



DeepL

Subscribe to DeepL Pro to translate larger documents.
Visit www.DeepL.com/pro for more information.

Is It Possible
to be
Ethically Impartial?

Is It Possible
to be
Ethically Impartial?

test

By

Victor Ausina Mota

TENDEREDITIONS

To the God who escapes me,
like sand between your fingers
on a beach

Introduction

This essay aims to address the problem of an impartial ~~is~~ The issue is addressed in the form of an ethics of responsibility. It is suggested that it is possible to be ethically impartial when one contextualizes and relates. It is intended to open communication between philosophy and the sciences towards an integrative action of all the forces of man, in the perspective of an anthropology that overcomes the problem of cultural and psychological differences of human beings. The aim is to find out what the science of the social has to do with philosophy and vice-versa, outlining possibilities for an ethically responsible, ethically impartial human action. Thus, from the perspective of experience, we try to equate relations between ethics and morality, desire and social commitment, in a perspective of freedom that is not only individual but also collective.

It is certainly possible in certain contexts to be ethically impartial. However, if we consider that existing is a ~~good~~ ethics, we do not see why in agency the question of impartiality should arise. The awareness that we are immersed in a world is already an ethical position. To exist is already to take sides, if only by refusing to live. Starting from this point, can we say that action is necessarily ethical? Doesn't it have a symbolic component? But if it has a symbolic component it is already ethical. It is therefore important to define what ethics is. If we understand ethics to mean intervening in the world outside our consciousness, then one cannot be ethically impartial. But if we consider ethics as taking a position vis-à-vis the values of the society in which we live and its daily events, one can say that it is possible to be ethically impartial. One has to distinguish, in my view, the world of thought, of reflection, with the evenemmanial world, the two being linked in terms of channel analysis. If they were not effectively connected, if they were not one, which we can call consciousness of the world, of others, we would be able to say that ethics would not make sense. Ethics makes sense because,

to use a platitude of common sense, "everything is which we think, we know, and what exists beyond or consciousness. By acting and thinking we are taking an ethical position on the world. It is reflection and our relationship with another that modifies and improves our ethical stance on the world. Ethics is no longer exclusive to religion, and perhaps it is on this focus that we have seen it so far. Historically, man was seen as the center of the world, and perhaps we are still influenced today in the analysis of the data of consciousness by this perspective. In fact, we can say that ethics implies an awareness of values, it is praxis loaded with human, social, anthropological meaning. The ethical position-taking, therefore, should not be above the individual and his existential circumstances, but should be related, should create a new attitude towards values. It must, therefore, be interdisciplinary. On the other hand, language makes ethics an imperative and complexifies the solutions. When there was no language, one would wonder if there was any self-consciousness, so the ethical impulse is born from a relational awareness towards others who live with us. A

word has made ethics an everyday affair. When we speak, we are taking positions, taking attitudes as social actors, so there can be no ethical stance towards building a better world if we do not use language. Ethical awareness comes from our desire for justice and equity, and also from observing that the world is not really fair. From this comes ethics as a demand from reason to reveal to man increasingly demanding solutions about the meaning of life. However, we will not speak of ethics only as the answer according to a set of social or historical constraints. Morality is always an awareness about something that has gone wrong, so it makes sense in Western civilization, with its component of stain and sin. I would say that it is possible to be ethically impartial insofar as ethics is relational and creative. Is it only man that has ethics, is ethics born from an anthropocentric vision, from a humanism? Is there ethics beyond reason? Analyzing the data from the senses, ethics appears to us as a call for a more just world, that is why we decide to intervene in the world, not remitting ourselves to a position

contemplative of man, the world, and ~~social~~ relations. ~~As~~
ethical, aesthetic, and religious are therefore connected in the
context of the diversity of human action. That is why ethics is
necessarily part of action. But it is also part of reflection. However,
an important question arises in these terms, which is the question of
timing, of the opportunity or otherwise with which we take an
ethical position on the world and on others. Somehow, an ethical
response takes the form of the voice of our own individual identity.
To speak of morals or ethics is to speak of the same thing but not in
the same way, nor from the same perspective. Paul Ricoeur
understands morals to be a set of values, judgments, and norms in
force in a society before any reflection. Morality has a double
character: universality and constraint. By ethics we mean reflection
on the sphere of human conduct, that is, reflection that has as its
object the behavior and experience of human beings through the
prism of goodness and badness, justice or injustice. If we do not use
language to make a point in the context of a dialog, we let pent-up
tensions accumulate and reflection may be of no use to us, it may be
too late to have

consciousness to change the world in the sense that it is **u**
Everything also depends on the value that we give to **£** namely human life. Given that we are a thinking thing it does not follow that we have to be superior to the animal, vegetable or mineral kingdom. But we have a relational thinking that, although it has man at its center, is intended to make a reading of the relationship between the world and the thinking thing. When we think together we create religion. And it is in this domain that ethics is also placed. To speak of a religious ethic is to speak of cultural interdicts, of Christian guilt, of canonical regulation over the intimate life of believers. So far I am trying to be as general and comprehensive as possible, but I will not prevent myself from giving some exemplary data on how religion functions in the human spirit as a coarctor of survival drives. I don't want to condemn the religious phenomenon, which seems to me to be part of both the individual and collective facets of people. I only want to state that religion regulates. And not only the Christian religion acts in this aspect, it regulates subjectively, by prohibiting certain acts, by channeling sexuality into the realm of reproduction. Morality, therefore, acts

