

Agapic Solidarity: Practicing the Love Command in a Globalized Reality

Author: Rene Sanchez

Persistent link: <http://hdl.handle.net/2345/3294>

This work is posted on [eScholarship@BC](#),
Boston College University Libraries.

Boston College Electronic Thesis or Dissertation, 2013

Copyright is held by the author, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise noted.

Boston College

The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences

Department of Theology

AGAPIC SOLIDARITY:
PRACTICING THE LOVE COMMAND
IN A GLOBALIZED REALITY

A dissertation

by

RENÉ SANCHEZ

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

May 2013

**Agapic Solidarity:
Practicing the Love Command
In A Globalized Reality
Rene Sanchez
Director: Roberto Goizueta**

Abstract

The injunction to 'love our neighbor' is a constitutive element of any Christian ethic. It is frequently found embedded within the triadic formulation of 'love of God, love of neighbor, and love of self.' Because this injunction must always be contextualized within each historical period it was important to explore how one should love the neighbor in our contemporary context. The dissertation begins by exploring the contemporary conditions of pluralism and interdependence. In this context we realize that love of neighbor must manifest in an encounter with the other. The project shows some current models of encountering the other. In showing the inadequacies of each model I also introduce the work of Johann B. Metz and Enrique Dussel. I then construct a process entitled Agapic Solidarity which seeks to use some aspects of the political theology of Metz and the liberation philosophy of Dussel to formulate an authentic encounter with the other. This process honors both elements; the condition of pluralism and the acknowledgement of interdependence. In doing this we begin the process of loving the neighbor which is so central to any Christian ethic. In the conclusion of the dissertation I show some possible applications of the process. The final component is a case study of the undocumented migrant in the United States of America as a demonstration of the process in action. In this way, it shows how the ethical demand can be enacted and embodied within a particular, concrete ethical issue.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction: Old Text, New Context 1

Old Text: Love of Neighbor	1
The Paradoxical Challenge of Pluralism and Particularity	4
Towards a New Approach: Models and Methods	7
Agapic Solidarity: Love in Three Moments	12
Dissertation Overview	15

Chapter 1: Love in the Here and Now 19

Differentiation and Interdependence in a New Key	22
<i>From Differentiation to Particularity</i>	23
<i>From Interdependence to the Colonial Wound</i>	24
The Typology or Model Method	26
The Three Models: Conflict, Dialogue, and Mestizaje	26
<i>The Conflict Model</i>	27
Samuel Huntington	
Dinesh D'Souza	
<i>Critique of Conflict Model</i>	38
<i>The Dialogue Model</i>	39
Seyla Benhabib	
Kwame Anthony Appiah	
<i>Critique of Dialogue Model</i>	46
<i>The Mestizo Model</i>	49
Virgilio Elizondo	
Edward Said	
<i>Critique of Mestizo Model</i>	52
An Authentic Encounter with the Particular Other	54

Chapter 2: The Multi-Dimensional Other 56

Introduction	56
The Levinasian Other: Other Than All Being	57
Critique of Levinas: On Matters of Particularity and Agency	61

The Many <i>Dimensions</i> Where We Encounter the Other	64
<i>The First Dimension: The Economic — Living Labor within the World Capitalist System</i>	66
The End of History/The End of the Economic Other	
From the Productive Circle to the Economic Other	
<i>The Second Dimension: The Cultural — Interculturalidad as Encounter</i>	71
Enunciatory Privilege	
Epistemic Privilege	
Dislodging Privilege: From <i>Multiculturalism</i> to <i>Interculturalidad</i>	
<i>The Third Dimension: The Political — The Subject as Citizen</i>	77
The Rise of “Imagined Communities”	
Phase One: Proto-nationalism	
Phase Two: Forming a National Narrative	
Phase Three: The Three Fields of Influence	
Citizenship as Subjectivity	
<i>The Fourth Dimension: The Religious — Salvation, Redemption, and Purity</i>	84
Religious Authority	
Religious Morality	
Religious Salvation	
The Religious Other: The Sufferer, The Sinner, and The Hell Raiser	
Religious Authority	
Religious Morality	
Religious Salvation	
Conclusion: From the Levinasian Other to the Disrupting Other	90
Chapter 3: Biography as Epistemological Loci: The Political Theology of Johann Baptist Metz and the Liberation Philosophy of Enrique Dussel	92
Johann Baptist Metz: The Sacred Subject in Political Theology	93
<i>The Endangered Subject in Modern/Post-Modern Discourse</i>	94
No History, No Humanity	
An Apathy which Leads to Domination	
<i>Bourgeois Religion or Messianic Christianity</i>	96
Optimism as Cheap Grace	
From Private Theology to Political Theology	
<i>The Eschatological Proviso: A Demand and an Opportunity</i>	99
The End of Time: Promise or Threat	
An Apocalyptic Sting that Innoculates	
Political Theology: A Resurrected Hope for All Others	
Enrique Dussel: The Transmodern Other of Liberation Philosophy	102

Atheism as Protection of the Subject	
The Communal Face of the Other	
<i>The Human Subject as Trans-Totality: Beyond Instrumental Reasoning</i>	
From Problems towards Solutions	107
<i>The Theology of Johann B. Metz</i>	107
The Interrupting Categories of Johann B. Metz	
Memory	
Narrative	
Solidarity	
Messianic Discipleship as Interruption	
<i>Enrique Dussel: The Sacred Other in Liberation Philosophy</i>	114
The Analectical Outlook: Beyond the Dialectic	
The Five Moments of the Anadialectic	
The First Moment: Originating in the Quotidian	
The Second Moment: The Re-Configured “I”	
The Third Moment: The Other which is not of our	
World	
The Fourth Moment: Distinction Negates Extinction	
The Fifth Moment: The Distinct Prophet	
The Transmodern Perspective: Beyond Modernity and Post-	
Modernity	
The Dusselian Other	
Lauds and Lacunae: A Critique of Political Theology and Liberation Philosophy	125
The Ahistorical Solidarity of Political Theology	
The Dusselian Other Revisited	
Agapic Solidarity: A Model for Love of Neighbor in the Twenty-First Century	129

Chapter 4: Agapic Solidarity in a Fragmented World 131

The Love Command in Three Moments	131
Love for a Fragmented World: Introducing Agapic Solidarity	132
<i>The First Moment: Disruption</i>	133
<i>The Second Moment: Agapic Discipleship</i>	136
Remembrance	
Recitation	
Resurrection	
<i>The Third Moment: Emancipatory Praxis</i>	139
Agapic Solidarity in the Four Dimensions	141
Agapic Solidarity in the Economic Dimension	142
<i>Disruption</i>	142

<i>Agapic Discipleship</i>	145
Remembrance	
Recitation	
Resurrection	
<i>Emancipatory Praxis</i>	147
Agapic Solidarity in the Cultural Dimension	148
<i>Disruption</i>	148
<i>Agapic Discipleship</i>	150
Remembrance	
Recitation	
Resurrection	
<i>Emancipatory Praxis</i>	153
Agapic Solidarity in the Political Dimension	153
<i>Disruption</i>	153
<i>Agapic Discipleship</i>	155
Remembrance	
Recitation	
Resurrection	
<i>Emancipatory Praxis</i>	157
Agapic Solidarity in the Theological Dimension	158
<i>Disruption</i>	158
<i>Agapic Discipleship</i>	160
Remembrance	
Recitation	
Resurrection	
<i>Emancipatory Praxis</i>	162
Conclusion: Ancient Text in Contemporary Context	163
Conclusion: Agapic Solidarity: A Kairos Response to a Kairos Moment	165
Solidaristic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century: Who is my Neighbor?	166
<i>Premature Unity</i>	168
<i>Postmodern Fragmentation</i>	169
Prophetic Voices: Enrique Dussel and Johann B. Metz	170
<i>The Analectical Method of Enrique Dussel: "Justice can never be Just Us"</i>	170
<i>The Categories of Johann B. Metz: A Liberating Language</i>	170
New Language/New Lands: Agapic Discipleship as Counter-Hegemonic Discourse	172
<i>The Many Faces and Places of Agapic Discipleship</i>	172
Academy	
Society	

Church
Conclusion 174

Appendix: Method and Terminology 177

The Concern: Terms of Clarification 177
The Objection: Familiar Themes, Unfamiliar Voices 178
The Question: The Privileged Other Dilemma 181

**Case Study: The Undocumented Migrant in the United States of America
An Application of the Method of Agapic Solidarity 183**

Undocumented Migration within the Economic Dimension 183
The Economic Dimension: The Invisible Hand of “Living Labor” 184
Agapic Solidarity: A Method of Encounter with the Other 185
The Economic Other—The Undocumented Migrant in the United States 186
 Disruption: “Do You See What I See?” 186
 Agapic Discipleship: Submitting to the Tutelage of the Other 191
 Remembrance
 Cubrir/Descubrir
 Mexican/U.S. History from the Eyes of the Other: The “Real”
Illegal Immigrants
 The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and the Occlusion of
 History
 Recitation
 Resurrection
 The Temporal Aspect
 The Spatial Aspect
 Emancipatory Praxis: From Migrant to Pilgrim 207
 Academy
 Church
 Society
Conclusion: Making the Invisible Visible...New Eyes and New Ears 213

INTRODUCTION

OLD TEXT, NEW CONTEXT

Old Text: Love of Neighbor

The duty to love one's neighbor has been a foundational element of Christian moral discourse throughout its history. The Synoptics are united in their claim that the love command forms the second half of Jesus' answer to the question posed by the scribe in Mark, "Which commandment is the first of all?" (Mark 12:28c). Each Gospel provides a slightly different account of the question, its source, and the initial part of Jesus' response (citing the Decalogue): "The first is, 'Hear, O Israel: the Lord our God . . . is one; you shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind, and with all your strength.'" But all three Synoptic Gospels report Jesus stating the second command as, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself (Mark 12:31, Matthew 22:39, Luke 10: 27b). John's version of the love command is equally strong, identifying love as the defining mark of discipleship: "I give you a new commandment, that you love one another. Just as I have loved you, you also should love one another. By this everyone will know that you are my disciples, if you have love for one another" (John 13:34-35).

Each generation, then, must find its own way to rearticulate and respond to this aspect of the great commandment dating from the beginnings of the Christian movement. Pope Benedict XVI and Karl Rahner, for example, speak of the Christian claim that "love of God is love of neighbor" and "love of neighbor is

love of God.”¹ Our millennium is frequently described as the “era of globalization,”² which the United Nations Division of Poverty and Development says, “generally refers to an increasing interaction across national boundaries that affect many aspects of life: economic, social, cultural and political.”³ This dissertation will argue that Christians in this globalized context must respond to the following question: What does ‘love of neighbor’ require of followers of Jesus in an era of globalization characterized by accelerating cultural diversity, intercultural contact, and social stratification?

In the pages that follow I will argue that twenty-first-century Christian disciples will define their response to the love command of Jesus in the context of virtually unavoidable encounters with those they regard as the *Other*. I define the Other as that which is beyond Being.⁴ This understanding has its roots in the work of Emmanuel Levinas but finds its most precise, political expression in the

¹ Pope Benedict XVI, *Deus Caritas Est*, 14, 15, 16, 18; Karl Rahner, “Reflections of the Unity of the Love of Neighbour and the Love of God,” in *Theological investigations*, Vol. 6: *Concerning Vatican Council II* (Baltimore, MD: Helicon, 1969).

² United Nations Human Development Report 1999, *Globalization with a Human Face* (New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999) 1; Available from: http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/HDR_1999_EN.pdf.

³ United Nations Poverty and Development Division. *Economic and social survey of Asia and the Pacific, 1999*. (New York: The United Nations: 1999) [updated 1999 Dec 20; cited 2006 June 1]. Available from: <http://www.unescap.org/dpad/publication/survey1999/svy4a.html>

⁴ Enrique Dussel, *Philosophy of Liberation*, Trans. Aquilina Martinez, Christine Markovsky, (Eugene: Wipf and Stock, 1985), 41-43): “If Being (esse) is the foundation of all systems, and of the system of systems that is the daily world, there is also reality beyond Being, just as there is also cosmos beyond the world. Being is like the horizon toward which and from which the phenomena of the world manifest themselves. It is the ontological foundation and identity; it is the light that illuminates the totality of the world. But beyond Being, transcending it, there is still reality. If reality is the order of the cosmic constitutions of things that are resistant, subsistent, “of themselves,” it is evident that there is reality beyond Being. How many cosmoses have never been incorporated into our world! Did not the reality of the primate come millions of years ago and then later the appearance of the world, of Being... The other is the precise notion by which I shall denominate exteriority as such—historical, not only cosmic or physico-livin, exteriority (4.1). The other is the alterity of all possible systems, beyond “the same,” which totality always is.”

work of Enrique Dussel.⁵ I will attempt to show that the Other teaches us how to love them (and that we in turn teach them the same) if we can only find ways of relating built on effective mutual understanding, ways of surviving and thriving in a sometimes hostile environment that fulfill the “duty of solidarity” (John Paul II, *Sollicitudo rei socialis*, #23). The dissertation will argue that an abstract *a priori* concept of Christian love is not tenable apart from a genuine and authentic encounter with a particular Other. It will present a model, which I call Agapic Solidarity, outlining certain criteria for this encounter, and proposing guidelines and techniques for how such encounters might take place. It will examine how this model advances the conversation in Christian ethics around the cultural dimensions of love of neighbor, with particular attention to contributions from political theology (represented by Johann Baptist Metz) and Latin American liberation philosophy (represented by Enrique Dussel), and it will indicate possible directions for future developments in this arena.

⁵ Ibid. 43-44. “Others reveal themselves as others (3.4.8.1) in all the acuteness of their exteriority when they burst in upon us as something extremely distinct, as nonhabitual, nonroutine, as the extraordinary, the enormous (“apart from the norm”)—the poor, the oppressed. They are the ones who, by the side of the road, outside the system, show their suffering, challenging faces: “We’re hungry! We have a right to eat!” That right, outside the system, is not a right that is justified by the *proyecto* or the laws of the system. Their absolute right, because they are sacred and free, is founded in their own exteriority, in the real constitution of their human dignity. When the poor advance in the world, they shake the very pillars of the system that exploits them. The face (pnim in Hebrew, prosopon in Greek), the person is provocation and judgment by its mere self-revelation...The other is a person as an imploring, revealing, and provoking face (2.4.5.1). The face of the other, primarily as poor and oppressed, reveals a people before it reveals an individual person. The brown face of the Latin American mestizo wrinkled with the furrows of centuries of work, the ebony face of the African slave, the olive face of the Hindu, the yellow face of the Chinese coolie is the irruption of the history of a people before it is the biography of Tupac Amaru, Lumumba, Nehru, and Mao Tse-tung. To describe the experience of proximity as individual experience, or the metaphysical experience of face-to-face as lived experience, between two persons, is simply to forget that personal mystery is always risked in the exteriority of the popular history of a people (3.1.3-4). The individualization of this collective personal experience is a European deformation derived from the bourgeois revolution. Each face, unique, inscrutable mystery of decisions not yet made, is the face of a sex, a generation, a social class, a nation, a cultural group, a historical epoch...The other person—metaphysical alterity, exteriority on the anthropological level—is primarily social and historico-popular.”

The Paradoxical Challenge of Pluralism and Particularity

Globalization both problematizes and enriches the myriad dimensions of human encounter but here I will focus only on *pluralism* and *particularity*.

Anselm Min argues that globalization creates a dialectic of *differentiation* and *interdependence* in societies where pluralism is found.

The globalization of the world brings together different groups into common space and produces a twofold dialectic, the dialectic of *differentiation*, in which we are made increasingly aware of differences in nationality, culture, religion, ethnicity, gender, class, language; and the dialectic of *interdependence*, in which we are compelled to find a way of living together in spite of our differences.⁶

Metz reminds us, however, that while, “We live, one might say, in a world of undeniable plurality,” on the other hand, “pluralism is not simply the answer, but first of all the question and the problem.”⁷

Many regard pluralism with great concern, particularly in regards to ethics, where different approaches to reality are sometimes seen as antithetical to the creation of a cohesive moral order on which coherent norms for human flourishing might be based. They argue that pluralism cannot be reconciled with universal or normative claims of any sort.⁸ Yet others celebrate the emergence of

⁶ Anselm Min, *The Solidarity of Others in a Divided World: A Postmodern Theology after Postmodernism*. (New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 2.

⁷ John Baptist Metz, Ed. John K. Downey, *Love's Strategy: The Political Theology of Johann Baptist Metz*, “In the Pluralism of Religions and Cultural Worlds” (Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press International, 1999), 169.

⁸ Jeffrey Stout, *Ethics after Babel: The Languages of Moral Discourses and Their Discontents*, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1988), 1. “When authors like Stanley Hauerwas, Alisdair MacIntyre and Basil Mitchell begin their books by proclaiming that modern moral discourse has

pluralistic societies as an ‘awakening’ to various voices which had been previously silenced.⁹ These writers argue that genuine pluralism brings clarity rather than confusion to international movements for universal norms on human rights and authentic standards for public truth. What is not in dispute is that we are living in a world where human relationships must come to terms with a plurality of perspectives.

suffered a great catastrophe, leaving us in conceptual disarray, they cannot help echoing Babel. *They are saying that pluralism is just another name for confusion.*” [italics added]

⁹ To use but one example of this assertion we can look at the work of Walter D. Mignolo. Instead I situate my argument within the decolonial paradigm of knowledge and understanding enacted by Waman Pumade Ayala (see chapter 3), as well as other intellectuals after him belonging to the sphere of society that anthropologist Eric Wolf identified as “people without history.” From the sixteenth-century Spanish missionary Bartolome de Las Casas to G.W.F. Hegel in the nineteenth century, and from Karl Marx to the twentieth-century British historian A.J. Toynbee, all we can read (or see in maps) about the place of the Americas in the world order is historically located from a European perspective that passes as universal. Certainly, every one of these authors acknowledged that there was a world, and people, outside of Europe. Indeed both people and continents outside of Europe were overly present as “objects” but they were absent as subjects and, in a way, out of history. They were, in other words, subjects whose perspectives did not count. Eric Wolf’s famous book title, *People without History* became a metaphor to describe this epistemic power differential. By “people without history,” Wolf did not mean that there were people in the world who did not have memories and records of their past, which would be an absolutely absurd claim. He meant that, according to the regional concept of history as defined in the Western world from Ancient Greece to twentieth-century France, every society that did not have alphabetic writing or wrote in a language other than the six imperial languages of modern Europe did not have History. In this view, History is a privilege of European modernity and in order to have History you have to let yourself be colonized, which means allowing yourself, willingly or not, to be subsumed by a perspective of history, life, knowledge, economy, subjectivity, family, religion, etc. that is modeled on the history of modern Europe, and that has now been adopted, with little difference, as the official model of the US. Perspectives from coloniality, however, emerge out of the conditions of the “colonial wound,” the feeling of inferiority imposed on human beings who do not fit the predetermined model in Euro-American narratives. To excavate coloniality, then, one must always include and analyze the project of modernity, although the reverse is not true, because coloniality points to the absences that the narrative of modernity produces. Thus I choose to describe the modern world order that has emerged in the last five hundred years since the “discovery of America” as the modern/colonial world, to indicate that coloniality is constitutive of modernity and cannot exist without it. Indeed, the “idea” of Latin America cannot be dealt with in isolation without producing turmoil in the world system. It cannot be separated from the “ideas” of Europe and of the US as America that dominates even today. The “Americas” are the consequence of early European commercial expansion and the motor of capitalism, as we know it today. The “discovery” of America and the genocide of Indians and African slaves are the very foundation of “modernity,” more so than the French or Industrial Revolutions. Better yet, they constitute the darker and hidden face of modernity, “coloniality.” Thus, to excavate the “idea of Latin America” is, really, to understand how the West was born and how the modern world order was founded” (*The Idea of Latin America*, Preface xii-xiii).

For some commentators, particularity forms the other side of the coin of globalization. In the introduction to her seminal work, *Situating the Self: Gender, Community, and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*, Seyla Benhabib acknowledges “the fractured spirit of our times”¹⁰ in which “the cultural and political ideas of modernity, . . . [including] what Richard Rorty has called the ‘metanarratives of liberal democracies, have become suspect.’”¹¹ She argues,

This current mood of skepticism...toward continuing the “project of modernity” is based upon an understandable disillusionment with a form of life that still perpetrates war, armament, environmental destruction and economic exploitation at the cost of satisfying human needs with human dignity, a form of life that still relegates many woman, non-Christian, and non-white peoples to second-class moral and political status, a form of life that saps the bases of solidaristic coexistence in the name of profit and competition.¹²

This perspective echoes the concerns of Walter D. Mignolo and others, who assert the centrality of particularity. Situated in the larger context of our conversation about the love command, Behnabib’s insistence on the radically “fractured spirit of our time” poses a serious challenge to the Christian ethic of love of neighbor. Stated negatively, her point is that we cannot love our neighbor if we do not acknowledge the uniqueness of his or her experience. Lack of attention to the particularity of the Other leaves us unable to connect with him or

¹⁰ Seyla Benhabib, *Situating the Self: Gender, Community, and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics* (New York: Routledge Press, 1992), 1.

¹¹ Ibid. 1.

¹² Ibid. 2.

her as our neighbor. On the positive side, however, an honest acknowledgment of the irreducible importance of the particularity of the Other creates the potential for a new appreciation of how much our worldview is shaped by power discourses which are, for the most part, 'invisible' to our ordinary vision,¹³ and which stand in the way of an authentic encounter with the Other as our neighbor.

Towards a New Approach: Models and Methods

In light of the preceding critique, the question driving this dissertation can be restated as follows: What does 'love of neighbor' require of followers of Jesus who seek to connect deeply with the neighbor while not sacrificing the ineffable particularity of the self or the Other, given that we live in an era of globalization characterized by accelerating cultural diversity, intercultural contact, and social stratification?¹⁴ Such a deeper understanding of how our moral 'sensibilities' have been shaped by prevailing systems and organizational patterns that have attained a kind of absolute quality in our particular socio-cultural context enhances the contemporary Christian disciple's appreciation of the profound challenge posed by Jesus in the love command.¹⁵ Critical self-knowledge pushes

¹³ There are many scholars who articulate this issue. In the project I will use Emmanuel Levinas, among others, to alert us to some of the obstacles to fully seeing the Other.

¹⁴ "This is the essence of the reign of God: to be together with God, face-to-face with God in community...The "face" indicates what appears of the other, his or her corporeality, his or her "fleshly" reality. "Flesh" in the Bible (basar) denotes the whole human being (without distinction of body and soul) who is born, who is hungry, who dies, who rises (see 3.4 and 6.3). "The word became flesh" (John1:14) not "became soul" or "became body" only, but "became a human being." This "face-to face," this "person-to-person," constitutes the practical relationship of proximity, of nearness, between persons. The experience of the nearness of persons as persons is what constitutes the other as one's "neighbor" (someone neighboring," our "nar one," a "some-one"), rather than as merely a thing an instrument, a mediation" (Dussel: *Ethics and Community*, 9).

