანუელ კანტი ლობირებდა;
2. შედეგებზე დაფუძნებული მორალური თეორია, რომელსაც ჯერემი ბენტამი და ჯონ სტიუარტ მილი უჭერდნენ მხარს;
3. სათნოებაზე დაფუძნებული მორალური თეორია, რომელიც ჩამოყალიბებულია არისტოტელეს „ნიკომაქეს ეთიკაში".

მოვალეობაზე დაფუძნებული მორალური თეორიის თანახმად, ადამიანი ვალდებულია განსაზღვროს, სწორია თუ არა მისი ქმედებები, შედეგების მიუხედავად.

მოვალეობაზე დაფუძნებული მორალური თეორია პრაქტიკაში ყოველთვის მომგებიანი არაა. ამის თვალსაჩინო ნიმუშია თევდორე კველთელის თავდადება.

ქართველი მღვდელი მორალური დილემის წინაშე აღმოჩნდა, როდესაც საქართველოში შემოჭრილმა ოსმალეთის ჯარმა შეიპყრო და მეფის დალაგტი მოსთხოვა. კანტისეული ეთიკის თანახმად, რადგან ქართველმა მღვდელმა იცრუა, სიმართლის თქმის მორალური ვალდებულება დაარღვია. მოცემული ისტორიული ფაქტი წარმოაჩენს ურთიერთსაწინააღმდეგო მოვალეობებს შორის კონფლიქტს.

კანტისგან განსხვავებით, რომელიც აცხადებს, რომ გარკვეული ქმედებები (მაგალითად, მკვლელობა) ეთიკურად მუდამ არასწორი საქციელია, დადებითი შედეგის მიუხედავადაც კი, კონსეკვენციალიზმი ანუ შედეგებზე დაფუძნებული მორალური თეორია ზნეობას, შედეგების მიხედვით განსჯის. თვალსაჩინო ნიმუშად გამოდგება მეფე გიორგი V-ის მიერ კახელი, ჰერეთელი და სომეხი ურჩი დიდებულების დახოცვა მთა ციცზე. ქვეყნის ერთიანობისა და პოლიტიკური სიმდიერის აღსადგენად, მას ასეთი ნაბიჯის გადადგმა მოუხდა. მეფის, ერთი შეხედვით, მორალურად მიუღებელი ქმედება, უტილიტარული თვალსაზრისით სრულიად გამართლებულია. მადლიერმა ქართველმა ერმა გიორგი V-ს „ბრწყინვალე" უწოდა და შვიდი საუკუნის განმავლობაში ქება-დიდებით მოიხსენიებს მის ბრძნულ მმართველობას.

საზღოების თეორია, რომელიც არისტოტელეს „ნიკომაქეს ეთიკიდან" იღებს სათავეს, კონკრეტულ ქმედებებზე წინ აყენებს ხასიათს, როდესაც სვამს კითხვას: „როგორ უნდა ვიცხოვრო?". არისტოტელესთვის განცხრომა (ევდემონიზმი ანუ ჯეჩშმარიტი ბედნიერება) უნივერსალურ მისწრაფებას წარმოადგენს, რაც ცხოვრების ჰოლისტურ ხარისხს აღნიშნავს და არა – წარმავალ ბედნიერებას. საამისოდ აუცილებელია ნამდვილი საზღოება, რაც ხასიათის სხვადასხვა თვისების ერთობლიობას გულისხმობს.

საზღო პიროვნებები იყვნენ მარტინ ლუთერ კინგი-უმცროსი და ნელსონ მანდელა. სამოქალაქო

უფლებებისთვის მებრძოლი კინგი სიკეთეს, გამბედაობასა და თანაგრძნობას განასახიერებდა. ის იყო არაძალადობრივი წინააღმდეგობის მომხრე პოლიტიკური აქტივისტი და უსამართლობის მსხვერპლთა მხარდამჭერი. ანალოგიურად აზროვნებდა და იქცეოდა აპარტეიდის წინააღმდეგ მებრძოლი ნელსონ მანდელა, რომელიც შურისძიების ნაცვლად, შერიგებისკენ მოუწოდებდა. თომას ჯეფერსონი სათნოების მნიშვნელობას გახაზავს „აშშ-ის დამოუკიდებლობის დეკლარაციაში“.

თუმცა, ამ თეორიას ერთი არსებითი პრობლემა აქვს: რთულია სათნოების ზუსტი დეფინიცია. თეორეტიკოსები ვერ თანხმდებიან, რა არის სათნოება, რადგან არსებობს იდეალის განსხვავებული ვარიანტები პირადი მოსაზრებებისა თუ საზოგადოებრივი აზრის ცვლილებების ზეგავლენით.

