



BERNARDO GOMES BARBOSA NOGUEIRA¹

TRANSLATED BY FELIPE ZOBARAN

ABSTRACT: The present paper attempts to face the challenge put by the series *Sense8*, which drives us to reflection about the way we deal with time and to the other people. In this sense, the concepts of Lévinas' ethic and the contribution of Derrida's hospitality will help us on the ride along the relationships of the eight main characters of the series. The challenge is to show, starting from a different way of existence perception – quantum physics – which new language possibilities the human relations require in order to achieve to a new ethic existence.

KEYWORDS: quantum physics; Lévinas; responsibility; Derrida.

CONJUGAÇÃO DA AUSENTE

Foram precisos mais dez anos e oito quilos
Muitas cãs e um princípio de abdômen
(Sem falar na Segunda Grande Guerra, na descoberta da penicilina e na desagregação do átomo)
Foram precisos dois filhos e sete casas
(Em lugares como São Paulo, Londres, Cascais, Ipanema e Hollywood)
Foram precisos três livros de poesia e uma operação de apendicite
Algumas prevaricações e um exequatur
Fora preciso a aquisição de uma consciência política
E de incontáveis garrafas; fora preciso um desastre de avião
Foram precisas separações, tantas separações
Uma separação...

Tua graça caminha pela casa
Moves-te blindada em abstrações, como um T. Trazes
A cabeça enterrada nos ombros qual escura
Rosa sem haste. És tão profundamente
Que irrelevas as coisas, mesmo do pensamento.
A cadeira é cadeira e o quadro é quadro
Porque te participam. Fora, o jardim
Modesto como tu, murcha em antúrios
A tua ausência. As folhas te outonam, a grama te
Quer. És vegetal, amiga...

¹ Ph. D. Candidate in Law at the Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais – PUC-Minas (Brazil). Master in Law at Universidade de Coimbra (Portugal). Specialization in Philosophy at the Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto – UFOP (Brazil). Professor at the Law School at Centro Universitário Newton Paiva (Brazil). E-mail: bernardogbn@yahoo.com.br

Amiga! direi baixo o teu nome
Não ao rádio ou ao espelho, mas à porta
Que te emoldura, fatigada, e ao
Corredor que pára
Para te andar, adunca, inutilmente
Rápida. Vazia a casa
Raios, no entanto, desse olhar sobejo
Oblíquos cristalizam tua ausência.
Vejo-te em cada prisma, refletindo
Diagonalmente a múltipla esperança
E te amo, te venero, te idolatro
Numa perplexidade de criança.

E no entanto avistava à poucos passos
Sua forma feminina que não era
Nenhuma outra forma feminina, mas a dela
A mulher amada

Vinícius de Moraes

INTRODUCTION

We often see ourselves lurking in the inaugural issue by Lenio Sterk, which has made us reflect upon and, with time, has become the subtitle of a collective work about “Law and Literature”, that is, “why should we write narratives?” This mention of the problem dwells within the heart of thoughts, where doubts make their living, a fright that has made us all keep walking since Ancient Greece. It is a torment, but also pulsating life. In a similar tune, Mozambican writer Mia Couto, questioned about how he makes his narratives, gives us his reflection: “I write every time, every moment, right now I am writing”.

Law and Literature. The connective “and” makes us, once again, reflect upon the relation this word proposes. Does it only mean a union of Law and Literature? Is it possible to match the endlessness of literary creation with the finitude and immediacy of Law? Would the literary time have the “time” to subsist in the strict legal routines? What if the order was inverted? Literature and Law. Would we be able to still analyze such relation? Or does the order, the precedence, the one that comes first, prior or superior, becomes more important? In Law and Literature, thus, is Law the one that guides the relation and Literature a humble tool for the legal science? Law comes first in the name of the studies, but it does not represent reality. Moreover, nowadays, what is legal reality and social reality? Is it really possible to establish such separation, one so dear to modern science? To make Law Literature. A Literature that is, maybe, more

of coziness and less of a prison. Somehow Dalí's stiffness and softness are within our reflection. Not that we should be talking about ending law application, which, *de per si*, would make it impossible to live with others. However, guaranteeing that people are able to live together must not be misunderstood by that. We are always surrounded by Law, by Poetry, by Literature; we are in a world told by narratives.