¹⁵ "This system is closed in upon itself. It has replaced the universal human project with its own particular historical project. Its laws become natural, its virtues perfect, and the blood of

us to ask whether our practice of love of neighbor amounts to anything more than the conventional behavior of ‘good people,’ as defined by prevailing moral codes. In what follows, however, I will suggest that human encounters grounded in a deep appreciation for the particularity of the Other provide the hermeneutical key to a kind of human encounter with the potential to radically transform the participants from Others into neighbors.

Building on this insight, the dissertation will present a practical model for love of neighbor in a globalized context. The model is designed to foster an approach to human encounter that simultaneously promotes deep connection while preserving the irreducible particularity and otherness of the participants. Utilizing a model-based approach to the literature review, I will argue that Agapic Solidarity represents an advance for the practical dimensions of the encounter with the Other that incorporates and surpasses important contributions from current models.

The dissertation will describe three schools or models for the encounter with the Other, showing how each fails to do justice to the radical demands posed by the love command. My typology will organize the contributions of various authors under what I will call the Conflict Model, the Dialogue Model, and the Mestizo Model.

The approaches that fit the ***Conflict Model*** tend to view encounters with the Other in conflictual terms. They believe that such encounters inevitably culminate in the destruction of the self or the Other (the Neighbor), rarely

those who offer any resistance—the blood of the prophets and heroes—is spilled by the system as if it were the blood of the wicked, the totally subversive” (*Ethics and Community*, 31).

acknowledging the benefits of mixing groups or blurring boundaries, and they thus characterize such attempts at unity as dangerous compromises and as inherently flawed. This approach tends to view communities and cultures as ahistorical, self-referential realities, celebrating a mythical past or future when one's own group was (or will be) 'pure' or free of 'contamination' by others. Pluralism is generally regarded as a degenerative process best avoided in favor of a binary logic, in which successful encounters are characterized by the subsuming of one community to the socio-cultural logics of another. This model sees little virtue in particularity, attributing supreme and teleological importance to unity. The result is an approach to love of neighbor that requires little or no compromise by one (usually the dominant) group, while demanding the capitulation of the other.

Approaches that fit under what I will call the ***Dialogue Model*** begin with a more dynamic, porous understanding of identity, cultures, and communities. They therefore have a less conflicted view of difference in relationships, tolerating a degree of tension between communities, while highlighting what unifies and is common to the participants. While a vast improvement over the more rigid approach to difference of the Conflict Model, the Dialogue Model lacks the critical and necessary self-reflective dimension that prevents the radical demand of agapic love of neighbor from taking root. While there is a focus on the quality of the relationship with the neighbor in this model, love of neighbor tends to be distorted by a practical focus on reshaping the Other in one's own image.¹⁶

¹⁶ Virgilio Elizondo speaks of encountering this model in *The Future is Mestizo: Life Where Cultures Meet*. Growing up in Texas he found that he was a 'member' of two communities,

This approach to the love command ultimately sacrifices the particularity of the Other for what at first blush looks like a ‘larger’ or ‘deeper’ union, but in reality only ‘covers over’ the unsettling difference of the Other. In this model the ‘pluralism’ of the Other is tolerated and occasionally celebrated, but never given the authority to challenge the power structures that marginalize difference.¹⁷

What is lacking in the Dialogue Model is a thorough grasp of the implications of particularity, most notably autonomy of the other, and this failure impacts all aspects of the conversation.¹⁸

the Mexican community and the American community. Elizondo always saw himself as bi-cultural and yet noticed that each of the respective communities held their encounter with each other in a very different manner. “Yet this certitude of being Mexican began to be questioned whenever we visited our relative in Mexico. Even though they loved us and we loved to visit them, in many ways they would let us know that we were *pochos*—Mexicans from the U.S.A. To this day, it is not uncommon to hear someone from Mexico say about a Mexican-American’s Spanish, “For a *norteamericano*, your Spanish is not so bad.” Yet it is not uncommon for an Anglo-American from the U.S. to say about a Mexican-American speaking perfect English, “For a Mexican-American your English is pretty good.” Whether in Mexico or the U.S., we are always the distant and different “other.” The core of our existence is to be “other” or to “not be” in relation to those who are. Yet being called *pocho* in Mexico was not insulting, for we were fully accepted. There was always rejoicing when our families visited San Antonio or when we visited them in Mexico. *Pocho* was simply a reality. Even though the U.S. was our home, it was in Mexico that we felt more at home. The label marked distance and difference but not separation or rejection... I lived on the border between two nationalities. I was an insider-outsider to both. I was “Mexican” in the U.S. and *gringo/pocho* in Mexico. There was a painful side to it, for it is difficult to always be different, but there was also an enjoyable side to it; I had a lot more options and could move easily in and out of two worlds. For as much as I loved the Mexican side of me, I never really disliked or hated the Anglo side, which I was making my own in the schools. Yet it was painful and incomprehensible because there were so many Anglo racists. Since I loved and admired Mexico so much the only conclusion I could logically come to was that the racists were ignorant. Much later on, I would discover that it was not just ignorance, but the Anglo drive to dominate, subjugate, and exploit. *And even when some Anglos wanted to be of help, it was by helping the other become like themselves* (Elizondo, 21) [italics added].

¹⁷ Walter Mignolo speaks to the difference between *Interculturidad* and *Multiculturalism*. Multiculturalism is much more reflective of the Dialogue Model. “What is the difference? “Multicultural means that the hegemonic principles of knowledge, education, the concept of the state and government, political economy, morality, etc., are controlled by the state, and below the control of the state people have “freedom” to go with their “cultures” as far as they do not challenge “the epistemic principles” grounding politics, economy and ethics as managed by the state” (*The Idea of Latin America*, 118).

¹⁸ “The question is not inclusion but inter-culturality, a shared project based on different “origins” confronting the colonial world and overcoming the imperial/national pride and interest. In the words of another indigenous movement, the Zapatista uprising in Chiapas, Mexico, it means dwelling in a “world where many worlds co-exist” (Ibid.124).

Our third approach, which I will call the *Mestizo Model*, finds its origins in the perspective of the Other. It is typically articulated by bridge figures, who inhabit both the world of the Same and the world of the Other.¹⁹ The model is characterized by a deep appreciation of communities as ‘works in progress’, and tends to be critical of approaches that characterize important concepts, sources of knowledge, or paradigms as having only one origin in space or time. The Mestizo Model insists that such monocultural approaches unintentionally occlude the contributions and perspectives of the neighbor. It insists that pluralism and particularity have always been a feature of human experience, a reality that certain communities have only recently come to appreciate.

Each of the models mentioned above, however, ultimately falls short of truly engaging the Other in all of his or her uniqueness. In light of these lacunae, the dissertation seeks to introduce a model by means of which a more authentic encounter might occur. The focus of this model will be on the initial encounter through which one begins to learn *how* to love their neighbor. It operates under the assumption that love for the Other (neighbor) depends on an encounter that allows us to see and appreciate the Other in his or her uniqueness. This is why Enrique Dussel characterizes love of neighbor as an “epiphany” through which the Other disrupts our horizons.²⁰ Like Dussel, my own understanding of the

¹⁹ This ‘space’ is best understood through the work of Homi K. Bhabha. “These ‘in-between’ spaces provide the terrain for elaborating strategies of self-hood—singular or communal—that initiate new signs of identity, and innovative sites of collaboration, and contestation, in the act of defining the idea of society itself...This interstitial passage between fixed identifications opens up the possibility of a cultural hybridity that entertains difference without an assumed or imposed hierarchy” (*The Location of Culture*, 2, 5).

²⁰ Enrique Dussel, *Philosophy of Liberation*, Trans. Aquilino Martinez and Christine Morkovsky (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 1985), 16. See page 58 for the following quotation: “Now we arrive at the central core of this chapter, at the essential moment of metaphysics,

Other, and specifically of our encounter with the Other, is deeply informed by the work of Emmanuel Levinas. Levinas argues that, as self-encapsulated beings we must experience a reality that is “Other than Being”²¹ in order to learn how to reach out in love. Levinas provides a helpful way of understanding the type of encounter that leads to love of neighbor, and his work is deeply inspiring; but it also has flaws. Thus, I seek to go beyond Levinas in formulating a more adequate way to respond to ethical demands regarding the Other that are placed upon us by the love command, considered in a globalized context.

Agapic Solidarity: Love in Three Moments

The model I will propose is called **Agapic Solidarity**. It builds on aspects of the political theology of Johann Baptist Metz, the liberation ethics of Enrique Dussel, and the understanding of the Other of Emmanuel Levinas. It differs from

understanding that metaphysics is the passage from ontology to transontological, to the one who is situated beyond Being, in reality (2.4.3 and 3.4.7), the other. Ontology is phenomenology; it is a *logos* or a thinking about what appears (the phenomenon, the being) from the foundation (Being). Beyond phenomenology the road of epiphany opens: revelation (or apocalyptic) of the other through the other’s face, which is not merely a phenomenon or manifestation, a presence, but an epiphenomenon, vicarious, trace or vestige of the absent, of the mysterious, of one beyond the present...Liberation is not a phenomenal, intrasystemic action, liberation is praxis that subverts the phenomenological order and pierces it to let in a metaphysical transcendence, which is the plenary critique of the established, fixed, normalized, crystalized, dead.”

²¹ Emmanuel Levinas, *Of God who Comes to Mind*, Trans. Bettina Bergo Meridian. Crossing Aesthetics Series (Stanford University Press, 1986), 71. “Biological human fraternity, considered with the sober coldness of Cain, is not a sufficient reason that I be responsible for a separated being. The sober, Cain-like coldness consists in reflecting on responsibility from the standpoint of freedom or according to a contract. Yet responsibility for the other comes from what is prior to freedom. It does not come from the time made up of presences, nor from the presence sunken into the past and representable, the time of beginnings or assumptions. Responsibility does not let me constitute myself into an *I think*, as substantial as a stone or, like a heart of stone into an in-and-for-oneself. It goes to the point of substitution for the other, up to the condition—or the noncondition—of a hostage. This is a responsibility that does not leave me time: it leaves me without a present for recollection or a return into the self.”

Levinas in two major ways, however, by addressing the Other in more explicitly political terms (with Dussel), and seeking a more concrete understanding the Other in their particularity.

Agapic Solidarity is focused on achieving encounters characterized by *respectful* and necessary distinctions between the parties, on the one hand, while creating profound connections, on the other. The approach consists of three distinct but deeply interrelated moments or stages, which I will call *Disruption*, *Agapic Discipleship*, and *Emancipatory Praxis*. The second moment of *Agapic Discipleship* may be further broken down into three sub-moments, which I call *Remembrance*, *Recitation*, and *Resurrection*. Each moment is an integral part of a larger process.

The first moment in Agapic Solidarity, then, is *Disruption*. Since an authentic encounter with the Other can only come from beyond our horizon of meaning, Disruption is experienced as a shattering of previously held cognitive categories. This moment of “epiphany,”²² as Dussel calls it, contains elements of both continuity and discontinuity with previously held worldviews.²³ The key is that, while interruptions allow us to ‘return to what we were doing,’ Disruption is much more radical in its demand for our attention and change.

The second moment of *Agapic Discipleship* may be seen as comprised of three discreet sub-moments or stages: *Remembrance*, *Recitation*, and

²² Dussel, *Philosophy of Liberation*, 16. “Phenomenology, as its name implies, concerns itself with what appears and how it appears from the horizon of the world, the system, Being. Epiphany, on the other hand, is the revelation of the oppressed, the poor—never a mere appearance or a mere phenomenon, but always maintaining a metaphysical exteriority. Those who reveal themselves transcend the system and continually question the given. Epiphany is the beginning of real liberation.”

²³ To more fully grasp the implications of the moment of Disruption it may be helpful to think in terms of Paul Ricoeur’s First and Second Naivete.

Resurrection. The key issue is that love of neighbor will have to be characterized by radical openness to the Other as neighbor who will tutor us in this mysterious praxis that we call *agape*. The first step in the process will be *Remembrance*, where we learn the history and enter into the memories held by the Other. We will have to accept that while this history may not be “our history,” a certain understanding is necessary for an authentic encounter with the neighbor. And here we may begin to realize that our previous interactions with our neighbor have been distorted by the fact that we were not yet ‘awakened’ to the Other.

Recitation is the next step, in which we become more conscious of the lived reality of our neighbor, including central figures, symbols, cultural patterns, language systems etc. Growing familiarity is an essential step in promoting agapic love, which must make ‘sense’ to its subject, creating a kind of ‘*corporeal connection*’ between members of an as yet unrealized body of fellowship, as understood by the early Christians.²⁴ It is only in this *becoming one* that we are finally able to speak of a true connection with the Other. Even as we *become one*, however, we must also re-assert the principle of distinction, acknowledging that no matter how close we get to our neighbor, we will never fully inhabit his or her world. Thus, it is in the third and final sub-moment of *Resurrection* that we come to realize that it is only God who has the power to make the neighbor and me into one. No amount of Agapic Discipleship will create a final or absolute

²⁴ “Sharing bread, holding all things in common, and selling one’s possessions all indicate the radical nature of love that is respectful of the loved person(s). The first Christians’ love was not platonic—a supraemotional, immaterial love. It was a concrete, real, efficacious, bodily love. Their love was attested to by *deeds* (praxeis), not words only. It was not only in “the prayers” that “they devoted themselves to...the communal life.” They also “took their meals in common...” *Their love imbued their existence. In it their whole “bodiliness” was committed*” (Dussel, *Ethics and Community*, 12) [Italics added].

union with the neighbor; rather than seeing this as a shortcoming on our part, it is an invitation to open our eyes to the *Imago Dei* encountered in the face of the neighbor. It is the neighbor who finally reveals the Ultimate Mystery of God to us. Here we begin to live a resurrected life in a new world that we create together,²⁵ mutually interrogating and challenging one another, each operating as true students to their neighbor.

The third and final moment of *Agapic Solidarity* brings us to what I call ***Emancipatory Praxis***. Here we return to our communities of origin, sharing the new and abundant life we have been granted through our encounter with the Other. In this moment we must be cautious of not speaking for Others. They can speak for themselves. We share with our communities the details of our encounter with the Other whom we now know as our neighbor. We witness to the transforming power of love, including all that we have learned in our getting to know one another, and both we and our communities are changed. Some are moved to better emulate the praxis of Jesus Christ, who Justo Gonzalez among others aptly described as a “man for others,”²⁶ and we continue to disrupt our communities with invitations to a life of Agapic Solidarity.

Dissertation Overview

²⁵ See footnote 15 and the definition given of *inter-culturality*.

²⁶ Dietrich Bonhoeffer, *Letters and Papers from Prison* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1971), 382. Gonzalez, L. Justo, *Mañana: Christian Theology from a Hispanic Perspective*, (Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1990), 151. “As we read the story of Jesus in the Gospels, the first thing that strikes you is that he is entirely for other...Nor was this the easy self-deprecation whereby we often hide cowardice behind humility. His was a strong assertative “for-otherness.” He was for other not only when he healed the sick, forgave those who condemned him, and died on the cross but also when he cleansed the Temple, spoke the harsh truth to the Pharisees, and called Herod a fox.”

Having outlined the questions, challenges, methods, and models driving this dissertation, I will now conclude with a brief overview of its contents.

Chapter One reviews selected literature on three influential models for the encounter with the Other. The chapter begins with a brief summary of current dilemmas regarding pluralism and particularity, then utilizes the aforementioned *Conflict*, *Dialogue*, and *Mestizo* models of encounter with the Other to organize the literature. While a comprehensive review of all the major contributions would exceed available space, two authors are chosen to represent each of the models. I examine how each model and its respective authors fails to deal sufficiently with the paradoxical demands of pluralism and particularity on the one hand, and the need to establish an authentic connection on the Other.

Chapter Two introduces the central concepts that are part of this project. It will introduce the work of Emmanuel Levinas, and particularly his understanding of the Other. Following the introduction there will be a critical appraisal of his work. I will introduce some conceptual lacunae found in his theory and seek to resolve them by introducing a solution. The solution which is proposed will be to speak of dimensions of human experience in general and four *dimensions* in particular.

Chapter Three provides a critical introduction to the particular contributions of Johann Baptist Metz and Enrique Dussel that are helpful for an authentic encounter with the Other. Again, the key issue here is how to do justice to both pluralism and particularity, while honoring the importance of love as union, which is so central to Christian tradition. The chapter concludes with a

brief examination of how, while helpful, their work is insufficient for a proper conceptualization of love of neighbor in a globalized context.

Chapter Four outlines the essential elements of *Agapic Solidarity*. The chapter identifies and explores its three sub-moments or steps —*Disruption*, *Agapic Discipleship*, and *Emancipatory Praxis*— and examines how the process of Agapic Solidarity can be a corrective to some of the shortcomings in the works analyzed in chapters One and Two.

The Appendix engages initial questions and concerns that arise in connection with Agapic Solidarity. I offer tentative responses, conscious that more complete answers will only come from the process itself, including further reflection on the results—an entirely appropriate outcome since Agapic Solidarity is a praxis-based approach and any assertions we make must have a provisional quality.

The Conclusion returns to the central question driving the dissertation: What does ‘love of neighbor’ require of Christians seeking a profound connection with the Other, while honoring their ineffable particularity, given a globalized context of accelerating cultural diversity, intercultural contact, and social stratification? The chapter summarizes the central claims of the dissertation and its supporting arguments, and suggests possible future developments, particularly how the model of Agapic Solidarity might be used in a variety of educational, political, and cultural settings.

The final part of project is a case study of undocumented migrants from Latin America to the United States. While the study is not part of the argument of

the dissertation, it serves as a rehearsal for how the process of Agapic Solidarity might be used in bringing the love command to bear on a current ethical issue of great concern within the United States. I will conclude by suggesting how the lessons of Agapic Solidarity might be extrapolated to other settings, situation, and issues.

CHAPTER 1

LOVE IN THE HERE AND NOW

All societies face recurring threats to their existence, to which they eventually succumb. Yet some societies, even when so threatened, are also capable of postponing their demise by halting and reversing the process of decline and renewing their vitality and identity.¹

If this book has a totem, it is, of course, John Stuart Mill, and we should not be surprised to find that he himself has pithily expressed the cosmopolitan ideal: “To human beings, who, as hitherto educated, can scarcely cultivate even a good quality without running it into a fault, it is indispensable to be perpetually comparing their own notions and customs with the experience and example of persons in different circumstances from themselves; and there is no nation which does not need to borrow from others, not merely particular acts or practices, but essential points of character in which its own type is inferior.”²

What makes all these fluid and extraordinarily rich actualities difficult to accept is that most people resist the underlying notion: that human identity is not only not natural and stable, but constructed and occasionally even

¹ P. Samuel Huntington, *Who Are We? The Challenge to America's National Identity* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 2004), xvii.

² Anthony Kwame Appiah, *The Ethics of Identity*, (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2005), 271.

invented outright. Part of the resistance and hostility generated by books like *Orientalism*, or after it, *The Invention of Tradition*, and *Black Athena*, is that they seem to undermine the naïve belief in a certain positivity and unchanging historicity of a culture, a self, a national identity.³

While Huntington, Appiah, and Said in the above quotations differ in how they understand the implications and strategies of dealing with the Other in their midst, they nonetheless seem to inhabit a similar worldview. All three take as a given that we encounter communities, identities, and persons unlike us. All three address both the contemporary reality of pluralism and the equally powerful reality of particularity. It is the dialectic of *differentiation* and *interdependence*.⁴ But for the Christian that is not only a call to engage the Other in our midst but to love him or her.⁵

For Huntington love of neighbor seems to be impossible because he perceives all such encounters or interactions as threats to the original community that will lead to a 'decline' in the essential nature and 'vitality' of the original community.

For Appiah the love of neighbor is not only necessary but, in direct contrast to Huntington, actually increases the vitality of the original community. A community which does not regularly engage with its neighbor ultimately is diminished and atrophies. However it is important to note that the motivation for

³ W. Edward Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 332.

⁴ Anselm Min, *The Solidarity of Other in a Divided World: A Postmodern Theology after Postmodernism* (New York: T & T Clark, 2004), 2.

⁵ See footnote #1 Introduction.

engaging the Other is for the well-being of ourselves and not necessarily the Other. We see a subtle form of enlightened self-interest operating in his position.

Said's position is more radical still. He questions the entire assumption that there can be any explicit sense of a fully self-encapsulated *identity*, or *community* which then exercises agency in engaging the Other. He identifies a much more dynamic and systemic understanding of these interactions, which would have us reconfigure much of our understanding of encountering the Other.

Rather than merely viewing these authors as individual responses to encountering the Other or the Neighbor, I suggest in this chapter that together they form a 'school' or reflect a 'type.' This chapter will consist of three sections. The first section is a very brief review of our contemporary milieu, which I suggest produces a 'twofold dialectic;' the dialectic of differentiation and the dialectic of interdependence.⁶ In this section I will make extensive use of the work of Anselm Min. The work of Min has two elements which are germane to this project; he articulates the contemporary milieu in very precise and illuminating terms. Later in this project I will also use his understanding and critique of Levinas to move that aspect of the project forward. The second section reviews how some have chosen to engage this twofold dialectic of engaging the Other in our midst. This section will introduce the concept of models which allows us to group responses to the Other by noting certain pattern. This review of literature will allow us to more accurately assess the various responses to the Other. This section also identifies who the authors view as the Other and why the various responses are inadequate in dealing effectively with the Other given the

⁶ Min, 2.

contemporary conditions of differentiation and interdependence. The final section will rehearse and more precisely restate the concern of this project.

Differentiation and Interdependence in a New Key

In his work, *Solidarity of Others in a Divided World: A Postmodern Theology after Postmodernism*, Anselm Min asserts the conditions under which all theological discourse must now occur.⁷ These include ethical discourse, and for purposes of this project, how the love command must be embodied and practiced in the contemporary globalized world. Min highlights two of the most salient features of our contemporary situation:

The globalization of the world brings together different groups into common space and produces a twofold dialectic, the dialectic of differentiation, in which we are made increasingly aware of differences in nationality, culture, religion, ethnicity, gender, class, language; and the dialectic of interdependence, in which we are compelled to find a way of living together in spite of our differences.⁸

Though in constructing his case for this twofold understanding of our contemporary world he marshals much evidence,⁹ I suggest that each side of the dialectic needs further development. In the dialectic of differentiation he fails to develop fully the implications of this differentiation. My response to this

⁷ Ibid. 1. "The central challenge of the globalizing world is how to manage and transform this twofold, antithetical dialectic of simultaneous differentiation and interdependence into a solidarity of others, the mutual solidarity of those who are different. The task of contemporary Christian theology is to interpret this demand of the new kairos in light of biblical and theological traditions and provide a conceptually coherent, systematic mediation between the context of globalization and the demand of its inherited faith."

⁸ Min, 2.

⁹ Ibid. 222-26.

shortcoming will be to emphasize what I call the *potency of particularity*. In the dialectic of interdependence he fails to contend properly with the implications of historical development which has created certain patterns of dependence and interdependence. My response to this shortcoming is to reassert the need to envision all language of interdependence from a much more explicit post-colonialist, liberationist perspective.