სათნოების ეთიკის ფარგლებში, ყველაფრის გასაჯაროების ტაქტიკა ანუ დანაშაულის საქვეყნოდ აღიარება პასუხისმგებლობის, გამბედაობისა და გულწრფელობის გამოვლინებად შეიძლება ჩაითვალოს.

თავდაპირველად, ძლიერი ნეგატიური რეაქცია მოჰყვა ჯულია რობერტსის ურთიერთობას ცოლიან მამაკაცთან. თუმცა, მისი „სხვის ქმართან“ კავშირის თემა წლებთან ერთად დავიწყებას მიეცა. ეს ლოგიკურიც იყო, რადგან ჯულია სასურველ ადამიანზე დაქორწინდა. შემდეგ კი ამერიკელი მსახიობი ახალ ამპლუაში, როგორც ცოლი და დედა, საზოგადოებრივი ინტერესისა და აღტაცების წყარო გახდა.

ანალოგიურად, ბრედ პიტსა და ანჯელინა ჯოლისთან დაკავშირებული სასიყვარულო სკანდალი დროის დინებასთან ერთად გადაიზარდა ბრანჯელინას თაყვანისცემაში. ჯენიფერ ანისტონის ცრემლებითა და ემოციური ინტერვიუებით გამოწვეული მასობრივი უარყოფითი დამოკიდებულება „მისტერ და მისის სმიტების“ადმი ნელ-ნელა მინელდა. მათი ურთიერთობით აღშფოთებულთა ისტერია ჩაანაცვლა მრავალშვილიანი

ოჯახის მზრუნველი მშობლების მხარდაჭერამ. ჯოლი და პიტი ამერიკელთა უსაყვარლეს წყვილად გადაიქცა.

წლების შემდეგ, აბსოლუტურად საპირისპირო განწყობით შეხვდა ამერიკული საზოგადოება კრისტენ სტიუარტის ურთიერთობას ცოლშვილიან რუპერტ სანდერსთან. ჯულია რობერტსისა თუ ანჯელინა ჯოლის მსგავსი ამორალური საქციელისთვის მან თანაგრძნობა დაიმსახურა, როცა მედიით დაუყოვნებლივ მოიბოდიშა დალატის გამო. უფრო მეტიც, კრისტენის შეყვარებულ, ბრიტანელ მსახიობ რობერტ პატინსონს დაატყდა საზოგადოებრივი კრიტიკის ქარცეცხლი იმის გამო, რომ თავისი „კულტურული შეუთავსებლობის გამო“ ვერ გაუგო მონანიე გოგონას და ორგულობა ვერ აპატია. ეს დინამიკა ასახავს, როგორ შეუსაბამოდ იდებენ ხშირად თანაგრძნობას ადამიანები, რომლებიც საჯაროდ საუბრობენ პირადულ საკითხებზე. მნიშვნელობა არა აქვს, დანაშაულს აღიარებენ თუ სხვას ამხელენ. მთავარია, დაასწრონ და პირველებმა „ჩააბარონ აღსარება“ ფართო აუდიტორიას. დაყოვნებულ მეორე მხარეს მუდამ თავის მართლების რეჟიმში ყოფნა უწევს, რაც ძალზე წამგებიანია.

ბოლდროინდელი ფაქტების მიხედვით, ამერიკული „აღსარების“ კულტი თანდათანობით პოპულარობას კარგავს. მაგალითად, პრინცი ჰარისა და მეგან მარკლის ცნობილი ინტერვიუ ოპრა უინფრისთან ამ ტაქტიკის მიმზიდველობის შემცირების ნიმუშია.

როდესაც საზოგადოება იდ ლება სკანდალებისა და საჯარო „აღსარებათა“ გაუთავებელი რიგით, ჯეშმარიტად მორალური შეფასების საჭიროება წამოიწევს ხოლმე წინ. სანამ მორალური ფილოსოფია ზნეობრივ საკითხებთან დაკავშირებით განსხვავებულ აღქმებს გვთავაზობს, პასუხი კითხვაზე: „როგორ უნდა მოვექცეთ სხვა ადამიანებს?“ თითოეული ფაქტის შემთხვევაში იცვლის ეთიკურ საზომს. ვრწმუნდებით, რომ მორალური ფილოსოფია ურთულესი სფერო მისი მრავალწახნაგოვნების გამო.