

Ethical responsibility between communication and separation

Reading the metaphysics of Martin Buber and Emmanuel Levinas

المسؤولية الإيتيقية بين الاتصال والانفصال قراءة في ميتافيزيقا مارتن بوبر

وإيمانويل ليفيناس

RAHIM AMAR [*] رحيم عمر amarrahim59@gmail.com	philosophy	Tlemcen university/Algeria
DOI: 10.46315/1714-012-002-038 .		

Received: 29/09/2022 Accepted: 24/03/2023 Published : 16/06/2023

Abstract:

According to Buber, ethical communication requires that two inseparable selves have a common and non-compulsory responsibility, and their encounter is the meeting of the ego with the you (je-tu), as a pair of an actual relationship that is itself a relationship - I with that (je- cela), in a moral temporal relationship, the proposition that made Levinas think that the other human being is different from the ego and separated from it, and the separation is what makes the other weirdness and also carries the ego feeling With absolute and urgent responsibility ,binds equality and individual identity is formed, in the moment and now, to what extent can it be said that the Levinasian and Buberian proposition is sufficient to speak of a moral encounter in the midst of the peculiarities of identity that distinguishes between the ego and the other?

Keywords: I; You; The other; Responsibility; Ethics.

ملخص:

يستوجب التواصل الإيتيقي حسب بوبر أن يجمع بين ذاتين غير منفصلين لهما مسؤولية مشتركة وغير إلزامية، ولقاءهما هو لقاء الأنا-بالأنت je- tu ، باعتبارهما زوج لعلاقة فعلية هي نفسها علاقة- أنا بذلك je- cela ، في علاقة زمانية أخلاقية، الطرح الذي جعل ليفيناس يفكر في أنّ الإنسان الآخر مختلف عن الأنا ومنفصل عنه، والانفصال هو من يجعل للآخر غرابية étrangereté كما يحمل أيضا الأنا الشعور بالمسؤولية المطلقة الاستعجالية. فإلى أي مدى يمكن القول أنّ الطرح الليفيناسي والبوبري كفيل بالحديث عن لقاء أخلاقي في خضم خصوصيات الهوية التي تميز بين الأنا والآخر؟
الكلمات المفتاحية: الأنا؛ الأنت؛ الآخر؛ المسؤولية؛ الاتيقا.

* - Corresponding author: amarrahim59@gmail.com.

1-What are the key words: "I-you-that" Martin Buber believes that man looks at the world doubly thanks to the basic words, and the language in turn contains a pair of words, the first is called I-you (je-tu) and the second is called I-that (je-cela), and what distinguishes the second pair from the first is The possibility of replacing it with the third person singular pronoun "he" -(il)- or the feminine form: she (elle), without the defect in meaning and significance. Buber says: "The human "I" doubles (le je de l'homme) like the husband of the scientist, because the pronoun "I" of the husband The actual I-you - is not the same with the actual I-that- husband" (Martin Buber,2012,35).

They are of a completely different nature, which means that the relationship that exists between you and I is not subject to the same conditions with the I-that pair, just as the "I" in the first pair I-you is not the same as I in the second pair I-that, the first is concerned with man and the second is with the world. The main essence on which language is built is not the world of things, but rather the world of relationships •rapport, when I say "I": I mean directly "you" and also when we say "that" we mean that husband, the relational world of Buber does not make the existence of "I" independent and individual, it always means "you" and in a relationship that is translated by meeting and meeting, and the base the language of the actual spouse "I-you" or "I-that" does not express something outside the framework of that relationship, it establishes "existence." The basic words are only an expression of this existence, for what constitutes perfect existence is the pair "I-you" because it is a human relationship with another human being. Because the relationship of the person "I" does not take place in the past or the future, but in the present and now. The adjective immediate is the instant that characterizes it. The ego when it thinks is present whenever it says "I". Buber says: "The I who thinks is present, when I say "I" as well as when I say "you" or "that" I mean "I" (le je) of one of the Fundamental Principal words "I-you" and "I-that", which is present"(Buber, 2012,36).