From Differentiation to Particularity

To speak of our increasing awareness of difference in nationality, culture etc. is to speak only in descriptive terms and consequently to fail to elaborate its implications. These implications are what I call the potency of particularity or how the communities which compose our identity create our worldview. This formation of identity has implications for whom we identify as *our community*, and also whom we identify as the Other. It is insufficient to speak only of our difference, which is obvious; what needs to be highlighted is how our differences construct a partial worldview by which we come to encounter the Other. Our awareness of difference also shapes our moral and ethical sensibilities. This is what Enrique Dussel means when he speaks of the 'system.'

Any system of prevailing practices (from Egypt or Babylon to Rome, the several Christendoms, or capitalist society) determines its established practices to be good. Its project (its end, its telos, its beatitude, as the Latin theologians termed it) is confused with the "perfect human good" as

such. Thus the norms that demand the execution of this project are “natural law.”¹⁰

We can speak of these various communities as systems of meaning which can become self-encapsulated and self-referential totalities. Unless we consciously resist the partial vision offered by this differentiated existence we can mistake our vision for universal and normative reality.

From Interdependence to the Colonial Wound

Min accurately identifies the incredible level of interdependence characteristic of our globalized world,¹¹ but at times fails to understand or at least be more explicit how the current relationships are outcomes of historical patterns of domination. This is particularly disturbing when he speaks of a lack of cultural patterns among the ‘poor nations’ that he says might preclude them from being able to engage in patterns of solidarity.¹² This fly’s in the face of enormous historical data that indicates that much of why the ‘poor nations’ are poor can be traced to patterns of development which find their origins in the ‘rich nations, and even more particularly periods when these rich nations failed to practice solidarity.’¹³ Dussel is one author who is deeply suspicious of any language of *solidarity* and the need for recognizing *interdependence* that does not take into

¹⁰ Enrique Dussel, *Ethics and Community* (New York: Orbis Books, 1988) Theology and Liberation Series, Ed. Leonardo Boff, Segrio Torres, Gustavo Gutierrez, Jose Comblin, et. al, 31-32.

¹¹ Min, 222-30.

¹² Ibid. 226.

¹³ There are many authors who deal with the question of how we have arrived at our contemporary globalized world. Some prominent authors that address this question are Walter Mignolo, Arundathi Roy, Noam Chomsky, Enrique Dussel, Samir Amin, Tarique Ali, Gregory Grandin, Juan Gonzalez, Eduardo Galleano, and Howard Zinn.

historical patterns of development. This perspective is brought forth most powerfully by the post-colonialist critique.

For Dussel, globalization spells the material, discursive, cultural and philosophical exclusion of the majority of the world's richest peoples (mostly located south of the equator), just as the rhetoric of inclusion and interconnectivity announces their purported participation and coresponsibility for a globalized planet. Globalization, in short, means for Dussel what Hans-Peter Martin and Harald Schumann have called the "20:80 society," in which only 20 percent of the world will suffice to produce what is needed, and the remaining 80 percent will be entirely superfluous, supplemental, a burden, a perpetual lumpen proletariat. To this it should be added that of this 20 percent, only the top 5 percent will enjoy the riches produced by the world society.¹⁴

To speak of interdependence and of sacrificing in the name of honoring this interdependence without taking into account the actual cost borne by certain communities on the planet is disingenuous and ultimately destructive.

Even as I find these shortcomings particular disturbing in the work of Min, I find particularly compelling Min's 'central challenge' to Christian theology¹⁵ that we must contend with pluralism in this world.¹⁶ Yet as Johann Baptist Metz reminds us, to speak of pluralism is not to speak of an answer 'but first of all 'the

¹⁴ Eduardo Mendieta, *Thinking from the Underside of History: Enrique Dussel's Philosophy of Liberation* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield, 2000), Ed. Linda Martin Alcoff and Eduardo Mendieta, 127.

¹⁵ Min 1.

¹⁶ Ibid. 1.

question and the problem.¹⁷ The following section will look at some of the current responses given to this question and problem.

The Typology or Model Method

In using the model method of organizing the responses to the Other, or the problem of pluralism, I am hearkening back to a manner of organizing information made famous in theology by Helmut Richard Niebuhr. Creating a typology allows me to categorize vast amounts of information in a systemic fashion.¹⁸ But using such a Typological or Model method for surveying the literature has its limits,¹⁹ and so it is best to understand ‘models’ as existing within a spectrum of responses. Even though we will not seek to find in any author a perfect reflection of any particular model, the model method can nonetheless be fruitful.

The Three Models: Conflict, Dialogue, and Mestizaje

The three models used to review the current responses to encounter with the other are: the Conflict Model, the Dialogue Model, and finally the Mestizo Model. In the presentation of each model we will examine two authors who may

¹⁷ Johann B. Metz, *Love's Strategy: The Political Theology of Johann Baptist*, "In the *Pluralism of Religions and Cultural Worlds*" (Harrisburg: Trinity Press International, 1999) Ed. John K. Downey, 169.

¹⁸ H. Richard Niebuhr, *Christ and Culture* (San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers, 2001), xxxviii. "Typology is the effort to order these many elements into families in such a way that some of the characteristic combinations of principles maybe understood."

¹⁹ *Ibid.* xxxviii. "The method is helpful but has definite limitations which need to be kept in mind. First of all, a type is a mental construct to which no individual wholly conforms. It must be used, therefore, only as a statement of necessary connection, so that the rational is given precedence over the empirical. Second, these mental constructs, if they are to be useful toward understanding, must be of one sort—that is to say: among the many variable factors to which may be discerned in any concrete, historical event, only one set can be chosen at a time to furnish material for the mental model.

be viewed as exemplars of each position. No author perfectly reflects a model; rather, we might say that an author *tends* to view the encounter with the other in one of these three modes. Accordingly each author will have a distinct understanding of who they are and therefore who is the *other* in their midst. In the conclusion of the chapter I will demonstrate why each model fails to do justice to this encounter with the other.

The Conflict Model

The three characteristics of the Conflict Model are: imagining an original community which is 'pristine;' understanding all encounters as occurring within a binary and dichotomous dynamic; and understanding all communities, both our own and the others', as best viewed as 'self-encapsulated' entities. The two representatives of this conflict model type are Samuel Huntington and Dinesh D'Sousa. Though the visions of these two scholars are not identical, they share some striking similarities.

Samuel Huntington: Encounter as "Clash"

Samuel Huntington continues to be one of the seminal authors in our contemporary understanding of what it means to encounter the other. Huntington addresses many issues but the two that are most germane to this discussion are his understanding of the Civilizational 'other' and, in a later work, of the Hispanic 'other.'

Early on in a work entitled *Clash of Civilizations* originally published in *Foreign Affairs* and later enlarged into a book he defines the term civilization and gives it an unparalleled degree of importance in the human experience.

What do we mean when we talk of civilization? A civilization is a cultural entity...Arabs, Chinese, and Westerners, however, are not part of any broader cultural entity. They constitute civilizations. A civilization is thus the highest cultural grouping of people and broadest level of cultural identity people have short of that which distinguishes human from other species.²⁰

Note that for Huntington, with the exception of specie affiliation, our civilizational identity is the core of who we are. It is the most totalizing community of which any human is a part. Civilizations are, for Huntington, the ultimate *us* and *other*.

*A civilizational approach, for instance holds that: The world is in some sense two, but the central distinction is between the West as the hitherto dominant civilization and all other, which, however, have little if anything in common among them. The world, in short, is divided between a Western one and a non-Western many.*²¹ [italics added]

This quotation clearly demonstrates the Conflict Model characteristic of viewing people in binary and dichotomous terms. This complete exclusivity given to each of the two parties, the Western and the non-Western, also indicates the understanding of each civilization as somehow existing in a self-encapsulated reality. The problem with this reading is that it discounts the fundamental reality that both communities had deep and rich interactions for centuries.²² Huntington

²⁰ Samuel Huntington, *Clash of Civilizations*, *Foreign Affairs* (Summer, 1993).

²¹ *Ibid.* 36.

²² Enrique Dussel, *The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of "the other" and the Myth of Modernity*, Trans. Michael D. Barber, (New York: Continuum, 1995), Wallerstein, Immanuel,

further asserts that the central mode in which these two communities encounter each other is conflict.²³ Because of this binary thinking everyone must choose between ‘the civilized’ Same, and ‘the uncivilized’ Other. The two communities which most possess the qualities of Western civilization are Europe and the United States of America. Taking the side of the latter, he speaks of the special role and responsibility that the United States has in being a bulwark against the encroaching Other.

Americans cannot avoid the issue: Are we a Western people or are we something else? The futures of the United States and of the West depend upon Americans reaffirming their commitment to Western civilization.

Domestically this means rejecting the divisive siren calls of multiculturalism. Internationally it means rejecting the elusive and illusory calls to identify the United States with Asia.²⁴

For Huntington, we in the United States must affirm our European and Western civilizational roots; if we do not make this affirmation, the entire edifice which is the Western “world” will become extinct.

Rejection of the Creed and of Western civilization means the end of the United States of America as we have known it. It also means effectively the end of Western civilization.²⁵

World Systems Analysis: An Introduction, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2005). The work of Robert Pasnau is also helpful in making these important historical connections.

²³ Ibid. 36. “The great division among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural...The clash of civilizations will be the battle lines of the future.”

²⁴ Ibid. 307.

²⁵ Ibid. 306-307.

Note that his work here exhibits some of the key elements of the Conflict Model. For Huntington, there did exist a moment in history when 'Western Civilization' was a community of unique singularity. By allowing any type of 'multiculturalism' or 'internationalism' to become part of this 'edifice' we are effectively causing 'the end of Western Civilization.'

In a later work entitled *Who Are We? The Challenges to American's National Identity*, Huntington speaks of another 'threat' to Western Civilization and the Western Creed besides *multiculturalism* and *identifying the United States with Asia*. This new threat is that of 'the Hispanization trends in American society.' This threat he identifies primarily, but not exclusively, in the recent wave of immigrants from Latin America in general and more specifically from Mexico.²⁶ In the construction of his position Huntington makes an important distinction between certain communities, which came from Europe to the Eastern area of the United States, those he terms 'settlers', and all subsequent arrivals, which he terms 'immigrants.'²⁷ By highlighting this distinction he creates a chasm that he claims is unbridgeable. He claims that 'the experiences and lessons of past immigration have little relevance to understanding its [the current Mexican immigration] dynamics and consequences.'²⁸ This lack of translatability is due to six factors that I will address in turn: Contiguity, Numbers, Illegality, Regional Concentration, Persistence, and finally Historical Presence.²⁹

²⁶ Samuel P. Huntington, *Who Are We? The Challenges to America's National Identity* (New York: Simon and Schuster Paperbacks, 2004), 225. "Illegal immigration is overwhelmingly Mexican immigration."

²⁷ Ibid. 38-44.

²⁸ Ibid. 222.

²⁹ Ibid. 222-30.

Contiguity:

Contiguity contrasts the traditional immigrants (people 'crossing several thousand miles of ocean') with the new immigrants (people crossing over 'a line in the ground and a shallow river').³⁰ Yet this line, this contiguous border, notably and uniquely connects one of the richest countries in the hemisphere with one of the most poor.³¹

Numbers:

Numbers concern Huntington because the "Hispanic domination of the immigrant flow has no precedent in our history"³² He notes that "Mexican immigration constituted 27.6 percent of the total foreign-born population in 2000. The next largest contingents, Chinese and Filipinos, amounted to only 4.9 percent and 4.3 percent of the foreign-born."³³ The vastness of numbers involved denotes a marked shift in this area.

Illegality:

Noting that part of the American Creed is a deep respect for the Law, it is particularly troubling for Huntington that the "Substantial illegal entry into the United States is a post 1965 and Mexican phenomenon."³⁴ He also notes that all attempts at curbing this reality have failed. Thus, "In 2003 illegal Mexicans in the United States were twenty-five times as numerous as the next largest contingent,

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid. "The income gap between the United States and Mexico is the largest between two contiguous countries in the world." This quotation, cited by Huntington, originates from an article entitled "Can We Still Afford to be a Nation of Immigrants?" written by David M. Kennedy in the *Atlantic Monthly*.

³² Ibid. 225. This quotation cited by Huntington originally appeared in an essay entitled "Will Americanization Work in America?" by Mark Krikorian and is found in the magazine *Freedom Review*.

³³ Ibid. 224.

³⁴ Ibid. 225.

from El Salvador,”³⁵ and concludes that consequently “Illegal immigration is, overwhelmingly, Mexican immigration.”³⁶

Regional Concentration:

Unlike the previous waves of immigrants, which simultaneously assimilated and dispersed, the current wave of immigrants seems to be much more geographically concentrated.

As we have seen, the Founding Fathers thought dispersion essential to assimilation, and historically that *has been the pattern and continues to be for most contemporary non-Hispanic immigrants.*³⁷ [italics added]

For Hispanics, and specifically Mexican immigrants, dispersion is much less evident.³⁸ This regional concentration is a problem because, “It is a sobering fact that the more highly concentrated immigrants are, the slower and less complete is their assimilation.”³⁹

Persistence:

The persistence of this wave of immigration has three particularly long term and detrimental consequences. The first is that once begun, migration ‘induces its own flow.’ This means that the immigrants that are already here facilitate the arrival of others. This ‘chain migration’ prompts the second and third consequences. The second consequence is that the longer an immigration

³⁵ Ibid. 225.

³⁶ Ibid. 225.

³⁷ Ibid. 226.

³⁸ Ibid. 227. “Today, however, one large immigration stream is flowing into a defined region from a single cultural, linguistic, religious, and national source: Mexico...the sobering fact is that the United States has had no experience comparable to what is now taking place in the Southwest.” This quotation, cited by Huntington, originally appears in an article by David Kennedy in *Atlantic Monthly*.

³⁹ Ibid. 227.

pattern is in place the more difficult it is to stop. The political will necessary to stop the flow of illegal immigration becomes much more difficult to mobilize, particularly when the 'newer' immigrants create political blocs which thwart control of immigration. The final consequence is that because of the high level and persistence of new immigrants the process of assimilation is retarded and even sometimes fully obstructed. Immigrants feel little need to learn the language or customs of their new land when they are constantly reminded and renewed in their old linguistic and cultural practices and patterns.

Historical Presence:

The final factor which makes this new wave of illegal immigration a phenomenon which cannot be understood using any previous experience is that of the unique historical circumstances that surround the relations between the United States and Mexico.

Mexico is the only country that the United States has invaded, occupied its capital, placing the Marines in the "halls of Montezuma," and then annexed half its territory.⁴⁰

For Huntington, the vast difference between 'traditional' immigrants and the 'new' immigrants are an unprecedented problem which cannot be solved by strategies previously employed. These factors combine to make the new wave of Hispanic immigrants in general and Mexican immigrants in particular a unique threat to the national identity of the United States of America.

⁴⁰ Ibid. p. 229.

The fundamental threat posed by the *Hispanzation* of the United States is the inability and lack of desire of these new immigrants to properly assimilate into the United States.

The criteria that can be used to gauge assimilation of an individual, a group, or a generation included language, education, occupation, and income citizenship, intermarriage, and identity. With respect to almost all of these indices, Mexican assimilation lags behind that of contemporary non-Mexican immigrants and that of immigrants in the previous waves.⁴¹

Here we see that Huntington once again demonstrates some of the features found within the Conflict Model, specifically that all mixing is seen as a loss of some essential or pure identity. He does a remarkable reading of history which seems to discount how some of the earlier immigrants into the Mexican Northeast also failed to 'assimilate' into the culture of Mexico. Rather than viewing the mixing of these two cultures he can only speak of the demise of the United States in its totality. He also speaks of the existence of the various communities, including settler and immigrant, as somehow having a 'self-encapsulated' existence prior to their 'encounter with the Other. This can only make sense if Huntington 'brackets off' certain historical perspectives. To the Indigenous people living in the geographical space of what is now the United States of America the distinction between immigrant and settler would be lost.

In the two issues that Huntington addresses, the relation between the Western and non-Western civilization and the United States and the Hispanic Immigrant, we see exhibited the fundamental features of the Conflict Model. We

⁴¹ Ibid. p. 230-31.

see how Huntington views the original 'settlers' as somehow existing in a pristine form. In this way all 'mixing' becomes a dilution of some 'original' cultural purity. We see how inaccurate this explanation is given that all of the communities of which he speaks are already a mixture of various other communities. We also see how he casts these interactions in binary and dichotomous terms; it has to be either America or Hispanic etc. Finally he treats all parties as existing within a self-encapsulated reality.

The next person we will introduce who represents the Conflict Model is author Dinesh D'Souza. While having many similarities to Huntington, there are some clear distinctions. What is important is to view him as an exemplar of the Conflict Model.

Dinesh D'Souza: The Other as Enemy—Foreign and Domestic

In *The Enemy at Home: The Cultural Left and Its Responsibility for 9/11*, Dinesh D'Souza makes a claim that he admits will be 'startling at the outset':⁴² that there is a causal relation between the views and practices which are part of the 'cultural left' and the attacks which occurred in the United States on September 11th 2001.

The cultural left in this country (such people as Hillary Clinton, Ted Kennedy, Nancy Pelosi, Barbara Boxer, George Soros, Michael Moore, Bill Moyers, and Noam Chomsky) is responsible for causing 9/11...In faulting the cultural left, I am not making the absurd accusation that this group blew up the World Trade Center and the Pentagon. I am saying that

⁴² Dinesh D'Souza, *The Enemy at Home: The Cultural Left and its Responsibility for 9/11*, (New York: Doubleday Broadway Publishing Books, 2007), 1.

the cultural left and its allies in Congress, the media, Hollywood, the nonprofit sector and the universities are the primary cause of the volcano of anger towards America that is erupting from the Islamic world. The Muslims who carried out the 9/11 attacks were the product of this visceral rage—some of it based on legitimate concerns, some of it based on wrongful prejudice—but all fueled and encouraged by the cultural left. Thus without the cultural left, 9/11 would not have happened.⁴³

He speaks of how the left-liberal values espoused by some within the United States have subverted traditional values here at home and abroad. These traditional values can best be understood as those which are espoused by many who identify as Western-Christian communities. For D'Souza the attacks of 9/11 were specifically a response to the perceived moral depravity of 'The West.' While echoing similar concerns with that of Huntington he also wishes to distinguish himself by not viewing this conflict as merely a simple 'clash of civilization' but something more nuanced. For D'Souza the other is not merely Islam or the Non-Western people but communities closer to home.

There is no "clash of civilizations" between the Islam and the West. But there are two clashes of civilization that are shaping the world today. The first clash is between liberal and conservative values within America. The second is a clash between traditional Islam and radical Islam, a clash within Islamic society. So whether they realize it or not, American conservatives are fighting a war on two fronts. The first is a war against

⁴³ Ibid. 1-2.

Islamic radicalism and fundamentalism. The second is a political struggle against the left and its pernicious political and moral influence in America and around the globe. My conclusion is that the two wars are intimately connected. In fact, we cannot win the first war without also winning the second war.⁴⁴

Like Huntington, D'Souza views the encounter with the other still within a 'clash' framework, even if he means a slightly different 'other.' Note that for him somehow the war (of values and traditions) must be either totally won or totally lost. D'Souza also speaks against multiculturalism, one of the touted values of the 'cultural left,' noting that the acceptance of the multicultural perspective merits careful scrutiny. He seeks to defend Western Civilization and, more specifically, America by speaking for that which is unique about 'us' and against those who would endanger the greatness that comes from this uniqueness.

“What I would say is that you should fix your eyes every day on the greatness of Athens as she really is, and should fall in love with her.” Even as he presents a somewhat idealized view of Athens, Pericles is saying that ultimately we fight for our country not in the name of some abstract theory, not even in the name of founding myths and constitutions, but in the name of the kind of society that we live in, and the kind of life that it makes possible for us. America today is in the position of the ancient Athenians, facing in the militants of the Islamic world a new kind of Sparta. What is needed, therefore, is an examination of the source of the conflict,

⁴⁴ Ibid. 27.

of the nature of the enemy. But what is needed, most of all, is an understanding of the moral basis of Western civilization, of what makes the American experiment historically unique, and of what makes American life as it is lived today the best life that our world has to offer. Only then can we know what is at stake in this war and what we possess that is worth fighting for.⁴⁵

We can see some features of the Conflict Model imbedded in the work of D'Souza. He views America as a self-encapsulated entity, particularly in his understanding of the 'American life as it is lived today' as existing within a historical vacuum. He does not take into account that the "American life as it is lived today" has some deep historical roots in the Middle East.⁴⁶ Note also his perception that even 'liberal' American values that may have been founded within the *American experiment* may ultimately diminish the pristine goodness of America.

Critique of Conflict Model

I will elaborate upon many of the critiques of the Conflict Model in the discussion of the other models. Here I will only briefly summarize the shortcomings of this model. In critiquing the Conflict Model I wish only to focus on why this paradigm is insufficient in doing justice to an encounter with the other. I do not wish to argue the actual merits of each author's political, cultural, or economic position. There are several problems with the Conflict Model, most fundamentally its inability to deal with the reality of how human culture is actually

⁴⁵ Dinesh D'Souza, *What's So Great About America*.

⁴⁶ Tariq Ali, *The Clash of Fundamentalism: Crusades, Jihad and Modernity* (New York/London: Verso Publishing, 2002).

created. I believe, like Seyla Benhabib, that “Cultures are formed through complex dialogues with other cultures”⁴⁷ Like Virgilio Elizondo who is an example of the Mestizo Model, I believe that it is naïve to view any culture, particularly any modern culture, as not being a ‘mix’ of many other cultures,⁴⁸ and therefore also naïve to speak of a culture or community of any kind as having existed in a pure state prior to any encounter with another culture. This understanding of cultures or communities as self-encapsulated entities belies the complex working of human history.⁴⁹The Conflict Model does an inadequate job of understanding what actually is involved in the constituting of a culture or community. Finally, I believe that viewing the encounter through a binary pattern creates unnecessary patterns of conflict. This is not to say that there will be no power struggles or conflicts but simply to state that we need not begin with that as the working paradigm precisely because it lacks the precision necessary to make an encounter with the other most authentic.⁵⁰

The Dialogue Model

⁴⁷ Seyla Benhabib, *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2002), ix.

⁴⁸ There are many who have dealt with this issue. However I have found Enrique Dussel’s work particularly helpful in understanding this process. *Philosophy of Liberation*, 1.2.4 Imperialist Recolonization. Also important in reconfiguring this discourse is the work of Robert Pasnau, *The Islamic Scholar Who Gave Us Modern Philosophy*, Humanities, November/December 2011/ Volume 32, Number 6. His work is especially important because of the need for many within the Conflict Model to speak of Western Civilization (or ‘The West’) as an entity which seems to have fallen from the sky in a fully developed state.

⁴⁹ Virgilio Elizondo, *Galilean Journey: The Mexican-American Promise* (New York: Orbis Press, 2002), ix. “Every modern human culture that we know is a composite. It is mestizo, made up of disparate elements, which nonetheless form an integrated whole.”

