

## **Moral Philosophy: Truth-Bending, Disclosure, and Public Good in Georgia and the United States**

KEYWORDS: Moral, Ethics, Truth-Bending, Disclosure, Public Good, Utilitarianism, Consequentialism, Eudaemonia, Media Influence, Georgia, United States (USA)

### **1. Foundations of Moral Philosophy and Human Interaction**

The foundational question of how we ought to treat one another has been central to philosophical discourse for centuries. This inquiry lies at the heart of moral philosophy,<sup>1</sup> which examines the ethical principles that shape our interactions and the complexities of human existence. Ethics<sup>2</sup> engages directly with profound questions about the meaning of life and the frameworks that guide our decisions.

If we are to discern the highest meaning in life and organise our existence by moral principles, we must confront several fundamental philosophical questions. What makes an action right or wrong? What do we mean when we say that someone ought or ought not to do something? How should we live? And, ultimately, how should we treat one another? These enduring questions have occupied philosophers for millennia, underscoring the field's timeless relevance.

The significance of moral philosophy is especially evident when we consider grave moral transgressions such as torture, murder, cruelty, slavery, rape and theft. If we cannot explain why these actions are wrong, on what basis can we justify preventing

them? Moral philosophy matters because it furnishes a rational foundation for our ethical convictions, ensuring that morality rests on reasoned argument rather than mere prejudice.

Moral philosophy also offers invaluable tools for addressing contemporary ethical dilemmas.<sup>3</sup> It clarifies the implications of commonly held moral beliefs and shows how they may be applied consistently in practice. When surveying moral theories, three principal frameworks emerge:

1. Duty-based moral theory (deontological),<sup>4</sup> as developed by Immanuel Kant.<sup>5</sup>
2. Consequence-based moral theory, exemplified by utilitarianism (the best-known form of consequentialism) and associated with Jeremy Bentham<sup>6</sup> and John Stuart Mill.<sup>7</sup>
3. Virtue-based moral theory, as articulated in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*.<sup>8</sup>

These competing frameworks provide distinct lenses for analysing moral issues. In the following sections, I shall outline the principal features of each theory and then demonstrate their application in a real-life case study.

## **2. Kantian Ethics and Conflicting Duties: Priest Theodorus**

Duty-based ethical theories maintain that certain actions are obligatory or forbidden irrespective of their consequences. This framework distinguishes deontological ethics – notably Kantian and Christian varieties – from consequentialist approaches.<sup>9</sup> Immanuel Kant (1724–1804) held that the only proper motive for moral action is a sense of duty,<sup>10</sup> arguing that genuinely moral acts must arise from rational deliberation rather than from emotion or self-interest.

A striking illustration of the tensions within duty-based ethics is the case of the Georgian priest Theodorus of Kvelta<sup>11</sup> (d.

1609), who faced a profound moral dilemma when the Ottoman army threatened his homeland. To protect his sovereign and country, Theodorus lied about the whereabouts of King Luarsab II (1592-1622). From a Kantian standpoint, this act would be judged immoral for breaching the Categorical Imperative,<sup>12</sup> which entails a strict duty of truthfulness; yet Theodorus's case exposes a palpable conflict between competing duties.

Kant maintained that rational agents are bound by categorical, unconditional duties; truthfulness among them. Nevertheless, such principles can be severely strained when duties clash. In Theodorus's circumstance,<sup>13</sup> the duty to defend his country and its young ruler<sup>14</sup> arguably outweighed the obligation to tell the truth. Critics of Kant's duty-centred account argue that it inadequately captures the ethical complexity of such predicaments.<sup>15</sup>

Kant's principle of universalizability requires that moral agents adopt maxims that could consistently be willed as universal law. One might regard Father Theodorus's lie as problematic on these terms, yet its life-saving consequences prompt intuitive resistance to condemning it categorically. While Kant privileges rational intent as the bedrock of morality, Theodorus's predicament shows how emotions and contextual factors bear on moral appraisal. Within the Kantian scheme, lying is naturally wrong because it breaches the duty of truthfulness,<sup>16</sup> which the Categorical Imperative secures; agents must act only on maxims they can will to be universal, so deceit – even to an enemy – counts as immoral regardless of motive.

The prospect of lying to safeguard one's homeland foregrounds the problem of conflicting duties. Although truth-telling is central, the duty to protect the community may be of equal moral force. Kant's system struggles to reconcile such

conflicts because it privileges conformity to moral law over contingent circumstances.

