

International Journal of Human Sciences Research

ETHICS OF E. LÉVINAS IN PANDEMIC TIMES: TOTALITY, INFINITY, SENSITIVITY AND FACE TO FACE

Luiz Fernando Gomes Ferreira

He finished high school at the Victório Bravim State School of Elementary and High School, attended the 6th semester of Philosophy at the Dom Bosco Catholic University. Volunteer Researcher of the Scientific Initiation Program for the PROJECT: CONTRIBUTIONS OF ETHICS FOR THE DISCUSSION OF CARE IN MENTAL HEALTH CARE Caratinga, Minas Gerais
<http://lattes.cnpq.br/8470584650548392>

José Manfroí

Professor at the Dom Bosco Catholic University (UCDB). He teaches classes at the undergraduate level in the disciplines of Scientific Methodology, Philosophy and Sociology, and at the postgraduate level in the disciplines of Research Methods and Techniques, Higher Education Methodology and Paradigms of Knowledge

All content in this magazine is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License. Attribution-Non-Commercial-Non-Derivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0).



Paper presented to Universidade Católica Dom Bosco as a partial requirement for obtaining the degree of Bachelor of Philosophy and submitted at the XXIV Scientific Initiation Meeting of UCDB.

Abstract: The present work aimed to analyze certain concepts of the ethics of the Lithuanian philosopher Emmanuel Lévinas, to consult a possibility of a face-to-face relationship in these times of pandemic. The research method was a narrative review of the literature of the Western philosophical tradition in which Lévinas is a participant, and on articles that portray some consequences of the Covid-19 Pandemic. Such a relationship addressed transcends the understanding of intersubjective relationships based on ontological relationships determined by the subject and object relationship. At the same time, this relationship goes beyond physical contact, not that it is not necessary, but it intends to approach a foundation that safeguards alterity, respects the “Other” that manifests itself to the “Same” without there being a totalization. It was found that the philosophical categories of ethics by E. Lévinas contribute to the face-to-face relationship in these times of pandemic and consequently, even in the absence of physical contact, there is a sign of sensitivity and care for the other.

Keywords: 1. Totality. 2. Infinite. 3. Sensitivity. 4. Face to Face. 5. Pandemic.

INTRODUCTION

The present work, based on Levinassian ethics, aimed to present the possibilities of an ethical relationship of “face to face” mediated by the media in these times of the Covid19 Pandemic. How can we relate when a virus is hitting us and imposing social isolation on us, and above all precisely at a time when we are subject to the games of the great political and economic powers?

The “face to face” relationship is not conditioned to any kind of representation or objective understanding. The Lithuanian philosopher calls this relationship in the transcendental field and not in the field of objectivity of knowledge. Such a relationship

opens the door to hospitality, the reception of the “Other”, which reveals what the studied author calls the third term. This third term is the one I contemplate, the infinite. However, this relationship must overcome the totalities that deprive it, it must overcome the historical baggage of ontological relationships and impositions presented throughout history.

The study of the categories of Levinassian ethics allowed us to approach the current reality in which dozens of countries suffer the consequences of the Covid-19 Pandemic that isolate human beings and do not allow their physical relationship. In this we ask ourselves how there is a possibility of an ethics if we are not allowed to have contact. For this, the philosophy of Emmanuel Lévinas answers us by giving a foundation to ethics, breaking certain understandings and visions of an ethics that is only moral, superficial or even based on aesthetics, in which individuals act in an apparent way, which pleases the eyes of the beholder. contemplate it and get the admiration necessary to meet the needs of your own ego.

Faced with the contemporary reality in which relationships are based on rational, ontological systems, highlighted mainly in the philosophy of Kant, Hegel and Martin Heidegger, tirelessly taking the thesis of ontology as a first philosophy either directly or indirectly, which emerges the thought of Emmanuel Lévinas. He experienced the captivity imposed by the Second World War in the Hitler dictatorship and had the opportunity to attend and have contact with the thought of the Marburg school.

The Lithuanian author was born in Kovno, Republic of Lithuania, in 1906. His thinking at first was influenced by the philosophy of his master Edmund Russell and Martin Heidegger in which the work “Being and Time” was of paramount importance for the construction of his thought. on the totalities imposed by

the question “what is it?” and for the time that it massacred that being in existence. It is from this context that we can infer about the current conjecture of humanity in which, at least we dare say, an ethical crisis is established in which the concern for the other and his care, his acceptance, that is, hospitality has not been a priority, thus establishing the supremacy of an “Egoistic Self”.