⁵⁰ Edward Said, *Orientalism*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1994) 25-26, “Rather than the manufactured *clash of civilizations*, we need to concentrate on the slow working together of cultures that overlap, borrow, from each other, and live together in far more interesting ways than any abridged or inauthentic mode of understanding can allow.”

The three features which comprise the Dialogue Model are: a much more nuanced and accurate way of viewing culture, communities and identity; a vision of relations between culture that is not binary or dichotomous; and a serious engagement with the critique made by the other. The two representative examples of this model are Seyla Benhabib, and Kwame Anthony Appiah.

Seyla Benhabib: Encountering the Other from within the Horizon of Modernity

In the introduction to *Situating the Self: Gender, Community, and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*, Seyla Benhabib begins by acknowledging the ‘fractured spirit of our times.’⁵¹ She specifically notes that “the cultural and political ideas of modernity, and among them what Richard Rorty has called ‘the metanarratives of liberal democracies, have become suspect.’”⁵² She realizes that this suspicion is well grounded in the lived experiences of those whom Franz Fanon has called ‘the wretched of the earth.’ Benhabib shows profound sympathy for the other within modernity.

This current mood of skepticism...toward continuing the “project of modernity” is based upon an understandable disillusionment with a form of life that still perpetrated war, armament, environmental destruction and economic exploitation at the cost of satisfying basic human needs with human dignity, a form of life that still relegates many women, non-Christian, and non-white peoples to second class moral and political

⁵¹ Seyla Benhabib, *Situating the Self: Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*, (New York: Routledge Press, 1992), 1.

⁵² Ibid. 1

status, a form of life that saps the bases of solidaristic coexistence in the name of profit and competition.⁵³

Clearly, we are dealing here with a different paradigm of encounter with the Other than the Conflict Model. Benhabib demonstrates the deep sensitivity that is much more reflective of the Dialogue Model. She seems to take seriously the critique and the experience of how the other has experienced this 'project of modernity.' In exhibiting this understanding she is allowing herself to enter into dialogue from a place of mutual respect that does not preclude conflict, and in fact presupposes it, but that clearly also envisions moving beyond it. She seems, however, to believe that this dialogue can only occur within the previous framework that was created by Western modernity.

It is my conviction, however, that the project of modernity can only be reformed from within the intellectual, moral and political resources made possible and available to us by the development of modernity on a global scale since the sixteenth century. Among the legacies of modernity which today need reconstructing but not wholesale dismantling are moral and political universalism, committed to the now seemingly "old fashioned" and suspect ideals of universal respect for each person by virtue of their humanity; the moral autonomy of the individual; economic and social justice and equality participation; and the most extensive civil and political liberties compatible with principles of justice; and the formation of solidaristic human associations.⁵⁴

⁵³ Ibid. 2

⁵⁴ Ibid. 2

Benhabib is willing to do serious reform within this tradition. In actively seeking the 'formation of solidaristic human associations,' Benhabib counters the position that all civilizations or cultures have to be framed within a 'clash' paradigm. In this way she differentiates herself from the binary and dichotomous vision of the Conflict Model. Her optimism stems in part from her ability to see cultures, communities, and identities as not existing in a reified or self-referential state.

But movements for maintaining the purity of distinctiveness of cultures seem to me irreconcilable with both democratic and more basic epistemological considerations. *Philosophically, I do not believe in the purity of cultures, or even in the possibility of identifying them as meaningfully discreet wholes.* I think of cultures as complex human practices of signification and representation, of organizing and attribution, which are internally riven by conflicting narratives. *Cultures are formed through complex dialogues with other cultures.*⁵⁵ [italics added]

In this passage she is countering some people's tendency to view the encounter with the other as somehow occurring between two 'pure' entities. She finds the position of the 'multiculturalist,' which is critiqued by both Huntington and D'Souza, as equally untenable but on slightly different grounds. Benhabib is critical of those she terms 'hard' multiculturalists, asserting that they have an essentialist view of culture. This view of culture claims an ontological coherence within each culture that she feels is false. She asserts that those who adopt the

⁵⁵ Seyla Benhabib, *The Claims of Culture: Equality and Diversity in the Global Era* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2002), ix.

Conflict Model, in this case both Huntington and D'Souza, suffer from this same false consciousness. Their claim to want to protect their culture (e.g. The West, America etc.) likewise rests on this false epistemological principle. Benhabib considers the entire debate on how to engage the cultural 'other' to be truncated precisely 'because both opponents and proponents of multiculturalism, despite disclaimers to the contrary, continue to defend a faulty understanding of cultures as unified, holistic and self-consistent wholes.'⁵⁶ For someone involved in the Dialogue Model, the desire to maintain cultural or civilizational *purity* is a moot point precisely because it bespeaks a desire to return to a utopian paradise that never existed. What is necessary instead is a capacity to engage in dialogue with the other, for through such dialogue all parties are enriched and empowered.

While accepting that all cultures are a work in progress, Huntington and D'Souza are conscious that the dialogue in the Dialogue Model must contend with the problem of making universal/normative claims while at the same time showing respect for the particularity of each community or culture. This is how they view the encounter with the Other; not in conflict but in dialogue.

A global civilization that is shared by world citizens will need to be nourished by local attachments; rich cultural debate; contestations about identity of the "we"; and a sense of democratic experimentation with institutional design and redesign...This is the future challenge of synthesizing democratic equality and cultural diversity.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Ibid. 86.

⁵⁷ Ibid. 37.

For Benhabib this synthesizing of cultural diversity must occur from within Modernity. For the Dialogue Model, the encounter between the communities occurs within an already existing 'democratic experiment' that must undergo 'design and redesign,' but always within an already pre-existing framework.

Kwame Anthony Appiah: Rooted Cosmopolitanism and the Creation of the Other

Anthony Appiah frames the encounter with the other in what he terms Rooted Cosmopolitanism. The central assertion of the Cosmopolitan is that what makes us truly human is our capacity to create our lives through the choices we make. This is the a priori condition which must be cultivated before any genuine encounter can occur. This is also a prerequisite for all human flourishing.

So Mill wrote in the book's celebrated third chapter, "On individuality, as One of the Elements of Wellbeing," and it is a powerful proposal. For it seems to suggest that individuality could be taken as prior to even the book's titular subject, liberty itself. Our capacity to use all of our faculties in our individual ways was, as least in part, what made liberty valuable to us... Individuality is not so much a state to be achieved as a mode of life to be pursued. Mill says that it is important that one choose one's own plan of life, and liberty consists, at least in part, in providing the conditions under which a choice among acceptable options is possible.⁵⁸

Appiah is immediately aware of the dangers in making individual autonomy a precondition for an encounter with the other. He is aware that many cultures have a vastly different anthropology which does not automatically cede

⁵⁸ A. Kwame Appiah, *The Ethic of Identity* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005), 4-5.

such authority to the individual.⁵⁹ He cites a variety of authors that are deeply suspicious of anything that 'elevates a controversial and questionable ideal of life uncritically and unduly.'⁶⁰ Many of the authors he cites note correctly that "many cultures don't place such values on the individual's freedom to choose his ends."⁶¹ In many cultures the individual's interest is subordinated to that of the community. His response to this concern is expressed in his term of *soul-making*. In this process of soul-making the autonomy of the individual and the honoring of collective identity are not understood as being in opposition.⁶² In addressing the question posed by the authors who are suspicious of a highly autonomous and individualistic anthropology Appiah exhibits the quality of sensitivity to critiques made by the other that is typically found in the Dialogue Model.

He demonstrates another characteristic of the Dialogue Model in his critique of those who have a crude understanding of culture or collective identity formation.⁶³ He does this by showing how those who are 'unsubtle in their

⁵⁹ Ibid. 40. "The controversy over how to formulate autonomy—over what set of criteria best captures our intuition, or best expresses our ideal; or over the precise content of the ideal (the debate has both a conceptual and normative dimension)—immediately let on to another: whether autonomy, even putting aside the details of its specification, is or ought to be a value in the first place, at least outside of the liberal democracies of the West."

⁶⁰ Ibid. 41.

⁶¹ Ibid. 42.

⁶² Ibid. 211. "It bears repeating that my aim in this chapter has been to venture an account of where soul making fits into the liberal-democratic politics; it has not been to expand or diminish its purview. Because we are persons, our autonomy ought to be respected; because we are encumbered, socially embedded selves, we will use our autonomy to protect and preserve a wide variety of extraindividual commitments. Finally, because we are human beings, we are frail, and we are formed; it is our nature to shape our natures. Earlier I mentioned the seeming paradox that Mill's paramount concern for freedom as noninterference enfolded a concern for governance that had a positive influence on the character of its citizens: what he understood as the "self" in "self-development" had to be the object of the process before it was the subject—that the cultivation of individuality was the most social thing of all."

⁶³ Ibid. 107. " But it seems to me that one reasonable ground for suspicion of much contemporary multicultural talk is the conceptions of collective identity they presuppose are indeed remarkably unsubtle in their understandings of the process by which identities, both individual and collective develop."

understanding of the process by which identities, both individual and collective develop' become prey to a faulty binary thinking on this issue. He also exhibits a much more nuanced way of viewing the creation of cultures and the absolute necessity for there to be an ongoing dialogue among all cultures to avoid human fallibility.⁶⁴ In citing John Stuart Mill's observation that 'there is no nation which does not need to borrow from others' he is directly refuting the premise of much of the Conflict Model. Not only is mixing good, it is absolutely essential for health of community.

Critique of Dialogue Model

There is much to praise in the Critique Model, including its sophisticated and much more accurate view of how cultures and collective identities come into existence. Much can also be said positively about how it does not fall prey to a faulty logic which sees all interactions in exclusively conflictual terms. Finally one can honor how its sincere engagement with the critiques made by the other shows a far superior example of love of neighbor than does the Conflict Model.

Its fundamental weakness lies in not taking its own position far enough. It still wishes to maintain a certain 'final authority' on discourse which is problematic. This is particularly true in two areas. The first is its understanding of the relation between the individual and the community. There is a view which is held by many, particularly those within the margins, that does not frame the discourse of

⁶⁴ Ibid. 271. "If this book has a totem, it is, of course, John Stuart Mill, and we should not be surprised to find that he himself has pithily expressed the cosmopolitan ideal: "To human beings, who, as hitherto educated, can scarcely cultivate even a good quality without running it into fault, it is indispensable to be perpetually comparing their own notions and customs with the experience and example of persons in different circumstances from themselves: and *there is no nation which does not need to borrow from others, not merely particular arts or practices, but essential points of characters in which its own type is inferior*" [italics added].

individual and community in the same manner. In this view it is not a matter of *individuals choosing* to respect, protect, or 'join' a communal identity, but rather the recognition that community exists prior to individual's agency. This view understands that respect of an individual makes no sense apart from recognition of this understanding of an a priori communal ontology.⁶⁵ The implications of this radically different anthropology are difficult to assess. However it is essential that this difference be honored and grasped before any authentic dialogue can occur. If not, all encounters and dialogues will lack authenticity precisely because they will be filtered through the lenses of an understanding which seeks to particularize the universal. By viewing all understandings of individual and community within these pre-conceived categories it makes no room for an-Other's way of inhabiting the world.

The second flaw can best be understood as a fundamental need to reframe the issue. The parameters of modern discourse are already situated within a logic of domination. There are many voices that have attempted to show this hidden 'history.'⁶⁶ The epistemological implications of this colonization

⁶⁵ Enrique Dussel, *Philosophy of Liberation*, Trans. Aquilina Martinez and Christine Morovsky, (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1985), 44. "The face of the other, primarily the poor and oppressed, reveals a people before it reveals an individual person. The brown face of the Latin American mestizo wrinkled with the furrows of centuries of work, the ebony face of the African slave, the olive face of the Hindu, the yellow face of the Chinese coolie is the irruption of the history of a people before it is the biography of Tupac Amaru, Lumumba, Nehru, and Mao Tse-tung. To describe the experience of proximity as individual experience, or the metaphysical experience of face-to-face as lived experience, between two persons, is simply to forget that personal mystery is always risked in the exteriority of the popular history of a people (3.1.3-4). The individualization of this collective personal experience is a European deformation derived from the bourgeois revolution. Each face, unique, inscrutable mystery of decisions not yet made, is the face of a sex, a generation, a social class, a nation, a cultural group, a historical epoch...The other person—metaphysical alterity, exteriority on the anthropological level—is primarily social and historico-popular."

⁶⁶ In a written correspondence between Enrique Dussel and Karl Otto Apel and Paul Ricoeur, Dussel seeks to explain how certain 'histories' remain hidden within dominant

process continue to be important. The center's discourses, even those interested in dialogue, will be blinded by its own 'logic.' This blindness will disallow a certain depth, and authenticity of dialogue to occur. A powerful example of this logic can be found in the continued understanding of the language of 'discovery' in relation to entire arenas of human experience.⁶⁷ Part of the fundamental flaw is that the

discourses. "This hermeneutics of incommunicable histories leaves the dominator from the metropolitan center in total innocence with respect to all the cruelties committed in the periphery during the whole of modernity. A French person will recognize that French colonists in Algeria have something to do with France; but just as well the Boers of South African with Holland, the *conquistadors* of Mexico and Peru with Spain, those of Brazil with Portugal, the Dutch merchants in Indonesia with the Low Countries, those of Haiti and Martinique (of Franz Fanon) with France, and the Company of the East Indies with England. Not to acknowledge that modernity begins with the expansion and "centrality" of Europe in the history that is thus inaugurated as "worldly"—before civilizations were regional, provincial—is to forget the violence of the European colonization."

⁶⁷ Walter D. Mignolo, *The Idea of Latin America*, Series: Blackwell Manifestos, (Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 3-5. "Discovery" and "invention" are not just different interpretations of the same event; they belong to two different paradigms. The line that distinguishes the two paradigms is the line of the shift in the geo-politics of knowledge; changing the terms and not only the content of the conversation. The first presupposes the triumphant European and imperial perspective on world history, an achievement that was described as "modernity," while the second reflects the critical perspective of those who have been placed behind, who are expected to follow the ascending progress of history to which they have a feeling of not belonging. Colonization of being is nothing else than producing the idea that certain people do not belong to history—that they are non-beings. Thus, lurking beneath the European story of discovery are histories, experiences, and silenced conceptual narratives of those who are disqualified as human beings, as historical actors, and as capable of thinking and understanding. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the "wretched of the earth" (as Franz Fanon labeled the colonized beings) were Indians and African slaves. That is why missionaries and men of letters appointed themselves to write the histories they thought Incas and Aztecs did not have, and to write the grammar of Kechua/Kichua and Nahuatl with Latin as the model. Africans were simply left out of the picture of conversion and taken as pure labor force. Toward the end of the seventeenth century, a new social group surfaced, and when they surfaced they were already outside of history: the Creoles of Spain and Portuguese descent. Although their marginalization was far from the extremes to which Indians and Africans were subjected, the Creoles, between the limits of humanity (Indians and Africans) and humanity proper (European), were left out of history. The geo-political configuration of scales that measured the nature of human beings in terms of an idea of history that Western Christians assumed to be the total and true one for every inhabitant on the planet led to the establishment of a colonial matrix of power, to leave certain people out of history in order to justify violence in the name of Christianization, civilization, and, more recently, development and market democracy. Such a geo-political configuration created a divide between a minority of people who dwell in and embrace Christian, civilizing, or developing missions and a majority who are the outcasts and become the targets of those missions. Max Weber has been credited, after Hegel, with having conceptualized "modernity" as the direction of history that had Europe as a model and a goal. More recently, since the late 1980s, Peruvian sociologist Anibal Quijano unveiled "coloniality" as the darker side of modernity and as the historical perspective of the wretched, the outcasts from history told from the perspective of modernity. From the perspective of modernity, coloniality is difficult to see or recognize, and even a bothersome

Dialogue Model begins from the perspective of the 'center' and not the other.

This cannot be said about the final Model.

The Mestizo Model

The three features which are found in the Mestizo Model are that: it begins from within the perspective of the other; it accepts the porous quality of culture but is much more explicit about the power dynamics involved in this 'mixing' of cultures; and it takes as its starting point the anthropology of the marginalized, viewing human experience as best understood through the lens of a socio-political anthropology.⁶⁸ The two representatives of this model are Virgilio Elizondo and Edward Said.

Virgilio Elizondo: The Mestizo Other Speaks

Virgilio Elizondo has written extensively on the subject of encountering the other using the lens of *Mestizaje*.⁶⁹ For Elizondo all cultures are ultimately a product of this process. To try to impede this process is actually detrimental and ultimately will lead to the extinction of that which one wishes to preserve.⁷⁰ He

concept. For the second set of actors, the wretched, modernity is unavoidable although coloniality offers a shifting perspective of knowledge and history. For the first actors, modernity is one-sided and of single density. For the second, modernity is double-sided and of double density. To understand the coexistence of these two major paradigms is to understand how the shift in the geo-geography and the geo-politics of knowledge is taking place. My argument is straightforwardly located in the second paradigm, in the double density of modernity/coloniality."

⁶⁸ See footnote 53.

⁶⁹ Virgilio Elizondo, *The Future is Mestizo: Life Where Cultures Meet*, (Colorado: University Press of Colorado, 2000), 17: "Mestizaje: the process through which two totally different peoples mix biologically and culturally so that a new people begins to emerge, e.g., Europeans and Asians gave birth to Eurasians; Iberians and Indians gave birth to the Mexican and Latin American people."

⁷⁰ Virgilio Elizondo, *Galilean Journey: The Mexican-American Promise*, (New York: Orbis Press, 2002), ix: "Every modern human culture that we know is a composite. It is mestizo, made up of disparate elements, which nonetheless form an integrated whole...A human grouping—like any other living organism—cannot survive except by confronting the unknown, the unexpected. It must re-form its identity at the threshold of every new encounter. It is engaged in a ceaseless effort of absorption, assimilation, and transmutation—of symbols, images, modes of existence. To

writes extensively of his embodying and engaging in this process.⁷¹ He is conscious of being an ‘outsider’ to both of the cultures which he inhabited: the Anglo culture of the United States and the Mexican culture of the Southwest *borderlands*, specifically Texas. He points out that his experiences of being an outsider, while in some ways common to that of others, also had some very sharp distinctions. It was in his early visits to Mexico from his place of origin, Texas, that he encountered the reality that, for the Mexicans, he would always be a *Pocho*. A *Pocho* is someone whose origins are in Mexico but who was born in the United States.⁷² Yet he also highlights that unlike his experience in the United States of being an outsider, here “The label marked distance and difference but not separation or rejection.”⁷³ He later comes to realize that this difference in response to the distinction is conditioned by many factors.⁷⁴

Elizondo demonstrates many of the characteristics found in the Mestizo Model. When he speaks of his experience of the ‘ignorance’ of the Anglos or their ‘drive to dominate, subjugate, and exploit’⁷⁵ he is clearly speaking from the perspective of the Other, the marginalized, or the ‘wretched’ (Fanon). He is much

try to arrest this movement at any given point—whether from nostalgia over the past or the dream of a sirenic utopia—is to condemn it to sclerosis and death.”

⁷¹ *The Future is Mestizo*, 15-27.

⁷² *Ibid.* 20 “To this day it is not uncommon to hear someone from Mexico say about a Mexica-American’s Spanish ‘For a *norteamericano*, your Spanish is not bad.’

⁷³ *Ibid.* 20.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 21. “I lived on the border between two nationalities. I was an insider-outsider to both. I was “Mexican” in the U.S. and gringo/pocho in Mexico. There was a painful side to it, for it is difficult to always be different, but there was also an enjoyable side to it: I had a lot more options and could move easily in and out of two worlds. For as much as I loved the Mexican side of me, I never really disliked or hated the Anglo side, which I was making my own in the schools. Yet it was painful and incomprehensible because there were so many Anglo racists. Since I loved and admired Mexico so much the only conclusion I would logically come to was that the racists were ignorant. Much later on, I would discover that it was not just ignorance, but the Anglo drive to dominate, subjugate, and exploit. And even when some wanted to be of help, it was helping the other become like themselves.”

⁷⁵ *Ibid.* 21.

more explicit about the differential power dynamic in the mixing of the cultures. He speaks of Mestizaje or the mixing of cultures as much more fluid and dynamic. Finally it is important to note that when he speaks of his *identity* he speaks in terms of the communities of his origins, specifically Mexican and American. He does not negate his 'individuality' but he would find it difficult to speak of his existence outside of these 'collective' identities.

Edward Said: Beyond the Oriental Other

While Edward Said does not use the term Mestizaje, he does articulate a vision of all human societies as being a 'slow working together of cultures that overlap, borrow from each other, and live together'⁷⁶ He, like Elizondo, is conscious of his interest in the question of encountering the other as originating from a profoundly personal/existential experience.⁷⁷ But even in this understanding of a *personal*, intimate experience he experiences himself as living also much more broadly as "an Oriental." By viewing an aspect of his personal reality through the 'lens' of a community he is reflecting the

⁷⁶ Edward Said, *Orientalism*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), xxix.

⁷⁷ Ibid. 25-26. "Much of my personal investment in this study derives from my awareness of being an "Oriental" as a child growing up in two British colonies. All of my education, in those colonies, (Palestine and Egypt) and in the United States, has been Western, and yet that deeply early awareness has persisted. In many ways my study of Orientalism has been an attempt to inventory the traces upon me, the Oriental subject, of the culture whose domination has been so powerful a factor in the life of all Orientals. This is why for me the Islamic Orient has had to be the center of attention...I have felt it important to be conscious of trying to produce one. Along the way, as severely and as rationally as I have been able, I have tried to maintain a critical consciousness as well as employing those instruments of historical, humanistic, and cultural research of which my education has made me the fortunate beneficiary. In none of that, however, have I ever lost hold of the cultural reality of, the personal involvement in having been constituted as, "an Oriental."

anthropology of the margins.⁷⁸ For Said the ultimate encounter with the other would entail relating in a manner which is ‘nonrepressive and nonmanipulative’,⁷⁹ He is aware that in order for this to occur we would have to ‘rethink the whole complex problem of knowledge and power’⁸⁰ in relation to the ‘study of other cultures and peoples.’⁸¹ He even asserts that this is one of the ‘most important tasks of all.’⁸² He reflects the Mestizo Model in being cognizant of how all encounters occur within already existing power relations.⁸³ He, like Elizondo, is conscious of this in part because he speaks from the perspective of someone who has been the victim of Modernity. But like Elizondo he is also a ‘bridge figure’ who has a ‘double vision,’ seeing the world both through the eyes of one particular community, because he was trained in the educational systems of that community, but also through the eyes of his collective identity as other, outside of that community.

Critique of the Mestizo Model

⁷⁸ See footnote 53.

⁷⁹ *Orientalism*, 24.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.* 24.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 24.

⁸³ *Ibid.* 11. “I doubt that it is controversial, for example, to say that an Englishman in India or Egypt in the later nineteenth century took an interest in those countries that was never far from their status in his mind as British colonies. To say this may seem quite different from saying that all academic knowledge about India and Egypt is somehow tinged and impressed with, violated by, the gross political fact—and yet that is what I am saying in this study of Orientalism. For if it is true that no production of knowledge in the human sciences can ever ignore or disclaim its author’s involvement as a human subject in his own circumstances, then it must be also be true that for a European or American studying the Orient there can be no disclaiming the main circumstances of his actuality: that he comes up against the Other as a European or an American, as an individual second. And to be a European or an American in such a situation is by no means an inert fact. It meant and means being aware, however dimly, that one belongs to a part of the earth with a definite history of involvement in the Orient almost since the time of Homer.”

