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Abstract
Identity politics promoted by the 212 Movement has led to increased intolerance in society. This study captured this problem through the perspective of Emmanuel Levinas’ Ethics. According to Levinas, the act of intolerance occurs because we see the Other, not with ideas, ideologies, teachings, doctrines, interests, and religion that should be upheld above all things. Our attachment to the ideas we have about others often makes us fail to treat them as humans because we are prevented from encountering them directly. For this reason, this study aims to find out the negative consequences caused by the 212 Movement through the philosophical perspective of Emmanuel Levinas’ ethics. With descriptive methods, literature study, and a qualitative approach, the results of the study showed that identity politics carried out by the 212 Movement could not be justified in ethical relations. The 212 Movement saw other human beings as objects that can be used to achieve their personal or group goals. The movement has controlled and exploited their fellow believers, and not reluctant to carry out hateful propaganda to people outside their group. Levinas ethical relations open a new type of relations that are different from idea-based relations. Encountering others makes us realize that they are not merely skin, flesh, and blood that can be destroyed just like that.
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I. INTRODUCTION
This study was about identity politics marked by the emergence of the 212 Movements as a group that supposedly fighting for the interests of Muslims in Indonesia. This study will review the movement using the ethical approach of Emmanuel Levinas, a contemporary ethic philosopher from France (1906-1995). The 212 Movement referred to in this study was a large-scale demonstration (initially claimed by the organizers to be attended by approximately seven million Muslims) demanding that the non-active Jakarta Governor, Basuki Tjahaja Purnama (BTP) be tried on charges of insulting Islam due to his statement on the Thousand Islands in September 2017. Some people predicted this was only a momentary phenomenon and would stop once BTP is legally processed (imprisoned). However, lately, it turned out that the 212 Movement was not just a political intolerance towards non-Muslims, it continues expanding, and its effects began to spread to the social level. The movement had opened the flood gate of “identity awareness” and “initial ideas” of how a group of people viewed other people. This study sought to provide a picture of daily life interactions which is strongly influenced by our ideas and thoughts about the people we met, so that often unknowingly they were just seen as objects. Therefore, the positive outlook offered by Levinas in this study invites us to experience true encounters with other people and their diversity in the context of the 212 Movement, which is against such diversity. It is only in encountering another person that ethics is born.

This is because in encountering the others, we are not dealing with mere objects or beings, but what Levinas refers to as the ‘face’(le Visage) (Lévinas, 1969, p. 24).
Conceptually, the face referred to by Levinas is not the physical form of the human body. It is not a face that has two eyeballs, nose, mouth, and ears. That is why he believes that true encounter with the others can only take place “beyond” the physical appearance of the faces that we meet every day.

The best way to encounter the others should not be by paying attention to the color of their eyes! When people observe the color of other people eyes, people are not in a social relationship with the Other. Relationships with a face can, of course, be dominated by perception, but what is unique to that face cannot be reduced to perception. (Lévinas, 1969, p. 85)

The face is something abstract and runs very deep. It is the way other people reveals themselves to us. In other words, a face is a way for others to appear before me that is beyond my ability to judge, understand, and categorize.

The face is meaningful to itself (Lévinas & Nemo, 1985, p. 86). Therefore, other people or “the others,” refers to other human beings who are not us, is one of the main philosophical reflections of Levinas.

Because, often we are using the categories of thought that we possessed in looking at and treating others: that they are of this ethnic group, adhering to that religion, having such backgrounds and characteristics, and so on. This is what is called the form, giving another meaning based on physical, behavior, name, religion, activities and others (Lévinas, 1969, p. 178). As a result, we are not open to what can possibly be revealed from the presence of the Other. Our attachment to the ideas we have about others often makes us fail to treat them as humans because we are prevented from encountering them face to face (Tjaya, 2018, pp. 8–9).

