



EMMANUEL LEVINAS & PAULO FREIRE: THE ETHICS OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FACE-TO-FACE INTERACTION IN THE VIRTUAL WORLD

Margarita Victoria Gomez

Prof., UNINCOR, Brazil, mvgomez@usp.br

The objective of this work is a reflection on the ethics of education on the net as a contribution to the face-to-face interaction in the virtual world. We think the ethics is a result of a process of responsible interchange with others. Two important thinkers of the last few decades, Emmanuel Levinas e Paulo Freire contribute each one with one's unique approach to the questions surrounding ethic in the online education: ethic of responsibility and humanist ethic. Almost no attention has been paid to examining their views on ethic in online education, but this article, in part, fulfills a gap and attempts to mediate their two positions towards a broader critique of face-to-face in virtual world. This work shows some implications of interaction in the virtual world and questions the possibility of the paradox of face-to-face being virtual. The experiences as a professor of web-courses about Paulo Freire, at Latin American Council of Social Sciences and the theoretical revision (Freire, 1970, 1999, Levinas, 1980, 1997, Gomez, 2004,) contribute to this reflection. The results suggest that ethics of responsibility does not allow fleeing from the Other who demands attention, listening and dialog to speed up the learning process. By utilizing both Levinas and Freire, it is argued, against a conservative pedagogy based on an instrumental ethic and in favour of a participatory pedagogy that can help strengthen the learning.

Key Words: ethics of responsibility, net-education, teacher education

INTRODUCTION

At this time of the webs, I question myself and invite you to join me to think about learning and what making net-education means, how we can have a face to face interaction in the virtual world and what it means for human education. As a professor of online education courses, which are courses taken on the Internet, I had a discussion on political, methodological and pedagogical challenges of this modality in social sciences (Fourth Conference Latin-

American and Caribbean Social Sciences, 2006) and on the kaleidoscope of identities in the net society (First International Forum-Applied epistemology "The kaleidoscope of identities", 2006). These meetings have promoted a series of academic activities aimed at stimulating debate and reflection necessary for the renewal of critical thinking in Latin-American and challenges for the social sciences. We considered that the changes originated from the usage of internet in the various social spaces are questioning the teaching and learning and generating a new sociability resulting from the human density in the virtual sphere. The cyberculture generated by the omnipresence of information, through the interconnected interactive documents and through mutual diachronic and asynchronous communications that occur between groups and reflects on social life (Cf. Gomez, 2004).

The cyberculture results, in part, from the use of personal computers. The Internet has contributed to education, but also led to conflicts over privacy, intellectual property rights, ownership of software, censorship, xenophobia, terrorism and sexuality bringing up ethic issues. The use of the Internet creates virtual communities that propagate certain ideologies and worldviews. The Computer Ethics Institute (2008), for example, studies, coordinates and disseminates the intersection of innovations in Information and Communication Technologies (ICT), business interests, regulations and other public policies. One of the hallmarks of the organization is "Ten Commandments for Computer Ethics" which consists of a core list of prohibitions for computer use, to maintain privacy and integrity of data describing people. Efforts are made to extract basic guidelines of ethical behavior with the use of computer, guidelines that are applicable throughout the american society. These rules are known as net-ethic, english term that means a set of rules of social behaviour to act on the Internet. Currently, due to other situations and studies, we also refer to the Cyberethics, which is a branch of ethics that studies the ethical dilemma posed by the digital technologies. Following these events, the judiciary in every country implements legislation against computer crimes. The mandate is applied in various social fields by the police. However, in our country the Cyberlaw is controversial, especially when it expresses excessive control over users. The cyberculture is a reality made by men and women, and it shows the education of people, their world view, the strategies they use to mobilize the world and within the network.

The cyberspace is a social phenomenon, which is studied including the most diverse theoretical and methodological standpoints, by several areas of the knowledge, by philosophers (Levy, 2000; Serres, 1995), psychologists (Turkle,

1997), semiologists (Johnson, 2001), sociologists (Castells, 2000; Latour, 1998), and educators (Pallof & Pratt, 1999; Demo, 2006; Belloni, 1999; Singh, 2001; Gomez, 2004, ANUIES, 2004), and which contribute to the debate. Especially with regard to the learning through the internet, it has been unavoidable to rethink the face-to-face in the virtual sphere that occurs, beyond the vision and perception, in the sensibility of the man or woman that enters the internet, with all these impasses, in order to learn through the meeting with others. It's a social and cultural fact that challenges the social sciences and education.

In our experiences as professors of courses about Paulo Freire, at Virtual Campus, digital domain, of Latin American Council of Social Sciences, we perceived that students gathered round an educational project referenced in the Freire's pedagogy.. The teaching strategies enabled them to make use of the devices on the Virtual Campus for their learning.

In this case, the Methodology was flexible and used the collaborative devices of the Virtual Campus, offered by *FirstClass* software, such as: chat, forum, e-mail, and others. The didactic material (course plan, bibliography and softwares) was sent to each participant to his/her personal or professional address in a CD-Rom kit, and was also available online at Virtual Campus. The basic procedures in the teacher education comprised: the purpose presentation, pre-register, enrollment, course beginning, students' presentation, teachers, staff; support and sensitization for the development, using *FirstClass* interface and interactive communication method, basic bibliography, links orientation for research, in Spanish and Portuguese, reading some advice and reflections around the theme, conferences, questions, online and face-to-face dialogs among the students, students and teachers and from the teachers to one, many or all students. The students' interaction, at most in groups of twenty five, was among the "classmates", the teachers' team and the technological support team; thematic systematizations were implemented, text readings by the teachers, that also emitted their opinion and evaluation. This transversal combination of elements allowed a production and publication of books, in a printed and online version, which are kept available at Latin American Council of Social Sciences web site and are references for other courses. The virtual meetings were developed in forum and other face-to-face activities. This experience showed the way of necessary acts to pedagogical practices done by the web. According to the Fourth Conference, we can consider that these courses succeeded because they had an authentic identity and, therefore, kept faithful to the critical

sociology, of democratization of the knowledge production and the potentiality of the human and digital convergence (Gomez, 2008).

This data, collected from assessments of pupils, shows us that the incident was due in part to their willingness to know this educator and his proposal, the fact to consider their culture and their knowledge. Their expertise shared is donated when inserted in social movements and in the institutions which act as teachers. Another result was the collective publication, the e-book *Paulo Freire: contribuciones para la pedagogía* [Paulo Freire: contributions to pedagogy] (Gadotti et.al., 2008).

These activities enable connections with others and give visibility to one of the many works of online education. Just like this experience of online education, based on a humanistic ethic, there are in the virtual and real world, others that deserve to be mentioned, however they are not specifically online courses.

We can refer to the excellent discussions and actions in favour of ethics on the Internet promoted by scientists, such as the International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility (INES, 2008). INES is an independent nonprofit organization which has a commitment to promote reflection and action for disarmament and international peace, ethics in science, the responsibility of scientists and responsible use of science and technology for sustainable development. Their actions in this regard, influence the impact that science and technology have on society and education. The official INES website (2008) reports that the network was founded in Berlin in 1991 and today has more than 200 organizations and individual members. This site is already a practice based on the humanistic ethic and it shows educational and research activities that are carried out by its members.

Moreover, Scientists for Global Responsibility (SGR, 2008) is also an organization that values the transparency, the accountability, the peace, the social justice and the environmental sustainability. Based on these principles, they conduct researches and education by providing a support ethics for the network development formed by natural scientists, social workers, engineers, professionals in information technology and architects.