Because I find the Mestizo Model to be the model most capable of allowing for an authentic encounter with the other, I find that its flaws are much more of degree rather than underlying concept. So, for example, while it does take seriously the power dynamics found in all encounters, it frequently fails to elucidate them. I think that the Mestizo Model speaks of a kind of *mixing* that does not take fully into account the powerful and brutal nature of this Mestizaje.⁸⁴ It is precisely in articulating and enumerating the details of mixing that we come to realize the long lasting and deep impact which this previous 'encounter' has engendered among the Other (and ourselves). We cannot call authentic any encounter that 'glosses' over the details of what occurred. In the mixing process we have to be rooted in a historical narrative which will give a 'preference' to certain voices in any encounter. The Mestizo Model also at times suffers from an 'essentialist' perspective similar to that which is found in the Conflict Model. It tends to view the cultures or communities that are part of the Mestizaje process in self-encapsulated wholes.⁸⁵ In this way it does not deal with sufficient subtlety

⁸⁴ To give but one example of this new understanding of Mestizaje we can read the writings of Gloria Anzaldua. In her seminal work, *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*, she describes the 'mestizaje' process of the Anglos and the Mexicans in powerful terms. "The Gringo, locked into the fiction of white superiority, seized complete political power, stripping Indians and Mexicans of their land while their feet were still rooted in it. Con el destierro y el exilio fuimos desunados, destroncados, destripados—we were jerked out by the roots, truncated, disemboweled, dispossessed, and separated from our identity and our history. Many, under threat of Anglo terrorism, abandoned homes and ranches and went to Mexico. Some stayed and protested. But as the courts, law enforcement officials, and government officials not only ignored their pleas but penalized them for their efforts, tejanos had no other recourse but armed rebellion." Pp. 29-30.

⁸⁵ The critique which Anzaldua lays upon the Mexican culture demonstrates how even the marginalized other in one set of circumstances can quickly become the power center which seeks to marginalize other visions and voices. "Culture forms our beliefs. We perceive the version of reality that it communicates. Dominant paradigms, predefined concepts that exist as unquestionable, unchallengeable, are transmitted through the culture. Culture is made by those in power—men. Males make the rules and laws; women transmit them. How many times have I heard mothers and mothers-in-law tell their sons to beat their wives for not obeying them, for being *hociconas* (big mouths), for being *callejeras* (going to visit and gossip with neighbors), for

with the question of communal anthropology that is so important for encounter with the other.

An Authentic Encounter with the Particular Other

The fundamental challenge is how to fuse the two sides of the dialectic, that of differentiation or potency of particularity and interdependence. I assert they can only be rightly understood from within a liberationist and post-colonial perspective. In saying this I see a twofold challenge stemming from each side of the twofold dialectic. On the side of the potency of particularity we are challenged to have an encounter with the Other that truly respects, honors, and maintains the integrity of the Other as other. In this way we acknowledge that an aspect of Christian love is seeing the Neighbor as not being a part of us. On the side of interdependence we are challenged to have an encounter with the Other that truly respects, honors, and maintains the integrity of *the experience of interdependence* from the perspective of the Other, as a part of us.

With these challenges presented and acknowledged we can begin to construct a process which seeks to encounter the Other in their otherness while concurrently seeking some foundational unity with the Other. This process I call Agapic Solidarity. However, before I introduce the process I must first accomplish two tasks; the first is to introduce a common vocabulary from which to have this conversation. I do this by introducing the work of Emmanuel Levinas. The second

expecting their husbands to help them with the rearing of children and the housework, for wanting to be something other than housewives?" p. 38.

is to present the authors who are most seminal in the creation of this process:

Johann Baptist Metz and Enrique Dussel.

CHAPTER 2

THE MULTI-DIMENSIONAL *OTHER*

Introduction

In the previous chapter we saw that two of the more salient features of our current globalized world are *differentiation*, what I termed the potency of particularity, and *interdependence*. Given this twofold dialectic, I suggest that the central manner in which the love command can be embodied today is in an authentic encounter with the Other. An encounter can only be considered authentic when two features are evident in the encounter: the honoring of the power of the particularity of the Other, and an honest appraisal of how interdependence has worked within the relationship between ourselves and the Other.

In being conscious of the potency of particularity in the encounter we affirm the uniqueness of the Other. What is equally important, however, is that by affirming the power of particularity we are also surrendering a certain 'epistemological privilege.'¹ This privilege is corrosive to our encounter with the

¹ D. Walter Mignolo, *The Idea of Latin America*, Blackwell Manifestos Series, (Malden, Blackwell Publishing, 2005), 153. "Control of money and control of meaning and being are parallel processes. Out of the top ten universities in the world, seven are in the U.S. and three in Europe. If control of meaning and knowledge is concentrated in the ten top universities that produce the leaders of tomorrow's world, control of money is concentrated in the same geo-historical locations. Almost 48 percent of major corporations and banks are located in the U.S. and Europe. Ten percent in Japan and the remaining 40 percent are scattered all over the world. If the geo-politics of economy is concentrated in three locales, with Japan having significantly less economic power, and the control of knowledge is located in Europe and the US, then talking about "deterritorialization" and a "floating" empire only masks the fact that the geo-politics of knowledge and economy remains anchored firmly in the West. Note, I use the term "geo-politics

Other because its power creates an obstacle in our ability to see the Other. Ironically one area in which this epistemological privilege has been most corrosive is in our understanding of the actual structure and content of interdependence between ourselves and the Other.

This chapter has three sections. The first section introduces the work of Emmanuel Levinas. This section allows us to gain a common vocabulary to speak of the issue of engaging the Other. It includes some of the key conceptual categories found within the work of Levinas, which are necessary tools for becoming conversant in this discourse. The second section critiques how Levinas conceptualizes the Other. It particularly attends to how Levinas' conceptualization of the Other is inadequate in dealing with the question of historical particularity. The final section proposes one manner in which to address the fundamental shortcomings of how Levinas conceptualizes the Other by introducing four dimensions of the human experience.

The Levinasian Other: Other than All Being

Few modern philosophers have written with such passion and precision on the topic of the Other as Emmanuel Levinas. His understanding of the Other, and specifically the infinite otherness of the Other, which cannot be sublated by any

of economy" and not "political economy" because this term can only tell part of the story, the story of Western capitalism as seen by its own agents and intellectuals. Alongside the economic and epistemic hegemony is the simultaneous control of authority, state, and army. Out of around two hundred countries in the world today, most of them weakened by globalization, those of the G8 (mainly the US and the Atlantic axis of European imperial countries of the past five hundred years) become stronger every day."

Totality, are particularly noteworthy.² The three aspects of Levinas' theory that I will explore as germane to this project are: Who is the Other? Where is the Other to be found? And, What does the Other ask of Us? In other words the question of Identity, Proximity, and Response.

Identity

For Levinas, the Other is she or he who exists outside all of my Totalities. Whatever manner or category I use to identify my sense of 'being in the world,' the Other will always be "other than being." The Other 'overflows absolutely every idea I can have of him [sic]³ and of myself. To understand the Other as used in this project and in the work of Levinas it is important to contrast it with the idea of the "I" as used in traditional philosophy and theology, particularly with the *cogito ergo sum* of Rene Descartes. This concept found in much of Western philosophical tradition has allowed all alterity and otherness to be submerged and subsumed into the Same, what Levinas terms the Ego.⁴ This Ego which then claims to 'think' about the Other is incapable of fully grasping the otherness of the Other precisely because it is trapped within its own logic or Reason.⁵ The

² Emmanuel Levinas, *Of God Who Comes To Mind*, Trans. Bettina Bergo, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998), Emmanuel Levinas, The Trace of the Other, in *Deconstruction in Context: Literature and Philosophy*, Ed. Mark C. Taylor, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1986).

³ Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*, Trans. Alphonso Lingis (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1969), 87.

⁴ *Of God Who Comes To Mind*, 12. "Nothing, in effect, is absolutely other in the being served by knowledge wherein variety turns into monotony...The unknown is immediately made familiar and the new customary. Nothing is new under the sun...Everything is absorbed, sucked down and walled up in the Same."

⁵ *Of God Who Comes To Mind*, 17. "Reason is identity that posits itself as I [*comme moi*]. It is an identity that identifies itself—that returns to itself—through the force of its form. It is that which is produced precisely as self-consciousness: an act of identification or identification in act. A force that returns to itself according to an itinerary traced only through the world and the history of humanity. The rationality of reason would thus leave nothing in the form of consciousness outside itself."

reasonable and conscious person then *chooses* to engage or encounter the Other but never surrenders a kind of self-referential autonomy.⁶ For Levinas, then, the Other is that which exists prior to all self-referential entities. 'It does not come from the time made up of presences, nor from the presences sunken into the past and representable, the time of beginnings or assumptions.'⁷ It is 'a transcendence that is no longer absorbed by my knowledge.'⁸ It is that which overflows from the totality of Being, it is 'other than Being.' It is the transcendent reality that relativizes all other Horizons. It is because of the total Otherness of the Other that in a binary dualism we cannot even speak of the Other as in opposition to the Same or the Totality. "If the same would establish its identity by simple opposition to the other, it would already be part of a totality encompassing the same and the other."⁹ Because the Other is ultimately beyond all horizons and systems of meaning which the "I" can create, the Other is always mystery.

Because of the flexibility allowed by this understanding of the Other, we can see how various authors, by identifying themselves within a certain horizon, precluded themselves from seeing the Other. This would be true whether the fundamental "I" with which you identified was a country, a historical period, or any other conceptual framework.

⁶ *Totality and Infinity*, 14. "The living being per se, is not without consciousness, but has a consciousness without problems, that is, without exteriority, an interior world whose center it occupies, a consciousness not concerned with situating itself in relation to an exteriority, which does not comprehend itself as part of a whole (for it precedes all comprehension), consciousness without consciousness to which the term unconscious (which hides no fewer contradictions) or instincts correspond...The identity of the living being throughout history contains nothing mysterious: the living being is essentially the Same, the Same determining ever Other, without the Other ever determining the Same."

⁷ *Of God Who Comes To Mind*, 71.

⁸ *Ibid.* 133.

⁹ *Totality and Infinity*, 38.

Proximity

While we can never have full knowledge of the Other, Levinas asserts that we are always in proximity to the Other. The Other is always in close proximity to the Same, within both time and space. When Levinas uses the language of 'awakening' to the Other, he is making us aware of a relational reality which has existed since the beginning of time between ourselves, however we identify ourselves, and the Other. The language of awakening allows us to fully grasp the autonomous existence of the Other. We accept that it is not our 'awareness' that gives existence and substance to the Other anymore than my 'awakening' to the sunrise gives the sun its existence. My experience of the sun (e.g. its light, heat, etc.) does not give the sun these properties. In the same manner, the relationship between myself and the Other 'is thus asymmetrical, without noematic correlation of any thematizable presence'¹⁰ It is always, 'An awakening to the other man [sic], which is not knowledge. Precisely the approach to the other man [sic]—the first one to come along in his proximity as fellowman [sic] irreducible to knowledge, though it may eventually call for knowledge, faced with others in the plural, a knowledge required by justice'¹¹ So proximity to the Other is in no manner connected to my agency, either on the level of knowledge, or personal agency. I am close to the Other long before I am able to sense my responsibility to the Other.

Response

¹⁰ Emmanuel Levinas, *On Thinking-of-the-Other: Entre nous*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1983), Trans. Michael B. Smith and Barbara Harshav, 168.

¹¹ Ibid. 168.

The Other has the effect of challenging all of my fundamental assumptions. This challenge occurs long before I am able to solidify my sense of identity and respond.¹² This responsibility has implications not only in a geographical or spatial dimension but also in a temporal dimension.¹³ We are in no manner able to manipulate, control, or construct the Other. For Levinas, the relationship is therefore asymmetrical; we are *hostage*, entirely emptied of agency in relation to the Other. Hence, there are some parallels between the relation of the Same and the Other for Levinas and that of the ‘preferential option for the poor’ in Liberation theology. In Liberation theology the ‘preferential option for the poor’ is not an actual preference in terms of a choice among other options but rather an intrinsic demand made by the Gospel. Another similarity between the Levinasian Other and ‘the poor’ of Liberation theology is that both seem to draw a very close correlation between the encounter of the immanent Other (or the poor) and the Divine. The theological implications are important in that the neighbor, the poor, or the Other all ultimately show us the ‘face of God.’¹⁴

Critique of Levinas: On Matters of Particularity and Agency

¹² *Totality and Infinity*. 71. ‘Responsibility does not let me constitute myself into an I think, as substantial as a stone or, like a heart of stone, into an in and for-oneself...It goes to the point of substitution for the other, up to the condition—or the noncondition—of a hostage.’

¹³ *Ibid.* 71. ‘This is a responsibility that does not leave me time: it leaves me without a present for recollection, or a return into the self. And it makes me late: before the neighbor I “compeer” rather than appear.’

¹⁴ See footnote # 1 in Introduction.

While I find the basic framework of Levinas compelling, I see two fundamental flaws in his understanding.¹⁵ The first flaw can be identified as a lack of agency or influence given to the Same in relating to the Other. By reducing the relationship to one of being held 'hostage' by the Other, Levinas essentially evacuates all power for the Same to act in a moral manner. If one of the conditions for authentic love to exist is freedom,¹⁶ then anyone being held hostage cannot truly love the person holding them hostage. By using the language and concept of *hostage*, Levinas is creating a condition that cannot allow for full participation on the part of any party towards the Other, for that would entail a much distorted sense of encounter with the Other. This would in part be due to the power differential which exists between anyone being held hostage and his *kidnapper*. Levinas, in trying to show the extraordinary power which the Other has in moral discourse, has 'emptied' all power from the Same or the Totality. The power differential and the lack of authentic agency on the part of the Same would militate against any authentic encounter. This would then render moot any possibility of love.

The second flaw can be found in Levinas' inability to assert the importance of particularizing some aspects of the Other. Levinas speaks frequently of encountering the *face* of the Other. Levinas, however, wishes not to give any specific characteristics, contours or shape to the face. Is this the face of woman?, a black face?, the face of a child? For Levinas we are precluded from ever

¹⁵ Anselm Min, *The Solidarity of Others in a Divided World: A Postmodern Theology after Postmodernism*, (New York: T & T Clark Publishing, 2004). A sympathetic critique of Levinas is found in the work of Anselm Min. Much of this section is inspired by Min's reading of Levinas.

¹⁶ Josef Fuchs, *Human Values and Christian Morality*, (Dublin: Gill and Macmillan, 1970).

knowing. Levinas views all attempts at particularizing the Other as a reductionism which robs the Other of all their uniqueness. It is true that in noting some particular quality or aspect of the Other we risk reifying or fetishizing that quality or characteristic.¹⁷ Yet by purging all aspects of the Other Levinas depicts an Other who is 'ontologically isolated from, and raised above, all sociohistorical relations'¹⁸ This lack of contextualization of the Other leads ultimately to an encounter which can make no specific moral demand on me. It is precisely because my love of neighbor has to acknowledge the potency of particularity that I must encounter not just *an Other* but rather *this particular Other*; this woman, this child. Rather than negate it, this specificity sharpens our moral response to the others' demands. In this way, mediation is not seen as a hindrance to our ethical response, but rather as an indispensable pre-condition for its fulfillment.

Even with these flaws I still find the work of Levinas fundamental to all understanding of encountering the other. I wish to take seriously his desire to maintain the complete transcendence of the Other while equally taking seriously his demand for us to respond ethically to this Other. This question may be framed in the following manner: how can we know the particulars of the Other without subsuming them into our pre-existing horizons. How can I view the Other within a specific particularity (gender, age etc.) without 1) reducing them only to that identity, and 2) having the Other be merely a reflection of my own predisposed understanding of that identity? In other words, how do we navigate

¹⁷ Min, 22. "No doubt mediating totality can lead, and has lead, to intellectual and political totalitarianism, and Levinas's prophetic outcry in defense of the irreducible transcendence of the other serves as an indispensable corrective against all totalitarian temptations."

¹⁸ Ibid. 22.

between the Scylla of the transcendent Otherness of the Other and the Charybdis of the mediating particularity which allows me to authentically love this transcendent Other?

The Many *Dimensions* Where We Encounter the Other

One solution to the problem posed above is found by drawing up parameters which serve as *locations* in which the encounter with the Other occurs. These locations are best understood as *arenas* or *dimensions* of the human experience. By understanding that all human experience is mediated through certain dimensions or arenas we can mitigate against some of the more extreme tendencies which are introduced above. By identifying who the Other is within these various dimensions of human experience we do risk, as is duly noted by Levinas, the reduction of the Other to only the understanding allowed within the horizon of each dimension; however, not to take this risk is to condemn ourselves to an ahistorical, non-particularized, and ultimately ineffective response to the Other.¹⁹

There are many dimensions of human existence. Given the parameters of this project I will focus on only four: the Economic, the Cultural, the Political, and the Religious. A dimension or arena can best be understood as a spatial/temporal field through which human life is mediated. Two elaborations

¹⁹ Ibid. 23. "It is often said that Levinas is more a prophetic thinker than a systematic philosopher and that, as such, he could afford to be one-sided and passionate about the "one-thing necessary" and forgo the responsibility of the systematic philosopher for completeness and balance. My argument thus far, has been that his "one sided" concern for the infinity of the other to the exclusion of all historical mediation is too costly precisely for the other's own historical well-being, the one thing necessary."

must be made before we begin to present these dimensions. The first is that we must acknowledge at the outset that there are many other dimensions or arenas that could be listed and explored, such as the interpersonal, the psychological, and the familial to name but a few. I will give some primacy to the economic, because of the foundational quality which the economic/political has in relation to all other dimensions.²⁰ The second point to emphasize is that to see human experience as mediated through these various dimensions or arenas is useful for our project but also imprecise for it does not capture the dynamic and fluid quality of human reality.²¹ With these two points of clarification in mind, we will move forward. The following section undertakes two tasks: the first is to elaborate the

²⁰S. Roberto Goizueta, *Caminemos Con Jesus: Toward a Hispanic/Latino Theology of Accompaniment* (New York: Orbis Books, 1995), 121-22. Goizueta does a masterful job of showing the way in which all other dimensions or arenas are fundamentally related to the economic/political dimension. "We have already seen how, in Latino popular Catholicism, human action is mediated by physical symbols. These, however, are not only religious symbols but also *products* of our labor: e.g., the beautiful dresses which the women wear of San Fernando so carefully placed on Our Lady and Mary Magdalen to prepare them for Good Friday, the pieces of bread distributed to the congregation at the end of Holy Thursday liturgy, the eucharistic offering itself, the gifts we exchange with each other, the house which, through a family's interpersonal actions (praxis), becomes a "home." Before these physical objects are religious symbols, they are economic products. Their religious meaning is mediated not only by their physicality in general, but by the specifically economic character of that physicality. The bread is not merely a physical object like any other; it is "fruit of the earth and *work* of human hands." By way of another illustration, the inability to appreciate the complex ways in which family relationships are mediated by economic relationships is precisely the weakness of contemporary sentimentalized, neo-conservative evocation of "family values." That is, neo-conservatives fail to recognize how the life of the "home" is not isolated from but embedded in ethical-political and economic relationships. It does little good to promote family values while, at the same time, supporting political and economic structures that, by promoting autonomous individualism and an instrumental understanding of human life, lead to the breakdown of the family. When forced to make their way within such structures, family values have little chance of survival. We cannot promote family values unless we recognize that the "private" affective realm of love and relationship is mediated by the "public," material realm of economics and politics."

²¹ Immanuel Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004), X. "Part of the problem is that we have studied these phenomena in separate boxes to which we have given special names—political, economics, the social structure, culture—without seeing that each of these boxes are constructs more of our imagination than of reality. The phenomena dealt with in these separate boxes are so closely intermeshed that each presumes the other, each affects the other, each is incomprehensible without taking into account the other boxes."

contours and content of each dimension. It will allow us to see what actually constitutes this dimension. The second task will be to identify who is the Other within each dimension. Based on these tasks we will be able to see who and how the Other is occluded within each dimension and to what particulars one must pay attention in order to encounter the transcendent Other.

*The First Dimension: The Economic-Living Labor within the World
Capitalist System*

The first dimension we will examine is the economic dimension. This dimension, like all dimensions, has the potential for becoming reified in our understanding, for example by conflating the economic identity of the Other with their entire personhood. If we reduced the Other to their economic Identity (e.g. The Worker, The Capitalist, The Peasant, The Proletariat etc.) we would be incapable of seeing the absolute transcendent quality of the Other. We must guard against this totalizing quality so that we do not fall prey to what Levinas warns against. And yet it is also true that if we not acknowledge the Other within this dimension we become incapable of responding to their 'economic' needs. To particularize even more specifically Levinas' concern I suggest that unless we see who the Other is within the economic dimension we cannot adequately respond to the Other in all of their needs. In order to do this we must ask two questions: First, what is the dominant economic horizon?, or, to use the conceptual framework of Levinas, How is the Same or the Totality best defined within this Dimension? Second, given what is this Totality, who is the Other who falls outside of its vision?

The End of History/The End of the Economic Other

There seems to be some agreement that we are now living in an era in which some form of capitalist economic structures has attained hegemonic status. One can say with some assurance that the dominant economic system found in the world today is a free-market, capitalist model. This assertion is being made by people of all political and economic proclivities (left/right, capitalist/communist/anarchist etc.) to varying degrees.²² This is not to deny that there are many other economic models which are currently in existence in the world today²³ but merely to say that all of them must deal in some form with living in a globalized capitalist world.²⁴ capitalism in its current stage of development has taken on an almost 'divine' status in its capacity to envelope all reality and see itself with a self-referential lens.²⁵ This is in almost direct opposition to classical Catholic Social Teaching, which asserts the primacy of labor in relation to capital.²⁶ It is within this particular dimension that we will encounter the Other.

²² There are many intellectuals who pronounce this reality; even as there is disputation of how salutary this condition is to the vast majority of people. To name but a few; Francis Fukuyama, Martin Feldstein, Thomas L. Friedman, Samir Amin, Slavoj Žižek, Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri, Noam Chomsky, Arundhati Roy, Amartya Sen, Holly Sklar etc.

²³ This is particularly true in Latin America where recent revolutions have allowed for some 'alternative' models to come into existence.

²⁴ Enrique Dussel, *Philosophy of Liberation*, Trans. Aquilina Martinez and Christine Morkovsky, (Wipf and Stock Publishers: Eugene, Oregon, 1985), 143. "All economic reality takes place in a concrete system, be it microeconomic (e.g., the level of erotic economy or the industrial enterprise), or national, regional, or global macroeconomics. Small systems are only subsystems of the global economic system, *which today is dominated by imperialist management of capital and the planetary dimensions of the transnational corporations. The controlling system is the capitalist, central mode of production, whose history Emmanuel Wallerstein records*" [italics added].