Kantian ethics, notably the test of universalizability,<sup>17</sup> has been criticised as offering limited guidance for real-world decision-making. Detractors contend that, while Kant furnishes a principled framework for moral judgement, he often offers no practicable resolution for agents torn between incompatible duties – for example, between telling the truth<sup>18</sup> and protecting another person. This tension is exemplified by the dilemma of lying to save one’s king.

Critics further argue that Kant downplays compassion, an emotional element many deem indispensable to moral action. The invading forces may have presumed a Georgian priest would be bound by duty to reveal the route to the royal residence; Kant’s neglect of consequences renders his framework ill-suited to appraise the morality of actions in such exigent contexts.

Practically speaking, many would maintain that in extreme necessity – such as defending one’s homeland – lying may be justified to fulfil a higher moral obligation. Yet, by strict Kantian lights, even laudable intentions cannot override the duty to be truthful. This tension highlights a central limitation of Kantian ethics when confronted with complex, real-world moral dilemmas.

### **3. Understanding Consequentialism through the Example of George V the Brilliant**

Consequence-based moral theory comprises ethical frameworks that judge the rightness or wrongness of actions by their outcomes.<sup>19</sup> This approach prioritises consequences over intentions; a consequentialist evaluates an instance of lying by

assessing the outcomes it produces: in the case of Priest Theodorus, his decision to mislead the invading army about the Georgian king's whereabouts can be construed as morally justified because it ultimately saved the lives of Luarsab II and many others.

The most prominent form of consequentialism is utilitarianism,<sup>20</sup> which holds that the supreme aim of human activity is to maximise happiness. Rooted in hedonistic premises, it regards pleasure or happiness as the highest good and defines 'good' as that which produces the greatest aggregate happiness – the Greatest Happiness Principle or Principle of Utility.<sup>21</sup> Its principal proponents include Jeremy Bentham (1748–1832) and John Stuart Mill (1806–1873).

Utilitarianism offers a distinctive way of addressing difficult moral dilemmas that recur throughout history. A notable example is the reign of King George V of Georgia (1286–1346).<sup>22</sup> Confronted by rebellious nobles who threatened royal authority and central governance, King George took drastic measures to eliminate his most formidable opponents. He convened a council at Mount Cold (Mta Tsivi) and executed noblemen from Kakheti, Hereti and parts of Armenia who opposed him.<sup>23</sup> While many regard the action as morally dubious, a utilitarian defence holds that it produced greater long-term stability and welfare for the kingdom. The subsequent legal consolidation under the code *Dzeglisdeba*, proposed by the king,<sup>24</sup> and the ensuing peace and prosperity contributed to his epithet, George the Brilliant.<sup>25</sup>

Despite its attractions, utilitarianism faces severe challenges – chiefly the difficulty of assessing and comparing different individuals' welfare. How can one determine whether the extreme pleasure of a sadist outweighs the suffering of their victim? Such questions expose practical and moral limits in applying utilitarian calculations.

Although George V's measures stabilised the realm, his severity instilled fear among dissident nobles and curtailed certain freedoms, consequences that ultimately weakened some aspects of Georgia's unity. In this narrative, the rebellious nobles might be cast as 'sadists' and the populace as 'victims', and the king's actions as an attempt to protect the latter – an attempt some would judge righteous on consequentialist grounds.

Consequentialism, therefore, contrasts sharply with deontological theories such as Kantian ethics, which hold that certain acts (for example, killing) are intrinsically wrong regardless of beneficial outcomes. Whereas Kantianism treats duties like truthfulness as absolute, consequentialism assesses actions (such as the king's execution of the rebels) solely by their consequences.

Utilitarianism maintains that the moral status of an action depends on its anticipated consequences: the action expected to produce the greatest net happiness is deemed right in that circumstance. Because future states are uncertain, utilitarian reasoning operates in terms of probable outcomes. Both Bentham and Mill emphasised happiness as the ultimate end of human endeavour. On consequentialist grounds, then, George V's policies merit praise insofar as they brought stability, peace, economic growth and widespread well-being to the Kingdom of Georgia.

#### **4. Reevaluating Virtue-Based Moral Theory**

Virtue theory, as presented in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*,<sup>26</sup> emphasises the importance of character and the individual's flourishing. Its central question is: "How should we live?" The

answer it offers is that one must cultivate virtues in order to flourish as a human being.