in the innermost realm of human souls, ~~is~~ channeling into social functions the representation that ~~was~~ built and first and foremost inherited from culture. There are frequent misunderstandings about ethics and, in particular, about morality. As for the relationship between morality and sex, one should not hastily identify morality and ethics with puritanical prohibitions on sexuality. As for the relationship between morals and religion, these souls of whom I speak continue to bring morals and religion too close together, as if ethics and morals made no sense except as the will of God. As for the relationship between morality and weakness, morality appears as something secondary, proper to weak creatures who limit their freedom through obedience to a set of moral norms, some of dubious character, internalized during the process of socialization, from which many have not freed themselves. As for the relationship between morality and ideology, ethics is accused of having often been ideological justification of concrete morals. Ethics can never be or become an ideological justification of any morality. It is morals that are or can be at the service of ethics, not ethics at the service of morals. Popular wisdom says that one learns

with the mistakes. However, it will not take only a humanism Christian to learn to respect difference. I believe that it is in ~~spring~~ difference that the question of ~~dis~~ arises most urgently. ~~His~~ thought, ethics of behavior. What popular wisdom says, among many things, is that we must learn from history, and perhaps this is the great difference between humans. But how to decentralize man from an anthropocentric perspective when it is man who thinks, we judge. In any case, religion works as an agglutinator of individual consciences and plays with difference in the sense of bringing it into its coexistence, it does not respect it as it is, in its identity. Should we therefore fight religion or ignore it and throw ourselves into a futile utilitarianism? Are there ethics outside religion? Are ethics eminently religious? Religion aims to unite men with respect to a superior entity to which all believers relate. Once again, ethics is relational here. By this we mean that ethics can be contextualized if we take into account the universal rights of man, but is there or can there be no universal ethics? We can only speak of prohibition when the passage from

ethics to morality, that is, when the third ~~be~~ comes into play, realized in institutions. Can man not be ~~for~~ ethics, through social institutions? Is it true that man is realized in the universe through the observance of rules? Is there no room for creativity? That is why ethics poses a challenge to human action, which is first of all to be creative, to invent, from the list of existing solutions, a solution for each situation. Only in this way, by exercising his creativity, can man be free, and ethics must first and foremost be freedom. If we describe all human actions and activities, we will see that there is compliance with rules and evasion of rules. However, in one's inner world there is a freedom, and this is the greatest freedom, which is that of consciousness. However, this freedom can be imprisoned by some offense, the conscience can be enclosed, but not for long if we believe in a life beyond death. This hope, a belief for the vast majority of men, creates included and excluded. It creates difference. This is why I believe that the question, the way it is posed, conditions the answer. We must ask ourselves first of all if it is possible to have an ethics in the world in which we live, having as a presupposition that we know it

satisfactorily to think so. Because the question poses ~~before~~ more the likelihood of the reign of the philosophers ~~it~~ was in classical antiquity. Times are different, the ways in which power is represented have changed, the exercise of power is increasingly rotating, an activity judged on social merit. But isn't there social merit in every social actor? When I speak of the social component, I mean that ethics is first and foremost relational, as I have stated. The way the question is posed gives an idea of moral obligation, that we are obliged to behave in a certain way in order to avoid a sanction. Paul Ricoeur tells us in this regard, in the aspect concerning morality as content to morality as structure: the traditional use and abuse of the concepts of morality and morality, the excessive influence of the churches, and above all the reduction of the ethical dimension to subordination to norms have contributed to these misunderstandings. Morality has to do only secondarily with a certain concrete content, translated into a moral code of some kind. Rather, morality has to do with our personal and existential fulfillment, with the fulfillment of others, and with the

construction of just institutions. Thus understood, ~~and~~ becomes
be seen as a structural dimension of every human being ~~and~~ every
community. Norms were made for men and not men for norms. A
place and role is reserved for norms: that of indications, certainly
respectable and potentially valid as a criterion by which we can also
assess the reasonableness of our actions. We need to reverse the
primacy of morality as content, replacing it with the primacy of
morality as structure. My perspective on ethics is humanistic, it gives
man the responsibility to position himself in history in the face of
his mistakes and the spirit of survival. However, I am not saying that
other species should not be taken into account, I am simply
advocating a return to a certain natural condition of man where he
occupies the place, it may sound like Aristotelianism, but he
occupies the place for which he is destined. And what is this
destiny? What is this place? Here one might introduce the concept
of culture, as opposed to the concept of nature. In certain existing
cultural contexts, it is possible to be ethically impartial. This
contextualization is not intended to be more than demonstrative of
the

human spirit. And can man be the owner of an ~~im~~ ethic on a universal level? We also believe ~~o~~ not only in the name of religions, but in the name of what is beyond man, a creative force that constitutes him and that animates him, a force that preceded him, that we might call magical because we have not yet reasonably discovered it, a force, a spirit that makes us believe in the memory of our ancestors and in the non-futility of the human species. My position sounds anthropocentric. But let us then speak not only of human life, but of life in general. It is for the sake of this life that we believe that ethics precedes violence, that it cannot be a mere constitutive element after the letters of governments just because there have been disagreements. The question of violence is important because it is fully ethical. Ethics is then placed over all areas of human action, all areas of life. If we want to believe that life is not restricted to the law of natural selection, that only the strongest win, why should we believe in ethics? I put this in terms of human behavior and observation that we have of life in general. Every action has an effect, and that's where ethics comes in, in a cause-and-effect relationship of phenomena

