

GENERAL TEXT

Freedom is a term that is often used in everyday language. But what does freedom actually mean? Is it about the individual experience and the possibility to make independent decisions? But if we grant everyone unrestricted freedom of action, others will also be influenced by these supposedly "free" actions – perhaps they will even be restricted in their own freedom of action. Is individual freedom in communities then possible at all?

To live completely – in today's parlance¹ – "free" in a society is not only difficult because society-specific norms and traditions subtly influence the individual, but also because freedom should not be seen as something purely individual, which can already be traced back to Hegel.² Thus, understanding freedom as something purely individual cannot work in a group-oriented society – at least not in such a way that the entire group can be "free."

When freedom is seen not only as something individual, but also as something collective, a tension arises between these two concepts. Individual and collective freedom are interrelated, between which the agent can weigh.³ The freedom that one wants to take for oneself should also be granted to others. Effects of action should not restrict others too much in their freedom. Thus also already Hegel said that some allegedly freedom-robbing actions do not restrict freedom, but only guarantee it.⁴

Accordingly, the measures of the Corona pandemic are not merely freedom-restricting for the individual, but also freedom-giving for the collective: the measures prevent many people from falling ill, which could result in the loss of their freedom, for example through death.⁵ Thus, if the potentially freedom-restricting effect of action is weighed before action is taken, it may be possible to choose a path that is freedom-maximizing – for the individual and the group – in the aggregate. This simulation allows you to explore such a path.

The interaction and relationship between freedoms is not unique to the Corona pandemic. Also in consideration of other issues – like climate change or the consumption of cheap products (and much more) – actions could limit or expand the different freedoms.

+ specific text to the respective end

¹ In today's parlance, freedom is often equated with individual freedom. Source: Deutschlandfunk Kultur: „Freiheit heißt nicht, dass man tun kann, was man will“, 2020.

² Deutschlandfunk Kultur: „Freiheit heißt nicht, dass man tun kann, was man will“, 2020.

³ Deutschlandfunk Kultur: „Freiheit heißt nicht, dass man tun kann, was man will“, 2020.

⁴ Deutschlandfunk Kultur: „Freiheit heißt nicht, dass man tun kann, was man will“, 2020.

⁵ ZDF heute: „Hegel, der Weltgeist und die Freiheit“, 2020.

ENDING INDIVIDUAL

The game should visualize this interaction between individual and collective freedom. Your game behavior has resulted in a high value of individual freedom. Thus, with similar decisions in the pandemic, the person acting would experience many "freedoms," but this would limit the freedom of the collective. The concept of freedom would shift to the purely personal.

In the game, the background grayed out at a low collective value, while the individual increased in detail. Hitting groups or ignoring the mask requirement makes the individual freedom value increase, but hurts the collective one. Nevertheless, there would be actions which let the individual freedom – without massive bookings of the collective – rise, like individual meetings with mask or the stay in the fresh air. So could also both values increase?

ENDING COLLECTIVE

The game should visualize this interaction between individual and collective freedom. Your game behavior has resulted in a high value of collective freedom. Thus, with similar choices in the pandemic, the actor would personally forfeit many "freedoms" to allow the collective as much freedom as possible.

In the game, the background grayed out at a low individual value, while the environment increased in detail. Choices during the pandemic, such as wearing a mask, disinfecting regularly, or avoiding large groups, limit the individual freedom value but make the collective value increase. Even though being mindful of fellow humans and their freedoms is important, the individual value should not be forgotten. In the game, there would be actions that let the individual freedom – without massive bookings of the collective – increase, like individual encounters with mask or spending time in the fresh air. So could also both values increase?

ENDING BOTH

The game should visualize this interaction between individual and collective freedom. Your game behavior has resulted in both a high value of collective freedom and individual freedom. Thus, with similar choices in the pandemic, despite an individual sense of freedom, the collective would not be severely restricted in its freedom.

In the game, either the background or the subject grays out as the collective or individual value decreases. When the values are high, the objects increase in detail. Choices during the pandemic, such as wearing a mask, disinfecting regularly, or avoiding large groups, limit the individual freedom value but make the collective value increase. Meeting groups or ignoring the mask requirement, for example, makes the individual freedom value increase but hurts the collective one. However, you have found a way to keep both values high. Congratulations!

Quellen und weitere Infos:

- https://www.deutschlandfunkkultur.de/mit-hegel-durch-die-coronakrise-freiheit-heisst-nicht-dass.1008.de.html?dram:article_id=474037
- <https://www.zdf.de/nachrichten/panorama/hegel-geburtstag-freiheit-100.html>
- <https://www.theman.de/freiheit-was-ist-das-eigentlich/>
- <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H5JGE3lhuNo>
- https://www.researchgate.net/publication/308675500_The_individual_the_state_and_political_freedom_in_hegel