

## **The cruelty possibility of an ethical and aesthetics life**

BARRERA-SANCHEZ, Oscar \*†

*Universidad Marista*

Received May 28, 2015; Accepted November 2, 2015

---

### **Abstract**

Cruelty and violence have been condemned by the moral and reason of modernity. However, cruelty is the foundation of architecture and sculpture itself, and the possibility of erecting an ethical and aesthetic of existence in the subject and the possibility of transforming an apparent reality, metaphysics, a less alienating reality conformist. Violence, one of their vehicles.

**Cruelty, violence, ethics, subject, aesthetics, alienation, power**

---

**Citation:** BARRERA-SANCHEZ, Oscar. The cruelty possibility of an ethical and aesthetics life. ECORFAN Journal-Republic of Colombia 2015, 1-1: 55-66

---

---

\* Correspondence to Author (email: oscarbs78@yahoo.com.mx)

† Researcher contributing first author.

## Preamble

I crucify me and I must be the cross and the nails. I tend cup and I must be the hemlock. I cheat and I must be lying. I burn and I must be hell. I praise and thank each instant of time. My food is everything. The precise weight of the universe, humiliation, joy. I justify what hurts me. No matter my happiness or my misfortune. I am the poet.

Jorge Luis Borges. The accomplice.

Violence is not prosecuted or punished, or seeks to correct. She has become an element of modern discourse that seeks to show what is actually seeking control: cruelty. This attempt to punish because it is the experience that the subject has with some of his deepest joys. The discursive treatment that has made modern violence is only locate and classification instance to interact medical, legal, educational, psychiatric, psychological and psychoanalytic devices. Its main function, objectification, significance, nesting, designation and use of the subject through his actions. Violence has become an essential for monitoring the various cruel practices of resistance to the powers and knowledge and hegemonic discourses in modernity element.

The next job is to contribute to identify how they have used certain practices of cruelty and violence in the genesis of modernity and as the speech has become in our time, this as an argument to write about how the violence has promoted public space and now it is democratic to talk not of her but of cruelty. Therein lies the problem.

## Violence and cruelty

Currently, the logic of modern discourse has been seeking to hide synonyms strategy persecution of an act by another act.

While violence cannot be appointed but in the events that emerge and presented to the definition of an Other, which seeks to define and classify the act of a performer, from the discursive use and its position in the balance of power and power, as a victim, or to deposit the act defining the individual and, thus chase, indoctrinate, educate, discipline, control it, enclose it, ie hold.

However, violence cannot threaten the established order, however it does function. This serves to make in the exercise of power and power relations and define someone acting against violent (who never defines himself as such) for the order of things, of life, of peace, of rights, of freedoms, according to the social and political definition of these.

Furthermore, violence can be the very manifestation of a force, which cannot be tamed, an act of resistance to the tamer power of life that needs to emerge exercise. However, as has been said, this does not necessarily attentive, upsets the order of things, the order of discourse, but it r intentionally or not.

Therefore, one can speak of two kinds of violence: first, those produced and appointed by the prevailing logic of power that needs a pretext for reviving relations and forces; secondly, that it emerges as a power of life that resists the social and cultural domestication, that is, the vehicle of cruelty.

Violence is the plot of the drama of the subject that allows you to get in touch with their own existence, with cruelty. In the world of concepts and signs do not live longer than in discontinuous states that do believe in the continuity of being and the continuity of concepts. Violence becomes a sign not sought or are punished, but it is the key to arrest the cruelty, the body.

Cruelty becomes imperative to be stated search from modern knowledge. It is the voice of the body as embodied in the violence, passion, desire, pleasure, enjoyment, sense of the flesh; the screaming in every act and this is what we will have to pursue, as it was from the Christian pastoral

[...] Want to believe in the beginning things were in its perfection; that came glittering hands of the creator, or light without shadow of the first dawn. The origin is always before the fall, before the body, before the world and time: on the side of the gods, and the telling is always singing a theogony. But the historic beginning is low, not in the sense of modest or discreet as the passage of the dove, but ridiculous, ironic, suitable to undo all fatuities.

Thus, we have that power as the foundation of the cruelty of life. This, in its deepest and truest sense, is characteristic disrupt morality, identity, unambiguous sense of Truth. Cruelty is always presented in the experience of life, unique, vivid, gozante deadly and allows individuals des-fastened by moment, as practice of freedom.