natural and of consciousness. How can we then eradicate ~~it~~ of humanity without understanding it? Should we ~~omit~~ that evil, the intention to hurt someone physically or psychically or even morally, is a constitutive part of the functioning of human societies? We would be, if we believe so, giving up on how much there is to do to make this world a better place. However, are we not at this point entering into an ideology of liberating the world from evil forces? The existence of good and evil may well be exemplary of how the human mind works, but still we are not satisfied. We think that it is man's desire to move towards a just world, where utopias are realized. And this brings us to a point, which is to ask ourselves to what extent the human species is the bearer of this legacy or will ever be able to realize the ideals or utopias that command the collective consciousness. It will be necessary, on the other hand, to prove the good through the existence of evil. Is ethics a good, THE good? In the realm of the ideal, can man realize himself by being an idealist? Doesn't he have to take a stand in the face of the differences of which the world is composed? So, I think that the ethical question can

be a cultural issue, in the sense that being ~~ethically~~ unbiased is not a truism, but a reality. Of course; it seems that history repeats itself and human deaths occur not to mention the others. But if we know the difference, we will be better able to live with each other. This brings us to the question of personal identity, to what extent cultural identity is a personal identity and there is no place for ontology. Isn't t h e ontological question a luxury in the world we live in? Should we not look more at the diversity of ontologies than at their uniqueness? What are the great questions that concern man? Are they ontological questions? Or, on the other hand, are they questions that have to do with his acceptance within a certain group? Being ethically impartial has to be a matter of individual freedom, and this can only be achieved through two things: a lot of training and/or being part of a culture. Because when we place ourselves within a culture we are not only protected, often not at all, we are simply exercising identity. The fact that we can be ethically impartial implies two reasons: either we want to save ourselves

of the world or we want to save the world. It's a ~~6~~ deeply religious, of morality. Returning to the ~~6~~ of sexuality, only human love makes us ethically impartial, because we are participating in the world without giving in to the evil in it. The question of sexuality and violence could be linked in this sense: if we do not exercise violence towards ourselves, we exercise violence towards the Other. But isn't there another way that is more praiseworthy and possible? Ethically possible? Therefore, to be ethically impartial is to move in the interstices of human action, to be original and therefore profoundly human. To be ethically impartial is not to have never erred, but to learn from our mistakes, however justified and contextualized they may have been, it is to have the hope that a new man can be born every day, transformed, able to live his ontology but also life. Finally, to be ethically impartial is to act knowing, to know that we are embedded in a culturally determining context and that our actions are not necessarily culturally determined. From here arises the idea of freedom, which is the spectrum of possible actions within a

creative work of the individual. Each profession has its ethics, its The best way to do things, the most appropriate way for each situation. This is why morality as content is so connoted with sexuality. Let's say that anyone who acts according to a set of principles has an ethic. However justified these principles may be, it is not right for a priest to talk about the things of the world without participating in them. We would say that the problem is directly posed to these people. Ethics ends where drives begin, and drives, particularly sexual drives, are life knocking insistently at the door of our body, so why deny life? Because the soul and the body are connected, they are a whole, they can't live apart for long. Because extreme adherence to religious life can cause perversions, it is good to keep in mind that whenever man has wanted to control the forces within himself, perversions have been generated: the force to love the Other, the force to believe in divinity. But when we can't realize ourselves within society, there is the temptation to flee from it, to ideals, that's for sure. Or to the margins of society, where we come into contact with people we never expected to meet. The notion of sin haunts us,

even though we know we have done nothing wrong, that ~~was~~ not betrayed the foundations of society. We live in an age that ~~is~~ according to Ricoeur, between intolerance and indifference. But why this preoccupation with the world? It is in the attempt not to exercise violence that we have tried to prove evil, to ultimately acknowledge the existence of good. This is being ethically biased, because one is speaking in one's own cause. When you are speaking for someone else's cause, it may be easier to be ethically impartial. Or not. When we are young, innocent, are imbued with an ideal, can all action be ethically impartial? Or does the question only arise in adulthood? In adulthood, however, we are hostages of our past, of the paths we have walked and have not walked, aware of the place we are in. The fact of posing a problem can be understood in this way by common sense: there is a problem to be solved, if it is a problem it is because it is something that someone has created and that someone must solve. To confer to the spirit the ability to solve the problem, is it not to rationalize, to affirm the primacy of reason over emotion? The notion of problem probably has its origins in the secular Western attempt to