Aristotle maintained that flourishing, or eudaimonia (Greek for ‘true happiness’), is a universal human aim. Although often translated as “happiness”, the term can be misleading; eudaimonia denotes a successful way of living, similar to the conditions that enable a cherry tree to grow and bear fruit. For Aristotle, virtuous living is essential to attain a well-rounded and fulfilling life. Virtues are not merely habitual behaviours but involve a discerning grasp of appropriate responses to differing circumstances. A virtuous person – one who is generous, for example – feels and acts in ways that express that virtue appropriately to the context.

Aristotle stresses that true virtue arises from the harmonious integration of the relevant virtues, forming a cohesive character equipped to confront diverse ethical challenges. Figures like Martin Luther King Jr. exemplify this integration, embodying courage, nonviolence, and empathy in pursuit of moral progress.<sup>27</sup> Likewise, Nelson Mandela’s struggle against apartheid illustrates virtue put into practice:<sup>28</sup> his steadfast commitment to reconciliation over retribution demonstrated courage and integrity, and his emphasis on collective responsibility underlines the need for a multifaceted ethical character when addressing complex social problems.

The *Declaration of Independence* (1776) offers another illustration of virtue-based reasoning in action. The Founding Fathers manifested virtues of integrity, intellectual curiosity, and commitment to liberty that helped shape democratic ideals and personal freedom. Thomas Jefferson articulated Enlightenment conceptions of human rights and governance, embodying visionary aspiration in his drafting of the *Declaration*;<sup>29</sup> his aim

extended beyond political change to a society grounded in equality and justice. Benjamin Franklin exemplified pragmatic virtue.<sup>30</sup> he valued collaboration and diplomacy in pursuit of collective aims, working to unite the colonies against British rule.<sup>31</sup> The intertwining of these virtues helped establish a polity attentive to individual rights and social responsibility.

Virtue theory faces a substantial challenge in defining which behaviours count as virtues. The absence of consensus among theorists raises concerns about bias: personal preferences may be mislabelled as virtues while opponents describe them as vices. Thus, although virtue theory offers a compelling framework for understanding ethics and moral character, it requires careful critical engagement to address its limitations. As societies change, our conception of virtue must evolve to remain relevant to contemporary moral dilemmas. A nuanced approach that attends to the integration of multiple virtues and the determining role of context will better support robust moral reasoning in an increasingly complex and dynamic world.

## **5. Moral Accountability and the Tell-All Attitude among Celebrities**

Each of the three principal types of ethical theory outlined above retains substantial influence within contemporary moral discourse. The application of these theories to concrete dilemmas constitutes applied ethics. One pressing concern in this field is moral accountability, especially as it intersects with what has been termed performative morality. It is important to recognise that different cultures approach ethical dilemmas in diverse ways; across history, distinct national traditions have offered varied perspectives on comparable moral problems.

From the standpoint of virtue ethics, a tell-all attitude – where individuals publicly confess wrongdoing – can be examined through the categories of moral accountability, courage, and authenticity. Such behaviour, however, invites scrutiny: some regard it as performative morality or moral exhibitionism, in which the emphasis shifts from genuine remorse to the spectacle of confession.

Moral accountability denotes the responsibility an individual bears for their actions. A disclosure acknowledges wrongdoing and often signals a desire to make amends. Courage is central: within virtue ethics, admitting faults and seeking forgiveness is regarded as audacious, since it typically entails confronting social stigma and personal guilt. Authenticity is likewise crucial to judging a confession's sincerity. A genuine admission manifests real remorse and a commitment to change, rather than serving merely as a bid for public approbation.

By contrast, performative morality describes instances in which public confessions appear motivated more by social recognition than by substantive moral reflection. Critics contend that such acts may reveal a preoccupation with personal image rather than with ethical rectitude.

The contemporary American tell-all attitude can sometimes serve to excuse wrongdoing once it has been publicly confessed. Although one can set out coherent reasons for moral judgements, morality in American society often appears susceptible to the sway of prejudice. Public opinion may be moulded by the dominant biases of the moment, so moral judgement can function as much as an expression of prevailing partialities as a manifestation of principled reasoning. This plasticity in moral appraisal underlines the need for careful analysis of empirical cases: only by scrutinising real-world examples can we

disentangle the complexities of moral accountability and appreciate how ethical beliefs are often shaped by social predispositions rather than by strictly objective argument.

