

# **The Representation of Evil Figures through The Various Embodiments of the Joker Character in Three Films of the 2000s**

**Amira Rihab Saidi**

PhD Student at the Doctoral School of Literary and Cultural Studies, University of Szeged, Hungary.

## **Abstract**

The Joker figures of Hollywood's *The Dark Knight* (2008), *Suicide Squad* (2016), and *Joker* (2019) represent evil through spreading anarchy and psychopathic performances. The three Jokers share the same traits of menace and villainous implications within the formations of their personas, albeit with some distinctive motives for villainy. Through critical analysis of the Joker figure, I aim to explore the various evil figures staged in the 2000s Joker movies. My analysis will be based upon James McDaniel's *Evil Figures Triad*, which are *Evil in-itself*, *Evil-for-itself*, and *Evil-for-others*, and investigate how each type of evil is connected to the three Jokers. As a final step towards my analysis, I intend to disentangle evil from all the tenacious myths that it has been related to and try to conceptualize a definition of it within the Jokers' world. The findings reveal that there have been various evil personas shaping the character of the Joker, notably, the irrational anarchist villain depicted in *The Dark Knight* (2008), who is the personification of pure evil; Leto's Joker in *Suicide Squad* (2016) is the helpless romantic who ventures his villainy to solely saving Harley Quinn; in addition to the emergence of avenger nouveau villain in Todd Phillips' and Joaquin Phoenix's *Joker* (2019).

**Keywords:** Joker, Evil figures, Evil in-itself, Evil for-itself, and Evil-for-others.

## 1. Introduction

There is something about evil, despite its malevolence, that oscillates between fascination and repulsion. At the outset, defining evil as a humanistic trait has long been a matter of philosophical, psychological, sociological, and scientific inquiry, whereby film scholars as well intend to leave their mark on this inquiry. Roy Baumeister stressed that people today “gain more frequent and vivid glimpses of the face of evil from movies than from religious writings” (qtd in Norden, 2007). In fact, philosophy, as well as theology, could not make things easier for laypersons to understand what is evil and who its perpetrators are. In the film industry, evil is not what hinders the existence of the morally good *tout court*, but a complex network of wrongdoings that might be justified and empathized by the audiences. Robert L. Simon defines evil as “a thick rope of many complexes, twisted, and intertwined strands. An effort to comprehensively define evil could be an impossible task, fool's errand” (qtd in Singer, 2004). It is true that building a complete study on evil matters could be challenging; still, Simon’s critical opprobrium did not stop filmmakers from trying to embody the various shades of evil that exist in real life and other possibilities that could exist subsequently out of people’s different personalities, social belonging, mental health, and others’ gazes towards them. In her analysis of horror movies, Cynthia Freeland asserted that horror films, amongst other film genres and television shows, “offer rich, varied, subtle, and complex views on the nature of evil” (Freeland, 2018). Although she aimed to investigate the allure of horror movies, nevertheless, evil to her is the motive for all horrors that, paradoxically,

Prompt emotions of fear, sympathy, revulsion, dread, anxiety, or disgust. And in doing so, they also stimulate thoughts about evil in its many varieties and degrees: internal or external, limited, or profound, physical, or mental, natural, or supernatural, conquerable, or triumphant”. (Freeland, 2018, p 3)

By the same token, emerging from the DC universe to Hollywood studios, the Joker and his villainy are under tremendous scrutiny as action and persona. The “Joker” character is tightly associated with evil that is usually depicted in a particular way, lunacy, maniac aggressions, and haphazard violence. In fact, if understanding evil conatus is a titanic task hence, scholars amongst James McDaniel ponder evil matters from its perpetrators’ approaches to evildoings. Instead of grappling with evil scenery, he tried to investigate figures of evil as they perform their villainy. *The Evil-in-itself, Evil-for-itself, and Evil-for-others* summarize motives for evil upon different psychological and social enhancements. By implying McDaniel’s Evil Triad, my objective is to explore how Joker movies have represented evil into a complex figure that is constantly altered from one adaptation to another. As a final step towards my analysis, I intend to disentangle evil from all the myths that it has been related to and try to conceptualize a definition of it within the Jokers’ world.