The connector “and” seems to work as the assertion of two narratives that ensure the human aspect in the world. That being said, our analysis could not fit anywhere else, since it is not within the dimensions of Law in Literature, nor in Law as Literature and not even in Law of Literature. “And” shows the very condition of moving within the core of the narratives and the relations these languages allow to happen, so that the birthplace of humanity is, once and every time, plural – regarding time, points of view, plural in humanity itself. Whenever something is commanded by a dated group of norms, let us not ignore that within the very regulations are forgotten narratives, by force or contingency. A multidimensional perception is the most ethical one. Literature, thus, is not only seen in the form of novels. Narratives are not solely novels. Whatever narrates gives us the world: its movies², songs³, series⁴, petitions⁵... “Are humans literature?”⁶ (Nogueira, 2014, p. 1).

² Hereby, filmic narratives are considered as a type of literary narrative genre.

³ As for songs, they are also types of narratives, as they deal with a certain reality in a playful manner, and with the amount of playfulness in reality and vice-versa. Such percentage is impossible to be measured, and musical narratives help people reflect about this and other issues. Two songs can be used as examples for analysis in these notes, which are since the beginning “musical notes”: the narrative in the song *Tigresa* by Brazilian composer Caetano Veloso is about a woman who admits her ambiguities, representing the female gender as seen beyond its modern concepts, which is the discussion proposed in the song. Besides that, in the song there is a figure of a tigress who wants to overcome a lion; the narrator makes it clear that the tigress wants to “invent a home”, thus, it is possible to infer that it represents women trying to escape the one-sided aspect which still echoes in society nowadays: “Ela me conta que era atriz e trabalhou no Hair / Com alguns homens foi feliz, com outros foi mulher / Que tem muito ódio no coração, que tem dado muito amor / E espalhado muito prazer e muita dor / Mas ela ao mesmo tempo diz que tudo vai mudar / Porque ela vai ser o que quis, inventando um lugar / Onde a gente e a natureza feliz vivam sempre em comunhão / E a tigresa possa mais do que o leão”. In the song *O querer*, by the same songwriter, there is a representation of the complexity of humanity, and a possible relation to otherness and the self: “Onde queres revólver, sou coqueiro / Onde queres dinheiro, sou paixon / Onde queres descanso, sou desejo / E onde sou só desejo, queres não / E onde não queres nada, nada falta / E onde voas bem alta, eu sou o chão / E onde pisas o chão, minha alma salta /

To a certain extent, Antonio Candido helps in the discussion:

I call literature, as widely as possible; all creations with a poetic, fictional or dramatic touch, ranging from what we call folklore, legend, myth, to the most complex and difficult forms of written production in the great civilizations. Therefore, literature clearly seems to be the universal manifestation of Man in all times. There are no people and there is no man that can live without it, that is, without the possibility of being in touch with some kind of fable. As everyone dreams at night, no one is capable of spending twenty four hours a day without giving in to a fabled universe. Sleeping and dreaming assure the indispensable presence of this universe, regardless of our will. And while sleeping, poetical creation, which is the engine of literary creation in all its forms, makes itself present within all of us, whether we are illiterates or scholars, as anecdotes, tales, comics, police news, popular songs, country guitars, carnival. It manifests itself from daydreaming about love or economics on the bus to the attention fixed on the television soap opera or after reading a novel (Candido, 2011, p. 174-175).