It is clearly seen how our perspective on the Other determines our treatment of them: we tend to show bad attitudes, hate, and even violence against those we consider enemies; instead, we will treat well those whom we think are good according to our criteria or are part of our group.

The use of these categories often feels safer because there is no need to meet face to face with the person. Encountering other people face to face makes us feel insecure and uncomfortable. Violence is often born from this insecurity, discomfort, and fragility, which makes us unable to withstand the full reveals of the Other. Humans prefer to cloak themselves with their own-thoughts or even in more extreme actions, humans will get rid of what makes them experience these unpleasant feelings. As a result, other people become victims of our violence. Violence shows our inability to accept the revelation of the Other as who they are (Tjaya, 2018).

On that basis, it can be said that the root of oppression, rape, and murder of others is the failure to see other people as the Others, failure to see the face of the Other. Humanitarian tragedies such as Auschwitz massacre, the Rwandan genocide, the Nanking massacre, the Middle East conflict, the Holodomor tragedy, the brutal Cambodian Khmer Rouge, the slaughter of PKI members, the Trisakti tragedy, the Rohnigya conflict, and other humanitarian tragedies show humanitarian crisis throughout the centuries (E. Y. Saputra, 2018). All discrimination events emphasize the failure of humans to establish relationships with other human beings and all their uniqueness.

Lately, Indonesia’s social and political situation is vulnerable due to the rise of identity politics in its society. Identity politics promoted by the 212 Movement has led to increasing intolerance in society. It is especially so during the national and regional elections in Indonesia. The diversity of races, ethnicities, customs, and religions which have always been the identities of the Indonesian people have been threatened, due to identity politics and intolerance actions (Sanur, 2017, p. 18). It was triggered by the hundreds of thousands to millions of people involved in what was called “Islamic defense actions” or better known as the 212 Movement, which began in November 2016. The movement was driven by a group called the Gerakan Nasional Pengawal Fatwa MUI (the MUI’s Fatwa Guard National Movement) which issued a religious view that the Governor BTP insulted the ulemas and the Koran. The movement consists of various Islamic organizations such as the Front Pembela Islam (FPI), Forum Umat Islam (FUI) and Persaudaraan Muslimin Indonesia (Parmusi) (Perkasa, 2017).

With good and organized funding, the group managed to gather hundreds of thousands of people and staged a demonstration in the streets of the capital city. From the discussions with key figures of the movement against Governor BTP, this blasphemy case was only a pretext for a bigger objective (Nairn, 2017). Therefore, even though BTP has been imprisoned, the “Islamic defense actions” carried out by the 212 Movement continue to be held. Of course, this time the goal was changed, to replace Jokowi’s “regime” which had been considered to be not pro-Muslims. The actors behind this movement began to “frame” their actions in the language and slogans that were easy to understand by their target group to touch their sentiments. This message framing is an art of communication, to convey a message to the target audience aimed to effectively gain their participation and loyalty supported by an
ideology (Supriyadi, 2018).

In this instance, they portray Islam as an ideology of a growing Muslim middle class.

There are at least three main issues that are used as fuel (“the frame”) to defeat Jokowi in the 2019 Presidential Election. First, Jokowi’s government is considered to be not pro-Muslims. Second, Jokowi enact the Government Regulation in Lieu of Law on Mass Organization that is considered detrimental to Muslims, and Third, the Jokowi government enact the 20% presidential threshold policy (Supriyadi, 2018). Also, President Jokowi is often associated with the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) (Hanifah, 2018). Although this issue has never been proven to be true, it is still used to bring down the group’s opponents (Johari, 2019).

These issues are thrown to the public as a strategy on political identity, especially religion, which is still relevant in Indonesia’s political arena. The Jakarta governor’s election and the recent Presidential election are clear examples where religious identity, appears as a political force (Herdiansah, 2017).