Cruelty is the blood itself, the force that runs through the veins; It is a sign of life and possibility of movement: it is life force. Cruelty is life, and this is cruelty. She reveals what is stirred under the skin, in the flesh and we are not, however, outside of which do not exist.

Cruelty look fascinates and get caught when they wanted to look [...]. Get caught in a violent seduction game that throws himself brutally. Cruelty is the loveliest thing: "the filter of the great Circe" often repeated Nietzsche [...]. Beside himself, to the other.

Looking closely, cruelty introduces dela painful experience intimacy that would be the exact opposite of piety and, in one act, engages the victim and the executioner of the same violence.

Cruelty, strictly speaking, bring-there-before the existence as such and subsumes the metaphysical experience of the hidden meat, as noted by Jean-Luc Nancy: "Everything's under the skin is metaphysics."

Cruelty is the result of an imperative: Search! In this sense, Camille Dumoulié mentioned that, in this mandate, two axioms are generated: 1) "cruelty stems from the other's place," that is, cruelty is always relational, is in the eye and in the bowels of and others; 2) "to cruelty is the real ', that is, it is revealed in a bloody tear announcing the manifestation of reality.

In The World as Will and Representation, which expose Arthur Schopenhauer

[...] Everywhere we see the nature of dispute, struggle and alternation in victory, and it precisely know more clearly the essential split of the will for itself. Each grade of the objectification of others will dispute the matter, space and time.

It is here that the moral and metaphysical governing everyday life, builds a framework of interpretation itself, which articulates the look to another and himself split, alienated, which is regarded as another being himself.

Thus, cruelty is installed in place of existence, in his house in ethics and language. Cruelty exists in relation to man; she is only him and not his ethics acquires more depth in it.

But like any manifestation is not perceived itself and if it ceases to be itself, ie, the relationship of cruelty to man diverts himself from his original purity. The man, in connection with cruelty, comes under the development of consciousness itself which is gained in debt and guilt, so the manifestations of cruelty is that man finds his dimension in excess. Thus, if the subject obeys his will, if followed, it leads him to the inhuman, which is for the modern consciousness scandal. Thus, the emergence of consciousness becomes the sign of a decrease in the power of life, the possibility, and a perversion, same as Friedrich Nietzsche called "unnatural" and Antonin Artaud's "perverse appetite" decreases and it is no more subject to closure in the imaginary and its voluntary nature.

The distant cruelty itself, relieves aggression against the alter ego that seeks the cruel a decrease in tension and relief from their suffering, resulting from the closure of the power of life. The cruelty is denounced as bestiality, which refers us to animality. This suggests that individuals who indulge in it are not truly human; are seen as a pathological symptom and are classified outside of human nature, that is, it is a beast, a sick or crazy.

Cruelty advocates a different moral of the ruling, pushing the subject to exit the closure itself, consciousness, leaving the contemplation of self and granted at the experience. Cruelty is only real when it gets to offend the conscience, self-alienation, the defining identity and truth. To fly its own ethical discourse becomes transformative, ie, it enables and posits an alternative. This feature is causing the persecution of violence, which is only a manifestation (in its authentic state) of cruelty, ie not pursued and violence is punished, but cruelty, rising as a possibility, as new morality.

The object is that which is Writing Natur (as mentioned Nietzsche) that seeks to rob. The cruel is that which resists the narrowness of reason, the gun violence. The new strategy speech, control devices and administering institutions of modern life, then, is to find this cruelty to the most hidden spaces, subjects corner. The tactic is to exalt, naming it, advertise it, take to the streets to be consumed, bought, sight stolen; advertise it, make it public, essential function of the stories told in stories, novels, movies and the media. It also reverses violence against genuine cruelty, when legitimized by the State and institutions if it is for the general welfare, to preserve law and order as shown by multiple news of any open or private commercial television. They play with tactics: condemn and exalt.

Soren Kierkegaard referred to this effect from exercise of Christianity, when he noticed already:

The artist moves in artistic indifference, with a cruel pleasure, as when the tyrant enjoyed listening to the screams of the martyrs. Yet the artist was full of admiration for himself. And all admired the artist; and the real suffering of the saint made him money and admiration.