Immediateness means that there is no subject before, and no concept or any pre-planned is assumed, all these elements constitute an obstacle, so what remains is only the "rencontre", for existence, then, is neither for a purpose, nor for appetite, or anticipation, so there is nothing but encounter and encounter. What is the nature of this relationship to you?

Buber emphasizes the relational character as a description of each of the I - you and I - that, because the final purpose of the two is to build the relationship, which does not make the ego found independent of you or that, so by saying I as for mean the "I" of the you or the special. By that", it does not deviate from the format of the basic words and their conditions. What is

distinguished by the interview that takes place with the you is" reciprocity, and this exchange is similar to the relations of exchange of love. Buber says: "The world of love is the world of relations as it is concerned with reciprocity between the ego and the you, and the movement between the ego and the you is instantaneous and reciprocal because there are two awareness Face-to-face sit together in a double perspective in which an affirmation of the other as you, and in its pure affirmation the phrase you"(Buber, 2012,15). The exchange is the condition for the continuity of the relationship between the ego and the you, which carries the meaning of equality, as there is no independent subjectivity, no differentiation in responsibility, not its limitation to one side, all that remains is peer to peer: 'The relationship is reciprocal,' Buber says, 'you' my behaves with me as I behave with him. Where the you become the only partner that the ego means. The Thou is real, manifested in the place through face to face and directly, where the rest of the beings are only a background for what can appear"(Buber, 2012, 48), It is similar to the mutual love between the Ego and Thou. Alone among people requires getting rid of hatred, but when the ego enters with the ego from the logic of the analogical relationship, this empties the ego of all its energies and obliges it to give certain things that require the ego to repay the debt, or in other words its reward, it is a relationship that aims to make the other absolute, and therefore "the ego is for what It merges in a relationship with the You and in an analogical relationship, which does not mean that the You is the Absolute Other". (Levinas, 1976,34).

Human life is characterized by several actions that are directly related to his relationship with the world that differs from him, with the intention of trying to discover it, Deciphering nature, his knowledge remains the opposite of the relational, which combines both "I and you", which is not similar to the world of things, Buber says: "When we are positioned before the human being who is my "you", I say to him the basic word "I-You" It is not something among things, and it does not consist of things"(Buber, 2012,35), Buber divides the relational character into three branches: The first relates to the mysterious relationship with nature, The second concerns the life of man with man, and here it is distinguished by its prominence and clarity, The latter intended to communicate with the spiritual essences, which he refers to as the eternal Thou related to God and the sacred. The person whom we call you, we do not have any empirical knowledge of him, simply because in the "relationship" the sanctuaries is the key words "I am you." The exit from the "sanctity" is consciously outside the relationship and through experience, because the nature of the experience here is characterized only by a negative character because it is based on By removing the you, the truth that derives from " you" is better than the truth of the world of "that"(Buber,2012,63), Because it is broad and comprehensive to which all beings

and facts, including man, belong, unlike our world, which is a specific and specific world that takes place between two selves, I-he, between a human being and another human being. But that does not mean that a person can live without that world, for you do not know except in the time and place of the meeting, since the original relationship takes place only between the ego and the you, because it takes place in a living language, and an intentional expression of an event within the world, these basic words "I-You" "You perceive directly with the concert eye. When we speak, we pronounce the language of our state in front of you or the other, and the human relationship is the relationship of the consciousness of the ego with another awareness, which is the consciousness of the ego.