\* \* \*

When Julia Roberts, a prominent American actress, pursued a relationship with Danny Moder – described by some as 'buying' him from another woman<sup>32</sup> – she attracted substantial public criticism. Initially, many condemned her actions; over time, the episode became material for late-night shows and stand-up comedians across the United States. The couple married in 2002 in a private ceremony and thereafter maintained a low profile, concentrating on family life; today, most people pay little attention to them, as there is no longer any scandal associated with their family life.<sup>33</sup>

\* \* \*

In 2005, the film *Mr. & Mrs. Smith*<sup>34</sup> premiered, starring Brad Pitt and Angelina Jolie, and ignited a scandal over their reported romantic involvement. Public opinion swiftly condemned them for betraying Jennifer Aniston, Pitt's then-wife, yet few acknowledged that Pitt and Aniston had faced personal difficulties well before their separation, which preceded filming.<sup>35</sup> Aniston's subsequent tell-all interview,<sup>36</sup> laden with emotional appeals and tears, intensified negative feelings towards Jolie and marked a notable moment in the modern American tell-all attitude: public outrage became so intense that Jolie was reported to withdraw abroad until the furore subsided.

When Pitt and Jolie later married in a private French ceremony in 2014, the intense scrutiny surrounding them tended to obscure the complex reality of Aniston's experience. The episode illustrates how transient biases often drive public

sentiment more than the truth. Ultimately, the American media celebrated the Jolie-Pitt family as an emblem of happiness, revealing both the public's appetite for happy endings and its propensity to follow the next headline.

\* \* \*

When Kristen Stewart, the star of *Twilight*,<sup>37</sup> publicly apologised<sup>38</sup> for her infidelity towards her then-boyfriend and English co-star Robert Pattinson,<sup>39</sup> few voiced disapproval. After compromising photographs emerged in July 2012 revealing her brief affair with *Snow White and the Huntsman* director Rupert Sanders, Stewart issued a heartfelt statement expressing deep remorse,<sup>40</sup> saying she was “deeply sorry” for the “momentary indiscretion” that jeopardised her relationship with Pattinson, whom she described as “the person I love and respect the most.”

Following her public apology,<sup>41</sup> Stewart received an outpouring of sympathy and support across North American media and social platforms. This reaction prompted a heartbroken Pattinson to return to England, stepping back from his growing career in the United States to escape the backlash from Stewart's supporters, who in some cases directed blame at him as an outsider supposedly unable to appreciate the need for a public show of contrition. Even members of Pattinson's family, notably his sisters Lizzy and Victoria,<sup>42</sup> attracted criticism for perceived insufficient understanding of the young actress. By contrast, Mrs Sanders, a mother of two, received comparatively little sympathy despite the collapse of her marriage.

Unlike the Anniston-Pitt episode, the Stewart-Pattinson affair provoked markedly different public responses, with much of the blame falling on the partner who suffered the infidelity. The case illustrates how public sentiment can skew narratives: the

initial confessor often emerges relatively unscathed while others bear the brunt of the fallout. These incidents underline the complexities of celebrity relationships and demonstrate how public opinion frequently favours those who first adopt a tell-all posture, granting them disproportionate sympathy regardless of culpability.

\* \* \*

The appeal of the tell-all attitude has recently diminished. In March 2021, when Prince Harry and Meghan Markle gave their controversial interview to Oprah Winfrey,<sup>43</sup> they attracted both support and criticism. Although their disclosure initially captured widespread attention,<sup>44</sup> the couple secured far less sympathy than many had anticipated: repeated recourse to the tell-all approach eroded the credibility of some claims, and by 2023, they had struggled to sustain broad public engagement.

The Sussexes are no longer the “hot ticket” for media executives or the public,<sup>45</sup> as interest in their narrative has waned. Their multimillion-pound deal with Spotify and Archewell Audio ended after a single series of Meghan’s podcast, *Archetypes*. Much like the myth of King Midas, what Meghan Markle touches may glitter briefly but soon fades, bringing little lasting consolation to the Sussexes.

From a moral-philosophical perspective, their saga serves as a cautionary example of how not to treat others and underlines the need for more constructive methods of resolving familial disputes. Gradually, the American public appears to be growing weary of the story’s repetition, which fails to deliver the expected “happily ever after.” The media audience is impatient for a resolution that produces a genuinely positive outcome.

## 6. Conclusion

Moral philosophy furnishes indispensable frameworks for addressing ethical dilemmas, yet how we ought to treat others frequently varies with context. That contextual fluidity substantially shapes the judgements the public deploys, whether in condemnation or defence.