Several issues during the campaign seized the nation’s energy, not only the Jakarta but also the Indonesian people, such as when the Al Ma’idah verse 51 case was raised which led to mass mobilization from various regions in the country to come to stage a protest in Jakarta. This then led to the rise of the public cry: ‘I am Muslim, I choose Muslim leaders’ (Sari, 2016, p. 145). This call to reject the Other (non-Muslims) is an effort to solidify the identity and force those who are Muslims to choose a leader who is Muslim too. This issue became a recurring theme in public discourse. It was repeatedly voiced on Friday’s sermons and various other religious events (Muthoin, 2015, p. 283).

Religion is a sensitive issue in Indonesia. Especially so when it is used as an identity politics centered on the politicization of a shared identity or a sense of ‘us’ (Kurniawan, 2018, p. 145). Identity is politicized through extreme interpretation, which aims to get support from people who feel ‘the same’ in terms of race, ethnicity, religion, and other elements (Abdullah, 2018, p. 207).

This was further strengthened with the help of the online media with all its construction which is also affecting the real-life dynamics.

The internet provides an online news site opportunity to provide a space for the public to participate in the discourse. It also gives freedom for the public to interpret the reality that takes place in the offline world, such as criticize certain groups (Pamungkas & Octaviani, 2017, pp. 73–74). Currently, the polarization of political groups identity is also developing in social media. People create their own public space that can be used collectively (Khamdan & Wiharyani, 2018, p. 199). Thus, the construction of identity is perpetuated by social media. Social media users can also track each other and guess which Islamic identity they assume. Identity is no longer a private matter. Now the community is mediated and intermediated by the internet, digital devices, and communication devices in their social interactions. It can be seen that the identity exists, strengthened, and has the potential to continue to be constructed for other benefits.

The identity formed from the primordial pattern has historically been creating conflicting collective solidarity. The collective identity explains how a group creates, introduces, and maintains its group identity as a matter of prestige against other groups. (Nasrudin & Nurdin, 2018, p. 41). Many people conclude that Indonesia is facing a potential new conflict between the state and religion, especially given the high political tension in the Jakarta governor’s election and the last presidential election (Kharisma, 2017, p. 109).

in the realm of plurality in diversity, each group should be able to see the encounter with the “Other” as an ethical moment to ensure that plurality is not merely seen as a rhetorical discourse. Emmanuel Levinas, one of the many experts who also voiced the value of humanity, became relevant to study because he tried to put forward the meaning of the Other (l’autrui) as his basis of philosophy (Drichel, 2012). For Levinas, the Others are opening the horizons of our existence, even breaking into our transcendence (Doren, 2018, p. 156).

Even though humans are not the incarnates of the Divine, their entire existence and presence reveal things that go beyond the realm of human knowledge and objectification. Therefore, humans cannot and should not be treated like other objects (Apriliyanti, 2011). Humans must be honored and respected for their dignity. The uniqueness and diversity (alterity) must be respected. Every human being, regardless of ethnicity, religion, social status, and background, has a noble dignity because humans are traces of the Infinite (Tjaya, 2018). This view is not religious doctrine or absolute teaching but is came from the human experience itself.

So far there have been very few studies that have been carried out on that. There are several studies that have dealt separately with identity politics by the 212 Movement and Levinas thinking, but none has specifically addressed the 212 Movement in Levinas perspective. For example, a study conducted by Herdiansah (2017). The focus of the study is to investigate the facts of an identity
politiciation which was strengthened after the 2014 election and explain its potential impact on the political instability and national integration. According to the study, the stronger identity politicization in Indonesia post-2014 election is inseparable from the use of identity issues by the parties and political elites in gathering supports. The weak party institutionalization helped push the parties and the political elite to collaborate with civil society elites which have some votes.

A study by Wildan (2016) describes the 212 Movement as popular piety and identity of Indonesian Urban Muslims. The study reviewed the 212 Movement from the perspective of popular culture. According to him globalization and modernization have drastically changed the face of Indonesian Islam by expanding religious differentiation and orientation. In fact, he saw that Indonesian Islam was heading towards a form of global Islam or Middle Eastern-style Salafi Islam (Hidayat, 2012, pp. 4–5). The free flow of information through technology and social media quickly spread radical ideas from overseas.