2-The Human World: Towards the Moral Given. The "dialogue" of Martin Buber is based on the condition of exchange between two of egos, which results in a joint responsibility that rids the ego of the obstacle of individual responsibility, and therefore the responsibility that the ego holds depends on what the ego offers it, according to the terms of the relational condition of the basic words: "I- You." The "I-You" relationship allows the creation of a space for the coexistence of the I and the other in the name of the Thou, according to a meaningful dialogue that does not favor one or exclude one over the other. It is joint and takes place "face to face" except that buber has made the you a reason to make the interview absolute, and for this reason the ego cannot be separated from the ego. The human world, which is a world shared by myself, Buber says: "The subjective truth "I-you" is rooted in dialogue, while in the instrumental relationship I-that is based on a monologue that makes the world and human existence objective". (Buber,2012;23). His subjectivity and selfishness, he realizes his selfishness It is subject and exploited in different forms, but in the dialogue system, the ego meets the ego, defined and called as a necessary being for the existential truth that occurs between two human selves, unlike the isolated ego that exists in the world of that, where there is awareness of one self in its ipseity, because this relationship is a relationship of separation. Concerning experience, usage and practice, Levinas expresses this relationship by saying: "That field belongs to the third person pronouns: he, she, they, they(elles), and they are concepts belonging to the -that- system, its indicates neutrality, and neutrality indicates That in "that" the beings are not related to the unity through which others are to me as they are to others"(levinas, 1976,28), and it also aims to control, discover, and decipher nature, for the ego here does not build its relationship here with another self, and there is no reciprocal relationship or joint responsibility, Because the essence of the human relationship is the participation that takes place in dialogue and encounter between

the ego and the ego, and in the midst of the ego and the ego meeting, it does not mean the existence of a self that controls the other or a self with another self, but rather a common dialogue. Buber says: "The ego does not build a relationship with another self as is the case for with the ego and the you, where all there is the relationship between two non-separate selves, and in a common dialogue, whoever is in the relationship (the ego-you) shares the truth, because the person is not involved in himself or controlling outside himself, every truth requires participation, if participation is absent, the truth is absent". (Buber,2012,97). Participation is complete and complete whenever contact with you is direct and immediate. A person is free whenever he clings to the truth about the ego, and the statement of shared responsibility does not mean that the "me" or the ego possesses an individual subjectivity that cannot be shared, because subjectivity does not mean other than selfishness and the self is far from any truth, and subjectivity loses the link between the ego and the ego and lives in dependence. For that world, there man says, this is mine, and this is mine, where there is no participation.

The world is the vast field of the extension of the self and the self, the world of relations according to Buber is the world of spiritual relations and the world of consciousness, which combines man and man, the reality of awareness of man is the answer to the ego, and the relationship between the ego and the ego is based on the language that aims to communicate with the only possible partner Buber says: "Awareness does not exist within the "ego, It exists through the relationship of the ego with the ego, and it is not even compared to the flow of blood in you, but to the air that we inhale and the person lives with awareness whenever he responds to his own ego"(Buber,2012,73-74), And the answer to you is only through "relationship".

The relationship pattern in Buber is not transcendental, all there is the "symmetry" found in the main word I-you, here the relationship combines the feeling of the ego and the feeling of the you, as they are a model for every relationship, the person in the shadow of the relationship speaks a living language living word because he utters simple words It is determined whenever we can position ourselves either before others, or before the Thou, who is the human being over whom I have no empirical knowledge. In the light of the world of relationships, the ego and you constitute a "meeting" in which the decision is taken, where the decision here constitutes freedom to take either the face we are directly in front of, and the social relationship begins from this meeting, which is translated with love and friendliness, more like the love relationship between a man and a woman who combines "love" And mutual interest, in love there is a responsibility about the you, and there is also equality of this responsibility for both lovers, but what exists between the ego and the you through the relational situation is the conceptual

structure, such as whim, desire, and longing, what is wrong with this relationship according to Levinas is its absence from The moral elements are morality, which are also indeterminate, and the ego and the you are only possible as a relationship with things." The moral given of the relationship "I and you" requires that the ego be the one who accomplishes the spatial relationship, which is not interchangeable with what the ego is independent of", and in the basic relationship between the e according to therelational world, the you are the only partner of the ego that receives it in an immediate, face-to-face relationship, so the relationship is sacred, heading towards eternal life".