Thus, a genuine cruelty-violence is generated, but to a proscribed cruelty-violence laws. Thus, it appears the same need for the appointment of illegalities to the functionality of the official cruelty, permitted the legitimized.

Joseph Shepherd believes that, as with the domesticated and useful to the dominant moral violence, cruelty is a conformist, not always detached from the spectacular cruelty, which becomes an instrument of ideological support of the dominant morality.

The cruelty in this sense becomes a mask of bliss, an ascetic of pastoral bliss and exercise of power from the other. In this sense, the subject, under the logic of the protection of society committed cruel, violent agreed under the permission of the dominant moral and exercising power controller and disciplining. Legitimized cruelty against cruelty banned. Murder, rape, mutilation, torture becomes a disciplined pedagogization cruelty, but exemplary sponsor of legislation, indicating how and how not to behave justified.

For this reason, Joan-Carles Mélich, cruelty Logic says:

It is clear that there can be cruelty in our actions, but what is not try that but something different, cruelty registered living in our way of being and thinking, but not so much in what we do but especially in the way we have to justify it and analyze it on their devices in their categories, their legal and legitimate procedures.

To mention one example, Alberto Manguel, well noted, regarding torture in US prison in Guantanamo, to Dante in the canto XXXII following Virgilio by various infernal circles, reaching the glacial lake in which Antenora souls of the traitors are prey to his neck in ice. Among the heads terrible scream and curse, Dante believes recognize a certain Bocca degli Abati, guilty of having betrayed his people and allying the enemy. Dante asks her head bowed to tell his name, as is his custom and along the descent magical promises the sinner posthumous fame in his verse when he returns to the world of the living. Bocca replied that what you want is precisely the opposite, and tells Dante to go away and do not annoy more.

Furious at the insult, Dante grabs Bocca by the neck and says that unless you confess your name, you start every hair on his head. "Even if you'd stop me bald," replied the unhappy, "you would not say who I am, do not show my face / I azotases but a thousand times." Dante then snatches "another handful of hair," causing howls of pain lance Bocca. Meanwhile, Virgil, commissioned by the divine will guide the poet notes and silent.

Through the centuries, Dante commentators have tried to justify these acts as examples of honorable noble indignation or anger, which is not a sin as anger (as St. Thomas Aquinas, one of the intellectual sources of Dante), but a born under a just cause. The problem, of course, lies in reading the right adjective. For Dante, just it refers to your understanding of the unquestionable justice of God. Compassion for the damned is unfair because it means opposing the imponderable divine will.

Similarly, the religious "systems of cruelty" that incite and suppress violence and cruelty, reveal some sadistic pleasure in representation, distribution and consumption of torments, causing horror in the viewer, but also relief and joy, same for the failure to be embarrassed by the flames of Hell and the demons delight of usurping their bodies and their flesh, no longer have, but are represented as well as through the shame caused by the spectacle of the cruelty exciting contemplated. It is the enjoyment experienced by Tertullian, St. Thomas Aquinas and other church fathers, to mention the pleasure of those who attained salvation and dwell in Heaven to observe voyeristamente torment to which the damned are subjected.

Also, these "systems cruelties" show the contradictions of consciousness and cruelty, Apollonian and Dionysian cohabitants, body-flesh, as Soren Kierkegaard refers: "Oh, you wear invaluable Copenhagen suit airs Sunday piety, and you forsaken those nasty and commoners delights of envy and cruelty, and so pretend to worship God. "

The extent of moralizing power of Christianity in modern society that boasts of a strong atheism, joined the church sadism towards God and society. Modern monarchy or democracy to commit any act of cruelty and violence under the status of "legitimate use of force" when the voltage hazard-sovereignty-torture-permissive for life, to an asymmetric exercise of power was evident that supported the protection of life (right to live and let die), private property, rights and freedoms supposedly fundamental. That's when the moralizing devices travel through medicine, education, judicial rehabilitation, militia and protection against an external enemy potential, hostis, and protection of bodies and souls, acquire a force of complicity between Governments and new citizenships-I against the other-foreign-distant-improper-infidels-sick-evil-mosntruosos-abnormal.