in discovering worlds, in blazing a trail through the ~~in~~ scrutinizing the mind of the Other. ~~Who~~ Problem is it? ~~Whose~~ is aware of having created it, or is it something that has been instilled by the Other, by the view of difference? It would be more appropriate to call what I consider the hypothesis of being ethically impartial a question. Because it is meant to be debated. Philosophy itself does not escape the voracity of the times in terms of nomenclature and poses this question as a problem. Moreover, is the formulation imbued with a psychoanalytic spirit that intends to see things that happen to humans as problems. The notion of a problem has an interrogative mode with which it is intended to make us think about the pertinence or otherwise of an ethics, be it professional, humanistic, or universal. What we should want to know is not whether ethics can or cannot be impartial, which we think of as an escape from the problems of existence, but whether ethics is possible, tout-court, or better, whether it is fair in the face of phenomenology. And at this point we wonder whether it makes sense to think of an ethics in a globalizing world, with all the movement of people and goods that this implies, that is not humanistic. However, we do not want to give the

reason to think only of man, but what other ethics exist if not be human? I am reminded once again of the law of survival and the law of life. What is the law of life? It rests on the assumption that only a few, the best, will be chosen. The same role is played by religion. Only some will be chosen. Society plays the same role: only the fittest, the most sociable, can succeed in an increasingly competitive world. The need is then created for an alternative knowledge, an almost magical, individual knowledge, which takes the form of a strategy to survive and leave a good memory. Because that's what men want deep down: to go further and leave the best impression possible. They are not concerned with the human aspect of things, with explanations for what simply did not happen. I cannot refuse to put this question of ethics in the midst of the current problems, such as terrorism, euthanasia, abortion. What is at stake is human life, rather, life. Is it legitimate to take the lives of civilians in the name of a cause, a territory, a religion? Is it ethical to terminate the life of a suffering being who asks for help to end his pain? Is it ethical

interrupt the life cycle taking into account the best ~~ends~~

of life, rationalizing social life and the future?

Exercising freedom implies a certain degree of silence and ~~we~~ We can never judge that freedom lies in being known by others. Freedom lies in the use one makes of social devices and the degree of creativity one uses through them. Being ethically impartial may be accurate and necessary and is the condition of our individual freedom, but to what extent by acting or thinking this way are we denying the evidence of a world and constant transformation and change that comes before our eyes every day? It is to be supposed that, associating being ethically impartial with a certain exercise of freedom, knowledge can imprison us in our Ego to the point of erecting it as the bulwark of our attentions and affections. Ignorance is already an exercise of freedom, in the sense that it does not question, judge, or question, but only manipulates reality to our liking. St. Anselm distinguishes human acts from human acts. Only human acts are free, because they are conscious and voluntary. On the other hand, what kind of agency is ethically impartial? O

The first power we use is that of the word and this means ~~h~~ we are committed to reality. A question that can ~~be~~ asked would be: is it possible to use freedom, or is it possible to be free in today's world? Does freedom come from that awareness that we have of the world, of people, of elements, of the units that make it up and the relationship between them? Isn't being free just being conscious? But at a certain point we have to make choices, and these choices, in terms of communication, fall into two hypotheses, either the awareness of self or, on the other hand, the awareness of the other. Self-consciousness can generate a path of remarkable egocentricity that can have important consequences in the role that the individual plays or doesn't play in society. However, even if he doesn't play any role, the individual may not be part of the scene as a character, but he is undoubtedly classified as such, as "one who doesn't play any role". He is, therefore, also part of the performance. When the individual decides to use his freedom that is immanent by the fact of having created religion, he is making choices, he is taking an ethical position, because all action is, whether we like it or not,

and ethical. Does being impartial have anything to do with the exercise of freedom? By making a choice, by ~~omitting~~ let's say ethically, to the world and its relations, the individual is not being impartial, because he is somehow playing a role on the stage of human relations. Is it not man's obligation to generate life, this being his first responsibility to the world and, in fact, his first ethics? How can one be ethically impartial? In questions that have to do with human life or not? How can a being that has been generated by life take a position of conscience that is ethically impartial? Only by believing that the data of consciousness and unconsciousness were fully human. What role then belongs to the belief in a supernatural world, and namely to the belief in an entity superior to man and which would have created him? These are questions that we pose under the assumption that there is indeed a supreme entity, but that it emanates from the deepest part of humanity. If we want to take it as possible to be ethically impartial we will have to define under what conditions this can be achieved. First, in a space of affirmation of the individual

as such. This includes all the pre-notions that the individual is as a cultural being and the belief that man is a product of culture, viewing the latter as the set of manifestations that make man what he is, that define him as such. But man is not immersed in a sea of social relations in which the exercise of freedom is conditioned by this. Let us not confuse freedom with irresponsibility. To be ethically responsible is to be aware of where our freedom begins and where it ends, where the freedom of others begins. This may seem like a truism in view of the tangle of things we have been saying, namely the thesis that man is conditioned by a set of pre-conceptions, as a cultural being. Is there in all this a place for a phenomenological man, a pure event man, where all his action is disconnected from any culturally determined context? Can man deny what he inherits by birth, what he learns culturally? Is it the economically difficult circumstances of life that make man an unethical individual? What place is there for ethics in contemporary societies, where everything takes on dimensions of competition, of exploitation, of

opportunism? In parallel, the image of ~~an~~ cultivated ethically responsible, not to say ethically ~~impartial~~ ~~in~~ what sense can we connect this image that is cultivated in contemporary society with cultural man? Isn't what we see as changing behavior more like cultural creation? Isn't man condemned to live generationally in a spiral where everything repeats itself, although in different guises? Can man create from nothing, constantly create, evolve, in the sense of becoming ethically impartial? And is it a necessity to be ethically impartial?