With this brief presentation is clear that Internet use has led to the emergence of ethical issues. Here we will pause to think online training of teachers. We, on one hand, want to highlight what is happening in the experiments and, moreover, show some differences between a distance-learning courses on the Web and the ones before the Web.

The traditional courses of UNED (Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia, Spain) or Open University (UK), for example, at that time, were done by printed material, followed by behaviorist's orientation. The students established a correspondence with the teacher, making use of the conventional mail mainly. The appointment was virtual; each one in one's place established a correspondence with the other (s). What is interesting, today, is to correspond using a telecommunication system and the digital mediation, that allows us to open spaces to chat using voice, text and videoconference.

This correspondence, possible by the connectivity, interactivity and interaction, on one hand, creates and incorporates a face-to-face, a certain presence that each one elaborates in a different manner to relate to the others.

The interactivity is "an act or faculty of an exchange dialog between the system user and the machine, through a computer equipped with a visual screen, the connectivity and the capacity or possibility (of a computer, device, operational system, program, etc.) of operation in the web" and the interaction is the "Shared activity or work, where there are reciprocal changes or influences" (Houaiss, 2001).

In this correspondence, in interpersonal communication that socializes in Internet courses, we find elements that differ and show other differences between the face-to-face in the classroom and the face-to-face on the web. We know that, sometimes, face-to-face interaction can make people more distant instead of bringing them closer, and it can also happen in the education on the Web.

We have some degree of certainty: we can narrate pages and pages of successful experiences and others not so successful, of criticism and concrete practices, but the net is no guarantee of anything and even less for development of face-to-face made possible by the responsibility and for relationships of with others in the virtual space, which is the subject on which we reflect on this work.

Considering this, we intend to describe some topics related to online education on the Web, from the ethical and pedagogical proposals that support them. We also intend to reflect on the kind of contribution the ethic can give to the elaboration of face-to-face interaction in the virtual educational space. In these studies, we defend education as a social fact, a web itself, which takes place in the real-virtual space supported by the principles of Freire's popular education. In this sense, the technology comes to contribute with peoples' connection and not to explore the earth and/or contaminate the environment.

For the development of the research, we have considered our own experience as methodological device and we have sustained the importance to think about the development of the face-to-face interaction in the virtual space starting from humanistic education that promotes strategies learning to mobilize students and teachers to participate with responsibility together with the others. Therefore, establishing a line between two thinkers on ethics that can contribute to the development of this proposal.

Thus, with some additional elements, today we continue our considerations and resume the net-education within the perspective of ethics. For this purpose, we call upon the Brazilian educator Paulo Freire (1921-1997) and the Lithuanian philosopher Emmanuel Levinas (1906-1995), who are thinkers that, as stated by Ernani Maria Fiori (1975), think the existence not the ideas. My only personal contact with Paulo Freire was in 1988, when he held a lecture at the Education Department of the University of Sao Paulo (USP), in Brazil. At that time we tried to set a meeting that has never happened. However, I have continued reading his work, which started in 1986 in the Science of Education, in Argentina, and continued in the doctorate advised by Professor Moacir Gadotti and until now as a university professor. I first heard about Emmanuel Levinas through the study of the doctor's degree of Professor Benedito Eliseu Cintra, published with the title *Paulo Freire: entre o grego e o semita* [Paulo Freire, between the Greek and the Semite] (1998) and at a lecture held by Enrique Dussel at the occasion of the Social World Forum 2002, held in Porto Alegre. It is about two authors, Emmanuel Levinas and Paulo Freire, who were not contemporary of the Internet, but who thought the human being historically and socially situated and technology as an appropriate instrument to connect people among themselves, empowering the human dimension and not the earth exploration and the contamination of the environment. These authors allow us to think that is possible to use the Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) to exercise the face-to-face relationship in the virtual space because it is from the human actions that comes the possible networking for living in a society. According to Levinas, technology must be recommended because it encourages all the democratic liberal values that frequently stimulate the responsibility and the justice (Cf. Hutchens, 2004).

With updated curiosity I turn to these authors again, asking questions on the ethics of the face-to-face in the virtual space. My curiosity finds resonance in the current study group on Levinas, directed by Rabbi A. Leone that has also contributed to develop this text.

CONSIDERATIONS ON THE PROBLEM OF STUDY

Development of face

Normally, paraphrasing Erving Goffman (1980), when we offer to meet the others in a course and study, we try to offer an image. In each appointment, we try to offer an action, a group of behaviors, of verbal or non verbal acts, that allow certain value of participants, as well as ours. We assume a position, that, presume, create an impression of us. This way, it can be a positive social value that the person effectively claims for himself/herself, or that the others presume was the line he / she assumed in contacts. Elaborated in a permanent flow of contacts, the face result of the relation with the others is assumed as an appointment and permits an individual and social dimension as well.

The face is one's own image outlined in terms of attributes that were previously approved by the society (...). Every person tends to try to give an answer to the emotional side, which is provided by a contact with others. A person has, is or maintains one side when the line that effectively follows presents an image of itself entirely consistent, supported by trial and evidence submitted by the other participants and confirmed by demonstrations transmitted through impersonal agencies in the situation (Goffman, 1980) [Our translation].

A set of events in social interaction where the evaluations are manifested was implemented. According to Goffman the face-to-face interaction is the reciprocal influence of individuals on the actions of each other, when in immediate physical presence. In the representation the individual uses a façade that is an intentional or unconscious modeled expression that works in a regular or fixed way. The development or activity of a certain participant influences the other participants. What happens is a simultaneous process of learning and of non-learning, elaborating a representation that, when accepted, becomes a celebration.

Thus, the face-to-face develops itself according to certain social norms with the objective of not leaving the person discredited. Maintaining the reputation involves learning attitudes that are accepted to live in society. This analysis is in fact an ethics attempt to follow social norms, often without foundation.

The "face-to-face" can be understood from the aspects of language, interaction, co-construction of meaning, with the prospect of ethnography of science and social organization of perception through the use of language. Charles Goodwin

(2008), Professor of Applied Linguistics, University of California in Los Angeles, California, in his investigations understands that humans construct in society, the cognitive and cultural world they inhabit. He considers the construction of the structure of the interactive speech as a social practice. Our work does not focus on his study, but we can not ignore the contributions that can lead to a deeper study of the processes of speaking, the structures of the Organization for one ecology of the action and interaction in the virtual world. In previous works (Gomez, 2004) we refer to studies of Jerome Bruner, to understand the interaction in the development of human communication across the network. This study has found that acts of speaking the language with the locution and expressions to indicate what is intended in certain circumstances. The nexus between the words, the relationship of these expressions or other forms, together with the reference, the field of meaning. The reference rarely reaches the timeliness of an expression and is only defined and is subject to the polysemy, hence, its meaning is always ambiguous and indeterminate. If something makes sense in the language, is by acts of disambiguation requiring the negotiation of meanings, in an exchange between people. Even so, it can be done by plotting a network of language and design.

Goodwin thinks there are different environments for cognition and action regarding the construction of language. For him, the environment for cognition and action is in constant transformation. That is why we reflect on what the role of ethics is in developing the relationship and the face-to-face interaction in the virtual environment.