Another study by Sobon (2018) only discusses Levinas’ ethics of responsibility. The ethics of responsibility is the focus when Levinas explains human ethical actions to others. He stated that the Levinas’ thinking was influenced by three main sources: inspiration from the Jewish tradition, the whole history of Western philosophy, and phenomenological approach.

Based on the above studies, it seems that a study on identity politics from a Levinas’ philosophical perspective has not been done. Therefore, this study sought to fill the void by studying the identity politics, marked by the emergence of the 212 Movement from the perspective of Emmanuel Levinas, to understand the true encounter with other people’s ‘faces’ as an ethical relation.

This study will focus on discussing 212 Movement as an identity politics phenomenon using the lens of ethical analysis on intersubjective ethical relationship based on sensibility.

II. Method

This study combines descriptive methods and document analysis. The descriptive method is intended to describe the emergence of the 212 Movement or the “Aksi Bela Islam” as a unit of analysis based on facts as they are presented (Kusumo, 2018, pp. 95–97). While the literature study (Zed, 2004) intended to gather relevant information to the 212 Movement as an identity politics from the perspective of ethical relations with the Other’s faces based on Levinas sensibility. The information was obtained from literature studies, extracting materials in the form of books, journals, newspapers, magazines, or study reports related to the study theme adopted by the author and other sources (Hasan, 2002, p. 11). The approach used in this study is a qualitative approach. This is a suitable approach since the 212 Movement is multidimensional and it has interconnected variables which exact nature of their connection is not known (Alwasilah, 2003, p. 103). Meanwhile, the collection of facts and data was done by browsing the news in mainstream mass media to enrich the analysis. The study was conducted for two months from the end of May to the end of July 2019. The location of this study is Indonesia, especially the DKI Jakarta Province. The DKI Jakarta was selected since it is the capital of the country and the gathering point for people who joined the 212 Movement to stage a demonstration as an affirmation of their Muslim identity.

III. Results and Discussion

The political change in Indonesia, from an authoritarian system to a democratic system, is pushing its multicultural society to return to its primordial spirit. Ethnicity and religion morphed into the most important part of political identity and even became the tool in the political competition. Identity politics was born (Kristianus, 2016, p. 88).

Identity politics refers to political practices based on group identity (ethnicity, religion, or other socio-cultural denominations), which are the interest of the group. Although this is not a new phenomenon, it attracted the attention of social science experts lately due to violent conflicts involving various groups. Conflicts between Tutsi and Hutu ethnic groups in Africa, Bosnia, and Serbia in the Balkans, and conflicts in Middle Eastern countries are some phenomenal examples that show the most obvious, brutal, and destructive face of identity politics (Purwanto, 2015, pp. 61–62).

In Indonesia, this tendency is seen more clearly when there is more room for freedom of expression. Supported by freedom of expression, identity politics becomes a winning template that is usually paired with a post-truth strategy. It is considered to be more powerful to gain support compared to data and facts. According to Executive Director of Indikator Politik Indonesia, Burhanudin Muhtadi, the rampant identity issues that divide society, are linked to global symptoms after the victory of Victor Orban in Hungary (2010), Brexit in Britain (2016), Donald Trump in the United States (2016), Milos Zeman in the Czech Republic (2018), and Jair Balsonaro in Brazil (2018) (Ristianto, 2019).
Identity politics is often interpreted as politics that prioritizes emotional relations while undermining rational considerations.

As such, the choices made are more primordial impulses that do not prioritize public benefits (Fernandes, 2019, p. 9). Choices made based on identity are made because of racial, ethnic, regional relations, and also the similarity of religious beliefs. It is not made based on public benefit.