Based on that, we see ourselves still trying to reach Lenio Streck's proposal, and, as we know for a fact, every time we face this reflection, there is something else built upon it. In such transcendence, one can even

E ganha liberdade na amplidão...". These are examples for the idea that there are many media for narratives, and not only a single "narrative".

⁴ This is the habitat of the analysis in this article. Serial narrative is an almost new way of telling stories, as it differs from movies for having a different timing, a particular idea of script development and a different narrative construction than that of filmic narrative. Series, as the word itself suggests, may be a type of reflexion of the time we live in as humans, a time filled with postmodernity, a new dimension of time, strongly connected to the idea of fragmentation of human connections. As Bauman suggests, liquid relationships are easier to develop, as they make time a fluid course. Series are usually similar to novels, which are also split in chapters, most often. It is the union of smaller pieces that converge. This construction is so adequate to the reality of present, which is organized as a means to answering to the "impatience" that "makes" people get uneasy facing time when it makes itself noticeable, people want to get rid of time. And then the chapter is over, and people are free to give into the fleetingness of the next one. It is possible, thus, to analyze to what extent serial narrative represents the "liquid times" we live in nowadays.

⁵ It seems clear that petitions in a court case are also narratives in progress.

⁶ This is the title of another published article in which the concept of literature is put together with the idea of otherness. The same correlation is used in the present article.

consider literature as independent of narrative models. “*And*” represents acceptance of what is different, and it includes filmic narrative, musical narrative, serial narrative – which is analyzed in this paper. I will respond to Lenio whenever these questions are raised. With his voice, the beginning of this road ends:

The daily life of law does not touch us. That is, reality does not “say anything” to us. But fiction does. That is why we often confuse the fictions of reality with the reality of fictions. We get frozen. Literature can be more than that. We need the absurd, the impossible, so we determine the cruelty of the world around us, that is why we need literature, showing us new ways, a new place of speech, in the words of Barthes (or hermeneutic situation, to speak with Gadamer) to demonstrate what is worthy of criticism. Literature can be the learning channel of Law in classrooms (Streck, 2013, p. 62).

ENCOUNTERS:

Sense8 is a fiction series that, linearly speaking, presents eight people from different parts of the planet that, by a sensory inexplicable force, inhabit within each other – with no apparent rational link that could justify such interrelation. Probably, diversity is the main topic of the series. The human beings portrayed in the script are not only in very distinct parts of the world, but also have no cultural similarities whatsoever. There is a Thai woman and an African man, together with a policeman from North America and a robber from East Germany. The group is completed by a transgender girl who dates a black woman, a Mexican gay movie actor, a businesswoman from Korea who can fight very well and a girl who lives surrounded by oriental beliefs. Such cultural miscellaneous could be, by itself, an interesting aspect to be analyzed. However, this is not the way we would like to take in our road. Plurality is there. And the most interesting aspect is the starting point of the series. Stereotypes are, since the beginning, dismantled into possibilities for humankind, despite the cages of modern thinking, modern logic, and modern concepts. It remains to know what is beyond plurality. And to what extent this series touches us as a reflection on

Derrida's thought in his considerations on hospitality together with the ethical reflection of Emmanuel Lévinas⁷.

Multiculturalism is not discussed in this paper. The ideas surrounding multiculturalism may help one understand the series, but, analyzing it like that would be to imprison ourselves in a language that comes from a line of thought from Ancient Greece and sets us inside a less widened vision. *Sense8*, as the title itself shows, claims for an ignored place in the modern thought, human rights in the Western World represent the speech, and the series the ears. This tune follows us now.