What is observed in the appointment between the people makes us think about how this process happens in the elaboration of the face in interaction, in interactivity and connection in digital world, beyond the immediate presence. When talking about the Internet and learning, many questions arise, mainly by the distance. These questions remind us of a presence and, on the other hand, of a necessity of a distance to elaborate the face. In what way does this elaboration differ? Will it be in one's presence or from a distance?

While there is some dissatisfaction with the form of online education, when we speak of internet and learning, we will think of online education, although there is uneasiness related to this modality of education, be it because of the lack of reliability and morality, or because of the lack of credibility, or the coldness of human relationship. We agree that some of the online education proposals still maintain Fordist principles, i.e. education is thought and done based on a fragmented, highly specialized knowledge, where the subject is only another

curricular element. But, proposals of face-to-face education also base themselves in an extracted knowledge and consider the subject only another curricular element. As stated by Paulo Freire, they contribute to a sort of banking education that is supported by information deposits, by data bases and by the mental contents of the pupil in the same way as banking deposits are made, may they be in form of printed or digital notes. This is a concept that “attempts to control thinking and action, leads women and men to adjust to the world, and inhibits their creative power” (Freire, 2007). In other words, education as an instrument of oppression and not education as the practice of freedom. Today, when the banking model of education or neo-banking detaches itself, to be interested in entertainment or in packages of knowledge sold by Internet, creating a big dazzle that makes us believe that it serves to a pedagogical way, the subject became liable to manipulate and not to relate to the culture.

This way, questioning the Web education mode reminds us of a presence and, then, the question comes: where does this presence take place? We can say, straight away, that it takes place in the e-mail writing, in the reply of a message received, in listening to the other’s voice, which can happen in a chat with audio or in a videoconference. This presence, even if it’s open and transparent, still conserves the person’s mystery. However, we can’t always establish a good relationship in this kind of courses, because sometimes some unethical and not very nice contacts may happen. For example, when a tutor or a student doesn’t answer the e-mails or make himself/herself open for dialogue, when one of them logs in with another person’s password and pretends he/she is another person, creating a certain relationship, or when the absences or silence serve as an obstacle for the dialogue and the learning process. Other examples, also, in education happen when people send racist messages in orkut from a group of students to another, or send fraudulent e-mails, to the shame of slander, defamation or libel of a teacher, a student or an institution, the violation of professional secrecy, the violation of copyright and so many others who are legislated under the Penal code.

In face-to-face situations this can also happen, but the face brings a certain corporality, which becomes more indirect in virtual spaces. From the examples mentioned, we can say that, in Latin American Council of Social Sciences courses, we didn’t know each other personally. The courses were totally taken into the virtual campus space. During the process, the participants were introduced to each other, exchanging e-mails with the topic discussions and the elaboration of the activities, the texts were written, resulting in the publication

of a book, printed and electronic, a digital one. A relationship was created by correspondence and, even though there were limits in the language, in the technology or in the expression of the thoughts, it was possible to mix polarities and perceptions and, the most interesting is that the presence was not excluded. In other words, the interesting of all this is that, in a certain way, there was a feeling that made the people want to know each other personally. The release of the book in the World Social Forum 2003, made it possible for the ex-students, the authors, to show their faces, which celebrated friendships and other relationships that could last longer. What they had imagined, from the physical description of the person or from the written and shared texts, was confirmed or not. Cultural elements were also confirmed in the meeting. In contemporary life, these meetings, the virtual courses, are a way to make us more powerful and able to be produced in the globalized world.

The experience allows us to think and share our own experiences to enrich the expression, not forgetting to make some critiques to the process, once we are involved in it. Anyway, it is a way to show directions.

In a prior study (Gomez, 2002), we considered that technology results from a social knowledge process – it is impossible to ascribe human form or attributes to a computer, let alone to demonize it – and the computer usage is the right of the people; so politics have to make this possible within public spaces, both urban and rural. In these studies we've considered that the education takes place in the real-virtual space, supported by the principles of popular education. We understand that the education is neither a service nor a commodity, it is not neutral either; it is a political act that demands reading, understanding, critique, creativity and transforming the world when necessary, from the contextualization, from the text-context relation; from the unfinished subject, result of a social and historical process; from the political-pedagogical organization; from the culture of silence, where we can find the word unsaid or the act of saying, which spins the web from the pronouncement and the dialogue methodology.

Context: beyond the generations - an educational action with the oppressed

When Paulo Freire published his *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, in 1970, it became evident that the Latin-American thinking was drifting apart from certain philosophical-pedagogical lines with their ideas, theories, themes and concepts. He thinks and makes education as a man situated in his own culture, time and space. Thus, the man and his praxis are the axle of the learning process. He was an educator who used all the technologies available in his time such as slides projector, radio and he could even use the e-mail to communicate. His work was, at the same time, an accusation and an announcement. At this same time, Levinas was already a reference for thinking the philosophy and the ethics of liberation in Latin America (Cf. Dussel, 1977).

And soon began the rethinking of education based on this proposal. In this context, we can see that men and women dealt with social behavior patterns according to each time period, always coming to the ultimate question: the lack or the crisis of ethics.

The education of people included diverse ideas of ethics, indicating certain concepts of man, such as the ideal man, the man of duty, the man as the result of production and consumption relationships. The static cosmos of the Aristotelian-Thomist universe searched for the ideal, virtuous man in a society without classes or conflicts. Within this perspective, education was at the service of aristocracy, the elite, legitimating the difference between classes, without giving the common men the possibility of stating his existence and becoming emancipated. This ethics deals with the morals of the virtuous and elitist man, bringing in fact unhappiness to most of the population, because it does not consider the concrete man, the people, in their social situation. The utmost of the Aristotelian-Thomist ethic is the theological ideal of reaching happiness – for few.

Within the Kantian concept, the human being would be submitted to the categorical imperative of duty and good-will towards people. Thus, duty would be the objective of the bourgeoisie and nowadays we can say that the imperative is "connect!"; stated with the voice of multinational companies, it meets the interests of the financial bourgeoisie. However, it does not work as a model in favor of humanization of people and their education.

On the other hand, the humanist ethic of the Marxian model, in spite of having been originated from the revolutionary ideal in favor of human being alienated

by exploitation, appears to be centered on the axis of the productive and economical system relations that generate alienated work without enhancing personal, psychological and psychosocial conditions. From our point of view, within the education process, those conditions could unchain, together, both emancipating movements and ethics.

The Protestant work ethics, which supported the capitalistic development, finds its summit in the vocational plenitude and the "calling of the chosen ones". According to Max Weber, the movement originated by the Reformation had unexpected consequences in contributing to the mundane ethos of capitalism that searches sheer enrichment as its sole objective and not the cultivation of discipline and an ethically correct life. Both the Protestant ethic and the capitalistic spirit are supported by legality, though "the pursuit of wealth, stripped of its religious and ethical meaning, tends to become associated with purely mundane passions, which often actually give it the character of sport", states Weber (2001). In part, the appropriation of this idea supports the mercantilism of education in the globalized world, and this very often occurs because of the deformation of this proposal.

Thus, with the critical education we realize that it is not enough to work in favor of the ideal and for ethics disconnected of men's social conditions and their educative practices; we also know that the good-will of people is not enough, as the road to hell is paved of good intentions, according to the popular proverb. As we try to invert the logic of bourgeoisie in thinking and making education, we recognize the praxiological man within a society full of conflicts to which the conceptualization, the thematic discussion and the theorization of man disconnected from his reality is not enough. Currently we also have to think about the existence in the virtual sphere.