As for more universal questions, we ask ourselves ~~what~~ ~~the~~ path the peoples must take to avoid entropy. Do people ~~know~~ what it is to do philosophy under pressure? At the same time, we ask ourselves how one can be ethically impartial while sharing the suffering and the pleasure of living in the world. As for the suffering, our Christian morality automatically makes us have compassion on the other and help him, but as for the pleasure, it seems to be hardly reconcilable with the questioning of the problem before us. It seems to be, but it is not. When we feel

pleasure, it is about being hypocritically in communion with world, because pleasure is an individual experience. It can also be a common experience, when we feel united to someone and love surprises us. It can also be a purely intersubjective experience, when through the senses and not only through sexuality we feel connected to a group. These are strange days when we feel futile, and philosophy cannot be an activity that promotes futility and isolation. All knowledge, be it philosophical or anthropological, needs to be shouted out. My answer to the problem is therefore in the realm of philosophical anthropology. I do not present ethnographic data because I do not have adequate ethnographic data to answer the question. Nor will it be necessary at all. Philosophical speculation must be brought closer to common sense, because the source of knowledge is the people, the people who work. And these people have an ethic, they don't need to be impartial. On the side of philosophical speculation, the question can be asked whether it is possible to be ethically impartial. Moreover, I ask if it is necessary to be ethically impartial, for the sake of what, the simple

scientific knowledge will certainly not be. I therefore advocate ~~it~~
Insofar as we admit a human nature, the ~~possibility~~ being ethically impartial
comes from participation in the world that is interior to us, prior to
us, and surrounds us. Only a moral consciousness that takes into
account the freedom given by a creative deity can save man from
being ethically partial. Let's take the question of the obscene. The
mere word exists or is understood as a counterpoint to religious
morality. Now, how can human love be seen as contrary to morality
just because the participants have not been baptized. The obscene,
of which we are afraid, a primordial fear, as if society regulates
reproduction and conditions pleasure, can well be understood in
another way. If God gave us freedom, if man earned it by fighting
against God, and He still gave us this freedom, it is because man is
free to do whatever he wants according to his conscience and will
not necessarily do it against God. If it was Christian morality that
created the conditioning of sexuality, which always expresses itself,
in a veiled, sickly or exhibitionist way, it is because this precedes
religious practice. Religion and morality seem to be intimately
linked, then.

When we know this relationship we notice that the creative act is a physical act, loaded with meaning, in which energies are shared and not mere animality. For I believe that a libertine sexuality generates violence and disorder in the world. Therefore, sexuality should be channeled for good and the union of bodies should be understood as a natural thing. Ethics is not born out of guilt. Guilt is at most the awareness of having broken norms, laws or rules that are imposed on us by the society or group we belong to. But the initial question remains ominous: is it possible to be ethically impartial? Isn't observation a participation of the mind in what is going on with the social actors? Does the underlying problem posed imply that we should be mere spectators of a world that we later conclude has passed us by? And the question arises: is it possible to participate and be ethically impartial? I believe that freedom lies first of all in thought, but it is in feelings, in the heart that we must put the emphasis. Without love there is neither true participation nor true ethical stance taking, be it partial or impartial. The question of being partial or impartial is first of all

political, positional, relational vis-à-vis the interests of ~~the~~ cause. He who takes a partial position is distancing himself and putting himself in the place of a political or religious leader, representative of a greater power. One who is biased may well behave ethically, defending his economic, family, political interests, his group through his person. That is why I believe that it is better to be ethically partial than ethically impartial, because such impartiality, because it is decontextualized, seems to me to be an impossibility. Ethics, then, derives from a context, as I argued at the beginning of this essay. The question of ethics has been equated by various philosophers, under different pretexts, but I believe that the question of ethics involves the questioning of the individual and the collective, especially with regard to the problem of identity. And the question of identity obviously involves gender. It also goes through the individual's learning about belief and the symbolic transgression that he/she experiences as an individual of a certain group. The symbolic transgression struggles for respect with the Other, and this is a question that we will analyze. In the field of sexuality, symbolic transgression means

not to have relations with the person you love but with the person who is available, even if it is necessary to enter into a market. This symbolic transgression for the group can take the form of actual transgression for the individual. On the level of sexuality, transgression is not generally punished by society, but sexual morality is sanctioned in the form of exclusion from the group. As for respect for the Other, this is where the foundation of morality lies. Everything that transgresses the integrity and identity of the other, his or her person, is morally condemnable, and we can only be ethically impartial if we are aware of this respect for the Other and in praxis fulfill it with respect for the Other, for his or her sensibility, for his or her desires. Because when we think of ethics, we must put in first place that which is linked to reproduction, that is, sexual ethics. To understand the desire of the Other, in this case of the Other, is therefore the most beautiful and complete ethical obligation. This is to be ethically impartial: not to superimpose our own desire on the desire of the other, but to make it equivalent, respecting the Other's commitment to the world. But the greatest ethical and moral dilemma comes from the economic factor. Nobody knows what it is to feed