Clearly, there was a break of paradigm in occidental philosophy after the production of Lévinas. Ethics were transformed into the main philosophy by the author, and such movement helps us relate in a less “frightened” way with the series. Our ears got used to being the point of arrival of reason. In a supporting role. The speaker, reason itself, has always been the fuse of human construction in the historical approach taken in this paper, from Ancient Greece until Postmodernity. At the moment Lévinas invites us to make Ethics as the main philosophy; he puts down reason, which had so far built the foundations of occident human existence. Now, Ethics is the privileged locus in which and through which humanity exists. Instead of “I am”, a kind of “Here I am” is predominant nowadays. It means that the existentialism of humankind is strongly tied to the relations with the other. That being said, to be in the world is to be in front of and before the world, and, above all, to be responsible for the other person, who, facing my own existence, becomes a condition, that is, the one that makes me human.

If we are not mistaken, the ear in relation to reason becomes a kind of active ear, now. Only through the ear of the other can we be in the world. This is important, because then reason is autonomous. On the other side, the ear, much differently than the speech, receives without choosing it. The ear is like a grace. The other is born only when his or her voice reaches our

⁷ The names of the characters were omitted on purpose, due to the infinity that dwells within human beings.

ears. The ear, actually, is not something we can call “ours” or “mine”, since in it there are differences between people and we do not know when the information comes. Likewise, we listen to ourselves as we speak. This selfhood relation would not be enough, because, we are when the other inhabits us, and, at the same time, when we inhabit the other. Filled with love and hatred. Filled with humanity. The ear might be a privileged place for such epiphany. Here we are, together with Lévinas, proposing not an importance order, as it would be just the fruit of a construction of thought which favors one over the other. In our narrative there is no such order, on the contrary, the ear gives us a dimension that reason cannot reach. Thus, we move beyond this construction dimension. Without the ear, existing would be impossible. So, the other, an unidentified, unexpected, silence breaking, outlaw person is the one whose sound we need to hear. From a place that is fecundation. The ear that resounds everything and makes no difference between the ones that reach it. Sense does not happen *a priori*, and, because of how unpredictable and impossible it is not to receive it while listening; the ear establishes an ethical reclaim that allows us to overcome the ethical formation which is commonly built by the one who speaks.

The other is an ear. Not his or her ear. It is not about property. All of us are, since the beginning, compelled by the tragedy of listening, of having the other as the one who arrives unexpectedly and inhabits time and makes another one to be born. Alterity is established then, as a command not to cover the ears – because if we do so, we will have to face our own silence. In the silence of the self, lives the silence of Ethics. Hospitality as taught by Derrida, as an unconditional matter, could fit here. Hospitality, for Derrida, is not selective, nor legal.

Law is not hospitable in Derrida’s conception. When the other arrives, with distinct sounds, from an Icelandic DJ to African drums, all of them must be received. And such reception makes itself clear when we ethically conceive humanity, without asking who is there, because it is always hosted by the Law of the other. The ear is, thus, the unconditional welcome. It happens with no need of asking for translation. Ethics are older than translation. No questions, no passports. The other is our very condition to

be in the world. A musician's perfect ear evidences the issue. And it is not in vain that the father of the Icelandic DJ is a professional musician and she, thus, accesses the world via songs.

It seems that reading things ethically as Lévinas proposes calls the need for focusing at the ears instead of scrutinizing speeches. The ear, in relation to Derrida, is speaking. Speech is saying. Now we have to face infinity and sense, which, as it seems, is the key to understanding the series. A key that cannot open doors, since humans, as beings for the others, need no password, only listening.

SENSE

We could propose now a reflection on the idea of "sense". The title of the series makes us do so. We do not use the word as something that "makes sense", as a synonym of "meaning", though. The idea here goes together with a physiological interpretation, in which, we cannot conceive that what makes sense is imprisoned by what is rationally plausible. The human aspect, besides, cannot be explained only by this dimension, in these terms, sense cannot be something merely rational. We feel with the heart, not only with reason. And that is why we cannot always "touch" sense only with reason, with the rationality taught to us since Ancient Greece. Sense sometimes goes together with things that are not at the reach of thoughts. What makes sense makes feelings. What we say is not based on the idea that a metaphysical or epistemological theory could be considered as the main philosophy, humanity does not happen nor walks towards this area, and it is placed in the world in relation to the other. There could not be, then, a better explanation of what makes sense: the other. The ear that makes us inhabited even before thinking happens. Such perception cannot be considered by philosophical thinking as an obscure one, or it would sound like an argument of authority, as, with the illustration, was wanted.