With this reflection on ethics in net-education and the face on the virtual world, we want to draw attention to the "yesterday" that still persists, and a tomorrow to come, which characterizes the phase of transit as an announcing time, of ethics disconnected from capitalistic values (Amin, 1988). That may be accomplished with the new interfaces, the possible reading, writing and relationship operators on the net. For example, we should not consider the design proposals for online education based on the optic of the World Trade Organization (WTO) that considers education as a commodity. Education as merchandise consists of a buying service-delivery to universities, through alliances of the virtualization in face of higher education imposed for alignment with the global production system. In this regard, the role of teacher would be

subject to the use of digital cultural goods and services offered by global markets (see Rama, 2006). Contrary to the idea of education as a public/social good, advocate imposing, private and commercial, of strategies across mounting reservoirs of learning objects.

The virtual education is one of the modes that assumes transnational education as a derivation of economic globalization that reaches the area of educational services. With cross-border education provided by the use of information technology in digital communications systems and network access, the World Trade Organization (WTO) considers four modes of cross-border education:

1. Supplies border from the territory of one country to another. i.e.: Ongoing remote or virtual
2. Consumption abroad of an educational service. i.e. Study Abroad (or exchange programs)
3. Commercial presence by allowing foreign suppliers to deliver the service in different countries. i.e.: Franchises or installation of foreign universities
4. Presence of people in other countries. i.e.: Mobility of teachers and professionals.

According to the WTO the education is a commercialization service, which is against this idea of education as public good defended in this work.

According to this idea, in part, we could accept that education is based on class and economic interests, certain powers and knowledge. We are looking for content to fill the head of the pupils and not developing strategies to help think and reflect on it to question their relationship with the world. The financial interests with regard to the provision of contemporary education are clearly on the principles that the WTO wants to impose as valid for the countries of Latin America (Cf. OMC, 1999).

DISCUSSION - EDUCATION ON THE NET

The net-education brings the idea of extreme connection or "devouring". Thus, the net would allow the man to appear and leave the amorphous universe of data and information, gaining existence on the internet through participation in debates and in chats, with the production of a spoken or written text.. Meeting a human need, a desire of transcendence also in the virtual world, man would acquire instruments for literacy and for digital interfaces. The net sustained in

the principles of the rhizome contributes to the interaction. In its rhizomatic dimension, the education admits the connection and the heterogeneity; the multiplicity; the non-significant rupture; the cartography and the production. Its epistemological matrix accepts the complexity and the transversal characteristics that the ethic dimension grants to the net-education when it shelters the other. It allows the other's characteristics and knowledge/experiences to come up, among the participants of the digital cultural circle (Cf.: Gomez, 2004).

The rhizome concept was created by Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari (1983) as an answer to the metaphor of the tree that forks itself and which represents the classical logic that operates through binary and dichotomic procedures. The authors describe the rhizome turning to the image of bulbs and tubers with multiple branches, to designate a semantic model opposed to the conception of a tree as a hierarchy, center and significance order. It is about a non-centered net, developed according to the principles of the rhizome, offering the possibility of expansion from the most superficial to the complex web that makes relationships meaningful. The complexity of the net education in the rhizome concept supposes considering its transversal characteristics to be able to create unusual synthesis (Barembliit, 1992) in the educational process, which is inter/transpenetrated by the productive efforts, the ones that wish, institute and organize. Its transversal characteristics surpasses the verticality, characteristic of the organograms with the pyramidal structures of the curricular organizations and, also, the horizontality, which is present in our daily lives when people meet each other by chance. The transversal effects actually happen when there is an intense communication between the different levels and in the multiple senses. It's a maximum opening to the process itself and to the multiplicity.

We understand that learning is a work shared by the teacher and the student, where both learn. But the net also expresses the idea of "devouring" both the teacher and the student until they become anonymous in a data and information bank, as those who were sucked in, dragged into this situation, lose their very identity.

For the herewith focused question, the ethics in net-education, we have to consider that the relationship established between people and machines in the virtual sphere has a specificity that makes it different. We understand that, if this relationship wants to become true, it needs the Other at the other side of the screen. That Other needs to have a face that is not the mere features of many people, but one that is constituted in the relationship through oral, written or

pictographic language, or through the sensibility of admitting the Other with his/her differences. There the interface, in its most common sense, refers to software that allows the interaction between the user and the computer. Citing Steven Johnson (2001) "the interface acts as a kind of translator, mediating between two parts, making one sensitive to the other" [...] "the relationship ruled by interface is a semantic relationship, which is characterized by meaning and expression".

We understand that, because of this capacity of being moved, the persons can obtain the maximum expression and constitute the educative spaces on the internet through language, links, words, browsers, e-mails, forum, voice, audio and video. Through interfaces, they may develop courses, or still better, a digital cultural circle as semantic-pedagogical devices for setting an initial territory of accomplishments. This circle, which is characterized by being formed of few people, during the face-to-face interaction, calls for the knowledge of the participants and uses the dialogue in order to find the thematic axis where the teacher is the mediator and the student is active, both of them building up, interactively, new knowledge. The link between the digital cultural circles defines the connection on the net that works according to the principle established by Paulo Freire (1970) Nobody educates anybody else. Nobody educates himself/herself; people educate each other through their interactions with the world. This is a respectful opening where there is no individual "I think" but a "we think" as a collective act.

Through the dialogic education it is possible to say the word itself, product of action and reflection. The participation in chats, forums, the choice of a visual identity, the cultural expression in the web, all of them constitute the political act that can come from all possible spaces producing critiques, creativity and transforming actions.

The deepest root of educational politics is in the human being's capability of being educated, which is funded in his/her unfinished nature and of which he/she became aware. Unfinished and unaware of it, historical, necessarily the human being would make himself/herself ethical, able to make an option and a decision. A human being linked to interests and who can be faithful to his/her ethics but can also transgress it (Cf. Freire, 1999).

In accordance with Freire's principles, we understand that education is not neutral, but it is a political act (critical-creative-transforming); reading the world is given by the context, by the text-context relation; the subject is uncompleted;

the political-pedagogical organization considers the silence culture, where the unpronounced word or "the saying" is located, the pronouncement and the dialogic methodology, which is weaving the fabric. According to Serra (2006) however "To the word of the other who sets a question, the subject can refuse an answer, and offer silence or violence. But in doing so, the subject denies himself/herself as a subject, as he/she can only be I as response to a you as long as he/she is responsible in front of and for a you". On the net, there is a said and a saying and "the said, but to relive the living experience that has generated the saying that now, at the time of the resaying, is said once more" (Freire, 2004), that involves the listening and the feeling.