The palimpsest body is revealed in one of his writings against one who stands and traps him in the closure of a closed discourse. Cruelty is punished, not violence. Work on the flesh and soul are turning on the body, but in turn, will inciting violence. Not that writing culture on the body and the soul has not done its job properly to express violence, but it has fulfilled to perfection. Violence becomes a device of freedom inherited control and therefore takes on the character of dangerous and persecutor. There would never be a dangerous individual who "offends" in this way but did not have the freedom to do so. The same freedom that modernity has served to control through it.

There needs to be free and if there force be, as Jean-Jacques Rousseau wrote, to leave a loophole for the purpose of prevention, persecution and correction. They should be free to reveal secrets freedom from cruelty.

Thus the Christian-atheist democratic moralization of modernity seeks the same confessional aspect of salvation. No longer will the confessional of the somber ancient temples or the enlightened modern campuses now are doctors' offices, the couch, the courts, among others, but always looking for a confession: I am sick, I am mentally ill, I am a criminal, I am a violent be: I am cruel.

The game violence has become one of the biggest attractions of enunciation of science and modern languages. It seeks at home, in men, in the genome, in the streets, in prisons, on the walls, in schools, it is discovered everywhere. His word is essential for classification and criminalization and victimization of some others. Find a source of violence means putting in place a sorting device for the acts of any person. Violence and cruelty happens to be pure intensity to a more significant in modern discourse. State the violence becomes the reason for the existence of the monitoring body and soul, bodies that seek to save victims and the enjoyment of the body. Michel Onfray says: "The thought arises, then, from the interaction of meat that says a subjective self and the world that contains it."

For some forms of social and political thought, violence between forms of social behaviors learned to like the sound quality of a group to protect the majority, what is clear is that in all those speeches violence becomes a speech, rather than speaking from a knowledge, it is made from that speech. As stated by René Girard, sacrifice truth is hidden on many levels. On the one hand, rationality intervened in the nature of man to hide his violent nature.

Religions, the Enlightenment, capitalism, positivism and even communism did nothing but cover up the truth about the origin of human civilization and the implications that entails coexistence. However, the sacrifice reveals the violence of man and thus reveals understand that nature, which has spoken, is nothing but the essence of human social structures.

The subject is constantly reaffirms itself citing violence. The subject must be careful and not monitored assaulting others, to be kind, friendly and tolerant. Otherwise, revenge by the institutions is brutal. Nietzsche mentioned that "The spirit of revenge: my friends, this was so far the best reflection of man, and where there was suffering, there must always be punished." Also he mentioned that "This yes, this is just the same vengeance. The against will and was"

Subjects who performed the violence become objects of medical, psychiatric, psychological, social and legal discourses, become abnormal beings to which we must enclose, monitor, confess and correct. Of them we should be prevented, all watching us all. Anyone can do damage. Anyone can become damaged. What comes out of his mouth will become, in the interests of some, speeches enablers Truth. His word and his eyes are metaphors for their actions and become sadists, psychopaths, sociopaths, sick; will surface traumas of childhood, which was stuck in some stage of development of their personality; perhaps it is the product of social breakdown, an anomic be breaking the social cohesion or; an offender who violates the rule of law and institutions.

This antisocial body must be stopped by any police (medical, civil or soul) and taken to where it belongs, that is, prison or mental institution. The "violent" may be civil, criminal and / or morally judged. This has been classified, but in reality the violent criminal act that is not the judge, but the exercise of the cruelty of who runs it. To paraphrase Michel Foucault and Roland Barthes, one might say, that is in terms of acts and these are judged according to the same cruelty.

There is always a moral justification for extermination, an alibi for the profusion of blood. Mythical stories, tales, literary epic, film and television channels are exemplary sublimation conformist cruelty and violence, far from presented as entertainment machines contemplation than livable.

Cruelty can then be willing to adapt to a pedagogical function that flatters the dominant values and can also be allergic to be converted into harmless show, exhaust valve that satisfies the morbid curiosity, causing a pleasant tingling, passive instincts satisfaction aggression, a small shot of adrenaline that we will not raise the seat ass.

As we have read, violence and cruelty are played in tensions. On the one hand an attempt of domestication, sublimation and use the power of life of the subjects, his blood, his life. Moreover, resistance to the orthopedic power seeks to reduce and inhibit the enjoyment of existence. However, it is important to note that although violence may be to cruelty, which the ritual to myth, not necessarily act in parallel. Not all logic cruelty ends with violence, cruelty sometimes involves no aggression to the other, but simply indifference.