3- Asymmetry or subjectivity versus reciprocity:

Levinas describes Martin Buber's writings on the ego and the 'it' in their relational position to the epistemology that aims only at truth through "possession" or control of the subject over its subjects, and this relationship is distinguished by the ontology characteristic more than the subjective nature of the foundation of responsibility, for example in a world that is Buber's ego linked With an objective experience that has the same proposition with the phenomenological conception of the relationship of the self with the object, and this connection between the ego and the ego according to the experience of the subject and the object establishes an external, apparent and superficial relationship that correlates with the rationality of things(levinas,1976,27). Something that has grown and that I represent something and believe in it are all concepts belonging to that field. The main feature of that world is neutrality, since beings here are not associated with unity, and remain isolated, and this relationship does not allow the construction of otherness because it is a basis related to knowing something related to "I-that", and Levinas describes this relationship as looking only for man to tell him you Only as the last end of this relationship: "Knowing this otherness does not give us an idea of it, because it only gets the idea of something in the I-that form, and here it is not a matter of thinking of an autrui, or even of thinking of another, but of calling him to tell him you are thou"(levinas, 1976,p 28), And if the main purpose is to know the Ego according to Buber, then the relational position is isolated from the moral proposition as a condition for the continuation of the relationship between people in the name of the Ego and Thou, or between the Ego and the different Other. You?. If you are a distance and a place for the meet and the event, what will be after the interview? The link between the ego and the ego means the occurrence of dialogue, or understanding, but according to the Levinas's proposition, the ego is not satisfied with merely calling about the ego. It is more moral, and the ego and you here do not carry a human reality, but rather an objective

reality, and every relationship between them takes place only in light of the consideration of you as a subject. Despite everything, the relationship I - you are with the absolute - despite the relationship(Levinas, 1976,33).

The social formula of Levinas is not determined according to the I-you, by the Buberian given, because what this relationship reveals is "similarity" and peer to peer. The dialogue relationship by which we perceive the other as you, or like a partner or like a friend,"(Levinas, 1971,64) that is, not on the moral and social level. The social character, the moral aspect of the relationship I - you in the basic words is not interchangeable - the interview - with the you.

4-Analog and self-criticism:

The nature of dialogue in Levinas begins with the concern for the other as a party that questions and calls out the ego, and this appeal represents the last and final situation indicative of the absoluteness of the other, and there is no way to evade or escape from that absolutism. The completeness of the other from the ego, such as not representing it and containing it within consciousness or the self, and if the subjectivity of Buber means exit from the relationship and the exclusion of the ego by virtue of selfishness that dominates the "me", then, on the contrary, it means to Levinas the essence of full responsibility on the other, his alterity is based on the advocacy of "others". And on his need for the ego, as if the ego goes towards responding to the call, because once the other enters into the relationship with the ego, he is in a situation of "need" and help, and therefore the responsibility is not shared, but rather belongs to the absolute individuality of the ego, Levinas answered the question of "Nemo" In his book "Ethics and the Infinity" about his question: What if the other is also concerned with responsibility in comparison to the ego's responsibility for him? He considered it - responsibility - non-symmetries, that is, it is not "in return." Here Levinas says: "It is in this sense that I am responsible for others without waiting for reciprocity - the return - The reverse, even if it costs me my life, for reciprocity is a matter that belongs to him alone."(Levinas,2017,94-95) Responsibility in this sense is the criterion that makes the ego and the other in an asymmetric separatist relationship, where the other becomes free and not subject to neither the "ego" and no the condition of the relationship, no is he required to answer and respond to what the ego asks or gives, that it is thus a difficult freedom experienced by the ego depends on The extent to which the other responds with acceptance or rejection, while in responsibility the ego is distinct from the other, in freedom the other is distinct and independent, and despite that, the ego is the most responsible and self-conscious of all, because responsibility does not depend on what others give, it is a complete and

complete responsibility of the ego He can act on behalf of all others despite all circumstances. In this regard, Levinas seems to be more influenced by the Russian novelist "Dostovitsky" in his novel, *The Brothers Karamazov*, when he said: We are all guilty, all before all, and I am the most guilty of all others. With guilt and negligence on the part of the ego, as if the most sinful thing made him do not link his position to others not to what others offer him, what falls on his shoulders is not compared to what falls on others, and responsibility becomes a personal matter to be a total responsibility, which means that I am responsible for And the same responsibility that is for the benefit of others and which acts on behalf of all others, "The ego always has more responsibility than others." (Levinas, 2017,95).