A. Identity Politics and Its Impact

Religion is an easy target for identity politics in Indonesia. Religion tends to be used as a tool to suppress other religious groups (Ibrahim, 2013, p. 39). One of them is the blasphemy polemic when Buni Yani spread a video which then went viral through his Facebook account (Widiyaningsih, 2018, p. i).

In the video, Governor BTP was giving a speech in the Thousand Islands on September 27, 2016. BTP mentioned QS Al-Maidah Verse 51, which was often used by his political opponents (to encourage voters) not to vote for him. BTP’s statement “Deceived (by using) Al-Maidah verse 51” has drawn widespread condemnation from the Muslim community, plus the BTP’s identity as a Chinese ethnic and Christian makes the case even more controversial (F. I. Saputra, 2017, p. 34).

As a responsible person, because he felt that he had caused such an uproar, BTP apologized to all Indonesian people, especially those Muslims who felt they had been disappointed (Tambun, 2016). The public apology did not disarm the situation, waves of protests continued to be staged through a series of Aksi Bela Islam (Ariefana, 2016).

The demonstrations took to the streets for the first time on October 14, 2016, headed by Habib Rizieq Shihab as the High Imam of the FPI at City Hall (known as the 1410 Action and Aksi Bela Islam I). Aksi Bela Islam II was carried out on November 4, 2016 in front of the Merdeka Palace (known as the 411 Action), the Aksi Bela Islam III was held on December 2, 2016 around Monas and the HI Roundabout (known as the 212 Action) (Agusti, 2017).

President Joko Widodo attended the 212 Action as a bid to meet the protesters and give a short speech. The 212 Action was the biggest actions in terms of the number of masses. It would later become known as the 212 Movement.

Although it is not known exactly how many people came, the crucial point here is that the 212 Movement successfully used the issue of blasphemy to attract many Muslims to take to the street. They described themselves as representations of Islam and Muslims in Indonesia (Jayanto, 2019, p. 12).

In May 2017, BTP was sentenced to 2 years in prison by the judges of the North Jakarta District Court (Humas, 2017).

BTP defeat in the DKI Regional Election followed by the court’s verdict further emphasized that the series of Bela Islam actions that had been carried out were not purely religious matters, but also political matters.

After successfully toppling BTP, they staged another action (the 212 Movement Reunion) on 2 December 2018. Allegedly, this was also laden with political interests as well, because it was held in the political year and the narratives to the public also called for changing the president, although formally the action was said to be only a religious action.

(bbc.com, 2019b). The 212 Movement was repeating the same storyline. It argued that the action showed an increase of faith of a Muslim, but in reality, it was expected to erode the electability of incumbent president Joko Widodo. Various other identity issues were also thrown to the public: descendants of the PKI, anti-Islam, pro-Communists, and fond of criminalizing clerics (bmw, 2019). The campaign did not produce the maximum outcome and Jokowi has been re-elected as President of Indonesia for the second term. However, the impact of the emerging issues has touched the social life of Indonesian. In addition to the religious identity issues spread by the 212 Movement, other issues also reappeared: anti-Chinese sentiment, economic and political injustice, anti-Islamic government, and concerns in the security sector with the active cells of radical groups. The discourse was related to the dangers of the economy controlled by ethnic Chinese migrants scattered on social media and in the community. At this point, the issue of identity gap was inevitable (bbc.com, 2019a).

Also, the campaign to boycott foreign products, as well as the movement to develop an independent economy after the 212 Movement (the action of “defending Islam”) shows how this unrest is strongly felt by the people. Concerns about the emergence of the terrorist group have also surfaced amid the strengthening mobilization of this movement (Sholikin, 2018, p. 12). Also, several acts of violence occurred when the 212 Movement 212 carried out demonstrations on the road (Rosana, 2019).

