

# Module 6-1 Ethics with a Human Face

Sa kabila ng absurdo, bakit pa ako magpapatuloy -> para saan ang aking ginagawa?

Same -> Kagaya

Other -> Kaiba

## Violence

### Background:

Primarily, Levinas was a phenomenologist (he looked up to Heidegger, though he criticized him and felt betrayed when Heidegger became a Nazi)

His family was annihilated, only his wife and daughter survived and went to France

He did not understand the violence of the Holocaust and its lack of rationality

connatus essendi -> inherent striving of every living being to persevere in its being, found in all living things; living things will do everything in its power to preserve itself

Violence is not only seen in a martial way, existing is violence

example: Flower taking resources from a corpse of a person -> the flower does not care about the person's gender, beliefs, desires, etc.; they only use the person to keep on living

The same wants to remain the same, so it is allergic of The Other

A friend in a group who does not want to go somewhere, you try to assimilate them to convince them (making them like the Self)

US' benevolent assimilation

Life is so much easier when surrounded by your alter egos - Narcissism

im the alpha im the leader im the one to trust  
awoooooooo!!!!

Flowey from undertale: kill or be killed

Trump -> us vs. them, capitalized on the violent attitude of Americans

Everything is violent

From the violence in our centripetal movement, we enjoy (jouissance)

A child does not draw on the walls with malicious intent, but rather for their own innocent enjoyment

"I enjoy your company!" No, you enjoy yourself in their company

Ego keeps making it about itself

Every experience of the world, of the elements and objects, lends itself to this dialectic of the soul conversing with itself, enters into it, belongs to it.

Every philosophy is an egology (to use Husserl's neologism) i.e. a study of the self.

May kakayahan tayong ikulong ang lahat sa konsepto at ideya

Every object in the world belongs somewhere in the classification scale (and this scale comes from us, to make it easier to make things like us)

As long as there is the Other, a person can only respond to this by making it an extension of themselves e.g. As Antipolo developed into like Manila, it lost its otherness

The body does not understand the spaghetti, it only understands the fundamental molecules and nutrients and it disposes of what is not needed as waste — the body does not have the capacity to handle the otherness

The point is—to make what is foreign domestic. In this way, violence is rooted in this natural phenomenon

In conversation—there is a difference when the person is in front of you rather than when you are talking about the same person e.g. can you talk shit about someone when they're right in front of you?

In a heated argument with your mother, there may be a moment where you begin to see your mother as a person rather than as a thing—why am I screaming at this person? You see the face, and you begin to see that you are doing something wrong if you continue to keep screaming at them. Their face becomes a metonymy for a whole thing that you will never understand fully.

The face can also be something that can be heard. The experience of the face is auditory, not visual. To perceive the face as the Other is a new experience, and to hear the commandment "You shall not kill!"—this commandment is a metonymy for the moral imperatives that command respect for the other.

The face says—hindi ako babae, lalake, Filipino, Hudyo, or any other category that you assign to the Other to reduce it to an object of violence. I am a person. From this epiphany, morality begins.

To have no sense of Other is to be a sociopath. They cannot see the face.

(Original reading)

"But if things do not resist the ruses of thought, and confirm the philosophy of the Same, without ever putting into question the freedom of the I, is this also true of men?" Could you also do the same thing to men as you do to spaghetti, guyabano, and Antipolo?

French -> only one word for conscience or consciousness

To have a consciousness as a person is to have a conscience

from weakness comes the power to command someone to "not kill"

"He commands precisely in his poverty, in his misery, in his weakness and he is weak precisely in his height, in his dignity, in his ability to command respect."

But in the end, it's still up to the one in power

Another example of the epiphany of the face: seeing parents as people -> there is more to my mother than just being my mother; she is her own existence and not just a function of my own life

Infinite responsibility for the other

The Other's face is the revelation not of the arbitrariness of the will but its injustice (pinapakita ng mukha ang kapal ng mukha mo) -> Consciousness of my injustice is produced when I incline myself not before facts, but before the Other (ang mukha ang sumusukat sayo)

When you are awake to the face's showing, you have a chance to reply

You can reply: I don't care, I will kill you anyways.

You can listen to the command and reply accordingly (and to be human).

To do the latter is to take responsibility for the latter. This is when you also assume your identity as the one who was called to respond to the Other (i.e. before you answer the call, then you are *nobody*.)

"Me voice!" -> Narito Ako!

Parallels to the story of Jesus and the disciples:

Rather fishermen, he called on them to be fishers of men (new identity)

"From this point on, you are now Peter."

As soon as Simon took on the responsibility of being a disciple, he gained a new identity, now a person.

During the Passion, Peter denied Jesus 3 times, as if he wanted to go back to his old identity to Simon. He no longer wanted to be a person, to be responsible (as his life was on the line).

That is the same problem with many people—sometimes they decide that they did enough, and they want to go back to be a nobody and to a life of violence.

When we go to the thinking of "ako muna", then our identity as a person is erased

Penelope and Odysseus

Your responsibility for the other is ALWAYS asymmetrical

Laging lagi ako, because I always would at least an iota more of responsibility for the Other