Violence is aggression against anyone specifically, regarding own name; however, cruelty, and violence due to the cruelty perpetrated against someone not by name, but because it has been classified by a category.

### **The ethics of cruelty, the architecture of Homo crudelis**

Unlike ethics, which is our response to the interpellation of the other in an unpredictable situation, morality is a metaphysics that governs our daily lives, tell us who we are, if we do it's normal, if we think it is perverse or if our life has value. It is a set of categories, frames, rules and procedures based on absolute and unquestionable principles.

The modern pursuit of being begins to take shape from logic of closure on genuine cruelty and exaltation and incitement of a conformist cruelty. Copies characters are: first, embodying evil, violent, villains, aggressors, provocative, quarrelsome, swashbuckling, provocative, troublemakers, criminals, terrorists and criminals; secondly, the abused, forced, forced, compelled, constrained, threatened, intimidated, errands, trampled, violated, broken, violated; third regulators, physicians, psychiatrists, psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, teachers, lawyers, all making and stating the function of truth, of what should be, God, what is Pending a citizen, an individual, a person. The speech-to moves through the most intimate place at the least expected time to assemble the work; stage in modernity, discourse and reproduction through the media. Thus, the same instruments brought and are the product of the rise of the bourgeois public, now they serve to build massive scenarios of modern moral education and the fight against cruelty and ethical practice and aesthetics of existence.

The new punches in the prevention-chase-correction tools have given pedagogization broadcast and violence. Those who disapprove of the time and constantly extol. The construction of public space and thus advertising resulted from the policy of morality which sought to extend the discursive practices of the nineteenth century and re-actualizations and during the twentieth century and now in the XXI. Thus, violence is constantly updated and articulates with the tricks of the pedagogies of the body. There is talk of violence to hide and show by way of confession of cruelty. This articulation occurs between objects of Christian morality updated pastoral disciplines, institutions and modern control devices in an area of freedom, provided it does not threaten, not against individuals but against the order of the scientific positivity, legal and political, and that is the best vehicle of knowledge practices that reveal the body and thus bring to the discussions of the speeches of experts to create closed, open talks and give the people of moralizing concepts that aim one constant state of persecution-prevention-correction.

In the words of Michel Onfray, which criticizes the cruel it is: "Will happiness on earth, here and now, not later, hypothetically, another unattainable world, conceived as a fable for children ... immanence is the enemy, bad word."

The moral logic organizes our way of being in the world and protects those who fall under the scope of immunity, but at the same time, it ignores and despises those who are not considered people, who have no dignity. To these they can be removed without guilt. Therefore, in all moral logic it operates cruelty.

Thus, one can understand basically two forms of cruelty: cruelty towards oneself and cruelty toward others, same that would correspond to the two forms of consciousness: the bad conscience and good conscience.



Cruelty to oneself is a bad conscience. It is constantly made to feel guilty. Then there is cruelty while the other category, which is the good conscience. He who is cruel to himself is calling himself something you cannot deliver. You are cruel yourself, not when you contemplate as a proper name, but when you think about what you are required to split that himself. In addition, this cruelty causes guilt that has no end, because it gives a sense of infinite Being requirement, from being subject to social discourse on the classification of entities.

Joan-Carles Mélich mentions that:

There is no morality without logic, no logic without cruelty. Many times imperceptibly, hidden behind a veil of naturalness and normality, and with little dramatics, cruelty appears on our language, breaks and remains subtly in the way of organizing the world. In a logic that manages us. We inherited a grammar: a way of seeing shared a way to create and create us, to set boundaries and limits between what is worth and what is not, between what is worthy of being respected and which does not deserve our attention, between the that is true and what is not a fiction or mere appearance. In this view, in this inherited way of seeing the world born in the world itself, the moral dominates and with it, the logic of what we are, a way of relating to others and to ourselves, to integrate and to exclude to respect and to exterminate. In all moral logic operates cruelty ".

Convenient to the logic of power and the balance of power, coupled with a logic of rational metaphysical and epistemological closure obstinate in lead and manage human existence humanism, the metaphysical moral well have prevented even turning to look at the possibility cruelty outside the dichotomous categories of good and evil, holy and demonic, of right and wrong.