### **1.1 Evil and Evil figures**

Evil representation has reached the tacit implication of violence and murder as the index of wickedness from real incidents, fictional plots, or through cinematographic screening. Until this point, we are still talking about the “representation” of evil while there is no clear-cut definition of evil that confine all malicious acts into one categorization. First, however, I would like to debunk some of the tenacious narratives that have become part of the definition of evil. Greg Garrett claims that to be evil was to go against the will of the gods in early ethical systems (ctd in Ewald, 2017).

In his *Evil Characters* (1999), Daniel Haybron ventures to offer a more accurate conceptualization of evil and its characterization shaping popular culture figures, referring to John Kekes’s evil as “undeserved harm to people” while labeling an evil character as an evil attribute to the condition of being “regular source of evil”. According to Haybron, these accounts are “indirect theories” that confine evildoings as permanent actions whereby “to have an evil character is to be disposed to do evil on a regular basis”. To this end, Haybron’s conceptualization of evil was a bit more distinctive than the aforementioned generalized ones. Basically, he divides evil into two extremes: pure evil and corrupt evil. On the one hand, pure evil is represented through a character with evil-qua-evil motivations who possesses anti sympathy, deficiency of conscience, malice, and malevolence. Here, these negative qualities that he maintains to the extreme degree are disposed to neither alteration nor to conscious awareness of being wrong. These characters cannot cease to be evil since their psychology nurtures evil to the extent that no external circumstance can change their wickedness unless some variations happen on the level of their psychology modifying evil impulses (Haybron, 1999). This kind is somehow inculpable for the harm caused since the latter is irrepressible in this situation. On the other hand, corrupt evil is not congenital evil but refers to a person who can shift from being good to evil by their choice (Haybron, 1999). The culpability is now an evident attribute of this type. *Ergo*, Evil is now less anchored to dubious definitions *per se* attached to radical evil. Still, instead, I may take an element of risk and argue that evil is all that has been stated by scholars, philosophers, and theologians. It could be radical, transformable from goodness to wickedness; it also is a source of sadism in others' harm. This leads us to refer to Charles Dole’s speculations (1913) that “evil is always self-limiting”; hence, it is “relative”.

Evil has a plethora of silhouettes that appear in real life and popular culture. In this article, I venture to offer a certification that evil figures do not belong to the same evil genre. Instead, each evil character is distinctive in nature and performance. In a similar vein, Cynthia Freeland asserted that modern evil had changed radically from the traditional one it is:

Often characterized as indifference to suffering rather than as the active pursuit of it by an extraordinary monster like Pinhead in the Hellraiser series—an update of Lucifer with his nail-studded head, maniacal laugh, and S&M paraphernalia. Pinhead is recognizably monstrous,

whereas Eichmann could pass as the man next door. Perhaps, then, horror-movie evil is too imaginative, creative, and intriguing. (Freeland, 2018)

This end leads us to enter the pantheon of pleasurable evil of the DC comics' most bizarre and thrilling villains, the Joker. It has been accredited that its first appearance was not in comic books in 1940 but a decade before. In 1928, Bill Finger's *The Man Who Laughs* was supposed to be the first medium to introduce the Joker to the world (Ewald, 2017). However, it is evident that the Joker crossed the limits of paper comics to be an extravagant supervillain through various film depictions like Jack Nicholson's *Batman* (1989), Heath Ledger in *The Dark Knight* (2008), Jared Leto in *Suicide Squad*, and Todd Phillips and Joaquin Phoenix in *Joker* (2019), going back to its first appearance as a cinematic character.

## 2. Methods

The Joker is a ubiquitous figure in popular culture, often identified as Batman's antagonist, an immortal disruption agent of the status quo, a "psychopathic, mass-murdering, schizophrenic clown with zero empathy", "terrorist" (Camp et al. 2010, p. 145-146). In a cogent conceptualization, Miller state that:

The Joker is not so much a Doppelgänger as an antithesis, a force for chaos. Batman imposes his order in the world; he is an absolute control freak. The Joker is Batman's most maddening opponent. He represents the chaos Batman despises, the chaos that killed his parents. [...] In a way, the Joker is a homophobic nightmare (Miller in Jürgens, 2014, p. 1)