a silent fight to starvation in the name of science, ~~lig~~
in scientific knowledge rather than technical knowledge, a
knowledge ~~not~~ of experience. What comes first, theory or common
sense? How to survive caught between the two when neither one, in
the form of university institutions, nor the other, in the form of
professional family knowledge, show solidarity? And how to survive
when they think we are mentally deficient or crazy or homosexual
and bear the weight of the world, of daily criticism, and why feeding
ideals with borrowed money, from family is certain, when we know
beforehand that we are stuck, because they will charge us for all that
money. And how to survive when we are threatened to lose family
property when we have always defended science or knowledge, in
the form of philosophy or anthropology. What ethical duty do
philosophers and anthropologists have to those who learn their
subjects and are installed in their university positions paid to think.
How can one be ethically impartial in this situation? The question is,
can one be ethically impartial while being economically successful?
Is there a path to freedom and justice

individual when they lay siege to us and threaten to cut off food and we continue to believe in knowledge? How can we be ethically impartial and not steal, not kill, not harm another in any way when the person who supports us economically takes from her income, hidden from her husband, a little for the one who is involved in certain things, knowing that the person who gives is about to have a child? How can we be ethically impartial when we subject ourselves to scientific knowledge in the name of a western concept of health, we were guinea pigs and on top of that we gained nothing from it, on top of that we paid and were exploited? Only a cry of rebellion can be heard from within the thinking subject who doubts if it is possible to be ethically impartial in a world like ours. How to be ethically impartial when one is dependent on others at the most diverse levels and that the concept of individual justice is nothing more than a mere schematism of crazy thinkers who were never hungry, or if they were, they were ordered to think. How can we conceive of the existence of philosophers in today's society when it has a savagely anti-philosophical attitude? This is the greatest moral dilemma. It is the dilemma that erodes by

inside, which self-destructs with slow and suffering death, where there is no space for the joy, laughter and play that is due to human being. How to be ethically impartial in such a situation? Actually, Karl Marx was right when he talked about intellectual workers: they need an infrastructure, because common sense does not recognize that such intellectual work should be paid. So it must be done on the sly, in the dead of time, requiring mental gymnastics never seen before, because society's calls for perfection are greater and greater, and so the demands placed on philosophers are greater and greater. They will have to reformulate many questions. Only in a certain sense can the philosopher be ethically impartial, but what awaits him is physical death, atrophy, wasting away. And all in the name of knowledge that is not common sense. Really, Socrates did not advocate work. One can only do philosophy on a full stomach, preferably when the others, the big fat State, pay for it, all of us citizens. However, in spite of everything, there is room to think, even if it's on train rides to work or on weekends when a country setting invites us to think

fundamentally life. This is why we think that being ~~dia~~ impartial cannot be confused with any ~~point~~ ^{point} world, of the things of the world, of a social context in which we are inserted. That is why we are often accused of only analyzing and of not participating effectively in causes, philanthropic or political. They accuse us of doing nothing and seeking refuge in women for our social frustrations. Well, a philosopher must be committed to the world and to his time. If this were not so, he obviously could not philosophize, because the data of his consciousness are those that come to him through philosophical historical documents but also through the voice of his contemporaries; the present perspective of the past is very important in this respect. Historical consciousness, in the manner of Gadamer, should make us take positions on the destiny of man, of men in society and in culture, of humanity in the measure of its cosmic - universal destiny. That is why the basis of ethics is free and responsible choice. Something has to be done to combat this image that the philosopher or anthropologist or even the sociologist has before society. The way is undoubtedly through interdisciplinarity,

without abdicating its own methods and purposes, in essence, the life of each subject.

I maintain like Aristotle and others that man is a being by nature, a political being by nature, because he tends to relate to others, avoiding solipsism, asexual or not, insofar as the lack, the loss of social meaning, can be recovered over time. It is our firm conviction that as man relates to others, he realizes himself, and we do not advocate any form of hermitism or social hermeticism in the form of the best known life choices, be they religious or secular. Man, however, lives contemporarily perhaps more in loneliness, which is largely the result of a Western conception of him. Should Western reason, in the form of science, be blamed for the so-called ills of civilization? On the other hand, we constantly look to primitive societies for the counterpoint of what in human nature seems precisely human to us. How then to define the philosophical intention, as it seems to us the most ethically impartial? It must take into account the results of science, its contributions to the expansion of thought, it must

to take into account the knowledge that a science called anthropology, produces, in the formulation of hypotheses ~~human~~ human, not only about his behavior, but also about his representations and desiderata, not only formulating hypotheses, but truly shedding light on universal data of human thought and I claim here the inheritance of Claude Lévi-Strauss to the extent that this was his intellectual intention. I therefore argue that both the philosopher and the social scientist should play a role in society, should be a social actor and not a mere observer, following the methodology of participant observation. This is the only way to generate a fertile situation of "engagement" that allows the production of knowledge. What should therefore be, in this context, the philosopher's role in contemporary society. It is clear that there is an abyssal difference between philosophical propositions and behavior, that is, the future of the individual himself. How can knowledge be generated without calling into question the personality and behavior of the person who generates knowledge? This is a question that I think is pertinent to discuss, to put on the table. Because you can't confuse the