TOTALITIES AND PANDEMIC

The consistency of dealing with a possible “face-to-face” relationship is to seek justifications for it. It is to sketch a foundation that leads us to relate to the Other who presents me, who is external to me and not an attempt to sketch an ethical plan of how to relate to the Other who presents me externally.

That said, the step to take is to look for possibilities for a Levinassian face-to-face relationship in these current times when we are affected by a pandemic, Covid-19. To address these possible relationships, we resort to some concepts that the author Emmanuel Lévinas has in some of his works in the field of Ethics, and for some current realities that insist a discussion that results in this field.

The face-to-face relationship becomes possible when there is a break with wholes, so understanding them is the first objective. Dealing with totalities results in the ontological consequence. This is an excluding system that is permeating the reality and the way of thinking of the modern West, founded by distinguished thinkers, Kant, Hegel, Heidegger in their ontology of being and time, among others. The discussion and dialogue between Ethics and the present day question us if there is an ethical crisis when we somehow try to preserve the survival of humanity.

Levinassian thought takes place from the ontologies traced in everyday life as totalities that express the lack of interest in the life of

others, for the responsibility that is inherent to the other. First, it is necessary to understand what a totality expressed as an ontological system is. The ontology as presented to us by Lévinas (2007, p. 24) is the understanding of the verb to be. It differs from other areas of knowledge because it does not study the entity, but the being of this entity. Therefore, to say that contemporaneity is taken by ontologies means that it is permeated by relationships that take place from the being and not from the interrogation of the entity that presents me. This is not an ethical relationship, but an ontological relationship, a knowledge relationship.

According to Lévinas’ thought, an ontology is always a totality, because when it thematizes being it does not thematize the entity that occurs in the relationship and thus brings to consciousness the understanding realized in the experience with the object. We always ask ourselves what it is, and this is characterized as a relationship of knowledge between a self that asks and the object that manifests itself. Therefore, the action of the being who knows is to bring an answer to consciousness, and this answer satisfies that need for knowledge. We are not seeking to deconstruct the ontological path, but to give it its due value and place, already advancing what we will say ahead, not that of first philosophy.

At the same time, the answer that satisfies, satiates, is a sign of an understanding of what came to my consciousness, thus resulting in the understanding of the other that manifests itself. This way, ontology is presented as a first philosophy, the one that provides a basis for starting and ending a discussion. It is not for this article to present Lévinas’ critique of Heidegger, but to understand in what sense this totality is born and why it has a severe consequence in the life of the West.

The primacy of the Heideggerian Ontology is not based on the truism: <<to know the

entity, it is necessary to have understood the being of the entity>>. To affirm the priority of being in relation to beings is already to pronounce on the essence of philosophy, to subordinate the relationship with someone who is a being (the ethical relationship) to a relationship with the being of the being that, impersonal as it is, allows kidnapping, the domination of beings (to a relation of knowledge), subordinate justice and freedom. (LÉVINAS, 1988, p. 32)

A totality is represented by the subsumption of an other to myself. It is the ability to make the other part of me, that is, if totalities are ontologies, it is the ability of the I to integrate into itself the being that is external to it that once presented itself. This is the relation of knowledge, making for itself what is understood of the object. It is directed to the model of knowledge visible in the West supported by ontology, being an ability to reduce the other to understandings, representations of the self. It is to make the “myself” presented by Emmanuel Lévinas familiar, integrating this other, which is now part of me, resulting in a homogeneous relationship, in the death of the exercise of otherness. The other becomes a product of knowledge.

According to Lévinas, in the ontological relationship the figure of the entity is left aside, giving priority to the being, which in turn is impersonally hijacked by representations, and or an attempt to understand this being. That is, in the ontological relationship, understanding being, I make it part of me. This kidnapping often happens in the sensitive relationship with the world, but a relationship in which reality adapts to beings. This ontology is presented in Aristotle and also in Heidegger.

The role of vision reflected by Lévinas (1988, p. 184), when analyzing these ontologies, is to take, capture what is presented in the light, that is, anything can be captured from an illuminated place, as it happens with the

light. face, that is, the “Other” that comes into contact with me can be understood by me once I see him. This is totally opposite to the idea of otherness in which the face cannot be understood by the same. Understanding the other results in integrating him to me, to my needs and wants, I can use him, I have and I exercise power over the other. This having power is a quality of ontology. This is what the Lithuanian author believes, in a violation of others, where we fail to comply with our responsibility for the infinite that manifests itself as a third party in the face of someone who is external to me.