Joker's *modus operandi* characterizes him as evil. Setting people in danger zones without any reasonable justification categorizes him in the zone of pure evil. In fact, the Joker never denies that he is indeed evil. Still, he tries to convey in each film version that evil is an existing trait within all individuals, including Batman supposing a superhero. By the same token, Erich Fromm cautioning about evil-changing faces made the Joker seem wiser than his insane featuring character. He notifies that "as long as one believes that the evil man wears horns, one will not discover an evil man" (Fromm 1973, 432). What is still enigmatic is not whether he is evil or not but what stands beyond his villainy. Until now, his *raison d'être* falls into deep waters like several other evil figures.

In his essay, *Figures of Evil, A Triad of Rhetorical Strategies for Theo-Politics* (2003), James McDaniel sees that evil is intersectional and relational to others and the self. He frames the evil triad in reference to Jean-Paul Sartre's *Being and Nothingness*, departing from Sartre's being-in-itself or being-for-others to composing a moral theory around the evil that takes the same model. According to McDaniel, such a reconfiguration "re-describes Evil *rhetorically* without sacrificing the option of also re-describing it *morally*" (qtd in Coleman & Cobb, 2007, p 110).

### **2.1 Figure 1: Evil-in-itself**

The first type of evil, according to McDaniel, is Evil-in-itself. This figure often has a mental health deficiency in recognizing the moral rules regulating relations with the other “in a manner that defies the reach of reason” (2003, p. 540). Closely related to Haybron’s pure evil, McDaniel provided a clear-cut metonymic representation of the first figure, such as tyrannical, insane, a serial killer. In this vein, he asserted that Evil-in-itself figures maintain a desire for evildoing that we as rational beings cannot understand. However, people who can understand these figures under discussion or start to find justification for their wickedness are the corrupted evil characters that Haybron also conducted in his research. These characters have been “touched by evil” in the sense of existing for a long time in a corrupted environment and eventually being corrupted by the surrounding immoralities. Evil characters like Hannibal Lecter from *The Silence of the Lambs* (1991), the Thing in *The Thing* (1982), or the alien from *Alien* (1979) provided by McDaniel are the perfect paragons of pure evil touching others and eventually making their process against their rational realm. Effectively, he argues that evil can be “intelligent but unintelligible to us”. Evil-in-itself cannot be comprehensible; in both cases, it is a disruption within the rational human mind, in its innate nature, or by exposure to the evil aura that causes paranoid impulses to harm.

### **2.2 Figure 2: Evil-for-itself**

In Evil-for-itself, McDaniel put forth the accountability-responsibility element into the body of evil. Evil-for-itself figures are aware of their wicked actions compared to the Evil-in-itself characters. McDaniel underscores that “this mode fits the grasp of reason in a manner that allows us to see it too as technically reasonable- but do not ethically justifiable” (2003, p. 541). The figures that fall under this type are “genius” and have the capacity to perform goodness in a malign manner; moreover, McDaniel points out that this also implies a sinister persona (2003, p. 541). Their mindset is not damaged but somewhat rationally reflecting on their committed wrongdoings and finding justification, such as Shylock in *Merchant of Venice*. Furthermore, Evil-for-itself could also occur as a reaction to another harmful action. It embodies revenge in the sense of *lex talionis* (an eye for an eye). It is “memetic, the negative image of the Good, not its opposite but its perversion”, ensuring the legitimacy of wrongdoings. (McDaniel, 2003, p. 542)

### **2.3 Figure 3: Evil-for others**

According to McDaniel, Evil-for-others “reflects the systematic breakdown of ontological-moral difference on which the judgment of Good and Evil depends” (2003, p. 542). In the sense of Sartre’s *Being and Nothingness*, the character that holds this type of evil is the one whose being-for-others’ self controls the morality of his actions. Indeed, they are fully aware of their evil. However, they do it for the sake of others. By virtue of their absent selfhood and

passive subjective agency, Evil-for-others figures are not necessarily irrational. However, they venture to offer indefinable morality for the well-being of others.

