

Siena Robertiello

SS336-801

Mid-Semester Reflection Paper

March 20th, 2024

The topic of sustainability is fundamentally complex, without even considering the added intricacies of human psychology and the dynamic nature of social systems. There's a myriad of things that I can try to write justice, but I'd have an emotionally entangled novel by the time I'm finished. Instead, I'll drive my thoughts with a perspective that is most familiar to me: creating art.

Art would cease to exist without an audience. Many even say that the art itself is a reflection of the viewer. As artists, it's important to determine what we want to do and say with the work that we create. When we think about changing people's perspectives on heavy and important issues, I believe what's most important is reminding an audience that as **one species**, we are all *instinctively* built to seek the same things: maintenance and strength of our physical bodies (basic human need which is adapted considering an individual's preferred source of fuel and pleasure), to experience love and belonging (combined sense of purpose and appreciation in a community setting), free access to roam and explore our Earth (tangible connection to our interdependence on the natural world), a sense of stability, security, and sustainability (with the opportunity for evolution), and the liberty for independent decision making (creativity, ingenuity, and the freedom to exercise individual mental capabilities, with no judgment from self or others; primal, instinctive play). These are our primary motives.

Of course there are appendages that may elevate the human experience, such as having a spiritual understanding/sense of purpose, self actualization, and other subjective psychological, emotional, and physical needs. Quality of life is inherently subjective due to the imperfect nature of organic life. This is why we must disassociate our fundamental definition of identity and humanity from the one thing that is intangible and separates us all; the mind.

This is where philosophical, ethical, and political ideologies begin to form, and also where individuals and groups begin to separate.

Philosophically speaking, we cannot understand something to which its very mechanism for analysis and comprehension is itself. Additionally, the subjective nature of the human mind intrinsically declares that we each have different beliefs about what we are, who we are, and what builds a conscious sense of identity. Psychologically, these beliefs are also heavily influenced by the "nature versus nurture" theory, including –but not limited to– social and mass media, independent influential figures, books, movies/TV, familial/ancestral beliefs, genetic predisposition, mental illness, and personal lived experience. What is our greatest power is also our greatest limitation.

Ethics plays a significant –perhaps dominant– role in the idea of “fairness”. It is a challenge for humanity to determine who gets what resources. It is even more of a challenge to maintain reasoning to solely objective factors. Communism has been named a solution to this by many political leaders, past and present. But as we know, this is only in *theory*. In practice, political communism has historically failed, and continues to prove unsatisfactory for its participants.

So, how can we begin to rebuild our world into one that is fair, just, and remains centrally unified with the awareness that we are connected beyond our distinguishable minds?

The answer is simple: we must not seek to understand the viewer. We must not set our aim towards reaching a viewer's mind. We must create content that makes the viewer *feel*. To do so, **we must look into ourselves as cohort humans**; what makes us feel?

There are a lot of complexities involved. We live in a world where, while humans might have similar comprehensive values, individual people hold different beliefs about how to implement those values. While emotionally connecting to the homo-sapiens in all of us is arguably the only way to successfully reach an entire population, the details of what we do after the fact is the part that tends to get messy. Individuals have their own personal biases formed by independent experiences and traumas. People have different physical abilities and needs (many of which are argued to be subjective). We all enjoy different things and use our resources in varying ways. But the question is how do we find the line between implementing moral obligation and totalitarianism?

While economic equality and fair distribution of Earth's resources sounds ideal, communism fails because it does not take into account the innate, biological nature of human beings and human psychology. It makes the assumption that humans can be put to work selflessly for the common good without self-interest. But alas, it doesn't work that way! Humans are not collective animals (like ants or bees, for example) whose psyche exists as a blank slate, completely fungible, programmable, with no individuality nor innate traits. We are dynamic, creative, curious, self-righteous, envious, vengeful, compassionate, and imaginative creatures who all exist independently depending on a lot of factors. This directly affects the collective environment we all share. It's imperative to take into consideration factors like societal conditioning, learned helplessness, ego defense mechanisms, Maslow's hierarchy of needs, sense of self/identity, cultural theory, etc.

It's difficult for me to imagine a world where we all work towards a common goal in a way that makes sense to everyone. I'd argue that a world like that is impossible. Again, the only thing I'm in control of is my personal output. I can create art that moves people because it moves me. I can participate in reciprocal activities with my environment. I can give back where I can. I can focus on modeling themes of respect and care. But large scale change? Trying to change the world is a weight that would kill me faster than I'd ever be able to save our planet.