During the dialogue it is possible to say the own word, which is the product from action and reflection. On the web, the participation in chats and forums, as well as the choice of visual identity, and the cultural expression in the digital culture circle constitute political acts that may depart from the possible spaces, generating criticism, creativity and transforming action. The proximity is possible since the data and information on the net are coherently organized in a clear and reliable manner, allowing interoperability. Taking advantage of the semantic dimension of the web and in front of the dynamics of the internet, the learning objects (text, image, etc.) as well as their describing language, it is possible to create a net that interconnects theories and paradigms that allow a new knowledge, but for that it has to be understood that:

The semantic web based on metadata, ontology and technology is making a revolution in education, surpassing the idea of distance and constituting a network, facilitating the meetings and information and scientific communication access. To provide visibility to production, knowledge and subjects is a principle of the web courses and educational democracy. The relation between the student and the knowledge, as well as the cooperative creation forms will be determinant for this new concept of virtual learning space. It may be one of the axes to democratize the access to education, although in our context the usage, legislation and acceptance is only beginning. The metadata and the Learning Object Metadata (LOM) enrich the creation and development process of open network education whenever they allow the usage of digital objects that are described, identified and located through internationally accepted formats. This process facilitates the interoperability that improves the potential of the repertory and the electronic control of the patrimony through transponders (RFID Radio Frequency Identification) and open the Uniform Resource Locator (URL) standards that provide syntax for

metadata and identifiers for the transportation of objects between information services, facilitating the research and the restoration of courses on the web. There is still much left to be studied and thought about these protocols, metadata, languages and metalanguages if we want to avoid making an acritical usage in the local cultural environment. The education and the formation of teachers that are active in superior education will find more questions and criticism than assertiveness; for this reason it will be necessary to think about integrating a critical pedagogy with the technological design and systems (Gomez and Ribeiro, 2006)

Whether or not to prepare the opening for the arrival of the other to the digital cultural circle is an ethical question. Facilitating access to information is a manner of opening by those who organize the spaces of education in order to welcome the other through reception and hospitality. In times of showing receptions, it is necessary to care for hospitality and that which seems to be forgotten has to be taught, as it has to do with the time/space that will constitute the subject that learns. Making the access and the permanence of people possible at the broadband connected by the net is also a question of justice, as the I has to be made sensitive to the you and the other through information and interfaces. The internet was planned, themed and designed by humans and although it seems to be a perfect mirror, it cannot be an existence in itself. It is the of man in addition to the non-human programmed for the computer-net that opens to the responsibility of the other and even to the machines that facilitate the proximity. According to Paulo Freire, in the book *Pedagogy of autonomy: necessary knowledge that leads to educational practice* (1999): the deepest root of politicalization of education is found in the very educability of the human being, based on its unconcluded nature and on the perception of it. Unconcluded and unconscious of it, historically, the human being would be forced to be an ethical being, a being of option and decision; a being connected to interests being able to maintain its loyalty to ethics, or else, to transgress it.

The net is the vinculum and social fact. What distinguishes one net from the other are the subjects and their interchanges with others, as well as with machines, and the union is based on the language. Thus, the net is built on dialogue and interaction between people and machines. Through the net we are plugged to an interior net that can either liberate us or discomfit, depending on how we proceed, i.e. with ethics or egocentrism.

The face-to-face, or "interfaces" in the virtual relationships, involves the principles of an open education that is respectful to others; the participation design of the spaces, of the pedagogical mediation, and of the professional multidisciplinary groups that take part in them.

As an example, the courses about Paulo Freire in the Latin American Council of Social Sciences virtual campus worked out because, in a certain way, they promoted the dialogue characteristic of Paulo Freire's pedagogical proposal. Analyzing and criticizing these examples we are led to others or the same situation, where we can realize it is not the computer or the net the limit of communication and dialogue, but the solidarity and knowledge exerted in the relationship. It is not about having or not the computers connected to the Internet, but it is knowing to whom, against whom in favor of whom we use the net.

Thus, the contributions of the pedagogy proposed by Paulo Freire and the philosophical concepts of Emanuel Levinas are relevant as they invest in the uncompleted human being, the oppressed man, the poor man, the foreigner, the praxiological man and his emancipation. They contribute to think an education that does not harm the dignity of the responsible man, because it gives honor to action and to effort. Through education, they try to reconnect man to his humanity, where the individuality is contingent and the collective overgrows at the opening for communication and for the dialogue.

THE FACE-TO-FACE

We consider that the virtual space, as it is topological, different from the Euclidean space of two or three dimensions, allows the proximity, the face-to-face interaction. And it is about a certain topology that expresses space in a distinct way, when:... it utilizes the closed (inside), the open (outside), the intermissions (between), the orientation and the direction (until, further, behind), the proximity, the adherence (near, upon, against, fitting, next to), the immersion (in), the dimension ... and so on successively, all these being realities without measures but with relationships (Serres, 1995) [Our translation].

The farthest and the expelled become close. As said by Michel Serres (1995), the net is a social bond, a witness of a collective existence and its fascination "does not depend on sound or images of the dazzling discovery that we exist collectively according to the relationships we built up..." (1995).

In the virtual relationships, man experiences his process of subjectivity, making himself the object of his awareness and his. During the transit through the virtual world, in a processing dimension, man can be ethical if he is engaged in this space, if he allows capturing and transcending it through his critical and creative immersion in relationships.

Men and women open themselves up respectfully to the others. "It would be impossible to know that we are unconcluded and do not open to the world and the others, searching for explanations and answers (...) The subject that opens himself/herself to the world and others inaugurates with his gesture the dialogic relationship where he confirms himself/herself as being uneasy and curious, as an inconclusiveness in permanent movement through History" (Freire, 1999).

In Paulo Freire's proposal the ethics is an accomplishment in time and space which does not follow universal and abstract norms, as its axis is the man within a situation, searching to be more. And it was the anthropological dimension, the one that thinks of man (oppressed/of praxis/in potency) related to his existential situations, that allows us to say that there are no finished ethical models to follow.

The relationship goes beyond the computer in the interaction between people, and the software will be able to empower this relationship and this sense of the other in the virtual space or it can make it poor. The virtual moment is almost restricted to the update of the knowledge and the relationship with the others, also touched with a certain educational proposal.

This is the topographical space, drawn and conceived in the experience, it is not linear, and it is understood that the net theory is thought beyond the Web, but not forgetting that the educational system in it is linked and answers or resists, also, to the current economical system. Because of that, it is not weird to feel excluded from this digital and capitalist universe, which excludes to include right away.

In a course through the Web, on the other hand, there may be a student who offends the people and gets expelled, disconnected from the group. His access is taken, as well as his password. And what happens? And when one is not open to the other making it difficult to communicate? And when the expected or ideal attitude doesn't take place? Can we simply get angry at that? And what about the subject that opens himself/herself to the world and others, inaugurating with his/her gesture the dialogic relationship where he/she confirms himself/herself

as being uneasy and curious, as inconclusiveness in permanent movement through ethical decisions?

The man, in his virtual relationships, also experiences his process of subjectivity, making himself and object of his consciousness and his sensitiveness. In the transit through the virtual world, in a process dimension, man can be ethical if, engaged in this space, he allows himself to capture and transcend it through its critical immersion, which creates relationships and may not be ethical making it a lack of value.

We think that interactions in the virtual space are possible when there are relationships beyond the contact. When the information "said" that circulates on the internet allows the "saying" on what we appropriated in the relationship:

We might say that the saying is my exposure – both corporal and sensitive – to the other person, my inability to resist the other's approach [...] The said is a statement, assertion or proposition of which that the truth or falsity can be ascertained (...) said that the content of my words, their identifiable meaning, is the said, while the saying consists in the fact that these words are being addressed to an interlocutor (Critchley, 2002).

The interhuman relationships find limits in the language used for expressing ethics. According to Levinas (1980), "The word escapes vision because the one who talks about himself only liberates images but is personally present in his word". While incorporating the words, according to Critchley (2002), the ethics "is lived in the sensitivity of an incorporated exposure to the other" and not as an obligation or duty.