subjectivity of the agent of knowledge of one's own knowledge, or can it? Because it seems to me that the source from which knowledge comes is not only individual, but collective. The heritage of knowledge is first and foremost a social heritage. I emphasize in this essay the social component of thought and behavior because it seems important to me, in Portugal or in Lusophony, to have a broad discussion about the social sciences. This does not mean that humanism is lost, the subjectivity that does not let go of us and to which we are addicted. There has to be a constant connection between the social and the individual, between the individual and society, between subjectivity and objectivity. I don't mean that the individual is subjective for the most part and society is objective. I learned that the opposite was dogmatic truth. I think that the question of subjectivity and objectivity should not be the finca-fide of the social sciences or philosophy. Both components of nature (of human nature, tout-court), are present in the production of knowledge and are posed in terms of ethics. Returning to the question of the relationship mentioned above, the young woman's position is not at all easy. She will have to abandon a married life with a child in order to

rediscovering love and youth. It may seem easy for ~~to see~~ from the outside, but simply the choice of love here ~~encounters~~ ~~an~~ obstacle, rather two obstacles: an institution called marriage and an offspring to be taken care of. The situation may be comparable to the well-known compromise between Jean-Paul Sartre and Simone de Beauvoir, but the cultural context here is different. And what the young man wants deep down is to be happy with an uncompromising woman, it doesn't matter to him that he has had moral ascendancy over the young women he has met in his life, but it does matter to him to have the life that everyone else simply has because he feels alone, on the fringe of the scientific community, on the fringe of society. The simple solution to the problem would be for everyone to go their own personal way and probably call into question the complicity and intellectual commitment. Because the young person is perhaps too demanding with the reality that he lives, perhaps he looks for what his imagination suggests, perhaps he is egocentrist, seeing the world and men through the lenses of his glasses. If we take into account that "there are many women," the young man could easily give up his intellectual life and live a social life

reproduced, which would certainly be an ~~an~~ choice, ~~th~~ now
This young man is persistent and does not give up with setbacks.
Perhaps the young man is thirsty and in the desert ~~and~~ has a set of
glasses of fresh water in front of him. Perhaps it is all a
communication problem, for he is aware that he lives in the same
cultural and social context that has not benefited him in terms of
love affairs. Will he have to emigrate to feel the difference and stay
away or perhaps come back different, with a new breath? How to
act in such a situation, not to mention how to act ethically? These
are simple human problems, when considered ethically much more
complicated.

Next I propose some ideas for a ~~the~~ world. The world, the mind of
man, is composed of simple things: the forbidden, the laws, the
beliefs, the myths. In man there is something of animality when it
comes to his sexuality. Is man or woman meant to have only one
partner all their lives? What do the holy books say about this? Why
are Muslim and Catholic religions considered the same, when in the
former a man can have several women and in the latter a man can
have several women?

second does society obligate itself to monogamy? Does ~~not~~ have the to do with something recent in monotheism? Being immersed ~~is~~ social relations, regardless of their intensity, has something experimental about it. To pretend to be outside social relations is a position that can take the form of refusal or observation of that world. I condemn those who observe it without participating in it, and I am not exempt from this fault. To see and conceive of society solely and exclusively from books can bring a failure of contact with reality, and if we want to talk about reality, if we want to understand the world, we will have to know aspects to which our bacchanalian Catholic morality was not accustomed. We have to know what is good and what is bad. What journalism does has a social role, which is to alert consciences to what is bad in the world, or simply to show it to shock, to generate panic, to experience people. I don't propose only to criticize. My analysis is something quite personal, not comparable to that of those who work in academies, paid to think, when they don't think, they just tend to reproduce the relationships they would have in practical life. This division between the academic world and the

he world outside does not collapse in two days, nor does it interest ~~he~~ who

of academism make life. I propose to draw, from my personal and social experience, what would be a better world, better in practice, not only in theory. First of all, difference should be accepted and recognized. Psychological and cultural difference. Psychological difference concerns the set of psychic dispositions that an individual has for reading and understanding the world, his actions that concern his identity. It involves aspects of sexuality and of intellectual and technical ability to pursue and pursue a particular goal or task. Cultural difference is not only racial difference. Of course we must understand other cultures in their context and import, this the human spirit itself does without us demanding it, importing cultural elements that belonged to other cultures. Cultures are less and less isolated, it's the individuals who are more and more isolated, and I'm not saying this from experience but from observation. Secondly, respect for the law that we have inherited and are continuously building. This is what the difference in treatment between the excluded and the included is based on. The excluded of which

How should they be penalized? By education, that they have had the from the moment of its birth? By ~~religion~~ certainly. Then, thirdly, by ~~freedom~~ freedom? Those who do not want to have children should not have them, they should resort to family planning. But this planning results in depression for mothers who abort, in problems of social integration because things are not given a natural direction. Religion prescribes about men's sexuality and this is deeply wrong. What about the relationship between sex and development? Is the economic difference between northern countries and southern countries rooted in this relationship? Then, the right to work. There is more and more unemployment and new forms of socio-economic support for individuals are emerging. More and more we have to think in global terms and this implies that we have to deal with a series of problems that resulted from the contact between Europeans and Africans, for example. Problems like the absence of structures that allow people to have peace, food, work, children. How can one think theoretically about the world if there are beings who are starving to death. It is not only an ethical cry, it is an effort to make the world a better place in the future. Why is it that

Only now do I care about that? Because I wanted to elide ~~my~~
literary of those who believe in the world from a ~~non~~ abrupt, more real
perspective, because this was a shock that resulted in a realization that
difference must be abolished. Do I therefore advocate anarchy? No,
only a set of principles of conduct that first of all concern myself,
because I don't want to refuse that the world changes every day and
others may do better than what I am doing now. Will my origins be
here in Portugal? Certainly yes, it is not because I was born in
France that I go there to look for my identity. If I see things from
my father's side, my roots are here, in this village, but if I see things
from my mother's side maybe they are further north. Maybe I
should see things from both sides and just live, because I carry that
identity in me, in my cells that I am burning out and I think I am
getting less healthy and intelligent as time goes by. The better world
can start with myself, living the intensity of thoughts, letting my
heart go when I know I should risk now above all else.

