



Choose to be Human

Amal Atrakouti
Marruecos

The world, as a whole, has clearly come a long way. We have been on an undefined mission of challenging ourselves and making of all our failures a lesson, of all our successes our glories and of all the mysteries in the world our goal to reach. We have become addicted to becoming better and to moving towards a future that holds everyone tightly. For that we have learned that discrimination has no place in a race that identifies as human and that lives by certain values and virtues. This reality that we have not only become part of but also have defined with our existence, can sometimes make us feel a little bit too assertive. Our pride of how the world has evolved in such little time has made us a little bit too comfortable with it, a little bit too confident.

There are two scopes we can look at our reality with. We can either look at it from the relativity perspective and compare what we are to what we used to be, or we can just stare at it by itself and try to cross all boundaries of biases and judge what we have become to what we should be. It is necessary to be more judgemental than we normally are to ourselves in order to move forward in our mission on this earth. John Rawls has introduced us to this concept of the veil of ignorance. The idea is that whenever we are about to make a very important decision we have to put ourselves behind a veil of ignorance that deletes all of our preconceived ideas. This veil makes us ignorant to all what we have already learnt and makes our judgements based only on what is in front of us at that moment. So in a situation where you have the choice to either kill one member of your family and therefore save ten strangers that you have never met before or the other way around you will save the ten people. This veil will make you blind to the fact that that one person is family and therefore you will act on the basis that saving ten people is better than saving only one. This veil basically cancels all types of personal interests that might influence our decisions.

What we used to be is a fact and is history. It is already achieved and gone. Contemplating it and talking about it, or relating what we are to it will always give us a point of reference which is not very beneficial to our evolving. We can't live our lives always looking back at the past. We should be striving for more and for better, and that is only possible when we free ourselves from all the previous ideas we learnt. I see two reasons that have had major roles in enforcing this satisfaction we have developed. The first one is this concept of international law or international community, that has come to sweep all countries in the world into one and delete all types of cultural and ethnic differences resulting in crowds of people oblivious to their own identity.

Combining humanity (or whatever it has become) with reality makes people come up with concepts



of international law such as Just War Theory. This theory, for instance, is divided into three parts: “Jus Ad Bellum” the fair cause that allows war to happen, “Jus In Bello” the set of rules that come into play once the war has started, and finally “Jus Post Bellum” once war is done and finished. Perspective and relativity are inevitable in this discussion. It is very easy for a nation, and as history proves, to pursue its personal interest in other people’s nations by fabricating some kind of a just cause. That is why JWT only makes sense when it evokes cases of conflict. It gives conditions for beginning war, details on who to target and who to protect and solutions if any of the conditions are not realized. JWT has very clear and straightforward applications. However, as much as it is needed sometimes, it does not cover all of the possible cases of conflict between states that might occur. If we are ready to accept that no state is like the next one and that they all differ in their identities in a way or another, we should be ready to accept that there is no way that rules such as JWT may cover every possible case of war. In other words, what could be just to a certain state is not necessarily just for another one. And this is true in most cases of war. This exact difference, backed with the magnitude of power and the willingness to use it, a state has over the other one is exactly what creates a victim-criminal situation. And again it is the case in all kinds of wars that the world has witnessed. This is where I see the inability for any “theory” to be actually just. Because allowing war between a victim state and a “criminal” state is very wrong.

To be completely fair and in order not to flak a theory that has been around since before Christianity, I see that a fourth part is missing. This theory ignores completely the possibility, in some cases, to stop war. Because stopping war, when possible, is the most just of all parts.

Such theories are, very simply, a product of the inability for men to act as men. War theories are trying to imply morality to an immoral thing: War. It is trying to marry justice and morality to war and violence. Some will argue that in some cases war is necessary and in other cases it is even inevitable. The same people that created war as a solution to conflicts could’ve created some other solution. But they didn’t. they chose not to. War is glorified for absolutely no reason, it is a lame and easy solution to convince and persuade and such laws have encouraged that very indirectly. People chose war over dialog because they thought that violence is more powerful than ideas. It is there exactly where the mistake started and where humanity as a whole failed. It is very sad that people are ready to fight using bombs and guns, instead of fighting using ideas.

The second reason is the very underrated idea of labelling and how we have become very used to sticking labels to whatever we wish and therefore engaging in a metamorphosis of certain ideas. Labels have become a big part of our lives as they are used unconsciously for everything. Some might say that it makes life easier. However, the misuse or the overuse comes at the cost of the distortion and perversion of already settled ideas. The definition and sometimes the name given to a certain fact or ideology is very dependent on the who, how when and where. Phenomenon are no longer true to their meaning and to their actual composition, and a very easy example is



the concept of terrorism. The magnitude of misconceptions that we are living in has made it nearly impossible for any individual to be sure of anything nowadays. The so-called truth has become a variable that changes and puts different covers every time it is addressed by different people. And this kills the true factor of ideas and the uniqueness of their power to change what should be changed in a smooth, direct and pacifist way. An idea is a constant, and the variable is the environment it is in. An environment that includes different people, with different mind-sets and mental processes.

If there's one outlet that contributes greatly to this, it is the media in all its kinds. Getting people to open a written blog, pick up a newspaper or switch on television is enough for these institutions to write falsehoods as they please. All it takes is a bunch of skilled writers, an ignorant and lazy audience, and a pretty influential and powerful lobby. The product of all of this is a famous wealthy writer, an even more ignorant audience and a more powerful lobby. Now, through this very pathetic process, wrong ideas are being fed to oblivious people. The same people that make up whole states, and decide with a single vote what kind of social reality they want to be part of. And if anyone is brave enough to dare and stand against such things and point fingers, they will be shut down. Because, nowadays everything is silenced using misplaced arguments of free speech in a democratic environment.

One of the most unnecessarily invented concept is race. People have decided to divide what was not meant to be divided by creating that word and giving it a meaning. It is one of those words, that is used to simply be modernly and politely hateful. Race is the product of humans, and not of nature. There are not different races, there is one: the human race. This separation and division is only existent because certain people at one point in time wanted to feel better and superior. We teach hate and watch ourselves suffer through it either with discrimination or with ignorance, sometimes a nice mix of both.

The very core of this, shows how ready we are to surrender to what our ancients chose for us. And most importantly, how unwilling and afraid we are to change it. We have accepted how war and violence have become a major part of our identity. If anything, the main point that I would like to get across is that there's always another side to the story. Being critical of situations should be more of a duty than a right. We owe each other to be critical and sceptical. It is the absolute least we can do to better ourselves and be the best versions of human beings we could be. We should be able to put ourselves behind the veil of ignorance whenever it's needed so that we can forget what we have been told about anything and actually simply act as humans. There is no one else and no possible power that could control what we think of and how we think of things but ourselves. And that is the gift of nature that we should utilize and abuse for our own human benefit. It is for a simple objective of being fair to our own selves that we should embrace that gift.