The face-to-face relationship:

It is the contact with the other. To be in contact: it is not giving to the other or annulling his distinction, nor is it to suppress myself in front of the other. During the very contact, the touching and the touched separate, as if the touched one withdrew, always being there, having nothing in common with me. As if his/her singularity, and therefore it is not anticipable and, thus, not representable, would only respond to the designation. This is a *tode ti* [what it is]. (Levinas, 1974 apud Dussel, 2002) [Our translation].

This contact-separation prepares the arrival of the other. The relationship would result from the sensitiveness and the acknowledgement of the other's humanity

and his/her transcendence. Without it, the Other could become a face without face in the crowd. According to Levinas (1980), the separation allows the relationship with the exteriority, but the relationship with the Other does not annul the separation; it does not occur within the range of wholeness nor does it establish it through the integration of I and the Other. The conjuncture of the face-to-face does not postulate anymore the existence of universal truths where the subjectivity may incorporate itself and where it would be enough to contemplate in order to make the I and the Other enter in a relationship of communion.

There is an asymmetry, an adamant inequality that supports the relationship acknowledging the total distinction as constituting the identity. The originality of all this, as stated by Hilary Putnam (2002), is a relationship between people without narcissism because of the respect for the Other's difference. This is a relationship without interests but with responsibility.

According to Critchley (2002), to be in some way in a relationship with the Other is not confined to the understanding, as the ethics is the relationship. Ethics do not exemplify in relationships. This relationship needs time, because nothing is given in advance, neither the subject nor the knowledge, not even the relationship itself; everything depends on the Other. In the face-to-face interaction:

The face is not something I see, but something I speak to. Furthermore, in speaking or calling or listening to the other, I am not reflecting upon the other, but I am actively and existentially engaged in a non subsumptive relation, where I focus on the particular individual in front of me. I am not contemplating, I am conversing. It is this event of being in relation with the other as an act or a practice... that Levinas describes as "ethical" (Critchley, 2002).

In the face-to-face relationship with the Other the visualization and perception do not predominate, but there is a dimension of sensitivity and the language which, in this case, would be primordial in communication:

From the interpreted sensitivity, not as knowledge but as proximity – searching for contact and sensitivity in language, behind the circulating information that language is – we try to discover the subjectivity as adamant to the awareness and the thematic discussion. The proximity appears as a relationship with the other that cannot be solved in image

and it cannot be exposed to the thematic discussion. (Levinas, 1974 apud Dussel, 2002) [Our translation].

In other words, the relationship with the other is not a moment of philosophical research on the being, as stated Critchley (2002). The other exposes himself/herself with his/her presence through language and through sensitivity, I can't avoid it, I cannot hide behind technology, I cannot run away or kill him. There is no time for a presentation, and there is no one that sets the theme and concept for the relationship to happen, but there is someone who welcomes and lodges, allowing the ethical subjectivity. The time-space of man is the relationship itself that constitutes the subjectivity. Although being temporary, the subjectivity only lodges the other that appears there, because his/her presence cannot be anticipated. In the relationship, it is through the rupture with the I that the reception of the entirely different Other occurs. According to Levinas (1997), in the ethical relationship the other presents himself/herself as an absolute other, "but this radical alterity in relation to me does not destroy or deny my freedom".. In spite of this, we have to recognize that in a time of complex technological mediations the denying of the other and the culture of the silence are still strong, and it is exactly this that makes them powerful.

Freedom is difficult when you are submitted to an exterior law or the will of another person; it is the difficult freedom of heteronomy, the condition of being under the domination of an outside authority, but it is the only one possible. This presence or absence of interest or of responsibility towards the other is what defines ethics.

THE ETHICS OF RESPONSIBILITY

I do not know if Jesus had the Internet in mind when he told his unbeliever disciples to throw their nets at sea (Istoe, 2000) is what the Italian Bishop Claudio Giuliadori said to announce the entrance of the Catholic Church on the Internet to attract more supporters. The Catholic Church, like other institutions, is also concerned with the expansion of the Internet in everyday life. That reflects what the official document "ethics and the Internet," presented at the last assembly, in the Vatican from February 25 to March 1, 2002 by the Pontifical Council for Social Communications. This document discusses the enormous advantages that the Internet can bring, but it also reflects on its ethical problems.

For the Catholic Church, the Internet can help with the Liberation of people as well as their alienation. The digital divide, pornography, virtual terrorism, pedophilia are some of the situations of concern.

Solidarity and responsibility would be the pillars of ethics. You may think that this idea of ethics approaches to the concept of ethical responsibility Levinas and the ethics of emancipation of Freire.

Levinas was Karol Wojtyla's philosophy teacher. When he became Pope, John Paul II, invited him to Castel Gandolfo. From their readings, Joao Paulo II, had the conviction that the Other was not the hell described by Sartre, but a vital necessity of man (Cf.: *Le monde*, 2005).

In the 80's, Levinas had established cordial relations with John Paul II, since he was a Cardinal, to attend philosophical meetings conducted in Castel Gandolfo. Wojtyla thought the man was an opening to the divine, while Levinas had a moral vision of the face- to-face.

The official document of the church states that the Internet can help make a reality for individuals, groups, nations and the human race only if you use sound ethical principles, especially the virtue of solidarity.

Hans Jonas (1985), a German philosopher of Jewish origin, contemporary to Levinas and Freire, also reflects on ethics and accountability. Jonas develops his reflection on the ethical responsibility in the technological civilization. Without wishing to make a study of the thought of this author on the subject, we believe it is essential to read for dialogue and discussion of humanist ethics in the use of technology. As imperative, and since his ontological study, one could say that swords are good and ploughshares are bad. With that we want to alert the mystification of modern technique. The ethics and accountability have to be inseparable for the Internet to be used for a more humane education. According to this author, the use of the Internet in education must seek an authentic human life.

From here we refer specifically to Levinas and Freire that somehow are open to contributions from other authors.

For Levinas the ethics without interest occurs between sensitive men. The book *Totality and infinity* (Levinas, 1980) begins with the verse Rimbaud: "the true life is absent. But, we are in the world" in order to transcend anonymous life, in order to open up and admit the other with his/her distinction, overcoming the

egomania and the condition of being based on interest. This is ethics as responsibility, as a primordial philosophy and it keeps distance from ethical concepts learned from traditional Western education. "The responsibility for the other goes so far that it reaches 'substitution' (...) that is shaped on the figure of the hostage" (Costa, 2000). The substitution, as it is not a voluntary act, may be understood as: (...) sensitivity (hospitality, reception). The constituted subjectivity singularized as sensitivity and affection is *hôte* constituting itself as *otage*, "a receiving host" of the Other and kept by him/her as a "hostage" of a concerned responsibility before it is even known and accepted (Costa, 2000).

The author explains that the French term *otage* (hostage) comes from *hôte*, from the Latin *hospes*, the one who hosts or the one who receives lodging. Therefore, we think that while taking responsibility for the other, he/she becomes a hostage of responsibility (or the lack of responsibility) to the point of dying for another person. The originality of the substitution resides in the simple day-to-day gesture, in approaching the other through sensitivity and through language – not through knowledge – which is summarized with the expression of Levinas': "after you, Sir". There is an educational transitivity between yourself and the other. We think that there is neither ethics nor pedagogy by anticipation on the net, as it tries to be supported by hospitality and reception of the other, giving privilege to contact, communication and sensitive relationships in the world of information and knowledge. Making use of a terminology used by Levinas, the said, this which is circulating and demonstrated on the net, can be understood as ontology, and the saying as the novelty, the new accomplishments.