Consequently, what has been dealt with, it is necessary to ask about the consequences of these totalities more clearly and what it would relate to relationships in times of a pandemic. Notoriously, we also ask ourselves how to escape or overcome these totalities that present themselves incarnated in various ways in society. Therefore, in this perspective, when we understand the role of totalities, we understand the consequence that manifests itself directly in our current days with the experience of the Coronavirus Pandemic, in which we perceive as totalities government representatives, political systems that exercise a certain form of dominion and power. Linked to this is the theme of messianism in which certain nations or a certain nation, people or class can be chosen, preferred or the most qualified in this or that, being able to receive benefits that others are neglected and denied. Objectively, those who do not understand themselves within the established requirements are placed on the “outside”, thus generating exclusion and, consequently, death.

The Lithuanian author helps us to understand that totalities always generate the exclusion of the third, of exteriority. Exclusion generates a sense of irresponsibility for the other, and in these times of Pandemic what

is perceived is the irresponsibility for the “Other”, for what is external to me, and can be applied to other nations, to people who have affective burdens, those who does not belong to us affectively, that is, that it has no ties. This manifests the movement of this totalitarian spirit that, decanted in the culture, still insists on justifying its attitudes with lies fated for truth and or types of messianism that promise a status of salvation to adherent disciples.

In a case presented by the author Judith Butler, the terms mentioned above are clearly exposed with the attempt to monopolize vaccines against Covid19, exposing a certain disinterest for other nations, for other families, for people who do not join the Self of a referred nation, and in this case the United States. At the same time, other attitudes are included in what we refer to about totalities, such as attempts to manipulate capital turnover, to capitalize on the suffering that society is experiencing in these times, to effect and reinforce inequality.

Of course, if it moves and attacks, the virus demonstrates that the human community is equally fragile. At the same time, without embargo, the incapacity of some states or regions to prepare in advance (United States, is the most notorious member of this club), the *refuerzo de las politicas nacionales y el cierre de las fronteras* (with a menu accompanied by fearful racism) and the arrival of businessmen eager to capitalize on global suffrage, all testify to speed with radical inequality, which includes nationalism, white supremacy, violence against women, queer and trans people, and Capitalist exploitation find ways to reproduce and strengthen their powers within pandemic zones. (BUTLER, p. 60)¹

On the one hand, we can see what we are

¹ In fact, it moves and attacks, the virus shows that the human community is equally fragile. At the same time, however, the inability of some states or regions to prepare in advance (the United States is perhaps the most notorious member of this club), the strengthening of national policies and the closing of borders (often accompanied by fearful racism) and the arrival of entrepreneurs eager to capitalize on global suffering, all bear witness to how quickly inequality resides, including nationalism, white supremacy, violence against women, dykes and trans people, and capitalist exploitation finds ways to reproduce and strengthen its powers within of pandemic areas. (Free translation).

talking about about totalities, that due to lack of sensitivity, it is understood that any sacrifice for their nations to survive, will have to be made, even if it costs human lives, political and economic crises, ethical crisis and morals. These crises that favor the great powers are justified by the discourses and do not allow the manifestation of dialogue. There is a lively sophisticated rhetoric there.

As we have seen, the decanting of totality is not restricted to one or another sphere, but decants over the political system, the economic and cultural system. The author Luiz Carlos Susin (SUSIN, 1949, p. 65) reveals that in the ontological application to the economy, poverty and wealth measure the nothing and the being, that is, we can think that the nothing would be who has less or has nothing is unworthy of existing or of receiving privileges, and the being would be the one who has more and is worthy of its existence. It is irresponsible and in some cases a denial of existence, denying a basic principle to exist. Exclusion removes the conditions to walk the earth and to relate, to enjoy the world that presents itself to us and, as Lévinas infers, confronts us.

Economic power reveals itself as the face of a totality that is perhaps not concerned with death if profit justifies and feeds the poor and weak interiority of the self. It is not intended here to criticize or make any allusion to Karl Marx, only to claim that economic possession justifies in certain cases the totalities and their consequences. As presented by Luiz Carlos Susin, money is the rationality that speeds up commerce and enhances ownership. It is the possession of the power to possess, the power of possession (Susin, 1949, p. 66). Thus, this power of possession justifies atrocities against

the most vulnerable.

Simple ways that neglect with others is decanted is the irresponsibility of certain groups that insist on facing the various recommendations of health, municipal, state, national and international bodies for health care in these times of pandemic. In the reference to the author Judith Butler, we capture a strong reference of an ethical crisis, of a selfishness that kills, revealing in the current moment totalities that are not willing to welcome the other with sensitivity, with hospitality. The creation of walls of barriers reveals the total disregard for the other, which in turn is not the term of sensitivity.