Humanity is more than what a light says. It is also a dark ear inside of which all sorts of human feelings inhabit. To talk about sense is to talk about what comes next. About things that touch and make way. Hegel was the one who told us that Minerva's bird flies only at twilight. Was it listening to the other and thus thinking? Is the ear the engine of thought? Is

thought the only way of making sense? Are we together with the other because we speak or because we listen?

This leads us to an interesting way. The other one is the sense. In better words, the human path could be highlighted if we thought that the ear has no light. The other, as the ear, does not appear, at first, enlightened, since it is plainly mystery. The absolute arrival, a term used by Derrida to refer to the one who arrives in his perspective of hospitality, does not happen. The ear that is going to be fertilized cannot be ready. It will be invaded in the mixture of sounds with the one that arrives, the new is born. Every act of listening is an act of birth. Sense, what is felt or sensed, is a product of alterity, not of reason. The sense of existence is given to us by the other. Even if from then on we can make choices, we are then inhabited. As a tragedy, we are doomed to this unknown and, because of that, infinite other.

Besides being in the title of the series, the concept of “sense” is an important reflection. The narrative does not follow a linear order, which may be another form of invention. Chronological time, with guides legal relations, the fair and unfair binomial, and the much caricatured constructions that legal concepts invent, are in check considering the interpretation hereby detailed. The third element included in Quantum Physics, the nonlocality, the place of non-concepts, is present in the narrative at all moments. It seems that talking about humanity is more coherent within the incoherence of Quantum Physics and the nonlocalities than in a chronological-logical way, as Law attempts, when trying to solve the problems of humans. It seems like an attempt of imposing order and sense for something that lacks them both. As Brazilian songwriter Renato Russo sang: “it is necessary to love all the people as if there were no tomorrow, because if you stop to think, there actually is not”. Similarly, in *Antigone*, the belief in reason is fought by hubris: “I was not born to hate, but to love”. Sense, a question that takes humanity beyond reason and as the Ethics of Lévinas show. What makes us sense and feel is the other. The ear activates this sense. We wanted to state that sense is beyond reason and far from the linear notion of time and that it necessarily transcends the

space dimension. We are on the way of thinking about another dimension of existence. Quantum Physics acknowledges the third inclusion. Modern physics does not. The legal thought acknowledges reason as the basis of sense. We propose, from the series in analysis, that sense, so called rational, that makes sense, can only be when it transcends it all. Otherwise, it is all ideological imposition of speech. The ear inserts the other in the world. The third inclusion happens through the ear, which has no distinction, no filter, and unconditionally hosts and creates the world at the same time. The humanity to come, the third one that is a contradiction of linear thought, brings new airs that make us breathe in relief. The world will never fit within our “head”.

∞

We do not often write numerals horizontally. Neither does the fact that there are eight main characters in the series interest us particularly. However, their interrelation that questions our idea of time and space makes it necessary to write it in a different way. Or, at least, to write it in a less violent way, a way that is more welcoming to listen, that fulfills less and suggests more invention for humanity. A way of writing beyond writing. This is the immersion we propose from now on.