The will to truth, as will to power (which implies a logic of cruelty itself, but denied) stick man humanism, the exercise of power from itself, from fraternal illustrated approval. In this regard, Martin Heidegger says:

But does this questioning the man, perhaps in an attempt to have the man for this claim is not a concern encloses man? And where that "care" if it is not directed at the address again is man to redirect its essence? What else does this, but man (homo) becomes human (humanus)? But in this case, the humanitas remains the goal of this kind of thinking, because that is humanism: meditating and take care of that man is human rather than nonhuman, "inhuman", that is, outside his essence. But what is man's humanity? Is its essence.

Thus, cruelty cannot be defined as the essence of man, but the pristine determining their being-in-the-world with the Other, while consciousness is the desired teleology by conscience to hide the foundation in a veil of dominant metaphysical moral. Heidegger himself mentions: "Metaphysics does not ask for the truth of being. Therefore, also never asked how the essence of man belongs to the truth of being ".

Thus, the moral determination of good or evil itself, as inherent in the existence metaphysical dimensions, are only samples of the act of the will to truth, as evening will power, under the guise of truth-unit- Well-identity: the humanist humanity.

Therefore, to paraphrase Nietzsche, in *The Birth of Tragedy*, one might say: Is cruelty necessarily the sign of decline, of decadence, of what failed, instincts, tired and weak? Is there an intellectual predilection for the hard, gruesome, the evil, the problem of the existence of the welfare, health lush, fullness of existence?

Cruelty, like excess, becomes visible what was hidden, showing an aspect of reality to destroy it and build it. The cruel acts in reality, handled, it exceeds it. It is recreating created. The architecture itself, hedonism and existential hapax Michel Onfray are examples of such use of force to exist, to the vital power of cruelty, that rather than being decadent for man, it is a way of standing in the world and exist.

Cruelty is the same that leads to Michel Foucault in his later works, in which raises the aesthetic life, ethics and aesthetics of existence, ie, do-is a work of art, a performative and transgressive act in practice spaces of freedom and power.

Both actuares, the Onfray and Foucault, the subject located in a strategic opportunity in their subject and the exercise of power that refuses to be drowsy, numb, entertaining, home lobotomized. Rather than waiting for television sessions avatar game played as a pornographer consumer repeats the scene to see the detail of the vulva or ass or ritual spectator sport violence. The cruel looking, acting, experience; sweats and bleeds; It exposed to deadly enjoy the pleasure of the senses, to know better than to know. Both want. The former enjoy the suffering of others, due to its own ban and proscription. The latter enjoy cynical and hedonistic way of their own existence, their ability, their will to power. However the latter are prone to cruelty of the first, to the rejoicing of morality, which yield their sovereignty to the television and entertainment; those who do not feel, for better or for worse; those who prefer to see naked in films, rather than bare-se.

The ethics of cruelty, in that sense, is like a sculpture of himself, he lived as a work of art. It is challenged to instrumental, logic, modern reason, trying to catch the feel of a concept, in a dictionary intended for a dreary library bookcase.

The ethics of cruelty involves turn against the only significant meanings, identity, guardian of self and not of the possibility of becoming, constructed and permanently break the sameness.

In this sense it is like Nietzsche understands the will to power as a force to exist, as cruel force of the great promise to-come. "Cruelty as a metaphor of life underlines the impossibility for man to agree with the world and with himself."

Homo crudelis is donated to the existence and not allowing the Truth define it. It is self-sufficient and creative. That's when Michel Foucault mentions: "It's not discover or describe what we are, but reject".

Understood as an ethical way of life that matters, then, is facing a power that has focused on organizing individuals under prevailing standards and conventions and standardize the form of its existence. Against the norm it is how the individual gives himself.

In terms of Onfray would be:

His ethics is also an aesthetic: the virtues against reducing prefers elegance and consideration, style and power, greatness and tragedy, lavishness and magnificence, the sublime and the election, the virtuosity and hedonism : a real theory of passions intended to produce a beautiful individuality, artistic nature whose aspirations would heroism or holiness that enables a world without god, atheist desperately empty of everything but the potential and make decisions that flourish ".

The immersed in a web of power relations is being ruled by forces outside the subject. Ethical reflection should take to find a way to govern themselves.

Thus, it could not completely escape the powers in our society, but it is possible to take on their own concerns itself, the acquisition or creation of self-care practices.