When devotion to a particular value system continues to be nurtured so that it is politically motivated, symptoms of violent acts may occur and trigger conflicts. By bullying others over their religion or ethnicity, acts of hatred are taking place in the form of rejection and resistance, especially on ideas and institutions considered contrary to their beliefs. This form of rejection and hatred that are often the main cause of mass violence, such
as the 212 Movement efforts to strengthen the value system and perspective of a certain ideology, will ultimately solidify the belief of its followers that their truth is superior to those of the Others (Widyaningrum & Dugis, 2018, p. 34).

It is this kind of ideological conviction that encourages its followers to willingly offer their sacrifice, but it also leads to a lack of tolerance, insensitivity to the atrocities and violence that take place. It is even more profound in an era of democracy where anyone is free to express their ideas and opinions (Haryatmoko, 2014, p. 130). The violence carried out by the 212 Movement was branded as if it was a form of expressing ideas and opinion in democratic life.

B. Philosophical Reflections on Emmanuel Levinas' Ethics

In front of thousands of participants in the Aksi Bela Islam, Riziq Shihab calls for the imprisonment of the Governor of DKI Jakarta BTP and stop the criminalization of ulamas: “Are you ready to defend the country?” “Are you ready to defend the religion?” “Are you ready to destroy PKI?” (bbc.com, 2019a). The call was then responded by takbir by his followers, the majority of whom were Muslim.

The 212 Movement, with its calls that carry its primordial identity, was similar to the call made by Adolf Hitler in the past. His call was simple, but it ignited the Germans' spirit at the time (Levinas & Hand, 1990, p. 64): The Aryan race is an ideal and pure race, and Jews as parasites.” Thus, the sacred mission of the German people was to gather and preserve the most valuable racial elements and lift the group into a dominant position to govern.

(Dixon, n.d.). This call was intended to stigmatize, discriminate against, and ultimately kill those whom the Nazis identified were not part of their race. The Nazis sought to increase the number of “Aryan” Germans while simultaneously decreasing the number of those they considered to be inferior, based on race or their biological condition (Smith, 2007, p. 75).

In Rwanda, a similar call made by the Hutu group. The involvement of RTLM radio in the Rwandan genocide could not be dismissed. RTLM Radio and Kangura magazine spearheaded the anti-Tutsi propaganda launched by Akazu. RTLM radio was more popular with the public compared to Kangura magazine. However, it doesn't mean that the two media compete with each other. Rather, they work together to spread anti-Tutsi propaganda in their own ways (Irenewaty & Widiyanto, 2016, p. 10).

Looking at the two tragedies of humanity above, it seems that the 212 Movement also has the same pattern. The 212 Movement was trying to subdue and get rid of “the others” outside of their group, which is very visible through the calls that the group made (Rizqo, 2017). The 212 Movement is formed as a group that dominates others (superior), while other groups (in this case non-Muslims and moderate Muslims) were viewed as inferiors and to be dominated. This situation triggers human relations problems. This is where Emmanuel Levinas’ thoughts on ethics or ethical acts are relevant because Levinas ethics are always associated with true encounter with the others, not with abstract thinking about human relations (Wolcher, 2003, p. 93).

Levinas is a philosopher who gives a deeper meaning to how humans see others around him, which is called “the Other.” According to him, the Other opens the horizon of human existence, even breaking into the subject’s transcendence. Therefore, a bridge is needed in the form of a meeting or encounter that gives birth to ethical relations. The encounter in question is an encounter with the Other. The Other in Levinas’ concept is another person or fellow human being, another person as a unique individual (Marlim & Jolasa, 2013, p. 13). This view is a self-criticism of the totalitarian spirit that is the absolute ego in the history of philosophy.

Levinas sees all Western philosophy as having pursued totality, building a whole that stems from “ego” as its center. This philosophical tradition departs from “me” and returns to “me” (Lévinas, 1969). This way of thinking according to Levinas is referred to as la philosophie du Meme (the philosophy of the same). “The Same” describes the nature of “the Self” or “I”, who always wants to master and incorporate everything that is outside of him into him. According to Levinas, “The Same” always tries to achieve a totality in which everything is contained. It is into this totality that “The Same” is trying to incorporate “The Others” (Tjaya, 2018).