Duty-based theories sharpen this analysis by insisting that certain actions are obligatory or forbidden irrespective of consequences. Kantian and Christian deontologies posit unconditional duties – truthfulness among them – that may clash in exigent circumstances. The case of the Georgian priest Theodorus of Kvelta, who lied to protect his sovereign from an invading army, exemplifies this tension: a strict Kantian reading condemns the deceit, whereas many intuitively regard the lie as necessary to fulfil a competing duty of defence. Such dilemmas expose the practical limits of absolutist duty-ethics and help explain why public judgements oscillate between censure and sympathy when duties collide.

Consequence-based theories complicate the picture by assessing actions according to their outcomes rather than their conformity to duty. Utilitarianism, the most prominent consequentialist school, reframes dilemmas such as Theodorus's deception or George V's severe suppression of rebels as calculations of aggregate welfare. Where deontologists insist on inviolable norms, consequentialists weigh probable benefits and harms and may, in some circumstances, justify morally fraught measures that plausibly maximise well-being. This orientation helps account for shifts in public opinion as new information about outcomes emerges; it also exposes practical limits, for forecasting consequences is uncertain and comparing disparate goods and harms remains contested. Nonetheless,

consequence-based reasoning offers an indispensable counterpoint to duty-centred ethics and illuminates the fluidity of moral appraisal in public discourse.

Public sentiment can at times reverse abruptly, leading some to tolerate a once-condemned act and to recast the perpetrator as a victim; the focus then frequently shifts to perceived societal failures in supporting that individual. This dynamic produces a complex interplay between moral accountability and social interpretation, demonstrating that ethical judgement is neither fixed nor purely rational but is moulded by prevailing cultural narratives, biases and affective responses.

These fluctuations in public opinion underscore the importance of scrutinising changes in perception, for they reveal the intricate relations among morality, truth-bending, disclosure, social support, the public good and judgement. A mature ethical practice – whether at the level of individuals, institutions or publics – requires attentiveness to principle, sensitivity to consequences and a readiness to subject shifting attitudes to critical scrutiny. Only by balancing these dimensions is it possible to adjudicate difficult cases with both moral seriousness and humane 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. იხ: ქართული საბჭოთა ენციკლოპედია. ტომი 4, თბილისი, გვ. 633 (თველორე 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 თველორე მღვდელი (კველთელი). შეადგინა და თარგმნა რუსუდან ბუაჩიძემ. პორტალი „მართლმადიდებელი“. Retrieved from <[https://orthodoxy.ge/tveni/ivnisi/08-mgvdeli\\_tevdore.htm](https://orthodoxy.ge/tveni/ivnisi/08-mgvdeli_tevdore.htm)>
14. გოგებაშვილი იაკობ (2023). თავდადებული მღვდელი თველორე. 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](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](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>>

მორალის ფილოსოფია: სიმართლის დეფორმირება,  
საჯარო „აღსარების“ კულტი და საზოგადო-  
ებრივი ინტერესი საქართველოსა და აშშ-ში

(ანოტაცია)

საკვანძო სიტყვები: ზნეობა, ეთიკა, სიმართლის დეფორმირება, „აღსარება“, საზოგადოებრივი ინტერესი, უტილიტარიზმი, კონსეკვენციალიზმი, ევდემონიზმი, მედიაგავლენა, საქართველო, აშშ

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 დალატი 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 ცივზე. ქვეყნის ერთიანობისა და პოლიტიკური სიძლიერის აღსადგენად, მას ასეთი ნაბიჯის გადადგმა მოუხდა. მეფის, ერთი შეხედვით, მორალურად მიუღებელი ქმედება, უტილიტარული თვალსაზრისით სრულიად გამართლებულია. მაღლიერმა ქართველმა ერმა გიორგი V-ს „ბრწყინვალე“ უწოდა და შეიდი საუკუნის განმავლობაში ქება-დიდებით მოიხსენიებს მის ბრძნულ მმართველობას.

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

სათნო პიროვნებები იყენენ 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

ადიარება 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 თავგანისცემაში. ჯენიფერ ანისტონის ცრემლებითა და ემოციური ინტერვიუებით გამოწვეული მასობრივი უარყოფითი დამოკიდებულება „მისტერ და მისის სმიტებისადმი“ 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 ლაღატის 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 იღებენ 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 მართლებების რეჟიმში ყოფნა უწევს, რაც ძალზე წამგებიანია.

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

როდესაც საზოგადოება იღლება სკანდალებისა და საჯარო „აღსარებათა“ გაუთავებელი რიგით, ჭეშმარიტად მორალური შეფასების საჭიროება წამოიწვეს 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 სფეროა მისი მრავალწახნაგოვნების გამო.