Thus, through the rejection of the ethics that operate by ideal, categorical, eternal and abstract norms, the ethics of responsibility and of freedom can be recognized. This means another possibility in favor of humanization and socialization of people, which is inherent to its nature.

It can be argued that a relationship may be interest-free or uninterested, from the perspective of a critical education, when it is offered without the purpose of economic benefits, status or simply recognition. The pedagogy here proposes to take responsibility for educating people without necessarily reciprocal of that hospitality, it is not limited to the simple transference of content. It can take advantage of the learning strategies to raise awareness for participation. This vision is contrary to that one followed by some communities that focus on purchasing and selling information packets. This goes against the aspirations of a hospitable and responsible education.

Neither Levinas's ethics nor Freire's ethics follow the ideal of obligation of the categorical imperative or by production relationships. These ethics do not exist a priori, but they occur in the experience of common men and women that are fragile, limited, suffering, even though they are sensitive and show solidarity. "The ethical subject is an embodied being of flesh and blood, a being that is capable of hunger, who eats and enjoys eating" (Critchley, 2002). The relationship between men and women occurs in the relationship with themselves, with the others and with the world, i.e. in the sensitive dimension. This ethics, according to Critchley (2002), is being experienced in and is being acknowledged in the corporeity in front of the other, as it is the conveying link of ethical subjectivity. Thus, "The relationship that is established—the relationship of teaching, of mastery, of transitivity—is language, and is produced only in the speaker who, consequently, he/she faces" (Levinas, 1980).

The face is not the mere assemblage of a nose, a forehead, eyes, etc.; it is all that, of course, but takes on the meaning of a face through the new dimension it opens up in the perception of a being. Through the face, the being is not only enclosed in its form and offered to the hand, it is also open, establishing itself in depth and, in this opening, presenting itself somehow in a personal way (Levinas, 1997).

This is about a presence in front of a face, an open and generous presence, "incapable of approaching the other with empty hands" (Levinas, 1980). At present, it would be of great value to think of the ethics of responsibility and the ethical of subjectivity within the globalized and interconnected context as well as to consider the policy and the politicalization of people that demand a fair organization of the beings, knowledge and other connected issues. Thus, as this political ethics is not totalizing, it would allow calling for all having a relationship beyond the totalitarianism of ideologies, parties, religions, as well as information that circulates on the internet and the market, which today also dominate the virtual space. It would be a call for an education that allows reconnecting man to his humanity.

Education as communication and dialogue, which are dimensions where men and women express themselves, is supported by the relationships with others, leaving channels open for new possible connections. Understanding man as being connective is equal to acknowledging the culture, the educative system and the intellectuality that operate transversally in Freire's pedagogy. We can say that education is a possibility to be built as long as there is the meeting and the reception of the other.

Freire affirms the need of communication pedagogy, considering that the one who dialogues does it with someone on something that may become a new programmatic content. Thus, the dialogue involves the word, language, affectivity, love, humility, faith in man, hope – as an active expectation – of those who try to be ethical and present, as Paulo Freire explains.

A presence, which, acknowledging the other presence as a "not I" acknowledges himself/herself as "myself". A presence that thinks of itself, that knows that it is a presence, that intervenes, transforms, that speaks of what it does, but also that dreams, that verifies, compares, evaluates, values, that decides, and that breaks up. And it is in the domain of decision, evaluation, freedom, rupture, and option that the need of ethics is set and the responsibility imposes itself. The ethics becomes unavoidable and its possible transgression is depreciation, never a virtue (Freire, 1999) [Our translation].

This original, singular existence emerges from the net that promises to devour us if we do not decipher it. Giving us existence on the net as a human and social question results from the relationships that are peculiar to be now in the connection, which sets us free from the monotony and the anonymity. Thus we allow the other to come to existence and extend himself/herself in a social and collective existence.

Promoting times and spaces of accomplishments among men and women, also in the virtual sphere, means considering the instances that interfere in those relationships and interfaces of the subjectivity process.

Although net-education does not give any guarantee, not even of the ethics in pedagogical practices, it does deploy/mobilize connection elements between the beings and the objects and may provoke new accomplishments, as long as it is carried out with responsibility. The ethical affirmation of man in the virtual space occurs in the praxis that promotes in others the restitution of this space as a place of learning. On the web, this location states questions about the possibility of presence and interface, and that leads us, in a certain way, to the concept of the conscious body; meaning that the human being is not only an object, but the mediation between the awareness of the world and the inter-subjectivity (See Freire, 2007).

The connection with the world through language bears a dialogue structure, accepting the total distinction of the subject in the learning process. The contemporaneous challenge is to think and make net-education from a matrix of

problematical, inventive thinking, which allows the knowledge to circulate and the power to take responsibility.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

As we have seen, having reflected on the educational Latin-American context about the development of the face in the virtual space and from the responsibility as a fundamental principle, it is necessary to highlight other social issues emerging.

From a socio-political, in the intimacy, where the experience of face-to-face is woven, the ethical principles of Freire's education and Levinas's ethics are important pillars of the rejection of capitalist values in education in Latin-American when they are introduced, for example, through documents, guidelines of the WTO, which considers education a marketable good. One possible disconnection of these values is not to follow these guidelines and look for a responsible cooperation with other institutions. They consider education as a public good, such as those already mentioned in this work. In other words, it requires institutions and a professional attitude in favour of humanistic education.

Moreover, this work highlights that during the development of online education, proposals should appropriate concepts that allow us to have a vision of a more humane education. Particularly during the development of this text, we have worked with the concept of ethics and face in Levinas and presence in Freire. In this sense, Levinas' ethics refers to the responsibility as a response to a freedom based on social justice. This issue questions the digital divide originated in the use of the Internet. This reflection emphasized that educational institutions have a responsibility to promote uninterested relationships between the students and develop integration projects with society disconnected from commercial interests.

We can say that "I" establishes uninterested relations when positioned in front of the other, student or teacher, to serve the other rather than satisfying its own interests. The responsibility as a response in Levinas and as a decision and opening in Freire involves not accepting the bank education and maintaining the interest of class and of power. In other words, they help to question the content in their relationship with the world.

The virtual face-to-face interaction that is possible within the ethics of responsibility, which is not a ready attribute but the relationship itself, which is

being produced during the accomplishments, allows the teacher and the student to dislocate to other places, other relationships and other knowledge without taking the risk of being caught in the meshes of instrumental ethics to business. The fact of not responding to an e-mail or a demand does not mean that we can hide ourselves behind the screen or the interfaces of the net. In the virtual face-to-face, the ultimate expression in the usage of reading and writing devices (e-mail, chats, forum, etc.) for the opening to the other and for a relationship, will reveal the ethics of men and women. For both Freire and Levinas the "saying" of the word itself based on the "said" is an ethical decision.