A man cannot have desire . . . He

can't be unwanted by freedom. Soon someone puts you on a margin of ~~it~~ and closes the doors. The question of merit has a lot to do with social issues and the networks of knowledge and access to power. Society, which is so benevolent towards those who are different in terms of race or religion, no longer knows how to welcome those who have made mistakes and who recognize their mistakes. We are in an age of political correctness. That's what gives birth to children, that keeps marriages going, that creates jobs. I don't believe that, after thirty-one years of democratic rule, we are truly in a democracy. On the other hand, the exercise of individuality is impregnated with the social. It's no use being formally social, you have to be originally individual to be socially recognized. It is no use being spontaneous when society is built as a façade in which injustice reigns. Religion also plays an important role in this respect. Most scientists are atheists for some reason. Not for any particular reason but mainly because religion prevents them from seeing scientific truth in some way. My words could be

literary or politically correct. However, it is not to ~~power~~
I want to get to, but to the truth of things, whether ~~it~~ for ethical.
When we are young, everything we dare to know and everything
makes sense to us. We reach a saturation point with so many
questions and so few answers. Then we cancel ourselves out socially,
wounded in our naivety. Because someone judged us, because
someone closed a door on us. We think "I'm going to be like the
mole" and we become adults. Religion, which has always been
important in our lives, seems to be the greatest means of segregating
cultural and psychological differences. The spontaneity -I would
rather say friendliness- that seems to be the engine of public social
relations, is in fact its facade. Because there is, after so many years,
no freedom. There is economic liberalism, liberality. And because
this chronicle is a cry of revolt, it is essentially for those who make
money the engine of Western civilization, more than religion. I have
admiration for those who make a living from their work. But the
work of thinking about social relations has a much more worthy
goal that is not recognized. Above all, difference is not recognized.
In the midst of this scenario, what is one to do? Violate the law?
Then

would once again function society in all its splendor. No the realization of a just and balanced humanity is near. Because everything is happy and content with its position, and social parasitism becomes public enemy number one. Very well, agreed. What image are we giving to the younger ones when we don't tolerate difference. I am talking about personality difference, not now cultural differences. On the other hand, we are receptive to American neo-colonialism and accept everything that is coming from the other side of the Atlantic. But maybe this is our vocation and, deep down, our identity: to receive cultural influences to meld a new way of being. In this Portugal, to be a winner, you don't need merit, or coherent thinking, you need to never fail in front of others, never show humanity, but be a comic book hero, be mediocre because mediocrity sells well on TV, in books, and in newspapers. Is it, and we are coming to the end of this essay, possible to be ethically impartial through loneliness? When our personal history indicates nothing about how our future will turn out, even intellectually, when insecurity is

screaming, when emotional and psychic stability is ~~an~~ when professional fulfillment is slow to appear, is it ~~be~~ ethically impartial? These are the questions I pose for evaluation. I end with a reference to the East, namely to Osho and Lao Tse. Don't we have to review the way we face the world and ourselves? Haven't we gone around in circles in history? Aren't we all crazy? What cultural heritage do we have? Osho's words lead us to review everything, everything we have built: philosophy, psychoanalysis, science, knowledge. Do we have to question our identity? Have we, as a civilization, come to the end of something? Or are we simply beginning, communicating with the difference that the world places before us, learning ourselves to be but aware of the diversity of which the world, inside out, is composed. If we make a clean slate of our knowledge, will we give up a spirituality that should accompany us as human beings? Can we somehow, finally, relate Jacques Derrida's thought to Osho's words? We can conclude by leaving an open question. We can consider the assertion of

that ethics precedes anthropological practice. We do not refer to it in the course of this text, but only to an anthropology filled with ethics. Ethics is the designation we give to the correspondence of an initial desideratum related to the idea of Good or social order with the achieved end. To this extent, ethics is not only a point of departure, but also a point of arrival. To have ethics does not mean to lose desire or to transpose or stifle it in our individual being, but it means to channel our energetic potential towards the Other, in this case, towards the feminine, obeying a logic of reproduction of human beings. However, another question arises: how do ethics relate to pleasure? How can we reconcile hedonism with faith, knowing that we can abdicate for a moment the protective powers of divinity, because we know we are mortal?

Works by the same author:

"Specifications" (Tender Editions)

"Reasons of the Heart: Citizenship Exercises" (Tender Editions)

"Imagined World" (Tender Editions)

"Christ, Carnation and Rose" (Tender Editions) "Pensarilho" (Tender Editions)

"Tight Curves" (Íris Editora)

"The Love Potion" (Tender Editions) "Social Theory.Aspects"(Tender Editions)

Request to:

geral@tender.com.pt

Tender Editions

www.tender.com.pt