THE INFINITY AND THE FACE

The theme of the Infinite addresses in this study the centrality of thought. This Other that is sometimes consumed in the relations of knowledge is the spokesperson for the Infinite, it is the face that manifests transcendence, that manifests the third term that makes justice possible, here is the relationship. The infinite is capable of breaking wholes, the metaphysical relationship is this possibility of breaking ontological impositions. Lévinas (1998, p. 11/12) says that this relationship with the "Other" that manifests the infinite cannot be expressed by objective experience, precisely because of the excess that the infinite has in relation to my understanding, that is, it does not fit, cannot be measured and understood by my reason, not as it happens in the process of knowledge. According to the Lithuanian, the face differs from all the represented content.

The idea of the infinite present in the same provokes this interiority and the Desire of what is external to it. This infinity that is manifested in the face in Lévinas' work is the key on which to base this refusal to be content. The idea is reinforced that I am not the one who decides for what is external to me, but it decides for itself, for being alterity,

for being a face that will not be the content of my possession.

In the author's perspective, the mediation between the "Same" and the "Other" is given in language. The inviolability of alterity takes place in dialogue, in the intersubjective relationship in which I request the presence of the other, and the other, questioning us, leads us to preserve the ethics of the "Other". As already portrayed, the presence of an other that does not fit into the sphere of the "Same", that does not become familiar to the Same is a surplus presence, a presence of the infinite. From a saying that thousands have said, the exemplification of this would be given in a simple way: "you cannot put the ocean in a glass of water". The ocean would be infinity, and the glass of water would be reason, understanding. It doesn't fit, you can't force it, because the more you try, the more you transgress the integrity of the "Other", violating its otherness and, consequently, violating "The Other, the Infinite".

According to the author, "the idea of the infinite surpasses my powers, - not quantitatively, but putting them in question, as we will see later. It does not come from our a priori foundation and, therefore, it is the experience par excellence". (LÉVINAS, 1988, p.190). That is, if the infinite that is before me surpassed my powers by a notion of quantity, we would again have the presence of totalities, because it would be the "Other" that would exert power over me. Consequently, we could not get out of this vicious circle. However, when we deal with the notion of questioning, it is the idea already mentioned that the "Other", and the "Infinite", leads the "Same" to confront itself with its bad intentions. However, it is necessary to add a quote from Lévinas that proves that the confrontation between the same and the other does not occur through violence or blood:

The <<resistance>> of the Other does not

make me violent, it does not act negatively, it has a positive structure: ethics. The first revelation of the other, assumed in all relationships with him, does not consist in catching him in his negative resistance and surrounding him in the morning. I don't fight a faceless god, but I respond to his expression, to his revelation. (LÉVINAS, 1988, p. 191)

Whenever we come into contact with the face, we ask ourselves who manifests itself, here we no longer have the relationship with the question of 'what is manifested'. The face challenges the ethical relationship itself and not a relationship of knowledge. The question and the answer about this who, about this face coincide, (LÉVINAS, 1998, p. 172). The presence of the face challenges responsibility, since it manifests my own nudity with its excess, making it possible to see the guilt of our immediate and past murders. This interpellation of the face to my interiority causes shame, because the look in the eye, the expression of the face that manifests the presence of the infinite causes me discomfort in the face of the attempts to totalize, to enjoy and satisfy my needs, to objectify the other that me it presents.

Thousands of faces are labeled, doomed, forgotten, they are no longer sacred, they have been totaled. Where are the thousands of faces? The inequality present in everyday life expresses these faces sealed with prices, labeled to be consecrated in the auction destined for those who have more resources and power, are destined to suffer neglect for being poor, marginalized, excluded and will be deprived of their survival kits, while others will be doomed to live under the privilege of the life of luxury. "Social and economic inequality will ensure that the virus discriminates. The virus itself does not discriminate, but humans certainly do, shaped as we are by the intertwined powers of nationalism, racism, xenophobia, and capitalism." (BUTLER, 2020,

p. 62). Here we find the consent that certain powers that exercise power and influence act out of an intentional impulse that aims only at profit.

The reason that justifies tough thoughts and positions reducing any manifestation of any face that presents itself. These relationships do not allow dialogue, and dialogue that is the result of language is the only one capable of allowing a relationship in which the "Other" is not taken as possession. And if in some cases there is no solution to this slippery transcendence, the massacre is perceptible, the brutal, shocking way in which the selfish self meets the face, destroying its features, its dignity, its justice. It's going over a humanity that veils the self and the other, that does justice. The massacre makes injustice, lack of dialogue, irresponsibility, insensitivity reign.

A mediation of language can contribute to the appreciation of the face, of the infinite. The presence of the face mediated by social media may be useful, which will bring to mind forgotten faces that have somehow been excluded from their surplus manifestation of infinity. The means of communication become effective in today's times for care, for responsibility, for hospitality. It is an opportunity to heal the soul, to heal the hearts of any insecurity caused by selfishness.