In this sense, text, as seen as the place where we put ourselves in the world via language, can be heard in a distinct manner from what we habitually do. The horizon which is always infinite shows itself simply by looking at a horizontally written number eight. The other is an apparition that does not demand a determined placement, on the contrary, when it arrives, as a creator of time, forces through its lack of order and makes the construction show new ways. On this road, a horizontal one, we can see that the end is not visible – infinity is the place where the one who arrives dwells. Number eight is the horizon of human infinity. Now we can recall what Galeano says about utopia. It is like the horizon, which serves to nothing, except that, as the horizon gets farther and farther as we approach, it always makes us move forward. The other makes us move forward. The

utopia of the other is, thus, out of hard sciences. It directs us, thus, to infinity. When the number eight is put horizontally, we allow it to unite to the infinity that conceives it and mixes together with it – as the people that inter-relate in the series, when they feel infinity they feel such alterity. There is no figure that exemplifies best the Ethics of Lévinas than the other which is the infinity that abide us. This is us existing. Otherwise, we are a rational construction that comes from a limited self within the horizon, which would make the series rationally understandable by the mere relationship of eight people.

These eight people are humanity as an ethical realization. As they do not wait, at the minor sign, without the sound of a horn, there is a novelty. And, completed the improbability of the “flight of the beetle”, habitation is born. We are when the infinite horizon of the other inhabits us. This makes it clear how the importance of the number is beyond a mere encounter of eight people. The semiology it guards represents the continuum that exists between all things, according to Quantum Physics. The relations established by people in the series are not what we all agree to accept as possible, scientifically and philosophically.

We face an encounter that does not allow us to ignore alterity for a second. It seems that we are facing the unstoppable presence of alterity that demands us to recover ethical responsibilities and, additionally, to put ourselves in the world from itself. The other, in the perspective the series allow us to understand, is beyond proximity. We can refer to this idea as long as we understand basically that Quantum Physics breaks the idea of local causality, we are inside that field called “Manifesto of Transdisciplinarity”: global causality,

which concerns the system of all physical entities, altogether. And, however, such concept is not so surprising in daily life. A collectivity – family, companies, and nations – is always *more than* the simple sum of its parts. A mysterious factor of interaction, not reductive to properties of different individuals, is always present in human collectivity, but we always send it to the hell of subjectivity. And we are forced to acknowledge that in our small Earth we are very far of the impossibility of separating humans (Nicolescu, 1999, p. 7).

Perhaps such perception was already there when Shakespeare said there are questions that philosophy can never explain. Maybe the idea was in progress, this fright facing the unachievable, the problem of the long-distance relation, the questioning about the continuity of relationships even if space borderlines exist, these are components that intertwine very often in the narrative of the series and that make us discuss the hyperbolic Ethics of Lévinas and what Derrida calls “unconditional hospitality”. Such unconditionally, such impossibility, which he himself calls justice, would it all be, thus, placed within Quantum Physics?

Lévinas also teaches us that the other is impossible, infinite, that is, as something placed too far of our acknowledgeability, the other is the haunting of the inappropriate. This noisy arrival of the other is a realization moment and not a realization of infinity. As said before, we are far from impossibility before our structural reason. Quantum Physics, the numeral eight written horizontally and its "eternal return" to the other bring up that question. That is, infinity is the very place of dwelling of humanity as human. The self-looking out for the other is a restless infinite situation. The appeal for responsibility, the call for hurry of existing, the wanting for what is next; it all is forever in our days, nights, in our sleep.

TIME ZONES

We must not forget the question of time. As we are talking about distinct continents, of people who “dwell” in distinct continents. However, in the series, it is different from what the time zones tell us. Far from thinking time zones stop us from encountering others, which claims the proximity question as a necessary piece in the game of encounters. Here we are at the insertion of time in otherness. The series shows us that the appeal of the other comes “out of time”. There is no alarm clock for Ethics. There is no time for Ethics, only time as Ethics.

Time is otherness in that dimension. There is no measuring its vastness. It *exceeds*. The ethical excess reclaims time. There is no time of love nor time of hatred. In the structure of thought we refer to, time itself is

what sets us inside the world that cashes in the idea of always being available. In this sense, the question of space and time can be discussed, since the non-linearity of the series evidences what we propose and at the same time that which makes the appeal of Derrida to the topic of an unconditional hospitality – including the residence on the other that steals from me. This is only possible as long as the barrier of space and time is overcome. We are in the time of the other, and if being is time, maybe we are in condition of saying that the alternance of hours as measured by clocks does not indicate limitation, but possibilities of ethical relations apart from time. The other plagues me with his or her nightlife, day life, and evening life. There is no late night in which the other stops inhabiting me, haunting me. The shadow of time brings the other within ourselves.