²⁵ Enrique Dussel, *Ethics and Community*, Trans. Robert R. Barr (Orbis Books: New York, 1986), 133. "Capital's self-absolutization, its claim to utter singularity, isolation, and existence ex se, its denial that it is beholden to anyone or anything, constitutes its character as a false god and an idol"

²⁶ *Laborem Exercens*, Catholic Social Thought: The Documentary Heritage, Ed. David J. O'Brien and Thomas A. Shannon, (Orbis Press: New York, 2006) 352-92. "Capital springs from labor, and bears the mark of human toil...Capital, inasmuch as it constitutes a set of means of

Because Capitalism does not acknowledge the place of human work in the production of capital, we can begin to see who might be the Other in this dimension. We can say using the Levinasian formula that in the current manifestation of capitalism it is they who are 'other than Capital,' they who have become the occluded Other. In the economic dimension, which is presently constituted by a globalized capitalist model, the Other is best understood as the living labor of all the workers in the world. It is important to highlight that this living labor which we speak of as the Other exists prior to the labor found within the Capitalist (and Communist) dialectic of Capital/Labor.²⁷

The Other that is outside of the system is that which has an a priori existence in relation to Capital.²⁸ This a priori aspect of the human experience is what Dussel terms *pragmatisis*.²⁹ This living labor aspect of human experience

production, is only an instrument, or instrumental cause...All means of production, from the most primitive to the most ultramodern, have been developed gradually from the human being...[They are] the fruit of work" This insight is echoed in all subsequent encyclicals including *Economic Justice for All*; "Pope John Paul II has stated that "human work is a key, probably the essential key, to the whole social question."...Because work is this important, people have a right to employment. In return for their labor, workers have a right to wages and other benefits sufficient to sustain life in dignity. As Pope Leo XIII stated, every working person has "the right of securing things to sustain life." The way power is distributed in a free market economy frequently gives employers greater bargaining power than employees in the negotiations of labor contracts. Such unequal power presses workers into a choice between an inadequate wage and no wage at all. But justice, not charity, demands certain minimum guarantees. The provision of wages and other benefits sufficient to support a family in dignity is a basic necessity to prevent this exploitation of workers. The dignity of workers also requires adequate health care, security for old age or disability, unemployment compensation, healthful working conditions, weekly rest, periodic holidays for recreation and leisure, and reasonable security against arbitrary dismissal. These provisions are all essential if workers are to be treated as persons rather than simply as a "factor of production." These are but two examples but the entire corpus of Catholic Social Teaching seems to assert the importance of Labor and its primacy over and above that of Capital.

²⁷ *Ethics and Community*, 114.

²⁸ Enrique Dussel, *Beyond Philosophy: Ethics, History, Marxism and Liberation Theology*, Ed. Eduardo Mendieta (New York, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2003) 140. "The human being, the living and free subject of creative labour, sells his labour and becomes a "wage-earner," an intrinsic, optic element of capitalism, dependent on the being of capital. The "other" (who is free) becomes other than himself or herself, a thing."

²⁹ Enrique Dussel, *Ethics and Community*, Trans. Robert R. Barr (New York: Orbis Books, 1988), 114.

occurs prior to any structured economic system and is much more essential to the human species.³⁰ This distinction is important because this understanding of the Other must be understood as distinct from the more traditional Marxist category of Labor. The binary category of Marx is helpful but Dusselian notion precedes this categorization.

From the Productive Circle to the Economic Other

What all humans do is consume energy. 'Human beings must replace their lost energy, their expended life. They must satisfy their needs.'³¹ Dussel terms 'this openness-of-need *pragmasis* (the Greek word for the "need to make use of something"), and the object needed *pragmata* (Gk., "things needed, useful").³² This entire process is named the 'pragmatic circle.' At some point in time, however, the *pragmata* (the object required to fulfill our needs) is not immediately available to us and must be extracted and transformed from the natural world. So now we have moved outside of mere *pragmasis* (our basic openness to fulfilling our needs) to *poiesis* or 'producing' the necessary object to fulfill our needs. For Dussel there still remains a basic link to the object which is produced and the life of the human person.³³ This 'blood' of the worker is

³⁰ Ibid. 114. "The point of departure for any reflection of work must be a stage 'antecedent' to the emergence of the phenomenon of work on the human scene (a merely utopian point, to be sure, hypothetical and perhaps a-historical)."

³¹ Ibid. 114.

³² Ibid. 114.

³³ Ibid. 114. " In order to produce an object, then, we work. This makes our work itself an object...As an object precisely *produced*, it has become human toil objectified...But if the work of the worker has become real in the object, if it has been objectified, then the life of the worker has been objectified in it as well—and life has a sacred dignity, because it is human life, the life of a person—1.3. The "use-value" of the object produced then is then human life objectified—and

precisely what becomes unjustly appropriated in the Capitalist system and through this machination produces poverty, privation. What is perceived within the horizon of the system as a 'mutual exchange' between two parties in fact occludes the fundamental unfairness of the relation between the Same and the Other.³⁴

By seeing how Capitalism 'exteriorizes' and blinds us all to the Other, understood as living labor, we are better able to respond to the moral demands made by the Other within the economic dimension. Yet we should not see the human person as only 'living labor' or a *pragmatis creature*. For to do so would make us guilty of the very thing that Levinas warns against; we would be seeing the Other only from the vantage point offered by the horizon or totality of the Economic. Yet it is also important to note that in responding thus we would be responding as co-members within this dimension, so that the relationship would always be mutual and not asymmetrical in the 'hostage' sense of Levinas. Below we will see how the process of Agapic Solidarity will propose to address the

nothing less. The use value of an object is "blood" (2.8, 3.10) it is life...The value of the object produced is ultimately the worker's lifeblood coagulated."

³⁴ Ibid. 126-29. "But there is a subtle inequality in this exchange, invisible both to the one who has the money and the one who offers the work [the Capitalist]. This is a social relationship (8.2) because it is a relationship of domination, of injustice. Invisibly, imperceptibly it is sin. Why? Because the person having the money uses the person of the worker while paying only for that person's work capacity (11.9). The employer makes use of the whole worker, makes use of the "creative source of value" (11.9, 12.2), though paying only for his or her "upkeep." It is as if someone wished to purchase an automobile by paying only for fuel and servicing. I receive the "creative subject" gratis, and pay only for what is needed to keep the subject from dying, to keep it working...Once the worker have sold their work, they are no longer their "own," but the property of another. Now they are "made other" ("otherfied") alienated, the objects of sin and exploitation, and this in an institutional manner (2.5) thanks to the social division of labor. Now their work must be sold daily. The only alternative is starvation...Now we have "work for hire," the obligatory alienated social relationship that demands workers that they sell themselves for a wage that pays them less life than the life they objectify in the product destined to be possessed by the owner of the money. "Work for hire" is the name of the institutional sin of our time. It has held sway for the past several centuries of human life on earth. Thus work for hire is the "original" sin committed against the worker (2.5)—committed by the "rich" (in the biblical sense) against the poor."

totalizing quality of globalized capitalism and create an encounter with the Economic Other.

The Second Dimension: The Cultural — Interculturalidad as Encounter

In the broadest sense the term *culture* may be designated as any work of human society. In this designation *culture* is frequently counterposed to *nature*. This conceptual framework has been used for many years.³⁵ Because of the historical roots of this theoretical bifurcation we can see that it is difficult to speak of culture apart from the rise of the political (and economic) entity which is the modern Nation-State. The need to see these various dimensions as intimately integrated was emphasized earlier.³⁶ Yet another aspect of this link between culture and national identity is also important in understanding who becomes the Other within the Cultural Dimension. The rise of so called *Civilizations* designated an 'advance culture' which could then pass judgment on the other 'cultures.' The application of this new category insisted that while all peoples had 'culture,' not all people were 'civilized.' This machination allowed the cultured (and civilized) nation-states of the European world (and later United States) to introduce 'civility' to the barbarian cultures of the new world.³⁷ Its continued use within

³⁵ D. Walter Mignolo, *The Idea of Latin America*, Blackwell Manifestos (Blackwell: MA, 2005), xvi-xvii. "Toward the end of the eighteenth century and through the nineteenth, nature, as God's creation was opposed to culture as man's creation. Consequently, the opposition between nature and humanity was not abandoned but simply redrawn. "Culture" (from the Latin *colere*, "to cultivate or to inhabit") surfaced as a necessary concept during the process of secularization because "culture" meant "to cultivate" in the sense of human production and creation. In the sense of inhabiting, "culture" is the dwelling place, the inhabitation of what is created. "Culture" was needed to replace "religion" as a community bond... "Culture," in other words, created national unity: national languages, national literature, national flag and anthem, etc. were all singular manifestations of a "national culture." It served to name and institute the homogeneity of the nation-state."

³⁶ See footnote 21.

³⁷ *The Idea of Latin America*, xvii. "However, insofar as the term emerged in the nineteenth century when England and France were embarking on the second wave of colonial

contemporary discourse shows the importance of this legacy. When Samuel Huntington speaks of a “Clash of Civilizations”, and then proceeds to speak of cultural patterns from within a certain hierarchical framework, he is continuing a process which has its roots in an expansionist/imperialist process. This is not to diminish the genuine multiplicity of cultures but to note how, from the outset, this multiplicity was already framed within a hierarchical framework that privileged certain ‘cultures’ above others. From the inception of this new way of viewing the human experience, we see entire peoples as being outside of the system.

Walter Mignolo, among others, has written extensively on the implications of this paradigm. He speaks of how this hierarchical arrangement has elevated certain communities while relegating others to the periphery. He has termed this phenomenon the ‘colonial wound.’³⁸ By beginning to recognize how and by whom the colonial wound is constructed and maintained we can see who

expansion, “culture” also served the colonial purpose of naming and describing those alien and inferior “cultures” that would be under European “civilization.” While European civilization was divided into national cultures, most of the rest of the population of the world would be conceived as having “culture” but not civilization.”

³⁸ Ibid. xii “From the sixteenth-century Spanish missionary Bartolome de las Casas to G.W.F. Hegel in the nineteenth century, and from Karl Marx to the twentieth-century British historian A. J. Toynbee, all we can read (or see in maps) about the place of the Americas in the world order is historically located from a European perspective that passes as universal. Certainly, every one of these authors acknowledges that there was a world, and people, outside Europe. Indeed, both people and continents outside of Europe were overly present as “objects” but they were absent as subjects and, in a way, out of history. They were, in other words, subjects whose perspectives did not count. Eric Wolf’s famous book title, *People without History*, became a metaphor to describe this epistemic power differential. By “people without history,” Wolf did not mean that there were people in the world who did not have memories and records of their past, which would be an absurd claim. He meant that, according to the regional concept of history as defined in the Western world from ancient Greece to twentieth-century France, every society that did not have alphabetic writing or wrote in a language other than the six imperial languages of modern Europe did not have History. In this view, History is a privilege of European modernity and in order to have History you have to let yourself be colonized, which means allowing yourself, willingly or not, to be subsumed by a perspective of history, life, knowledge, economy, subjectivity, family, religion, etc. that is modeled on the history of modern Europe, and that has now been adopted, with little difference, as the official model of the US. Perspectives from coloniality, however, emerge out of the conditions of the “colonial wound,” the feeling of inferiority imposed on human beings who do not fit the predetermined model in Euro-American narratives.”

becomes marginalized (and by whom) within this dimension. I will focus on two aspects of this wound that are central to continued power in contemporary discourse; the *enunciatory privilege* and the *epistemic privilege*.³⁹

Enunciatory Privilege

The privilege of enunciation has to do with the location from which truth claims are voiced. The communities that create the parameters of cultural discourse have a distinct privilege and power in all subsequent discussions.⁴⁰ This privilege allows for *the system* to create its own ontology without ever having to see the face of the cultural Other. The entire system sees only what the single privileged position deems worthy of attention. Furthermore, that privileged position views all challenges to this vision as suspect and deficient.⁴¹ This 'deficiency' may be an actual deficiency or it may be merely the incapacity of the Totality or *the center* to perceive the truth quality in the vision presented by the

³⁹ Much of this work will be grounded in the work of Walter Mignolo.

⁴⁰ *The Idea of Latin America*, 35-36. "It is from the West that the rest of the world is described, conceptualized, and ranked: that is modernity is the self-description of Europe's role in history rather than an ontological historical process. Without a locus of enunciation self-conceived as Occidental, the Oriental could not have been thought out... This allowed Western Europe to become the center of economic and political organization, a model of social life, an exemplar of human achievement, and above all, the point of observation and classification of the rest of the world."

⁴¹ *Ibid.* 35. "Hegel's philosophy of history is a striking example in which the West is both a geo-historical and the center of enunciation. History [for Hegel] moves from East to West. In that move, the very idea of Western civilization became the point of reference for the rest of the world, and the goal as well. How was it that the "West" came to occupy the "center" in terms of political theory, political economy, philosophy, arts, and literature? And when? Up to the fifteenth century, Western Christendom (or Europe in Greek mythology) was literally the "West"—but "West" of what? Of Jerusalem, of course, as it was the center of the Christian world. Athens and Rome were construed as part of the "West" that offered the foundations of knowledge, social organization, and the consolidation of the church and the state under Emperor Constantine three centuries AD. Thus, "Western Europe" did not occupy the "center" until the emergence of the "Indias Occidentales" (later called America and, even later, Latin and Anglo America) in the Christian European consciousness. The very idea of a West (Occidentalism) and the ideology of Western expansion since 1500 also began with the identification and invention of America. From that moment on, the Indias Occidentales defined the confines of the West and, as its periphery, were part of the West nonetheless. Those confines were traced back from a locus of observation that placed itself at the center of the world being observed, described, and classified."

cultural Other. The central manner in which this enunciatory privilege is sustained is by having control of the categories, descriptions, and modes of understanding by which cultural reality is configured. This is understood as the epistemic privilege.

Epistemic Privilege

The epistemic privilege includes, but is not limited to, the ways in which *knowledge* is understood and constituted within any dimension.⁴² Through the logic imposed by this privilege, all perspectives which are outside of this horizon are deemed as not worthy of exploration. Another manner in which this logic deals with the cultural Other is that of ‘co-opting’ the vision and insights of the Other and seeing them merely as ‘reflections’ of already existing knowledge.⁴³

This helps us see that Mignolo is critiquing the logic and not merely the people who currently possess this logic. He is aware that the imperialist powers have changed hands throughout history but that the logic exercised by each era has remained fundamentally unchanged.⁴⁴ The newest configuration of *coloniality* comes in the form of ‘multiculturalism,’ which does little to change the fundamental power arrangement. Mignolo is aware that non-Western, and hence

⁴² Ibid. 36. Italics in text. “Western peoples have disciplines and Eastern peoples have cultures to be studied by Western disciplines. The West was, and still is, the only geo-historical location that is both part of the classification of the world and *the only perspective that has the privilege of possessing dominant categories of thoughts from which and where the rest of the world can be described, classified, understood, and “improved.”*”

⁴³ Ibid. 36. “One of the most devastating consequences of such a system of belief is that the world seems to be what the European (and later US) categories of thought allow us to say it is. The rest is simply wrong and any attempt to think otherwise opens one up to harassment, demonizing, and, eventually, elimination.”

⁴⁴ Ibid. 7. “[C]oloniality’ refers to the logical structures of colonial domination underlying the Spanish, Dutch, British, and US control and management of the entire planet. In each of the particular imperial periods of colonialism—whether lead by Spain (mainly in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries) or by England (from the nineteenth century to World War II) or by the US (from the early twentieth century until now)—the logic was maintained; only power changed hands.”

non-dominant cultures may, inadvertently, accommodate the logic of coloniality.⁴⁵

For Mignolo multiculturalism does not address the substance of the problem which is the colonial wound in all its manifestations. Mignolo suggests we replace the vision proposed by multiculturalism with that of *Interculturalidad*.

Dislodging Privilege: From Multiculturalism to Interculturalidad

The vision that Mignolo proposes is found within the various social/cultural movements throughout the world. He is aware of how this shift has deep and broad implications for all peoples in the world.⁴⁶ The project of *interculturalidad* advanced by Mignolo would demand that the cultural Other gain equal power in issues of 'epistemic rights.' In doing this, the Other would have access to interpreting the realities of the world on an equal footing with all other cultural communities.⁴⁷

Because the imperialist project mentioned above created a world in which only one community had both *enunciatory* and epistemic authority we can speak of the cultural Other as any peoples or communities that were left out of the equation of shaping the world inhabited by the human species. The Other are any communities who suffered this *wound*. In the excerpt below we see Mignolo begin to identify who are some of these peoples, communities, and cultural

⁴⁵ Ibid. 37. "What is the difference? "Multicultural" means the hegemonic principles of knowledge, education, the concept of the state and government, political economy, morality etc., are controlled by the state and below the control of the state people have "freedom" to go with their "cultures" as far as they do not challenge "the epistemic principles" grounding politics, economy, and ethics as managed by the state."

⁴⁶ Ibid. 124. "The question is not inclusion but inter-culturality, a shared project based on different "origins" confronting the colonial wound and overcoming the imperial/national pride and interests. In the words of another indigenous movement, the Zapatista uprising in Chiapas, Mexico, it means dwelling in a "world where many worlds co-exist."

⁴⁷ Ibid. 118. "'Interculturalidad' doesn't mean speaking the same logic in two different languages, but putting them into collaborative conversation: two different logics for the good of all." This also echoes aspects of the project of Anselm Min.

Others as well as who are some of the communities who have inflicted these 'wounds.'

The proliferation of other paradigms can no longer be determined by universal liberating projects, be they theology of liberation or Marxism. Why would Islamic progressive intellectuals wait to be liberated by Christian theologians? Why would Afros in South America and the Caribbean, and Indians from Chile to Canada, want to be liberated following a Marxist blue-print for revolution?...The explosions coming out of the theoretical, political, and ethical awareness of the colonial wound make possible the imagination and construction of an-other world, a world in which many worlds are possible...However, decolonization of knowledge and of being (and more generally, of politics and economy) cannot be thought out and implemented other than from the perspective of the damnes (and not from those of the World Bank or from an updated Marxism or a refreshed Christianity); that is, from the perspective, provided by years of modern/colonial injustices, inequalities, exploitation, humiliation, and the other humiliations of and pains of the colonial wound, of an-other world were creative care for human beings and the celebration of life will take precedence over individual success and meritocracy, and accumulation of money and of meaning (e.g., personal CVs, the personal satisfaction of celebrity, and all other ways in which alienation is being reproduced and encouraged). The imperial perspective (advanced and implemented by European and US men and institutions) cannot find the

solutions for the problems of the world created because of imperial designs and desires. Las Casas and Marx are necessary, but far from being sufficient. They should not only be complemented by Waman Puma, Fanon, and Anzaldua; their very critical foundation should be displaced.

The Other can only obtain their cultural authority and authenticity when they revolt against the cultural categories given them by the dominant system. Those at the privileged center can only find authentic existence when they are able to see the face of the Other within an *Interculturalidad* encounter.

The Third Dimension: The Political — The Citizen as Subject

Similar to the economic dimension we can see that the political arena is entering a period of contestation. There are now many identities by which people are choosing to affiliate within any one 'body politic.'⁴⁸ Nonetheless, one can still speak of a certain 'model' or 'structure' being dominant. The dominant political entity, which continues to hold sway within political discourse, is the nation-state. The dominant form of managing this 'Leviathan' is within a Western, liberal, and democratic framework.⁴⁹

Given the length of this dissertation project we cannot undertake here a full treatment of the history of the rise of the nation-state as a political reality. It is however important to note that the concept of the nation-state is a relatively recent phenomenon in world history. By historicizing this construct we can see

⁴⁸ A wonderful exploration of some of these issues can be found in *Globalization and Identity: Cultural Diversity, Religion and Citizenship*. Edited by Majid Tehranian and B. Jeannie Lum. We can also see in the rise of the 99% Movement a new way of configuring memberships within a Nation-State.

⁴⁹ The article by William T. Cavanaugh entitled *Killing for the Telephone Company: Why the Nation-State is not the Keeper of the Common Good* does a wonderful job of showing the development of the contemporary Nation-State. This includes some concerns about its continued efficacy within current ethical discourse.

how it is a human made horizon which can (and does) exclude certain perspectives and voices.⁵⁰ This understanding of the historical roots of the concept of nation-state allows us to conceive who was, from its inception, outside of this system. But first, any proper apprehension of this dimension requires a brief exploration of its origins.

The Rise of Imagined Communities

In *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, and reality*, Eric John Hobsbawm, following the work done by Miroslav Hroch,⁵¹ sees the development of the nation-state as occurring in three phases. The first phase is a “purely cultural, literary and folkloric”⁵² component and has ‘no particular political or national implications.’⁵³ “A body of pioneers and militants of ‘the national idea’ and the beginning of political campaigning for the idea” marks the second phase of the idea.⁵⁴ In the third phase the ‘nationalist programmes acquire mass support’⁵⁵ It is interesting to note that prior to the third phase, the pioneers and militants who are interested in this ‘programme’ will already claim its existence.⁵⁶ As we unpack and unfold this process we can see how these pioneers and militants created an ‘us’ (the nation) which, *de facto*, created a

⁵⁰ Hobsbawm, J. Eric, *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth and reality*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 3. “Nations as we know—not least through the efforts of Hays—Kohn era—are not, as Begehnot thought, ‘as old as history.’ The modern sense of the world is not older than the eighteenth century, give or take the odd predecessor.”

⁵¹ Hroch, Miroslav, *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe* (Cambridge, 1985).

⁵² *Nation and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth and reality*, 12.

⁵³ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 12.

'them' and excluded certain communities. In doing this they created an Other within the Political Dimension.

Phase One: Proto-nationalism:

The first phase in the rise of national consciousness is what Hobsbawm terms 'proto-nationalism.'⁵⁷ This term describes 'certain variants of feelings of collective belonging which already existed and which would operate, as it were, potentially on the macro-political scales.'⁵⁸ The conglomeration of these variants was used to fill the vacuum which was created in part by the disintegration of previous bonds of connection, specifically that of empires, and religious kinship. It is interesting to note that two of the more common sources of bonding found in contemporary political thought were not among the 'variants' which were used to create cohesion; I am speaking of language and ethnicity. There are several reasons why the place of language and ethnicity were not focal points for the creation of national identity.

To a vast non-literate population, language was a much less homogenous phenomenon. The variations in dialects and vernacular made language as a source of connection much less feasible.⁵⁹ Given the organic and varied quality of language in any pre-literate period its use as a source of unification would be

⁵⁷ Ibid. 46. All of chapter 2 is dedicated to explaining this phenomenon.

⁵⁸ Ibid. 46.