Currently, each photo, video, lives, or any other form of media expression in which the face, the "infinity", evokes us from its appeal, its questioning, its presence before the "Same", the Goodness. We can exercise the virtue of kindness not to correspond to the aspirations of the media community, but to correspond to the desires of life, of each argument that validates the ethical position, prior to any other anteriority.

The infinite continues to resist its murderer, because this face, even if it allows itself to suffer the consequences of a selfish self, resists him and guarantees to maintain its dignity.

It is pure evasion, it is pure transcendence, it does not allow itself to fall into the domains, it does not become familiar. "His face is an original expression, it is the first word: you shall not commit murder". (LÉVINAS, 1988, p. 193). The infinite resists until the end. When we are eye to eye we feel naked, it makes the "I" shudder, feel naked, ashamed and totally defenseless. Infinite appeals to humanity that is within the egoistic "Self".

SENSIBILITY

In the face of totalities, sensitivity has an outstanding role in order to break these structures that we have previously portrayed. According to Márcio Luis Costa, sensitivity in Lévinas starts from a subjectivity that is irreducible to human understanding (COSTA, 1998, p. 173). This sensitivity is not reduced to the degree of objectivity alone. Lévinas presents that this term needs to be evaluated in a transcendental way and that it does not simply aim at the adequacy of the object to the ideas and concepts of the subject, much less to the qualities of things, but rather objective what underlies the qualities:

A transcendental phenomenology of sensation would justify the return to the term sensation, which characterizes the transcendental function of the quality that would correspond to it – a function that the old conception of sensation, in which the affectation of a subject by an object nevertheless intervened, evoked better than the naively realistic language of the moderns. (LÉVINAS, 1988, p. 183)

In this perspective, in his work "Totalidade e Infinito" Lévinas presents that sensitivity as fruition is much more than turning to the object. Sensitivity, therefore, starts from a subjectivity not thematized or not "thematizable", it is a pre-originating constitution of the subject, being prior to any anteriority. This justifies that the theme of sensitivity is relevant to support the responsibility we have for those

who are outside us, that is, for those with whom we live and meet on a daily basis.

We can ask ourselves what is external to us, and we would have several answers, however, this work, when leaning on the sensibility in Emmanuel Lévinas, we realize that what is external to us is what is given to us in the light. And the light prior to the object that is given underlies our sensitivity to the non-qualifiable. It justifies because light, which dissipates all darkness, produces a void in space when there is no object to be qualified. However, even if there is a void, we perceive in Levinassian theory that there is no absolute void, because there is the "there". This "there is" is the non-thematizable, it is a non-categorizable existence. Therein lies the foundation of the sensibility that precedes the simple objective sensation of the things we encounter.

Sensitive humanity based on the transcendental condition leads us to flee from a moral foundation, in which we are subject to having to be and/or do. Therefore, sensitivity in the transcendental field grounds the relationship with others, going beyond the sensitive experience in its simple application of the term. According to Lévinas, "The relationship with others is the only one that introduces a dimension of transcendence and leads us to a relationship that is totally different from experience in the sensitive sense of the term, relative and selfish" (LÉVINAS, 1988, p. 187). This shows us that sensitivity to the other flees from any intentionality that leads to personal satisfaction.

In these times when there is a phenomenon that threatens existence, the term of sensitivity evokes care, calls us to welcome, to hospitality. Sensitivity and hospitality are not distant terms and, therefore, inherent, and can contribute to the preservation of life and solidarity with humanity.

In contact with the infinite, sensitivity, hospitality, responsibility opens up a bond

that respects alterity and does not violate it. However, otherness is not based on the Same, but by itself, questioning and provoking the Same. Consequently, this respect and preservation of otherness helps us to play a word game on Emmanuel Lévinas' theory. Let us think of a subjectivity of a nation, which must be irreducible to the understanding of any nation state. Any attempt to impose, totaling criteria to qualitatively compare which nation would be able to receive the vaccine against the virus, would be a violation and disrespect of the commitment to human fraternity.

From the sensitivity taken as hospitality, welcoming those who suffer the most and trying to feel the pain experienced with the loss of thousands of people and thousands of grieving families is progress in these times of consent, even if in a simple way, with the level of ethics in which the preservation of life is aimed. This loss of sensitivity reveals a subjective fragility, a human fragility in the field of relationships that still take place through knowledge. The human being is objectified, and consequently he becomes a mere instrument and, when no longer able, he is disposable. At the current moment of the pandemic, it becomes a mere number in the group of contagions and another mere number in the group of deaths.