When a sex scene appears on screen between the main characters of the series, it seems that time also relates to the awakening of the other. Time is the other. The relationship in the scene transcends pleasure, which also constitutes us, gets us activated, “turns us on” as humans when feelings are touched. The scene is an act of donating oneself to the other. Of donating the body to be inhabited by the other. Somehow, when Lacan says there is no sexual relation, this overcoming of time and space in the series makes us rethink such statement. When there is no limit of space and time, there could be a new dimension of habitation, thus, there might be sex. As an encounter. “C+8”.

It is eight people and at the same time they are all the people in the world. The series makes us acknowledge that ethical constructions always involve a third part that observes us. When space and time are left behind, at least as constructions of modern physics. When there is the recognition that the other gives him or herself to us no matter how close they are in space and time, right there, in the infinity of this other time, in this horizontal endless dimension, in the constant meeting, we can understand the ethical responsibility claimed by Lévinas.

If so far we were trapped in an elementary question of proximity in order to feel responsible for the other. If the other is distant and does not constitute us as responsibility, there is, thus, no other, and, hence, no self.

The information is that time itself is the other. In this moment of constant interpellation, if we are always questioned, if the other is the one who makes us, in the non-measurement of a time open to the other, in its own confusion, this otherness communicates with infinity. There are no time limits for Ethics. Ethics of otherness is endless. The other that carries time in it, his son, father and mother, is the very condition of our existence. Time is the creator. And only as Ethics, not as a time concept. Thus, the question of time is hereby established: not as a limit, but as a fertilizing condition of the encounter. We are in the infinite time in which humans meet at every glance, touch or not.

There are no time zones in ethic relations. The other, the foreign, will come. There is no predicting the time. There is no arrival notice, flight or precision. The unconditional condition of hospitality in Derrida is made of surprises. Thus, it is important to highlight: whatever belongs to humanity, from now on, may be imagined outside of a time barrier, within itself, in the opening, foreigners live. They will come. No warning. The condition of humans in the series explains the state of emergency for Lévinas' Ethics. It will be hospitality if there is no schedule. Time zones are inventions to represent geographical places. Non-proximity and the relations of Quantum Physics base and support this Ethics theory. Sleeping, waking up, humans are time and time is Ethics. We are going to be inhabited. The inertia of the human being is the ability to be inhabited.

WE ARE NOT APART

We are not apart!

Even if we were stopped in our space and emotional locales of inhabitation. Stopped, safe within our walls, right there, where the wind blows, with no previous sign, listening to the wind howling, even if only as a mote in the eye of reason. No matter our precise decision of setting ourselves apart in different hemispheres. Even if we believe maps are reality. Even if reason tells us that the “human that is coming” is not. We shall be for the other. Not by force of a proximity relation. We shall be for a planetary cosmological relation, not only as an attempt of warning the global community, not as a summoning. But as the very condition of

possibility. Of pleasuring the world, only possible from this otherness. Not only pleasuring the world, but also all the evil in the world. In otherness there is our tragedy of arrivals and departures, life and death. Otherness, thus, is divine, because through it we inhabit the world. And now, towards our way, this world becomes bigger and bigger, it does not fit within what is on our side, quantum proximity is the ethical responsibility we speak of. Each *quantum* moving moves the cosmos.