⁵⁹ Ibid. 52, "Non-literate vernacular languages are always a complex of local variants or dialects intercommunicating with varying degrees of ease or difficulty, depending on geographical closeness or accessibility. Some, notably in mountain areas which facilitate segregation may be incomprehensible as if they belong to a different linguistic family." He later tempers his comment by stating that this does not "...exclude a certain popular cultural identification with a language, or a patently related complex of dialects, peculiar to a body of communities and distinguishing them from their neighbors..."

premature.⁶⁰ The reasons for ethnicity not being efficacious as a source of unification are threefold. Ethnicity was usually connected to a 'common origin and descent' and this sense of commonality of origin was difficult to ascertain given migration patterns.⁶¹ Another factor is that 'ethnicity tends to be negative, inasmuch as it is much more usually applied to define 'the other' than one's own group'⁶² It is difficult to see physical and ethnic difference in the other but easy to accept that we come in all different shapes, sizes, etc.⁶³ The final reason is that ethnicity can be used most effectively to promulgate a proto-nationalistic passion when there is some historical precedent.⁶⁴ It is important to remember that these groups were from their inception already incredibly ethnically homogenous. If language and ethnicity were not the proper instruments from which nationalism could be cultivated, then what were the original 'building blocks' of unity? The answer lay in religious affiliation and identity. This and what Hobsbawm calls "the consciousness of belonging or having belonged to a lasting political entity."⁶⁵ This *consciousness* is further formed with the creation or invention of a 'national history.'

Phase Two: Forming a National Narrative:

The second phase is constructed by elites (read: the literate) of a given geography. The need for greater cohesion grew with the desire to shore up

⁶⁰ Ibid. 62-63, "In short, special cases aside, there is no reason to suppose that language was more than one among several criteria by which people indicated belonging to a human collectivity. And it is absolutely certain that language had as yet no political potential."

⁶¹ Ibid. 63.

⁶² Ibid. 66.

⁶³ Ibid. 66. "For to 'us' it seems obvious that the members of our 'nationality' cover a wide range of sizes, shapes, and appearances, even when all of them share certain physical characteristics, such as a certain type of black hair. It is only to 'them' that we all look alike."

⁶⁴ Ibid. 66.

⁶⁵ Ibid. 73.

greater support for the nascent nation-state apparatus. Some of the cohesion came 'organically' as more people came into more intimate contact with the State.⁶⁶ This ongoing contact and intervention of State with the quotidian existence of the people allowed themselves to be seen as part of a larger unit. The importance manifested itself in that the State began to be the location of such key documents as birth and death certificates, and marriage licenses. The church was no longer the sole place in which this type of information was kept. However, this importance needed to be cultivated because loyalty was not guaranteed. Loyalty was important due to the need for protecting the nascent, and still fragile, authority and power of the state. The power of the state was most readily apparent in the formation of a military and a police force. There were two key elements in helping insure and shape the growth of this loyalty and strength. The first was an idea of revolutionary 'participation' in the creation of the state apparatus, a theory which would be called democracy. This concept created an entirely new subject: the citizen. The second element was the creation of an organized education system. This allowed the new elites "to spread the image and heritage of the 'nation' and to inculcate attachment to it and to attach all to country and flag, often 'inventing traditions' or even nations for this purpose."⁶⁷ It is through the educational system that the importance of *national language* grew. This was particularly true in equating language and citizenship. These aspects will have particular importance when we begin to realize who is the Other in the Political Dimension.

⁶⁶ Ibid. 80-81.

⁶⁷ Ibid. 92.

Phase Three: The Three Fields of Influence:

The third and final phase of the creation of national consciousness came with the greater consolidation of three spheres found in society. These three spheres are still major forces in how people identify and perceive themselves within the political dimension. The first is what might be termed 'national economies.'⁶⁸ The second 'was the rise of the modern mass media: press, cinema, and radio. By these means popular ideologies could be standardized, homogenized and transformed, as well as, obviously exploited for purposes of deliberate propaganda by private interests and states.'⁶⁹ The final sphere is the rise of sports in its new permutation. The most obvious evidence of these new permutations is in the nationalistic frenzy of the Olympics. This includes, but is not limited to, the 'medal count' which many countries participate in. An event that is designed to bring the world together becomes a vehicle for greater allegiance to our nation-states.⁷⁰ These three spheres created a seamless web of identification in such a manner as to create the modern political subject; the citizen.

Citizenship as Subjectivity

⁶⁸ Ibid. 132. "By 1913 capitalist economies were already moving rapidly in the direction of large blocks of concentrated enterprise, supported, protected and even to some extent guided by governments."

⁶⁹ Ibid. 141.

⁷⁰ Ibid. 142. "Between the wars sports as a mass spectacle was transformed into the unending succession of gladiatorial contests between persons and teams symbolizing state-nations, which is today part of global life."

Inclusive in the conceptual framework of the Nation-State is found the presupposition that the most effective manner of running this 'sovereign' entity is by means of a political process which can loosely be labeled as Liberal-Democratic. The rise of the Nation-State as a means of political organization occurred concurrently with the rise of aspects of capitalist formation. The importance of this historical synchronicity is that the 'rights' of citizens within a nation-state was usually seen as identical with the rise of the propertied class.⁷¹

The central concept that gives these disparate labels some cohesion is the birth of a new concept of subjectivity: the person as citizen. Within such discourse the 'non-citizen' becomes a 'non-person. In much political discourse the non-citizen loses their subjectivity. Their ability to be treated as a human person in the political system (even more than in the economic system) is their membership *qua* Citizen by the nation-state. ' We see that in much contemporary discourse the place of human rights in relation to citizenship rights is a highly contested arena. This contestation comes in the form of attempting to widen the parameters for who can be considered a 'citizen' and what constitutes human subjectivity.⁷²

⁷¹ Samir Amin, *The Liberal Virus: Permanent War and the Americanization of the World*, Trans. James H. Membrez, (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2004), 45. "According to this reasoning, democracy must necessarily be restricted, reserved for those who are both citizens and property owners. Hence it is easily understood how their electoral choices probably always, or almost always, conform to their interests as capitalists. But at the same time, the political loses its autonomy in this convergence with, not to say submission to, the economic. Economic alienation clearly functions here to hide the elimination of the autonomy of the political."

⁷² Ibid. 45-46. "The later extension of democratic rights to others in addition to citizen-businessmen was neither the spontaneous product of capitalist development nor a necessity of that development. On the contrary, the extension of these rights was progressively attained by victims of the system, the working class, and later women; it is the result of struggles against the system."

Because the dominant political organizational entity in contemporary life is the nation-state we can begin to see that the Same or the Totality is the citizen. The Other in this paradigm is the non-citizen. It is not uncommon to have many non-citizens having aspects of their humanity called into question. Given the length, and purpose, of this project we cannot fully delve into this topic, however, it is important to note how the nation-state can use various aspects of a people's subjectivity (culture, labor, language etc.) and yet the actual persons themselves will be devalued or placed outside the system.

The Fourth Dimension: Salvation, Redemption, and Purity

In speaking of the Religious Dimension it is crucial to understand that we are not referring to anyone specific religion. We are speaking about a more general religious *vision* which characterizes all religions. This vision allows all religions to have similar paradigms even though their individual contents may differ greatly. The frames which form part of this religious dimension can best be understood using the categories of *Authority, Morality, and Salvation*.

Religious Authority

Religious authority will claim for itself a certain self-referential capacity. Its claim is precisely that its grasp of reality is based on something beyond all other dimensions (economic, political, cultural etc.). Thus, it will speak of a 'natural' or 'divinized' view which precludes any need to seek any authority beyond itself.⁷³

⁷³ *Ethics and Community*, 31-32. "Any system of prevailing, dominating practices (from Egypt or Babylon to Rome, the several Christendoms, or capitalist society) determines its established practices as good. Its project (its end, its telos, its beatitude, as the Latin theologians termed it) is confused with the "perfect human good" as such. Thus the norms that demand the execution of this project are "natural law."...[It] now legitimates the praxis of the flesh and the world as if it were the praxis of the very reign of God."

Many, if not all religions will have a version of this concept. They will tend to identify their praxis with some divinized order.

Religious Morality

The second frame within the Religious Dimension is an outgrowth of the first. It posits a certain foundational grasp of the moral universe that can only be ascertained by inhabiting the vision proffered by this dimension. It claims to be the 'North Star' from which all moral decisions must find their bearings. This moral authority has a two-fold effect; it allows the people who are following the moral law (within the religious system) to have a clear conscience⁷⁴ and it allows for the system to self-regulate by abolishing that which is 'bad' or 'morally degenerative.'⁷⁵ It is precisely because of its certitude in matters of morality and law that it will view all questioning of its Totality as 'sin' or morally reprehensible. Because of this all communities which demonstrate anything other than moral rectitude, vis-à-vis the moral code as espoused by the system are seen as Other than moral within the Religious Dimension.

Religious Salvation

The final aspect of this religious vision involves the type of authority found within this dimension. The religious vision will claim to have 'the keys to the kingdom' (in some cases literally). It will claim to have a final and definitive

⁷⁴ Ibid. 33-34. "If my moral conscience has been formed within a framework of the principles of the system, it will recriminate me if I fail to comply with the laws of the system... In this fashion "moral" conscience, formed in the moral principles of the dominant system, creates a peaceful remorseless conscience vis-à-vis a practice the system approves but that may originally have been perverse (a praxis of domination)."

⁷⁵ Ibid. 31. "This system is closed in upon itself. It has replaced the universal human project with its own particular historical project. Its laws become natural, its virtues perfect, and the blood of those who offer any resistance—the blood of the prophets and heroes—is spilled by the system as if it were the blood of the wicked, the totally subversive. "

jurisdiction on all that has ultimate meaning. This understanding of “ultimate” has a two-fold quality; it will understand its judgment as pertaining to matters of ‘ultimate’ importance; and also it will assert its judgments to be of an *ultimate* or *terminal* nature. Thus, the religious dimension will deal with questions such as: Who is Saved? Redeemed? or even Good? at an ontological level. Some element of this logic is found embedded within all religious logic or theology.⁷⁶ To some degree, all theologies and religious visions will have to address the questions of who is saved and who is redeemed. Each will also have to deal with the question of what *Salvation* or *Heaven* would look like. Because of this binary quality to religious salvation it will speak of an *in* group and an *out* group.

The Religious Other: The Sufferer, the Sinner, the Hell Raiser

When we speak of the Other in the Religious Dimension we must speak in terms of those who are outside of the categories referred to above: authority, morality, and salvation.

Religious Authority:

If religious authority is based on a self-referential reflection, then the Other is that source of authority which challenges a priori this self-referential reality and reflex; most precisely, the unjust suffering of the innocent.⁷⁷ Given the reality that all humans experience suffering we must try to make more precise the quality of

⁷⁶ *Beyond Philosophy: Ethics, History, Marxism and Liberation Theology*, 210. “A theology of domination fixes the “frontiers” (“that my salvation may reach to the end (frontiers) of the earth” Isa. 49:6), and declares the Other “beyond” salvation, beyond being, beyond dignity.”

⁷⁷ Johann B. Metz, *A Passion for God: The Mystical-Political Dimension of Christianity*, Trans. J. Matthew Ashley (New York: Paulist Press, 1998), 134. “In my view there is one authority recognized by all great cultures and religions; the authority of those who suffer. Respecting the suffering of strangers is a precondition for every culture; articulating others’ suffering is the presupposition of all claims to truth. Even those made by theology...The sole content of its universal responsibility is this: There is no suffering in the world that does not concern us.”

suffering of which we speak. When we speak of the suffering of the Other we are speaking of the 'flesh of the suffering Other.'⁷⁸ We are not speaking here of one aspect of the human person (e.g. psychological, physical etc.) but rather the existence of the human persons in all their dimensions.⁷⁹ This includes both the individual dimension of human person and what we would term the socio-historical elements.⁸⁰ For religious authority to become authentic it must break the chains of solipsistic epistemology and ground itself in the *sensibility* and *corporality* of the Other.⁸¹ A way to avoid the potential for *idolatrous totalizing* of corporality or sensibility is to connect it, not with our 'flesh' but with the sensibility of the Other.⁸² In this move we have shifted the source of authority from its original 'self-referential' totality to the corporeal suffering of the Other. All our

⁷⁸ *Ethics and Community*, 60-61.

⁷⁹ Ibid. 60. "The "flesh", the "flesh" of the other, his or her "face" (persona—see 1.3), is the only sacred thing in creation. It is second only to God in worth and dignity. Hence everything bound up in any way with "flesh" (sexuality, sensibility, pleasure, and so on) is good, worthy, and positive, not to be rejected. Only sin in the flesh, which occurs when the flesh idolatrously totalizes itself, is to be rejected."

⁸⁰ Ibid. 60. "The flesh is the whole human being, then, the human order of things, the history and society of human beings."

⁸¹ Ibid. 60-61. "By "sensibility" ("sensitivity") here I do not mean only the sensible cognitive faculty, the "senses"—sight, hearing, and so on—as a means of the constitution of the "sense" or meaning of what appears in the world (referring to the intuitive moment). No, here I wish to stress *sensing* itself—the actual sensation of pain, hunger, cold and so on, or indeed of pleasure, satisfaction, empirical happiness. Our subjectivity is wounded in the deepest, most secret, intimacy when something wounds our "skin"—when our corporality is assaulted in its constitution by some trauma. By "sensibility," then, I mean the resonance of, the impact on, our capacity for "contentment," for suffering, for joy or sorrow in reaction to some stimulus irrupting from the world around us." It is important to note that Dussel here extends his understanding to all living creation. In this way I believe he opens up possibilities for some powerful ecological ethical theory to be created. This would entail seeing the suffering of the Other as including the 'natural' world.

⁸² Ibid. 61-62. "I am speaking of "sensibility." And the "sensibility" of which I speak is that of others. What is under consideration here is their hunger, thirst, homelessness, cold, illness—the "negatives of sensibility" that sin produces...If the "flesh" is something positive, something worthy and good, then hunger, thirst, homelessness, cold and so on, will be evil. And their evil is not only physical, but ethical, political, communal, as well. These things are evil as the fruit of sin, of injustice...Thus the pain of the flesh, in its sensibility, constitutes the "last judgment" of human praxis. Jesus' expression, "I was hungry and you..." capsulizes the sensitization in the oppressed of the sense of the praxis of the dominator and the just, respectively."

'judgments' and, in fact, our 'last judgment' will be based on how we relate to any system, and in particular, in relation to the corporeal well-being of the Other.

Religious Morality:

Because the dominant morality within any system is always the following of the moral 'laws' which are articulated by the moral authority of the religious system, we can see that morally 'good' behavior would just be an extension of the will and desires of the authority.⁸³ Because of this, all ethical behavior that takes into account the Other will appear as 'lawless' or 'criminal.' At times the ethical demands placed upon us by the Other, and particularly his or her suffering, may call us to engage in activity which will be deemed to be the behavior of an 'out-law,' and, in a sense, the assessment would be correct.⁸⁴ It is important to note that disregard of any law would not be arbitrary, but rather is guided precisely by the authority found in concern for the corporeal suffering of the Other. In this manner our ethical behavior will be improvisational but not arbitrary and will always be grounded in the situational needs of the Other.⁸⁵

⁸³ Ibid. 32. "The classic definition of morality was expressed in terms of relationship to a norm or law. Kant demanded the moral law be loved. For Thomas Aquinas it was the relations of an act to the moral law that determined its morality. The problem, obviously, is that once the system of the world has asserted itself as the foundation or law, morality will depend precisely on the actualization of the system. An act will be morally good if it is "adequated to," if it complies with, the ends of the prevailing system. If I pay taxes, the minimum wage, and so on, as required by law, I shall be a "just" person, a "good" person. The law itself may be unjust. The taxes may be insufficient, the wages may be starvation wages. But all of that lies *outside* any possible moral consideration."

⁸⁴ Ibid. 32. "Correlatively, immorality will be constituted by the sheer non-realization of the prevailing norm. The thief whose thievery is a vice is now less wicked than the prophet who criticizes the system in its totality. Barabbas and Jesus are both "evil" for the Jewish and Roman morality of their time. Juan del Valle, bishop of Popayan was regarded by the encomenderos of sixteenth-century Latin America as "the worst bishop of the Indies" because he defended the Indians."

⁸⁵ *Beyond Philosophy: Ethics, History, Marxism, and Liberation Theology*, 144. "It is not possible to begin by defining as moral theologians do the morality of an action by its transcendental relation to a norm or law. On the contrary, the absolute morality of the action indicates its transcendental relation to the building of the kingdom in the historical processes of

Religious Salvation:

In speaking of this element within the Religious Dimension we are speaking of something which goes by many terms within many traditions. For purposes of this project we will focus on one term; the Kingdom of God. Those who are 'saved' will inhabit the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of God, however, always has a dialectical dynamic composed of an 'already' but 'not yet' quality.⁸⁶ In this way *Salvation* can be understood as those who already exist in the Kingdom of God or are *guaranteed* entrance at the appropriate time. Those who are, by definition, outside of the Kingdom are those who are condemned. This creates an insider/outsider dialectic which can only be broken by moving beyond binary thinking in terms of salvation. The only ones capable of breaking free of the spell created by the binary thinking within this dimension are those that are outside of 'kingdom logic: the poor or the Other.'⁸⁷ The Other, precisely and ironically because they exist outside of the 'pseudo' Kingdom of God that is claiming an inauthentic reality, allows us to encounter the true Kingdom in all its

liberation of actual material peoples, "who are hungry." It is only subsequently within this framework, that it becomes possible to situate all the problems of abstract moral subjectivity (with which all moral theologies start)...The ethics comes afterwards, affirming as its first premise the absolute priority of the poor person in whom we encounter, as an absolute challenge responsibility Christ, a poor person who is God himself [sic]."

⁸⁶ Ibid. 85-86. "The Kingdom of God is an "already" which has been inaugurated among me; it is God's free gift in the redemptive reality of Christ, through his liberating lordship in the Church. But it is equally a "not yet" which is coming, which directs hope to the *parousia* and which is coming towards us as future. The Kingdom as the "already" now present and as the "not yet" in the future, as history "already" transformed by the incarnation of the poor and crucified Christ and as the "beyond" of history, as true History, this Kingdom is the dialectical unity of an action that is real, yet is also in the process of fulfilling itself without end."

⁸⁷ Ibid. 86-87. "Every system in history tends to close in on itself, sacralizing itself as a divine whole. It claims to be the Kingdom of God on earth. In its long history, the Jewish-Christian tradition has known many different systems and has, within each of them, fulfilled the function assigned to it by God in world history. In each successive sacralized system, God has made himself [sic] known in the poor; for their sake he was the God of Moses, of the Judges and Prophets, of Jesus and the Christians. God reveals himself [sic] in the poor because they cannot live in the divinity of the system that is oppressing them. In the very pain of their oppression is revealed to them the non-divinity of that oppressive system."

dialectical complexity. To the degree that the poor exist outside all kingdoms they inhabit both the Immanent Kingdom of God which is *already here* and also point us toward the Transcendent Kingdom of God which is *not yet* fully realized.⁸⁸

Conclusion: From the Levinasian Other to the Disrupting Other

In the beginning of this chapter I spoke of how this project would use the Other as defined within the work of Emmanuel Levinas in dealing with the question of an ethical response toward the Other given our pluralistic reality. After defining and explicating Levinas' position I also introduced a critique of his work. In illuminating his shortcomings, specifically what I consider to be his inadequate understanding of the question of the particularity of the Other, I proffered a solution by introducing the concept of Dimensions which is part of all human experience. I specifically introduced four Dimensions: the Economic, the Cultural, the Political, and finally the Religious. I do concede the danger of reducing the Other to the limited identity options offered within that dimension (e.g. The Other in the Economic Dimension becomes *only* his or her living labor, the Other in the Political Dimension becomes *only* the non-citizen in the Nation-State etc.) however it is precisely because I take seriously the moral and ethical demands of the Other which is so persuasively articulated in the work of Levinas

⁸⁸ Ibid. 98-99. "The poor, moreover, by having no part in the system, by being oppressed, marginal, non-subject of rights and property, are outside the system. By being outside the system they are inside the Kingdom. In other words, the marginality of the poor in respect of the kingdom of this world is a measure of their participation in the eschatological Kingdom of God. Non-possession and marginality in the system are possession and participation in the Kingdom...The poor, like exteriority in the system, are "already" in the Kingdom. It may well be that they have no knowledge of this; it may well be that no explicit mention of Christ and his Gospel has come to their ears. Yet anything they do in order to eat and drink, in order to achieve a juster [sic] order, is a being "already" in the Kingdom."

that I hold we must know some specifics of the existence of the Other. It is, however, precisely because the Other is always more than any one dimension that he or she will always appear to me as disruption. The Other will always demand (command) that I inhabit not only these four Dimensions but, in fact, transcend them and their respective horizons. It is through engaging the Other in all dimensions of human experience that I can begin to love the neighbor, myself, and God. What became necessary was to become more precise about the content of this encounter. We can find some elucidation to this issue in the writing of Johann B. Metz and Enrique Dussel.

CHAPTER 3
BIOGRAPHY AS EPISTEMOLOGICAL LOCI: THE POLITICAL THEOLOGY
OF JOHANN B. METZ AND THE LIBERATION THEOLOGY OF ENRIQUE
DUSSEL

The love command is central within Christian ethical discourse. This command, however, must constantly be reconfigured for it to become effective within each historical period. As we saw, the work of Emmanuel Levinas does an admirable job of creating the conditions necessary for all Christians to realize the implications of this command within our contemporary milieu. Levinas, however, was incapable of moving us towards a more precise understanding of how and what this moral demand might entail given current historical conditions. His desire to maintain, at all cost, the ultimate otherness of the Other made it impossible for the ethical demands made by the Other to have any true *substance*. This was the case because, ultimately, all demands of the Other would have to be mediated within a specific socio-historical location. The demand of the Other would have to be shaped, in part, by who the Other is (e.g. a woman, an indigenous person, a child etc.) and what the needs of that community were within that given period.

To resolve this shortcoming I proposed the concept of human *Dimensions*. This concept allows us to understand that what we and the Other share in common is that we experience of life within the parameters of certain

dimensions. We all experience life through the matrices of these dimensions. When we speak of the Other we are always speaking of ‘an’ Other within a specific dimension. This conceptual framework allowed us to acknowledge some element of particularity while also granting a certain transcendent quality to the Other precisely because each dimension is itself always understood as only part of a larger reality. No person is ever only who they are within the economic dimension, cultural dimension etc.

What was lacking in this concept was a more precise apprehension of what was needed to fully encounter the Other within these dimensions, particularly the method and content of this encounter. I found some guidance in this area from two sources: the political theology of Johann Baptist Metz, and the liberation philosophy of Enrique Dussel.

This chapter will serve as a brief introduction to the political theology of Johann B. Metz and the liberation philosophy of Enrique Dussel. It has three sections: the first is a general introduction to each author’s overall vision, the second introduces some very specific concepts found within their respective theology or philosophy, and the final section is a critical appraisal of their work.