### **3. Results**

#### **3.1 The Dark Night (2008)**

Heath Ledger's 2008 Joker is perhaps the most overwhelming filmic depiction of the clown prince of crime. *The Dark Knight* establishes a visual representation of what is evil and what is good. Batman is obviously the superhero that serves goodness; however, what was captivating through this film particularly is not Batman at all but instead the rise of a maniac supervillain whereby his villainy needed to be decrypted.

At the outset, it is safe to say that Ledger's Joker is the full embodiment of Evil-in-itself. Throughout the movie, his persona shows clear signs of mental disorders. His villainy is often unjustified. Accordingly, Ash Cocksworth states that the Joker character in this version does not appear to have evil inclinations nor other desires that boost wicked aspirations such as financial gain or revenge, "however, is simply to cause boundless terror and chaos for no reason (and following no strict plan) other than for the sake of terrorizing" (qtd in Ewald, 2017). The Joker says, "*their morals, their code, it's a bad joke, dropped at the first sign of trouble. ... I'll show ya when the chips are down, these, uh, civilized people; they'll eat each other. See, I'm not a monster – I'm just ahead of the curve*" (Nolan, 2008). This argument solidifies my assumptions that the Joker persona simply does not follow any moral conduct. He only serves what McDaniel assumes, that the Evil-in-itself persona "stands outside the realm of reason and against democracy" (2003, p. 543). Probably the most honest confession made by Ledger's Joker was to Harvey Dent after Rachel's death in the hospital, where he attempted to justify the way she died; he explains that "*Do I really look like a guy with a plan? You know what I am? I'm a dog chasing cars. I wouldn't know what to do with one if I caught it! You know, I just...DO things*". (Nolan, 2008). In other words, he does not know why he is even trying neither to harm others nor to promote the state of anarchy. The close-up scenes always concentrate on his face and his wicked laugh that delineates evil but nothing else behind the apparent. In fact, Heath Ledger mastered the empty look that Joker has in a way to prove that his actions are only what matters. He got neither conscious nor unconscious stimuli for his actions. Perhaps he is driven by his mental illness that muted the reason within his body. There is a great possibility he forgets what he says or performs; in the same way, he does not give great importance to his next steps. There is no scene in the movie that shows the Joker planning for the next operation, unlike the police and Batman. A suitable illustration of his mental instabilities is the alterations that touch the story of his face scars each time he recited to someone new. Throughout an argument between the Joker and the mob's boss "Gambol", tells him what his origin story might be,

"Wanna know how I got these scars? My father was...a drinker. And a fiend. And one night, he goes off crazier than usual. Mommy gets the kitchen knife to defend herself. He doesn't like that. Not one bit. So—me watching—he takes the knife to her, laughing while he does it! Turns to me, and he says, "Why so serious, son?" Comes at me with the knife..."Why so serious?" He sticks the blade in my mouth..."Let's put a smile on that face!" (Nolan, 2008).

The scene ends up with the Joker killing Gambol. This situation is quite intriguing since we have no way of knowing whether any of these stories are all made up or truly have happened. While the story he told to Gambol denotes him having an abusive childhood, he recounted to Rachel that his marriage was dramatically destructive. All these speculations terminate at one single point: suffering. It is evident that he suffered in his past life, as a child or as an adult; the violence he consumed made him lose his mind.

The most famous sentence in the Batman franchise has been filmed in this section, "why so serious". The seriousness here might imply reason, morality, or fear of evil. All these traits are absent from his persona. To this end, Ledger's Joker is definitely a maniac wicked with no definite *raison d'être*. He was neither corrupted by another wicked nor fully aware of his actions. Paradoxical to his unawareness of the reason why he is committing crimes, he is aware that he would benefit nothing from harming others, just for the sake of a joke. Be that as it may, his state of approaching evil and his philosophy of chaos follows his "selfish calculation and greed", although unconscious "that is, by disregard universal ethical principles" (McDaniel, 2003, p. 543). The Joker enjoys unleashing anarchy, moving against law and order, and being the ultimate herald of chaos.

The Dark Knight's Joker is undoubtedly a complex persona. However, calling the sadist motivations he showed throughout the movie demonstrated that he could fit in the Evil-for-itself category. For example, in the scene when Detective Gerard Stephens has interrogated the Joker, he explains why he uses knives instead of guns:

Do you want to know why I use a knife? Guns are too quick. You can't savor all the... little emotions...you see, in their last moments, people show you who they really are. So in a way, I know your friends better than you ever did. Would you like to know which of them were cowards? (Nolan, 2008).