In this perspective of infinite responsibility, singularity, which is not singular, appears in every face, which carries within themselves and in the future, all humanity. The eyes, the skin and the physical constitution are only “traces” of an invention that is humanity. Humanity is here and there, being and not being. The principle of non-contradicting is left behind. There is no longer this rational prejudice against the dimension of a third part not seen. The third part is ethics. The third part is hospitality itself. To be in the world is to be on this track. Every moment, everywhere, in the arms of this third part that modern physics and Law and Sociology insist in leaving behind, humanity has multiple faces, as we see humanity in eight people.

When the other inhabits us, we are changed. We leave the self behind. That is what the series tries to teach us. Just look at the African man who gives himself up for his mother. We can go further when the Japanese woman saves the African man in a fight against a whole gang. There is the pedagogy of the other. We cannot be without the other abiding by us. The other will come to save or kill. There are no guarantees in the future. Life, the poet would say, "is only given to those who gave themselves to it." Neither the poet himself could imagine that before saying that there was an otherness that dwelled inside him, even from far, even if not human. Giving oneself to life is therefore taking responsibility for the other that comes. Even if Geography tries to limit the invention of a world without end. As the ear that was touched for the first time with the word love. Love is the word that explains this absence, which is present and ∞.

REFERENCES

- CANDIDO, Antonio. *Vários escritos*. Rio de Janeiro: Ouro sobre Azul, 2011. 272p.
- DERRIDA, Jacques. *Da hospitalidade*. Trad. de Fernanda Bernardo. Praga: Palimage, 2003. 142p.
- DERRIDA, Jacques. *Força de lei – o fundamento místico da autoridade*. Trad. de Fernanda Bernardo. Porto: Campos das Letras, 2003. 145p.
- HEIDEGGER, Martin. *Ser e tempo*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1989. 598 p.
- LÉVINAS, Emmanuel. *Totalidade e infinito*. Trad. de José Pinto Ribeiro. Lisboa: Edições 70, 1980. 312p.
- NASCIMENTO, Evando. *Derrida e a literatura – “notas” de literatura e filosofia nos textos da desconstrução*. Niterói: Editora da UFF, 1999. 424p.
- NICOLESCU, Basarab. *O manifesto da transdisciplinaridade*. Triom: São Paulo, 1999. 24p.
- NOGUEIRA, Bernardo Gomes Barbosa. *É o humano literatura?*. In: FRANCO, Ângela Barbosa; GURGEL, Maria Antonieta Rigueira Leal. (orgs.). *Direito e literatura: interseções discursivas nas veredas da linguagem*. Belo Horizonte: Arraes Editores, 2014. p. 1-12.
- NOGUEIRA, Bernardo Gomes Barbosa. Hospitalidade condicional/hospitalidade incondicional: entre Kant e Derrida, paradigmas que se autodesconstroem. In: DUARTE CUADROS, Rubén Alberto (Org.). *Perspectivas de la filosofía del Derecho y las teorías jurídicas contemporáneas*. Bogotá: Editorial Kimpres Ltda, 2011. v. 1. p. 43-52.
- NOGUEIRA, Bernardo Gomes Barbosa. Imaginar a existência na poesia literária de Mia Couto. *Diké* (Itabirito), v. 1, p. 81-89, 2013.
- NOGUEIRA, Bernardo Gomes Barbosa. O direito como possibilidade de um projeto autêntico do homem ocidental. In: ÁNGEL ALVAREZ, Jaime Aberto. (Org.). *Filosofía y Ética: deliberaciones sobre política y globalización*. Bogotá: Editorial Kimpres Ltda, 2011. v. 1. p. 339-350.
- STRECK, Lenio Luiz. *Porque precisamos de grandes narrativas no e do direito*. In: NOGUEIRA, Bernardo Gomes Barbosa; SILVA, Ramon Mapa da (Org.). *Direito e literatura: por que devemos escrever narrativas?* Belo Horizonte: Arraes, 2013. p. 61 - 66.

Original language: Portuguese

Received: 19 Jan. 2016

Accepted: 31 Jan. 2016