Understanding this sensitivity prior to any precedence is to allow a subjectivity to be present that is also prior to any anteriority, (prior to ontology, thus having an ethical anteriority in mind), it is part of the constitution of each individual, concluding that the individual is responsible for the other since its first constitution, is part of its essence. To ignore this ethical prediction is to go against the essence of life, against what is part of the human constitution, and if it is life, the opposite will be death. However, if lived, it is capable of generating otherness, it generates

intersubjectivity and non-egoism.

The pre-originating constitution of subjectivity as sensibility opens the door to intersubjectivity pre-originately constituted as "reception". Relating to another human being is to receive him before thinking about him and before deciding whether or not to receive him. A reception prior to freedom and the decision to receive or reject. Human fraternity is the reception of the "other in me. (COSTA, 1998, p. 175)

This statement by Márcio Costa is not suitable for some cases of the current moment, revealing the rejection, the non-inclusion of A and B. This is not considered an escape from human fraternity, but a rupture with this fraternity and with a Self that shame in front of the other who exceeds his understanding becomes hospitable. There is the presence of wholeness, of selfishness.

In relation to the States, the economy manifests itself with total disregard for human fraternity. The virus crossing almost all national borders showed the unity of the world, but that is still denied by the rulers who do not accept this interdependence. "What are the consequences of this pandemic when thinking about equality, global interdependence and our mutual obligations"? (BUTLER, 2020, p. 60). The economy sees itself in the role of continuing to capitalize on resources and manipulating in its own interest what would be necessary to preserve and protect life.

Can you imagine that most people think that it is the market that must decide how the vaccine will be developed and distributed? Is it even possible within your world to insist on a global health problem that must transcend this moment of market rationality? (BUTLER, 2020, p. 62)

This statement is translated into Levinassian terms if it will be possible to escape these governmental and economic totalities. Let us deal here with the responsibility that is recognized and capable of breaking the

shackles of slavery imposed by totalities. Responsibility for others is initially based as the Lithuanian presents us, in a subjectivity. This subjectivity, in Lévinas, tries to be based on a being for the other.

An important characteristic of sensitivity is not only to make us look at the pandemic chaos with its negative perspectives, but to observe it in the face of the living human fraternity established in the concern for those who most need care and attention. The responsibility towards the other at this moment is explicit in the very distance we perform. If, in the past, the care was in the physical approximation, now I could perhaps say that there is a care that goes beyond this approximation, daring to say of a metaphysical approximation.

The metaphysical Desire is not exhausted, it is not satisfied and that is why it is disinterested, leading us to say that even in the distance we are close to those faces that manifest themselves. Desire, as presented by Lévinas (1998, p. 50), does not start from the self, but from the desirable, so there is no interest, but there is revelation. If it started from the self, it would just be a need, it would just be something to be satiated. From the Metaphysical Desire, we manifest solidarity when we take the data of each city, state, country when analyzing the number of contaminated cases and deaths and we feel “guilty” for this loss when we follow selfish paths, and otherwise we feel responsible for the other when we take the measures established by the health bodies.

We cannot see in neglect the need to enjoy the condition for the maintenance of the state and to favor the boom of the economy; not using this as an attempt to reduce the older population; I do not ally myself with the assassin who will kill when he escapes his authoritarian power, leaving him with the only alternative but to kill so that he is no longer the target of annoyances and doubts, of neglect, and does not allow freedom.

It is in sensitivity that I allow myself to feel the other, I allow myself to welcome him as a guest in my home, but above all after having welcomed me. In these times of a pandemic, self-care is to welcome yourself and welcome others in their own skin, caring, managing affective feeling, raising awareness of the care and pain of the other. There is before us a humanity that is lost when we try to dominate it, but that presents itself in the world when we allow externality to manifest. To welcome humanity as a host is to open the doors to that foreigner who needs care, who needs to be veiled, who needs comfort.

In sensitivity there is no uncertainty as to who could arrive, there is no distinction of who is arriving, but the first giver of coziness. Sensation is not taken as a simple quality in which something pleases or dislikes me. The sensation does not make me strange with the other, but it allows me to see the other. We don't need to perform the objective experience of all the faces suffered by the Pandemic, because the metaphysical experience is in realizing in sensitivity that there are other faces around the world, who suffer. The transcendent experience is to contemplate before us the presence of this face, which is external to us.