According to McDaniel (2003), evil as such is providing "the radically senseless violence and enjoyment of hatred". Ledger's Joker is undoubtedly the most intriguing filmic depiction of the comic supervillain. However, there is less concrete proof within the movie to confirm his entirely insane spirit or his rational thinking. All his actions are the consequences of illogical reasoning; however, all that he utters is out of a sense of wisdom. Excluding the possibilities of his accurate figure out of the scope of *The Dark Knight*, at the intradiegetic level, Ledger's Joker belongs to the in-itself and for-itself- configurations of evil.

### **3.2 The Suicide Squad (2016)**

*David Ayer's Suicide Squad* marked the third appearance of the Joker on big screens after Jack Nicholson's *Batman* (1989) and Heath Ledger's *The Dark Knight* (2008). However, this version marked the first filmic portrayal of Harley Quinn, more notably. Few are the segments whereby the Joker arrives on the scene within this movie, which invites film critics and academicians to account for his romantic relationship with Harley Quinn. The Joker made clear his *raison d'être* in this movie as long as Harley Quinn is there for him.

Before even her transformation into the Joker's lover, he declared his devotion to her "*Dr. Quinzel. You know, I live for these moments with you*" (Ayer, 2016). Leto's *Joker* maintains an evil-for-others repertoire. According to McDaniel (2003), such evil is nurtured by selflessness and the absence of moral reasoning due to the intense purposefulness of hurting others. In these accounts, the Joker was truly selfish; however, after falling in love with Harley Quinn, he embraced evil driven by his romantic agony, fearing her loss. After Harley jumps into the chemical toxins following a conversation with the Joker where he asks her whether she would die for him, then replies, "*No, that's too easy. Would you live for me?*" (Ayer, 2016). Leto's Joker could have the same irrational evil traits belonging to the Evil-in-self category; he is a purely evil clown without any specific reason explained in this cinematic iteration. Be that as it may, his dive after Harley into the chemicals demonstrates that his state of mind is not entirely elusive. As he comes into view holding her, he denies himself for hers. He sacrifices himself several times for her despite the fatal situation he put himself in. In this regard, McDaniel affirms that evil for others "*constitutes a Kairos of suspended animation, an eternalizing of the moment of hesitancy within which anything and everything seems possible*" (p. 545).

Leto's Joker was suicidal. His evil was neither self-centred nor seeking mass devastation. He is a lousy clown with plans, unlike Evil-itself characters like Ledger's Joker, who act out of insanity and uncalculated violence. His statement to Harley after her motor chase of his car: "*I am not someone who is loved. I'm an idea. State of mind. I execute my will according to my plan and you, Doctor, are not part of my plan*" offers evidence to his planned evil, yet not fully pictured in supplementary film segments (Ayer, 2016).

### **3.3 Joker (2019)**

Todd Phillips' *Joker* is almost the only movie that contextualized the origins of the Joker's villainy. Set in the 1981 Gotham city starring Joaquin Phoenix as the Joker, the movie exposed the genesis story of the Joker as a normal American citizen before his subversion into a supervillain. The movie foremostly deals with its protagonist Arthur Fleck, a struggling clown with a neurological illness that turned out to be the most frightening killer in Gotham after being abused several times. Arthur lives in a greedy classicist society that humiliates the



poor and heeds only on people in power positions. After being assaulted and stolen by thugs in the streets, manipulated by his friend Randall to possess a gun, he got fired from his job. At this event, we reach the train scene where he committed his first crime. Although killing those men on the train could be done in defence, Efthymiadou and Koukouvinou (2020) explained the murder of two out of three men as a reactive act done by Arthur to protect himself from the abuse, while the third person he was killed after the train stopped “as an act of revenge”. They claim that the concrete evidence of shooting the third person multiple times despite his death after just the first shot is that he sought power and revenge from others who had humiliated him before. After these incidents, Arthur turned to an evil persona driven by vengeance. What the notion of Evil-for-itself asserts in society is featured by “the uncoupling of close communal ties, increasing mobility, and intensifying tensions between the classes” (McDaniel, 2003, p. 544). Fallen by the same token, Arthur demanded equality with others, respect, and non-violence. Despite his mental disorders, Arthur was fully aware of his actions. He is not “ethically justifiable” but “technically reasonable”. Arthur is an Evil-for-itself persona. He appeals for self-justice and self-justification, and eventually, he manages to gain the audiences’ catharsis. McDaniel impersonates Evil-for-itself in Shylock’s speech of *Merchant of Venice*:

And if you wrong us, shall we not revenge? If we are like you in the rest, we will resemble you in that. If a Jew wrongs a Christian, what is his humility? Revenge. If a Christian wrong a Jew, what should his sufferance be by Christian example? Why, revenge. The villainy you teach me, I will execute, and it shall go hard, but I will better the instruction. (Act 3 Scenes 1)

Thus, Evil-for-itself operates in exchange for already existing evil action “within the logic of exchange, this reaction for that action, this price for that commodity, fire against fire” (McDaniel, 2003). Eventually, Arthur kills his mother as he discovers that she fooled him about his real identity revealing that he was adopted from Arkham State Hospital. His subsequent murder was not planned, but he could not miss the chance to avenge Randall, who was the reason behind getting fired from his clown job. Joker stabs the scissors into Randall’s neck and hits his head through the wall until he is completely dead. The close-up on his face and his hard breathing indicate his difficulty in killing others. Despite his full transformation, he is not an Evil-in-itself persona. He had a strong motive to kill whoever caused harm to him. He let Gary go safe out of his apartment, considering that he is the only person nice to him. Other characters in the film ridicule and assault him; after committing the train murder, Arthur says, “*For my whole life, I didn't know if I even really existed. But I do, and people are starting to notice*” (Phillips, 2019). It seems that his Evil was merely for the sake of reclaiming himself as visible with dignified existence.

In his debate with the talk show, Murray unveiled how he approaches committing evildoings in the sense that kindness no longer exists. He shouts,

Have you seen what it's like out there, Murray? Do you ever actually leave the studio? Everybody just yells and screams at each other. Nobody's civil anymore. Nobody thinks what it's like to be the other guy. Do you think men like Thomas Wayne ever think what it's like to be someone like me? To be somebody but themselves? They don't. They think that we'll just sit there and take it, like good little boys! That we won't be a werewolf and go wild! (Phillips, 2019).

In the quotation mentioned above, Arthur moved from the passive victim's position into the sphere of the uprising. His goodness is replaced with motivational greed for power and control. Revenge is no longer his aspiration but dominance. He killed Murray due to his attempts to make fun of him in public and his previous televised mockery of his standup comedian performance; Arthur outrages the host: *“What do you get when you cross a mentally ill loner with a society that abandons him and treats him like trash? You get what you fucking deserve”* and shoots him (Phillips, 2019). Overall, Arthur represented “the negative image of the good” that defines the nature of Evil-for-itself.

#### **4. Discussion**

The Joker figure has been depicted as a force of chaos (Jürgens, 2014), an evil person with no limits for his actions or external fear to stop his chaotic aspirations. Evil in the Joker's mind is the same evil in all human minds. The only difference between his unleashing violence and normal individuals' goodness lies in his engraved incapability to self-control emotions and violent impulses within his persona. Deemed mentally ill, the Joker is held by internal forces to his evil, which means that the absence of self-control is the reason behind his villainy. *The Dark Knight's* Joker is a megalomaniac persona that could not reveal any index to rationality or apparent impulses to murder. Instead, his playful methods reach a tacit implication of intelligent thinking. He had several chances to kill Batman, but his goal was to create a chaotic environment suitable for his destabilized state of mind. On the other hand, *The Suicide Squad's* Joker has unquestionably no self-control over his actions. Driven by his mad love for Harley, all the violence he committed was attended to keep her far from him; perhaps the Joker has another psychological weakness; fear of intimacy, which he tried to hide. However, after his mad love intensified, his fierce devotion shifted toward protecting his lover. In both ways, he forfeited to control his moves and emotions to die, trying to save Harley from a foreseeable sentence to death.