The definition of responsibility is to be for the other, and for the other and the poor in need, because morality is not upright except with responsibility that makes it a first philosophy, so it goes beyond what a person can offer. No to selfishness that excludes the different Other. Identity is based on the limits of others and their differences and their transcendence, and it is not based on containing it in the self or reducing it to the same. The distinguished and different spokesperson for the face and the language of ethical discourse that is determined by the proximity and to get close to him, and to exist for the other is to be at his service.

5-Wounding and Suffering:

As a Path to Transcendence and the Sacred. The ethics of Levinas is directed to concern for the other, and can be described as Goodness, which is an ethics of care and treatment, and treatment comes through absolute morality and centered on suffering and vulnerability to the other, which calls for a responsibility that is concerned with the "moral self" subject morale in front of the other meaning, and from here it can be said that the moral relationship between the ego and the other is similar to the relationship of the doctor to the patient, or between the person being treated and the person being treated, and here there is no equality between the patient and the doctor, that is, in the service provided by the doctor and the need of the suffering patient. The inequality between the ego and the other, or between the doctor and the patient, in the language of surgery, indicates asymmetries. It is not possible to ask compensation for the responsibility that is given to the other. The applied morality starts from this point where the person who is close is considered a form of respect that deserves to be respected as the patient. Etiquette, then, is the responsibility of care and care as a result of the suffering and pain felt by the other, Levinas says about it: "It refers to the self-responsible for the other and for his suffering, so the responsibility becomes responsibility, or as suffering for the sake of free suffering on the other, it is the suffering of the ego over the suffering of others. unjustifiable, which is open to an

inter-human suffering (Levinas, 1991, 110-111). The relationship with the other is linked to his pains and diseases, and the responsible person is fully aware of the evil that is evident in the pain of the unbearable, causing pain and expressing all forms of weakness, fragility, nakedness and poverty. The relationship with the other in Levinas begins when paying attention to his pleas and his speech directed to the ego, as the summoning directed to the self indicates the last situation that cannot be evaded and evaded, and therefore the obligation to answer all the questions directed to us, just saying "you" means listening to him, and this stems completely. It is the rectitude that the ego adheres to in front of the ego." (Levinas, 2016, 105) Integrity stems from the elevation and sanctity of the face and the strictness of its speech, and it requires leaving the self and morally oriented towards the other, in an altruistic relationship between two separate selves that are not subject to a relationship of similarity and conformity. Freedom is the condition of interpersonal relations that open to the other. And you specifically mean the pain resulting from poverty, weakness and suffering, which calls for violence and the exercise of force on the face, which is exposed without protection and without resistance, but the duty that awaits the self stems from not committing violence or killing and in all cases and without conditions, because the face is the original situation and the holy appearance. Of the deity, who embodies the religious in the ethic aspect, and this is what propitiation calls for, Levinas says: "The new reading offered by the New Testament, through revelation is established by the god, who is always dependent on the next, and through the defense of the poor, widows, orphans and strangers... And in another text, he says that: "God is beside the repentant and the poor, isaie 57-15. contrite et humble." (Levinas, 1991, 73) Hence, the responsibility is related as if it were on the hostage or that it was God's mercy on man. And human compassion towards his neighbor, which is the relationship of the ego to the relative with the neighbor or the relative.

. The other is defended according to the sanctity of his face, which indicates the words and authority of God. Every ethics relationship established by the ego passes through transcendence, but he is transcendent by the logic of immediate, or the direct relationship "face to face." Immediateness does not go beyond the "interpersonnal" relationship.