THE FACE TO FACE RELATIONSHIP

The face-to-face relationship is named after what was in charge of discussing the infinite and the face. To be in front of the face that encompasses the “Other”, is to be in front of what is irreducible to understanding, to “conceptualization”. In this relationship, the Lithuanian author uniquely presents us with the role of the face-to-face who does not intend any satisfaction of his needs, any selfishness. Different from the relation with or beside. Levinas presents:

A relationship whose terms do not form a totality can therefore only be produced in

the general economy of being as going from me to the other, as face to face, as drawing a distance in depth – that of discourse, of goodness, of Desire – irreducible. to that established by the synthetic activity of understanding between the different terms – different from one another – that offer themselves to its synoptic operation. (LÉVINAS, 1988, p. 26)

It is here in the face-to-face relationship that the concretization is deduced, so to speak, of the metaphysical relationship. This relationship thematized by Desire, which is not supplied because it is not desire in the face of my needs, but according to Lévinas, it is “Desire” of the desirable, of the “Infinite” that reveals itself in the Other before me.

The Face-to-Face Relationship that evokes sensitivity, brings up the theme of substitution, or that we can translate to what we have said before, hospitality. These inherent themes form this face-to-face relationship par excellence. As we have seen, it is an integral, constitutive part of a subjectivity that does not accept its totalization, does not allow itself to be integrated, to become familiar. If we have this conclusion, we can say that the face-to-face relationship will actually evoke an intersubjective relationship in which hospitality, sensitivity will be guides to ensure the incorruptibility of alterity and the preservation and security of the Other’s face, allowing a revelation of the infinite.

In this revelation, Lévinas bases his primacy on feminine grace. Before welcoming the other, it is necessary to welcome yourself. Reception, first sensitivity, calls interiority to home, interiority itself. Consequently, the hospitable reception according to Lévinas can be carried out. This intimacy of the house is manifested with excellence in the female figure. The feminine is the welcome par excellence, with sweetness, it is a figure to say that it prepares the house to welcome the indigent, the widow, the orphan, the poor. The

term feminine or Woman with a capital initial, wants to represent a figure par excellence of alterity, which withdraws into interiority and prepares to welcome the “Other”. Her interiority builds the subjectivity that we have portrayed in this work. This figure alludes to pregnancy, in which there is a withdrawal of oneself so that the other will be born. Author Magali tells us:

Woman is presence and absence, language without teaching, therefore silent, presence always discreet, secret, mystery. The woman is also not the you of the face (which implies height); she is the you of familiarity. It is the only moment in which Lévinas admits a relationship with Buber’s philosophy, when he comments that this relationship resembles this author’s relationship between I and You. The way that the Woman has to reserve herself makes possible the construction of the interiority of the Subject (moment in which the human assumes himself as a man) – sweet fainting of the being, since the emergence of the Woman does not threaten; on the contrary, it withdraws so that the Other (as itself) can be born. (MENEZES, 2008)

Grounding this theme intends to say that the face-to-face relationship is not based on a subject facing an object, but on two subjects, containing in itself a subjectivity that constitutes it in a pre-originating language of its being. Lévinas presents the objective of demystifying these relationships given by the ontological determination and that has contributed to justify the totalitarian attitudes, which in many cases generates physical death, but in the majority removes the hope of continuing to live, it is to be in existence and not to exist. The Lithuanian author felt this totalitarian presence in his skin when he was a prisoner of the Nazi system. Despite his indirect references to it, and almost not cited objectively, the consequences of this system are known and felt even today.

It is in this face-to-face relationship that will

sustain the current period in which human beings face their tomorrow with insecurity because they do not know if they will be able to overcome or perhaps survive a pandemic, and consequently the totalitarian systems imposed on political and economic systems. This relationship goes beyond the idea of history as the purpose of being, it goes beyond the ontological determination of being. It is a solidarity that can rescue the meaning of life, that rescues the value of those who are outside us and the respect for what they are.

According to Lévinas, it is in the face-to-face relationship that the revelation of the third occurs through the face, the revelation of the infinite. More than a way of being, it is an original production of being. It is here that Desire opens the doors to infinity and breaks with existing totalities. According to the author, placing the being as Goodness is to take possession of an inner self that reflects in a significant gesture the same Goodness for those who are outside it.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Covid19 Pandemic, brought humanity to its knees, and made it realize human fragility, its ephemeral life. According to Faro (2020), "COVID-19, the name of the respiratory syndrome caused by the new coronavirus, was initially detected in 2019 in the city of Wuhan, capital of the province of Central China" and reached the population without any social, economic, political distinction, gender, etc. Currently in the world there are 25,197,938 infected and 846,552 dead according to official data presented by BBC News updated on August 31, 2020.