## Conclusion

As could be read, cruelty is the engine of the body intersubjectivity, the act of the individual in an attempt to de-clamping cultural malaise; It is a practice of ethical aesthetic claim seeking affirmation of the individual in a reality that is constructed from the practices of freedom.

Cruelty becomes, without a metaphysical quest essentializing, the foundation of human action and the construction of the social bond. Is cruelty which is beyond good and evil; It is the engine that leads to authentic joy; the engine that searches the unique experience; is the innocent instinct that serves as a bridge between Flaubert animal exposed by Gilbert Simondon, it breaks with modern rationality subject to the Cartesian cogito ergo sum.

Cruelty also is the impulse of transforming the metaphysical reality, exposed as apparent, but who watches that product of experiencing, of lived experience, of existence. The real cruelty, not adapted to a term of reality, instead seeking its transformation and that transformation is the same subject.

However, cruelty seeks to be domesticated, entertaining or worse, persecuted, controlled, punished, locked. Just think of a docile philosophy, a scientific discourse with real character will and a TV that digested a desire to appease the anxiety of real cruelty. Conformist cruelty is the best ally of castration of existence, of being-in-the-world search of anxiety; to snatch what primordial right by her proper driving of his life to the subject.

This conformist cruelty is legitimized individual submission to the Truth, Unity,

Identity and Moral hegemonic, dominant, regulatory and conducting life. Devices and institutions act as managing the disposal harpies prey to the comfort of home.

Also, a number of control devices or punitive operate together to define anomic, abnormal, dangerous, anyone who attempts deliberately fly the flag of innocent cruelty. Logic that acts of cruelty against the real cruelty; cruelties in tension and reveal hidden tactics to achieve, at moments, the satisfaction of the strategy. Creating dangerous tensions and abnormal, just let escape from the administration of life and direct the project autarkic conspicuous multiplicity, ethics and aesthetics: one that is a Homo suprahombre crudelis.

## References

- Artaud, Antonin. *El teatro y su doble*. (México: Tomo, 2010).
- Roland Barthes. *Lo neutro*. (México: Siglo XXI Editores, 2004).
- Dumoulié, Camille. *Nietzsche y Artaud. Por una ética de la crueldad*. (México: Siglo XXI Editores, 1996).
- Foucault, Michel. *Cuatro conferencias sobre el poder*. (México: Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, 1994).
- Foucault, Michel. *Nietzsche, la genealogía, la historia*. (Madrid: Pre-Textos, 2000).
- Michel Foucault. *Vigilar y castigar*. (México: Siglo XXI Editores, 1997).
- Girard, René. *La violencia y lo sagrado*. (Barcelona: Anagrama, 1985).
- Heidegger, Martin. *Carta sobre el humanismo*. (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2014).

Kierkegaard, Sören. *Ejercitación del cristianismo*. (Madrid: Trotta, 2009).

Manguel, Alberto. “La crueldad de Dante”, Madrid, *El País*, 18 de mayo, 2009, 19.

Manzano, Jorge. *Apuntes de historia de la filosofía 8: Sören Kierkegaard*, (México: Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México, 2012)

<http://rei.iteso.mx/bitstream/handle/11117/1309/08%20Kierkegaard.pdf?sequence=2>, (2 de noviembre de 2015).

Mélich, Joan-Carles. *Lógica de la crueldad*. (Barcelona: Herder Editorial, 2014).

Nancy, Jean-Luc. *Corpus*. (Buenos Aires: La Cebra, 2006).

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Así hablo Zaratustra*. (Madrid: Alianza, 1994).

Nietzsche, Friedrich. *Genealogía de la moral*. (Madrid: Alianza Editorial, 2011).

Onfray, Michel. *La fuerza de existir. Manifiesto hedonista*. (Barcelona: Anagrama, 2008).

Onfray, Michel. *La escultura de sí. Por una moral estética*. (Madrid: Errata Naturae, 2009).

Ovejero, José. *Ética de la crueldad*. (Barcelona: Anagrama, 2012).

Rousseau, Jean-Jacques. *Discurso sobre el origen de la desigualdad*. (México: Gernika, 1993).

Schopenhauer, Arthur. *El mundo como voluntad y representación*. (México: Porrúa, 2000).

Simondon, Gilbert. *Dos lecciones sobre el animal y el hombre*. (Buenos Aires: La Cebra, 2008).