Through which God is present, then by what given is God present in the human relationship? The god or the infinite is present in the final or man, he becomes the god of the widow, the poor and the orphan, a god who does not transcend beyond existence (au delà de l'être). the face of my neighbor." (Levinas, 1991, 73) It is possible to contact "God" according to Levinas through dialogue and openness to others, as he made the characteristics of God manifest through the ethical relationship, specifically in the form of the ethical obligation, this obligation that the ego

feels that it is always guilty of the right of others, the feeling of sin is what generates responsibility on others, the other is this The meaning calls the ego out of a state of tranquility to stand with it in all its suffering and pain, for the infinite we seek through the face of the other that is not reduced in the eye of the self, and getting closer to God is a matter of ethics. The face of others, for the true I am the one whom God demands through the face of the neighbor...". The extreme straightness of the extreme of the near face tears most of the plastic forms of the face highlighting weakness, pain and injury, so he stands with him in front of the mystery of death and prevents the commission of violence, because in the face there is a basic sign that expresses "glory" and lofty that commands the self and summons it, and when it is required to say anything about God It must be through human relations, and when we talk to the other, we have spoken of God "towards the command directed to me that makes my presence and my responsibility questionable." And transcendence appears only through concrete relations with others. Orientation to God is through moral commitment for the benefit of the other, and transcendence understands that it is he who directs us to man and not the one who distances us from him, because the other is the most free because his freedom derives from his transcendence that forbids him all forms of violence and invasion, he says Levinas: "I do not say that the other is God, but that I hear in the face of the other the words of God."(Levinas, 1991,128)

A summary at the end of our research, we concluded that the other person has carried several interpretations and readings in contemporary philosophy, which made his identity acceptance and rejection, and the basic problem related to the other includes the conditions for his definition and his identity, which resulted in the tendency of the self, which on the one hand rejects the other and reduces it to the self of the self that refers it to the definition of the ego. On the other hand, the tendency that gives the other independent freedom, seeing him as a different person from the ego, which is a condition of his identity. In our study, we relied on two important models in contemporary philosophy, representative of the contemporary Jewish trend, and in the moral proposition. It was Martin Buber and Emmanuel Levinas, who had an opposing reading about the reality of the other human being. The identifier is in the context of the reality of the ego, and its existence and freedom are related to the existence and freedom of the ego, and this is within the conditions of the relational situation that establishes the basic words i_you, according to preliminary conditions that represent equality in responsibility and freedom, the relationship between them is based on exchange and reciprocity, but we find in the you what We do not find it in the world represented in that, but the ultimate goal that the ego seeks through the ego is to reach the eternal, which contains all the elements of the world "that", you here become eternal,

and the relationship becomes a moral, sacred, humane, transcendent that reveals the religious religious through commitment Moral, love and concern for man as a relationship between man and man, which in the end is a relationship with God revealed through the Thou, because the orientation to the Thou is only through the eternal. On the other hand, Levinas rejected the "principle of symmetry" or contrast, which demands equality in freedom and the treatment of the ego and the other as one person. The moral and as a face bears a directed obligation, which cancels all freedom and independence of the ego, and the justification for communicating with it is its freedom and difference, which assigns the "self" the total and absolute responsibility directed towards the other human without conditions, and it is an ethical direction similar to the direction of the human being, the doctor or healer who responds to the call of the patient, and the poor, the weak, and the suffering, through the moral discourse that is heard from his face, and as sacred words and an effect of the infinite and God.

Ref:

- 1- Martin Buber,(2012) je et tu, présentation inédite robert Misrahi, aubier ,France.
- 2- Emmanuel Levinas,(1976) noms propre, fata morgana, biblio essai ,France.
- 3- Emmanuel Levinas,(1971) totalité et infini, essai sur l'extériorité, biblio essai, édition martinusnijhoff, paris.
- 4- Emmanuel Levinas,(2017) éthique et infini, livre de poche, librairie arthene fayard et radrie, édition21 , paris.
- 5- Emmanuel Levinas,(1991) entre nous, Essai le penser –à- l'autre, figures Grasset, édition grasset et fasquel, paris.
- 6- Emmanuel Levinas,(2016) altérité et transcendance, biblio essai, livre de poche, fata morgana, édition 07, France.