As we mentioned before, the technology, in Levinas and Freire's perspective, is a connection and the greatest expression of people, of human solidarity. According to Hutchens (2004), Levinas "regards it as likely that the world consists of a network of social arrangements through which we discover the wonders of our world." Therefore, we appeal to the right to disconnect ourselves from the values of instrumental ethics of the market that tries to impose on us a connective reason. For Levinas this is not ethic, it is economy and for Freire it is an anti-value. We also appeal to the solidarity of people that envision an education that is supported by the connection between beings and the world. There is no doubt that the net raised the potential of information proliferation and knowledge monopoly, of online courses of questionable ethics and the difficulty of thinking a radical humanization through education. On the other hand, we consider that the net is amplifying the planetary ethical relationships around critical education and social movements. There are unsuspected relationships going on in education and therefore we will persist in studying the proximity as stated by these two humanists, Paulo Freire and Emmanuel Levinas, and we appeal to continue to work in favor of emancipation ethics. Thus, this reflection, which encompasses others, aims to open a field of construction and deliberation about the contributions of the ethic of responsibility in drafting the face in the virtual space. Here are some elements presented to you for the purpose of opening the dialogue, and I invite you to reflect with me upon these questions.

REFERENCES

- Amin, S. (1988). *La desconexión*. Buenos Aires: IEPALA,
- ANUIES. (2004). *La educación superior virtual en América Latina y el Caribe*. México: ANUIS.
- Barembliit, G. (1992). *Compêndio de análise institucional e outras correntes: teoria e prática*. São Paulo: Rosa dos Tempos.
- Belloni, M. L. (1999). *Educação a distância*. Campinas, SP: Autores Associados.
- Castells, M. (2000). *The rise of the network society*. 2nd Edition.. U.S.: Blackwell Publishing.
- Cintra, E. (1998). *Paulo Freire: entre o grego e o semita [Paulo Freire, between the greek and the semite]*. Porto Alegre: EDIPUCRS, 1998.
- Computer Ethics Institute. (2008). *Providing a moral compass for the ocean of information technology* Retrieved: <http://www.computerethicsinstitute.org/>
- Costa, M. L. (2000). *Lévinas: uma introdução*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
- Critchley, S. (2002). *Introduction*. In Critchley, S.; Bernasconi, R. *The Cambridge companion to Levinas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1983). *Rizoma*. *Introducción*. México: Premia.
- Demo, P. (2006). *Formação permanente e tecnologias educacionais*. Petrópolis, RJ: Vozes.
- Dussel, E. (1977). *Para uma ética da libertação latino-americana*. São Paulo: Loyola.
- Dussel, E. (2002). *Ética da libertação: da idade da globalização e da exclusão*. 2.ed. São Paulo: Vozes.
- Fiori, E. M. (1975). *Aprenda a dizer a sua palavra*. In: Freire, P. (1975). *Pedagogia do oprimido*. 2.ed. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.
- First International Forum -Applied epistemology "The kaleidoscope of identities." (2006). Guadalajara, Mexico: CUCSH, November.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Herder and Herder.

Freire, P. (1999). *Pedagogia da autonomia: saberes necessários à prática educativa* [Pedagogy of autonomy: necessary knowledge that leads to educational practice]. Rio de Janeiro: Paz e Terra.

Freire, P. (2004). *Pedagogy of hope: reliving pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group,

Freire, P. (2007). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Continuum.

Fourth Conference Latin-American and Caribbean Social Sciences. (2006). *Distance education: policy challenges, methodological and educational for the social sciences*. Rio de Janeiro.

Gadotti, M. et.al. (2008). *Paulo Freire: contribuciones para la pedagogía*. Buenos Aires: CLACSO. Retrieved: <http://bibliotecavirtual.clacso.org.ar/ar/libros/campus/freire/>

Goffman, E. (1980). *A elaboração da face: uma análise dos elementos rituais na interação social*. Rio de Janeiro. Francisco Alves. In.: Figueira, S. (Org.). (1980). *Psicanálise e Ciências Sociais*. Rio de Janeiro: Francisco Alves, p. 76-114.

Gomez, M. V. (2002). *Educação em rede: o processo de criação de um curso Web*. Tese (Doutorado em Educação) – Faculdade de Educação, Universidade de São Paulo.

Gomez, M. V. (2004). *Educação em rede: uma visão emancipadora*. São Paulo: Cortez/IPF.

Gomez, M. V. (2008). *Dispositivos de la educación en red que se procesan en subjetividades democráticas*. In: Gadotti, M. et.al (comps) (2008) *Paulo Freire. Contribuciones para la pedagogía*. Buenos Aires: Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales. Retrieved: <http://bibliotecavirtual.clacso.org.ar/ar/libros/campus/freire/19Gome.pdf>

Gomez, M.V.& Ribeiro, R. (2006). *Metadata - Learning Object in the design of open and distance education*. In: *The 2nd International Open and Distance Learning (IODL) Symposium (September 13-15,2006) Lifelong open & flexible learning in the globalized world, 2006, Eskisehir. Proceedings*. Eskisehir : Anadolu University, v. 1. p. 525-534.

- Goodwin, C. (2008). Research projects. Retrieved: <http://www.sscnet.ucla.edu/clic/cgoodwin/projects.htm>
- Houaiss, A. (2001). Dicionário – Houaiss de língua Portuguesa. Rio de Janeiro: Objetiva.
- Hutchens, B. C.(2004). Levinas: A guide for the perplexed. New York: Continuum publishing.
- INES. (2008). International Network of Engineers and Scientists for Global Responsibility. Retrieved: <http://www.inesglobal.com/>
- Istoé (2000) nº 1590, São Paulo, Brasil, 22 de Mar.
- Johnson, S. (2001). Cultura da interface: como o computador transforma nossa maneira de criar e comunicar [Interface culture: how new technology transforms the way we create and communicate]. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar.
- Jonas, H. (1985). The imperative of responsibility: in search of an ethics for the technological age. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Latour, B. (1998). De la mediación técnica: filosofía, sociología, genealogía. In: Domenech, M; Tirado, F.J. (comp.) Sociología simétrica: ensayos sobre ciencia, tecnología y sociedad. Barcelona: Gedisa. Le Monde, 7 May 2005.
- Levinas, E. (1974). Autrement qu’être ou au-delà de l’essence. Paris: Kluwer Academic.
- Levinas, E. (1997). Difficult freedom: essays on judaism. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Levinas, E. (1980). Totality and infinity: an essay on exteriority. New York : Springer.
- Levy, P. (2000). Cibercultura [Cyberculture]. São Paulo: Ed. 34.
- OMC (1999). Introducción al Acuerdo General sobre el Comercio de Servicios. Ginebra, Suiza: Organización Mundial de Comercio, Secretaría.
- Palloff, R. & Pratt, M. (1999). Building learning communities in cyberspace: effective strategies for the online classroom. 1. ed. São Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers.

- Putnam, H. (2002). Levinas and judaism. In Critchley, S.; Bernasconi, R. *The Cambridge companion to Levinas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rama, C. (2006). *La tercera reforma de la educación superior en América Latina*. Buenos Aires: Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- Serra, P. (2006) Levinas e a sensibilidade como comunicação originária. Retrieved on 20 Jun, from <http://bocc.ubi.pt/pag/serra-paulo-levinas-sensibilidade.pdf>
- Serres, M. (1995). *Atlas*. Madrid: Julliard.
- SGR. (2008). Scientists for Global Responsibility. Retrieved: <http://www.sgr.org.uk>
- Singh, H. (2001). Introduction to learning objects. Paper presented at the July 2001 Washington eLearning Forum. Retrieved April 10, 2003 from the <http://www.elearningforum.com/meetings/2001/july/Singh.pdf>
- Turkle, S. (1997). *Life on the screen: identity in the age of the Internet*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Weber, M. (2001). *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism*. Translated by Talcott Parson. New York: Routledge.