Contrary to the two discussed filmic characterizations of the Joker, Arthur's transformation into a brutal clown is the result of long-term forced determination to be good. At the same time, his aggressive social surroundings enhanced similar reactions by virtue of his safety. Putting himself as a priority turned off all reasonable motivations to perpetrate malevolence.

He realized the epiphany of self-worth circulated within a neurological disorder. Arthur's evil is vengeful, motivated by all the deceiving events he experienced.

## **5. Conclusion**

Regardless of my numerous efforts to create a definite conceptualization of evil, I might not be able to confine evil only within the scope of violence cinematized in Joker movies. It is evident that the Joker persona exposed an exhaustive list of lived experiences directing the perpetration of evil. Its evil is still far from being mythicized; it is realistic in reflection of life incidents in the sense that even domestic violence is also considered evil; robbers, outlaws, and criminals, in general, are evildoers.

Evil in the Joker's context departs from an individual's desire to prioritise the self to harming all the rest. It is always the Joker against the whole world. Its villainy is addressing all people without exceptions. There is a significant deduction that all Jokers do maintain Evil-for-itself evil motivation. They have all enhanced a selfish inclination for personal gratitude.

## **References**

- Ayer, D. *Suicide Squad*. Warner Bros. Pictures. 2016
- Camp, M. E., Webster, C. R., Coverdale, T. R., Coverdale, J. H., & Nairn, R. (2010). The Joker: a dark night for depictions of mental illness. *Academic Psychiatry*, 34(2), 145-149. <https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.ap.34.2.145>
- Coleman, R. R. M., & Cobb, J. N. (2007). Training Day and The Shield: Evil cops and the taint of blackness. In *The changing face of evil in film and television* (pp. 101-123). Brill. New York.
- Dole, C. F. (1913). The Meaning of Evil: I. The Limitation of Evil. *The Biblical World*, 42(1), 3-8.
- Efthymiadou, P., & Koukouvinou, P. (2020). *The Joker Returns A new perspective on the violent Clown Prince of Crime*. Malmö University, Faculty of Culture and Society (KS). (MA Thesis)
- Ewald, J. (2017). *The Joker: A Character Study of a Modern Madman* (Doctoral dissertation).
- Frank, M. (2007). The Radical Monism of Alfred Hitchcock. In *The changing face of evil in film and television* (pp. 37-54). Brill. New York.
- Freeland, C. A. (2018). *The Naked and The Undead: Evil and The Appeal of Horror*. Routledge. UK
- Fromm, Erich. 1973. *The Anatomy of Human Destructiveness*. New York: Henry Holt

- Haybron, D. M. (1999). Evil characters. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 36(2), 131-148.
- Heit, J. (Ed.). (2014). *Vader, Voldemort, and Other Villains: Essays on Evil in Popular Media*. McFarland. Jefferson, North Carolina
- Hills, M., & Schneider, S. J. (2007). "The Devil Made Me Do It!": Representing Evil and Disarticulating Mind/Body in the Supernatural Serial Killer Film. In *The changing face of evil in film and television* (pp. 71-87). Brill. New York
- Jürgens, A. S. (2014). Batman's Joker, A Neo-Modern Clown of Violence. *Journal of Graphic Novels and Comics*, 5(4), 441-454.
- McDaniel, J. P. (2003). Figures of Evil: A Triad of Rhetorical Strategies for The Politics. *Rhetoric & Public Affairs*, 6(3), 539-550.
- Mowat, B. A., Werstine, P., Poston, M., & Niles, R. (2004). The Merchant of Venice.
- Nilsson, J. (2015). Rictus grins and Glasgow smiles: The joker as satirical discourse. *The Joker: A Serious Study of The Clown Prince of Crime*. Jackson, MS: The University Press of Mississippi, 165-179.
- Nolan, C. *The Dark Knight*. Warner Bros. Pictures. 2008
- Norden, M. F. (2007). *The changing face of evil in film and television*. BRILL. New York
- Phillips, T. *Joker*. Warner Bros. Pictures. 2019
- Singer, M. G. (2004). The Concept of Evil. *Philosophy*, 79(2), 185-214.