Indeed, following the previous statistics, the concepts addressed in Levinassian ethics that allow us to think about the present day in which humanity is experiencing a crisis of an ethics that is metaphysically grounded and respects life. What we perceive is an ethics

established in an ontology that degrades existence and profoundly the existing. There is to some degree no concern for human life. If we can say so, it lacks a responsibility that we previously based on human subjectivity, pre-original, constitutive of being.

The means of communication in these times are one of the most viable and most used means that make a bridge between people and can help to guarantee the preservation of otherness and ethics. The form of hospitality and care develop from this interiority of the self represented in the figure of the feminine in which humanity takes care of itself by staying in the interior abode and its physical home as a safe abode in which it can live preserving its health and the from there, preserve the health of those who are outside us, of those who knock on our door.

There is, at this very moment, human fragility in physical and psychological health and in Levinassian language those who lack health, care, shelter, are the guests to be welcomed by us, are the current poor, widows and orphans. For what we live, ethics, guaranteeing a metaphysical relationship, can ensure fraternity, proposing a relationship of charity of gratuitousness. It is actually being an absent presence, being able to contribute to health through simple gestures, protecting yourself at home, respecting the regulations presented by local, national and world health bodies, it is being able to provide care to those who feel hungry in the face of a eminent increase in unemployment and in view of the need of the poorest who previously lacked resources, now even more, it is to contribute to the risk group, it is to bring supplies to those who need it, it is to know how to listen and call those who suffer from a distance.

The Pandemic perhaps allowed us to reevaluate our concepts of relationships. It makes us rethink the importance of the other in our lives. In this Levinassian ethical path, we

can make the face to face mediated by social networks a way to evoke the presence of the other, to cry out for transcendence. It is time to let the face speak, to reveal its precious gift, the infinite. In a certain way, it is not possible to guarantee an absolute resignification, but to a certain degree, since we base the responsibility for the other on the subjectivity prior to any anteriority, we can say that in the distance, the absence of the other is affecting us and with that, the I wish for infinity.

Face to face is still possible and in this possibility it is unique to manifest the goodness that emanates from the heart of every human being. The face to face as we have seen is more than a physical presence, it is a transcendental relationship. To be in front of the other who challenges is to care, is to be responsible. We

are responsible for those who are outside us and thus we bring to memory each individual who no longer inhabits physical existence, but who inhabits transcendental existence through memory. It is possible to think about each one of those who have already left and those who find themselves in our exteriority, seeking the encounter, the dialogue, the nostalgia of good times lived and the opportunity to feel the pain of those who have already left. We are ethical beings, and it is possible to continue to live ethically in the pandemic, but we need to return to interiority and find this Desire, this Goodness that is present in every being and embrace humanity in the warmth of remembrance and memory, in the paternal embrace of thinking. not good, not wishing good.

REFERENCES

- AGAMBEM, Giórgio *et al.* **Sopa de Wuhan**: Pensamientos Contemporaneo en tiempos de pandemia. Editorial ASPO, 2020.
- Coronavírus: o mapa que mostra o alcance mundial da doença**. Disponível em: <https://www.bbc.com/portuguese/internacional-51718755>
- COSTA, Márcio Luis. **Lévinas: uma introdução**. Petrópolis: vozes, 2000
- FARO, André *et al.* **COVID-19 e saúde mental: a emergência do cuidado**. Estud. psicol. (Campinas) vol.37 Campinas 2020 Epub 01-Jun-2020. Disponível em: https://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0103-166X2020000100507&lng=pt&nrm=iso&tlng=pt
- FERNANDEZ, Atahualpa. FERNANDEZ, Athus. **Meritocracia e Desigualdades**. Disponível em: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/271209358_MERITOCRACIA_E_DESIGUALDADE
- LÉVINAS, Emmanuel. **Ética e Infinito**. Trad. João Gama; ver Artur Mourão. Lisboa, Edições 70, 2007.
- **Totalidade e Infinito**. Trad. José Pinto Ribeiro; ver Artur Mourão. Lisboa. Edições 70, 1988.
- MENEZES, Magali Mendes **O pensamento de Emmanuel Lévinas: uma filosofia aberta ao feminino**. Centro Universitário Feevale, Novo Hamburgo, RS. Disponível em: https://www.scielo.br/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0104-026X2008000100002
- SUSIN, Luiz Carlos. **O Homem Messiânico**. Uma introdução ao pensamento de Emmanuel Lévinas. Porto Alegre, Escola Superior de Teologia São Lourenço de Brindes, 1984. p. 199 – 276.
- TEIXEIRA, João Paulo Allaim. **Pandemia e Sociedade: Reflexos da COVID-19 na institucionalidade contemporânea**. Disponível em: <http://www.unicap.br/catedradomhelder/?p=3910>