In modern Western philosophy, egocentrism and narcissism are getting stronger through Rene Descartes, Cogito ergo sum (I think; therefore, I am). Descartes makes the ego cogito (reason) the only mental faculty of humanity that can provide objective certainty. Even the ego cogito (“I”) is assumed to be able to describe reality in a single certainty. Thus, the conversation with the ego of the Other, outside the ego cogito, becomes increasingly neglected because it is only considered to be an extension of self or even a foreign object that can be manipulated in such a way as to benefit the self (Purnama, 2016, pp. 7–8). In this context, the unfair treatment of people deemed as an outsider
or not included in the group was ‘nurtured’ by the 212 Movement, which brought ethnicity, religion, race, and different groups issues to identity politics during the 2017 DKI Jakarta elections and 2019 Presidential Election (bbc.com, 2018).

This is what Levinas meant by the Same in us, that we tend to master and absorb everything else outside ourselves. We want things that are foreign, or we consider to be foreign, to be subject to our control and become identical or “the same” with ourselves. The Other is forced into that totality system, so that we will feel safe, comfortable, and at ease because there is nothing “foreign” or beyond our control.

C. Breaking the Exterior

For the Other to exist, the Same needs to be broken down with another exteriority. This exteriority was not part of rationality, it is the idea of Infinity. The “Infinity” here is a reality which is beyond the knowledge and capacity of the I. This infinity is “other person” (the Other). The totality that I collated breaks when encountering the Others (Widjajanti, 2016, p. 287). According to Levinas, the 212 Movement in its social relation on their identity (religion and ethnicity) should not conduct things as a totality, they must see the difference of the Others.

In this case, Levinas distinguishes two ideas: the idea of totality and the idea of infinity. The idea of totality is a pure theory (epistemology), while the idea of infinity is ethics. Levinas rejects the totality in the ontology which reduces the Other to the Same by promoting freedom. According to him, freedom is the identity of the Same. The Same refuses to feel alienated in the existence of the Other. Metaphysics recognize the idea of infinity as the idea of plurality, that is, the subject accepts the Other as the idea of plurality: the subject accepts the Other as an ethical form (Apriliyanti, 2011, p. 17).

Clearly, Levinas’ ethic is not something theoretical, but rather an existential matter because it is based on a true encounter with another person (Tjaya, 2018). Ethics in Levinas thinking is very different from most other philosophers. Levinas’ ethics do not merely discuss basic principles or moral rules, but rather emphasizes an existential commitment and demand that goes beyond the theoretical structure of any construction of justice values or ethical codes institutionalized in the social sphere (Critchley & Bernasconi, 2004, pp. 26–27). As such, ethical encounters require an ethical conversation that goes beyond ethics itself.

To be honest, Levinas ethics is more accurately called fundamental ethics (Magnis-Suseno, 2000, p. 106), because he tried to show that humans in all their appreciation and attitudes are driven by ethics, that is, responsibility towards others. This primordial responsibility is always borne by humans every time they encounter someone else. Levinas would like to show that the formation of our identity has always been based on a default event that is repeated every time we encounter other people (Magnis-Suseno, 2000). For him, encounters with other people are the most primordial ethical event in humans.

The issues on ethics will continue to develop with the times as if there were no end. Ethical matters arise when relationships are formed between individuals and between groups. This relationship is interesting to explore because there will be many differences between individuals or groups, causing either acceptance or conflict (Yusrinna, 2017, p. 4). In the context of the 212 Movement, the relationship caused conflicts. Every action always involves a subject and object. The subject is in a higher position than the object because the subject can control the object. Violent acts by the arrogant subject are what caused the problems (Pranowo, 2016, p. 84).

In the context of the 212th Movement, BTP was considered by the group to commit blasphemy against Islam, and Jokowi was considered anti-Islamic. The group (the 212 Movement) felt threatened and fought by holding multiple actions and provoking propaganda that sparked hostility between individuals and between groups. In such circumstances, we have not encountered them at all. All we face is just our ideas about them.

True relationships according to Levinas, only take place through a true encounter with other people’s faces, because the face is a significance without a meaningful context in itself (Lévinas & Nemo, 1985). That is, the existence of others as human beings is not determined by any context and any location.

Despite their wealth, social status, ethnicity, and religion, humans are still meaningful to themselves without considering their identity.

Levinas called it the face of the other, it destroys and surpasses people’s plastic images of them because the human face expresses itself (Lévinas, 1969). Therefore, in Levinas’ view, people cannot see, and touch faces because faces are present in their refusal to be subdued (Levinas, 1969: 194).

This face is not something that can be seen, but its existence is manifested in our sensibility. The Other’s faces reveal themselves as they are, naked and without any mediation to be processed by our consciousness. The face is “the exact identity of a person” that cannot be grasped by phenomenology (Levinas, 1998, p. 33). The face of the Others always rejects to be absorbed and used as content,
because it can never be done.

The face never just stays in the realm of being, but it goes beyond it. The face comes from a realm that transcends the existence.

That is why encountering people face-to-face is ethical. People often think that problems will disappear by getting rid of or even killing people who are disliked. In reality, this is not the case. For Levinas, nothing can kill the face. We are only able to kill the abstractions or ideas about the face of other people because the face, or what transcendence through the face, can never be killed.

Thus, face-to-face encounters are the source and the origin of ethics or the ethical, beyond any attempt to formulate universal moral principles. “Encounter with the face is not at the level of pure and simple perception, the level of intentionality that is moving towards equalization” (Lévinas & Nemo, 1985).

In his book Otherwise than Being, Levinas describes the face as an of the destruction the phenomenology If we want to truly experience the transcendence of the face of the Other, we should not approach it just as a phenomenon (such as physical appearance, ideas, thoughts, and certain perspectives, which is part of the phenomenology embedded in human consciousness) (Levinas, 2011:88). Therefore, Levinas invites us to approach others not through awareness, but through the sensibility that we have, only then will we experience the meaning of ethical transcendence.

**IV. CONCLUSION**

Identity Politics carried out by Aksi Bela Islam or more commonly known as the 212 Movement cannot be justified in the ethical perspective of Emmanuel Levinas. The propaganda made by the 212 Movement showed their efforts to subdue and get rid of the Other, the ones outside their groups. The 212 Movement is formed as a group to dominate others (superior), while other groups (in this case non-Muslims and moderate Muslims) were viewed as inferior and to be dominated. This situation triggers human relations problems.

Such great pressure on human rationality often makes them lose their sensibility. The value of human lives is nothing compared to its political interests, just like what happened with the 212 Movement group.

Sensibility is an essential part of human subjectivity, it gives access to humanity, no matter how big the identity difference between oneself and the others.

While consciousness tends to objectify something, sensibility opens us up and allow ourselves to be greeted and touched by others. The voice of our hearts marks the creation of the ethical realm. That sensibility-based ethics is Levinas ethics. The ethics that Levinas wants to build are the ethics of strangers, ethics that make us willing to be questioned, disturbed, interrupted by people we don’t know and even willing to take responsibility for them.

For him, if the ethics that is preached only serve the well-known groups and a particular interest, then that is false ethics. This is also a false transcendence because, in the end, we only seek and serve our own interests. That is a sign that we have been deceived by morality.

Therefore, in treating other people or who are not our group, do not base it on the ideas or abstractions that we have on that person or group. Because such encounter prevents us from meeting face-to-face with them, we can no longer shake hands or sit side-by-side as fellow human beings. When we have formed new relationships that are different from idea-based relationships, an encounter with the Other makes us realize that other people are not merely skin, flesh, and blood that may be destroyed just like that.
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