Johann Baptist Metz: The Sacred Subject in Political Theology

Johann B. Metz is one of the founders of Political Theology.¹ Metz himself has stated that ‘the itinerary of political theology has been a reflection of my life.’² He, like Elizondo and Said, is aware how theology and biography are profoundly

¹ Johann B. Metz, *Faith in History and Society*, Trans. J. Matthew Ashley (New York: Herder and Herder Book, 2007), 1. See also *Love’s Strategy: The Political Theology of Johann Baptist Metz*, Ed. John K. Downey

² Johann B. Metz, *A Passion for God: The Mystical-Political Dimension of Christianity*, Trans. J. Matthew Ashley, (New York: Paulist Press, 1998), 1.

intermingled. His theological vision deeply reflects his commitment to the potency of particularity, including his particular faith/intellectual journey. This chapter focuses on three aspects of his vision: the safeguarding of the subject in modern and post-modern discourse, his shift away from what he labels *Bourgeois Religion*, and finally his eschatological vision. While these three aspects are interdependent within the political theology of Metz, here I address each separately.

The Endangered Subject in Modern/Post-Modern Discourse

Metz is a theologian who is deeply concerned with the retrieval and importance of the Subject.³ This subject is not the atomized individual within most modern and post-modern discourse but rather a profoundly social creature.⁴ His concern for the disappearance of this subject arises from what he perceives as a two-pronged assault: the first is the ahistorical existence of the modern person, and the second is the dangerous distance which exists between the modern subject and the suffering of the world, including the awareness of the subject's own suffering.

No History, No Humanity

³ Johann B. Metz, *Love's Strategy: The Political Theology of Johann Baptist Metz*, Ed. John K. Downey (Pennsylvania, Trinity Press International, 1999), 83. The essay is entitled *Between Evolution and Dialectic: The Point of Departure for a Contemporary Fundamental Theology*, "Any Christianity, then, can be defined, at least in its task and intention, as a defense of hope. What is the hope that is in question here? It is the solidarity of hope in the God of the living and the dead, who calls all men [sic] to be his [sic] subject. "

⁴ *Faith and History*, 70. "The history of religion in the Bible is the history of a people, and the individuals within it, becoming subjects in the presence of their God. "Subjects" here does not mean the isolated, the monad, who subsequently ascertains his or her coexistence with other subjects. Solidaristic-antagonistic and liberative-unsettling experiences with other subjects belong to the constitution of the religious subject right from the start, and here the question about the relation between the individual subject to other subjects seems rather forced, the product of an abstraction after the fact. To talk about "universal solidarity" as a fundamental category of political theology does not, therefore, mean the absorption of the individual religious subject; rather, it is the way that these subjects exist—before God and through God."

For Metz, the modern person's subjectivity is threatened by our overreliance on technology and concurrent lack of historical consciousness.

We have already received public notice of the successor to the human person, one which is no longer plagued by any memories of suffering or catastrophes. Time magazine portrayed it in a recent cover: the robot, a quietly functioning machine, an intelligence without memories, without pathos, without morality. Is this the future of humanity? Is this the overman [Übermensch], the strong and pitiless one? With its *memoria passionis*, and the understandings of history and times that are operative in it, Christian theology struggles against such disappearance of the human being, against the decline of the subject and against a widespread weariness in history.⁵

Metz combats some of this 'decline of the subject' by introducing categories which battle some of the most powerful features of this new reality; this includes, but is not limited to, a renewed emphasis on the importance of memory as a theological concept. It is important to note that this robot-individual will have little capacity to engage in an authentic encounter precisely because of its inability to honor the particular characteristics of the Other.

An Apathy which leads to Domination

The second concern which is a threat to the quality of human life is found in a growing apathy among all modern persons. These subjects, who inhabit insular and distracted lives, are disconnected from all suffering and, ultimately,

⁵ *A Passion for God*, 41. Found in the essay entitled *On the Way to a Postidealist Theology*.

even from death. Metz concludes that this *numbing* allows for the subject to sustain modes of domination that discount the suffering of the Other.

Only when people themselves remain capable of suffering do they refrain from forcing suffering arbitrarily on others, and are able and ready in their own way to share in the suffering of others and become active in the liberation struggles of the tortured and exploited. The same Nietzsche who forces into submission all sufferings afflicting him and cooks them into the food of his domineering will becomes the great enemy of compassion toward the suffering of others. The culture of the subjugators is one of apathy and disconnectedness from others.⁶

Because of this concern with how numbing can lead to a culture of domination we will see that an essential aspect of political theology will be a demand to stay connected to the 'stories' of the suffering subjects within history. This demand requires that all subjects be in intimate contact with the struggling peoples of the world.⁷ For Metz this demand of being conscious of one's connectedness to all humanity is not principally created by the modern world but rather is inherent in the love command itself.

Bourgeois Religion or Messianic Christianity?

Metz draws a sharp distinction between what he terms *Bourgeois Religion* and *Messianic Christianity*.⁸ Two aspects in Bourgeois Religion which Metz

⁶ *Love's Strategy*, 57. Found in an essay entitled *Bread of Survival*.

⁷ *Ibid.* 8. "We must act and do theology while touching victims."

⁸ Johann B. Metz, *The Emergent Church: The Future of Christianity in a Postbourgeois World*, Trans. Peter Mann (New York: Crossroads Publishing Company, 1981), 1-16. This essay is entitled *Messianic or Bourgeois Religion?*; however, he addresses this issue in much of his work. Political theology can be seen as an alternative to what he terms *Bourgeois Theology*.

wishes to combat are its superficial optimism⁹ and its understanding of faith as exclusively or primarily a 'private matter.'¹⁰ For Metz these features, found in much contemporary Christianity, threaten to make the Christian faith, and the Gospel message, anemic and irrelevant to the modern world.

Optimism as Cheap Grace

The optimism found in the bourgeois expression of much contemporary Christianity is merely a reaffirmation of the worldview held by the dominant groups of the world.¹¹ The superficiality of this 'faith' appears disingenuous and naïve in light of the profound horrors of history.¹² It is precisely the inability to critically engage history in all its complexity which makes Christianity, or more precisely for Metz, the Bourgeois religion that is currently understood as Christianity, culpable in silencing the suffering of the victims in history.¹³ This silencing of the suffering makes its claims of hope superficial and ultimately not the authentic hope found in Messianic Discipleship. For Metz, Christianity must

⁹ Ibid. 1.

¹⁰ Ibid. 2.

¹¹ Ibid. 1. "When the church in West Germany repeats the messianic sayings regarding the reign of God and the future disclosed therein, it is speaking primarily in this case to people who already possess a future. They bring their own future, as it were, into the church with them—the powerful and unshakeably [sic] optimistic to have it religiously endorsed and uplifted, the fearful to have it protected and confirmed by religion. In this way, the messianic future frequently becomes a ceremonial elevation and transfiguration of a bourgeois future already worked out elsewhere and in the face of death the extension of this bourgeois future and ego dominant within it into the transcendence of eternity. In the Christianity of our time, the messianic religion of the Bible has largely been changed into bourgeois religion."

¹² *A Passion for God*, 56. The essay is entitled *Theology as Theodicy*. "Do we believe in God? or do we believe in our beliefs about God and, in so doing, perhaps really believe only in ourselves or in what we would like to think about ourselves? Consider, however, a faith that does not believe only in itself, but really believes in God...Finally this is true even for a Christian's faith: Whoever hears the message of the resurrection of Christ in such a way that the cry of the crucified had become inaudible in it, hears not the Gospel but rather a myth."

¹³ Metz addresses this issue throughout his corpus but a powerful example may be found in this essay entitled *Christians and Jews after Auschwitz: Being a Meditation Also on the End of Bourgeois Religion* found in *Love Strategy*.

always exist within the tension that is intrinsic to our waiting for the Kingdom, even as we build towards the Kingdom.¹⁴

From Private Theology to Political Theology

The second feature of Bourgeois Religion that is problematic for Metz is its desire to privatize the political dimensions which he believes are intrinsic to the Gospel.¹⁵ He asserts that much of this shift occurred in the writing of Augustine who 'continues to be extremely significant even when he erred.'¹⁶ Metz contends that St. Augustine shifted the focus away from the theodicy question and towards the soteriological concerns of Jesus' ministry. In this shift salvation becomes defined exclusively as redemption.¹⁷ Because of this shift the central concern for Christianity became personal salvation rather than engaging the political or public understanding of the salvation question.¹⁸ He claims that, "The reversal of this

¹⁴ *A Passion for God*, 56. The essay is entitled *Theology as Theodicy?* "There is a hint of something unreconciled in Christianity. To banish this would be an expression not of faith, but of smallness of faith."

¹⁵ A clear explanation of how Metz views this issue can be found in *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory: Political and Liturgical Theology in Dialogue* by Bruce T. Morrill S. J.

¹⁶ *A Passion for God*, 59. The essay is entitled *Theology as Theodicy?*

¹⁷ *Ibid.* 61. "3. Discourse about God, as we know it from the biblical traditions, contains a promise: the promise of salvation, paired with the promise of a universal justice that salvifically includes even past suffering. But in Augustine "salvation" now becomes thought of exclusively in terms of "redemption," as redemption from sin and guilt. What has been lost from view is all the suffering and histories of suffering which in our everyday experience simply cannot be traced back to sin or to a history of guilt and which nonetheless make up the largest part of this world's suffering that cries out to the heavens. The biblical vision of salvation, the promise of salvation that is implicit in God's name (*soter*) touches not only sin and guilt, but above all deliverance from all the situations of suffering in which men and women find themselves. In Augustine the God-question determined by the hunger and thirst for justice, that is, the eschatological question about God's justice, is replaced by the anthropocentric question about human sin. The theodicy question as *the* eschatological question is silenced."

¹⁸ *Love's Strategy*, 30, In an essay entitled *The Church's Social Function in Light of a "Political Theology."* "Salvation, the object of Christian faith in hope, is not a private salvation. The proclamation of this salvation drove Jesus into deadly conflict with the public authorities of his day. His cross does not stand in the exclusive privacy of the individual, nor in the sanctuary of a purely religious experience, but outside the threshold of sheltered privacy and the screen of the purely religious: it stands "outside," as the theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews formulated it. The veil of the Temple has definitely been torn. The scandal and promise of this salvation are both equally public. This public aspect cannot be taken back, dissolved, or hushed up. It

“privatizing” tendency is the primary critical task of political theology.”¹⁹One way to reverse this trend is by concerning ourselves with the *dangerous memories* of the innocent suffering of all victims.²⁰This is what Metz terms an ‘*open-eyed mysticism that obligates us to perceive more acutely the suffering of others.*’²¹ Metz is emphatic that this concern for the suffering of others is not limited by time or space or any human boundary but is inherent in the love command.

The ‘Eschatological Proviso’: A Demand and Opportunity

Metz wishes to retrieve the eschatological dimension of the Gospel.²²This *eschatological proviso* is important because of its capacity to be a critical corrective to two paradigms which dominate our understanding. The first is our uncritical evolutionary view of the universe; the second is our tendency to absolutize a particular historical construction.

The End of Time: Promise or Threat?

Christianity must retrieve the apocalyptic insight that speaks to a God that is not only found within time, but also is the Lord of time. In order to achieve this new understanding Christians must break free from the current model of viewing

accompanies the message of salvation on its way through history. And in serving this message the Christian religion has been molded in the critical and liberating form of public responsibility.”

¹⁹ Ibid. 28.

²⁰ Ed. Kevin F. Burke, and Robert Lasalle-Klein, *Love That Produces Hope: The Thought of Ignacio Ellacuria* (Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2006), 260: “Jesus did not look in the first instance on others’ sins, but rather on others’ suffering. In this way Christianity had its beginning as a community of memory and narration in following a Jesus whose gaze was directed first at others’ suffering. This new sensitivity to others’ suffering was a defining feature of Jesus’ “new way of life.”

²¹ *A Passion for God*, 69. Found in an essay entitled *Theology as Theodicy?*

²² *Love’s Strategy*, 30. Found in an essay entitled *The Church’s Social Function in the Light of a “Political Theology.”* “Political theology seeks to make contemporary theology once again aware of the suit pending between the eschatological message of Jesus and the reality of political society.”

time exclusively in evolutionary terms.²³ The effect of viewing time in this fashion is a growing apathy. This creates a subject who inhabits a world which is 'no longer capable of surprising him'²⁴ and, in turn, creates a sense of despair that whatever one does will have little impact within history. This freedom from carrying the weight of historical responsibility has the unexpected effect of de-anchoring our sense of reality and leaving us afloat in a sea of temporal indifference.²⁵ In having time be *eternal* it diminishes the importance of our action. When time has no end, the provisional quality of our life becomes merely a banality of existence. What needs to be retrieved, for Metz, is a more authentic understanding of the 'end times' or the eschatological vision so pronounced in the Biblical tradition. This apocalyptic vision will urge each of us to re-evaluate our praxis based on a new level of accountability. This vision, however, in order that it not fall under the spell of Bourgeois religion, must be interpreted not exclusively as a concern and demand on my individual life and death but also as a concern and demand made on our political (in the broadest sense of this term) life and death.²⁶

²³ *Love's Strategy*, 51. Found in essay entitled *The Second Coming*. "In the interval the symbols for the understanding of time have changed. The Christian apocalyptic symbol of time coming to an abrupt end has been exchanged for the crypto-religious symbol of evolution. That has penetrated all of us in its very impenetrability, right to the last glimmer of awareness, to such an extent that we hardly notice any longer its irrational sway over us and its quasi-religious totality."

²⁴ *Ibid.* 87. Found in an essay entitled *Between Evolution and Dialectics*.

²⁵ *Love's Strategy*, 154. Found in an essay entitled *The Second Coming*. "Surely the idea of time as something evolutionary and unending has long since bred in people's minds a special form of resignation that persists long after it has been labeled as "science," "objectivity," and "pragmatism."

²⁶ *Ibid.* 152-153. "Following Christ on the basis of immanent expectation of the second coming averts the danger of an ineffectual state of permanent reflection. The kind of following we want does not merely reflect on itself but impels one toward action and forbids any postponement of following Christ...Imminent expectation on the second coming repairs hope that has been

An Apocalyptic Sting that Inoculates

The second paradigm which Metz feels needs correcting is the human tendency to universalize the particular. In the biblical tradition this may be spoken of as the problem of idolatry. By re-asserting the apocalyptic and eschatological dimension of the Christian perspective we can affirm the provisional but not arbitrary character of our contemporary social arrangement.²⁷ This re-orientation allows us to move away from the mystification so prevalent within modern and post-modern thought which understands God as existing within time (if it acknowledges God's existence at all) rather than God being the "Lord of all," including time. This insight allows Christians to challenge the hegemonic reading of history which seem to be perennially written by *the victors* and see the world through the *preferential lens of the victims*.²⁸ This *apocalyptic sting* allows us to critique the evolutionary understanding and impels us to image a new, and as yet, unimagined future, one not completely of our making.²⁹

soothed and led astray by ideas of evolution. It offers hope to the perspective of expectation and time. It does not paralyze responsibility but gives it a solid foundation."

²⁷ *Love's Strategy*, 31. Found in an essay entitled *The Church's Social Function in the Light of a "Political Theology."* "The New Testament community knows that it has been called from the beginning to live the promise of the future in the present conditions and thus to overcome the world. The orientation toward the promise of peace and justice changes every time our historical presence changes. It creates and forces us constantly into a fresh critical and liberating position with regard to the existing social environment in which we live. In a somewhat similar way, the parables of Jesus are parables that put us into a new critical relationship with the world that surrounds us. *Therefore, every eschatological theology must become a political theology in the sense of a theology of social criticism.*" [italics in text]

²⁸ *Ibid.* 80. Found in an essay entitled *Theology Today: New Crisis and New Visions*: "The biblical God has always allied himself with those who, according to an endless evolution and its pressure of selection, should have no history, no future. This is true from the alliance of God with the weak, insignificant tribes of Israel to the alliance of God with the defeated Jesus of Nazareth on the cross. I do not see how we can hinder the absorption of history, which is always God's history with us, into a timeless time without reclaiming the apocalyptic dimension of our Christian eschatology. This is why I hand on to you the question of an as yet undisclosed, suppressed truth in the apocalyptic symbols."

²⁹ Bruce T. Morrill, *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory: Political Theology and Liturgical Theology in Dialogue*, (Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 30. "The definite memory of

Political Theology: A Resurrected Hope for All Others

Metz sees the Subject as being enthralled and ultimately victimized by various forces which threaten human dignity. These forces threaten not only the oppressed but the oppressor (albeit, in a different manner) and make an authentic encounter with the Other more difficult. However, in typical dialectical fashion these very same obstacles become conditions which are optimal for such an encounter to occur.³⁰

Enrique Dussel: The Transmodern Other of Liberation Philosophy

Enrique Dussel is one of the early architects of Latin American liberation philosophy. Dussel combines aspects of traditional (read Western/European) philosophical contents and concerns but with a unique perspectival and methodological turn. Like Said, Elizondo, and Metz, he thus becomes a bridge figure that engages our unique pluralistic contemporary world.³¹

suffering, therefore, is dangerous in its capacities both (1) to render a critique of the evolutionary world view and (2) to stimulate human imagination for social-political action.”

³⁰ *Faith in History and Society*, 213. “It is only today, for instance, when human beings are becoming more and more present to each other as humanity—and this not only as an idea but in terms of their dependency, neediness, and suffering—that it is becoming possible to see the breadth of obligation contained in a statement as seemingly self-evident as the one about the equality of all men and women as God’s creatures.”

³¹ Enrique Dussel, *Thinking from the Underside of History: Enrique Dussel’s Philosophy of Liberation*, Ed. Linda Martin Alcoff and Eduardo Mendieta, (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2000), 2. “No one has contributed more to the development of Latin American philosophy as a critical reflection on modernity and globalization in the last half of the twentieth century than the Argentine-born philosopher Enrique Dussel. Dussel’s life has included extensive studies of “pure” Western philosophy, political activism, repression and exile from a military dictatorship, a turn toward Marxism and liberation theology, and the development of the comprehensive articulation of a philosophy of liberation. Dussel has incorporated and arguably surpassed the leading critical resources of European philosophy toward this project, including the hermeneutic critique of universalism, the critique of totality in the work of Emmanuel Levinas, and the discourse of ethics developed by Karl-Otto Apel and Jürgen Habermas. Dussel insists that our primary concern must be nothing less than the ongoing global genocide. An estimated 20 million persons die each year from starvation and malnutrition perpetrated by the new world order of global capitalism. Like many African philosophers and Indian postcolonial cultural critics, Dussel is convinced that European thought is an important site at which one might interfere with the smooth production of this system. In his philosophy of liberation, Dussel has sought a solution

Because of the breadth of Dussel's work we will focus on only three aspects of his project: the Subject as possessing inherent dignity, the Subject as existing within a communal ontology, and finally the Subject as Other in relation to all Totalities.

Atheism as Protection of the Subject

For Dussel, the dignity and worth of the human person is intrinsic to the creaturely character of the person and exists prior to any outside acknowledgement or recognition of this fact.³² This dignity will be in constant tension with all the systems which try to subsume the dignity into its own totality. An aspect of all liberation theologies, philosophies, and ethics will be to combat this ever-present threat. This is done primarily through not allowing any system to become totalizing in relation to the Subject, or the Other. Dussel begins by asserting that any system can move into this Totalizing category. He speaks of a system becoming 'fetishized' and this leading to the system becoming self-referential.³³ This will require that we be atheistic 'vis-à-vis all Totalities or

to the totalitarian thought of oppression through a recourse to what is excluded: the perspective, and the labor, of its victim. What emerges very clearly from this approach is that liberation must be a pluri-topic not mono-topic, and that it will be culturally local. Dussel calls such an approach, which revises universality by combining recognition of irreducible difference, a "diversality."

³² Enrique Dussel, *Beyond Philosophy: Ethics, History, Marxism and Liberation Theology*, Ed. Eduardo Mendieta (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers Inc., 2003), 207. "Man [sic] possesses "dignity" intrinsically, through being a human person; there is nothing in all creation more dignified than the human person."

³³ Enrique Dussel, *Philosophy of Liberation*, Trans. Aquilina Martinez and Christine Morkovsky (Eugene: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1985), 95-96. "In this section our discourse reaches its end and confronts itself with the phenomenon of fetishism. I call "fetishization" the process by which a totality is made absolute, closed, divinized. Politically totality is fetishized when it takes over within imperialism (3.1.5) or nationalistic totalitarianism (3.1.1.). Erotic totality is fetishized when it succumbs to fascination with the perverse phallus of macho ideology (3.2.5.6.). Cultural totality is fetishized when oligarchical ideology alienates popular culture (3.3.6.) or castrates the son (3.3.5.). Fetishism is the death of totality, of the system, of discourse...Atheism vis-à-vis the present system is a prerequisite for innovative, procreative, liberative praxis."

systems. This atheism however is not the atheism that denies a transcendent Other but rather one that seeks to relativize all systems in relation to this transcendent Other.³⁴

This vision of the primacy of human dignity over any system put forth by Dussel could, in our modern hyper-individualistic milieu, be interpreted as an affirmation of a more traditional libertarian position where individual freedoms trump all else. This, however, would be an incorrect understanding of his position precisely because of Dussel's anthropology. For Dussel the human person is constitutively social. All humans are created within the warp and woof of community.

The Communal Face of the Other

The Subject which is confronting us, for Dussel, is therefore not primarily the atomized, self-enclosed specimen of humanity we are so used to envisioning in modern (and post-modern) ethics, but rather is always already found within a web of relationships. The face of the Other is never merely one face but always the face of a community.³⁵ This demand of seeing the Other as ontologically communal in character is especially important given that a significant feature of much theological, philosophical, and ethical discourse is predicated on the

³⁴ Ibid. 99. "Pure atheism, without affirmation of the infinite Other, is not sufficiently critical; it permits the fetishization of a future system. Only if it is affirmed that the divine is other than all possible systems will liberating revolution be possible. Hence disbelief in the fetish—atheism—must be affirmed as the exteriority of the absolute and of the Origin."

³⁵ Enrique Dussel, *Metodo para una filosofia de la liberacion: Superacion analectica de la dialectica hegeliana*, (Salamanca: Sigueme, 1974), 182 "The Other is never only <<one alone>> but rather, also and always, <<a we>>. Each image in the face to face is equally an epiphany of a family, a class, a people, an epoch of humanity, and of humanity as a whole, and, even more so, the Absolute Other." [author's translation]

individual Subject. This has inadvertently but systematically made invisible the *collective* Other.

The face of the other, primarily as poor and oppressed, reveals a people before it reveals an individual person. The brown face of the Latin American *mestizo* wrinkled with the furrows of centuries of work, the ebony of the African slave, the olive face of the Hindu, the yellow face of the Chinese coolies is the irruption of the history of a people before it is the biography of Tupac Amaru, Lumumba, Nehru, and Mao Tse-Tung. To describe the experience proximity as individual experiences, or the metaphysical experience of face-to-face as lived experience between two persons, is simply to forget that personal mystery is always risked in the exteriority of the popular history of a people (3.1.3-4). The individualization of this collective personal experience is a European deformation derived from the bourgeois revolution. Each face, unique, inscrutable mystery of decisions not yet made, is the face of a sex, a generation, a social class, a nation, a cultural group, a historical epoch.³⁶

We can no longer speak of ontology exclusively as an individual quality which must be guarded, developed, protected, etc. but rather we must acknowledge a collective ontology in our encounter with the Other. This collective or social aspect of human dignity is, in a sense, more foundational to our

³⁶ *Philosophy of Liberation*, 44.

humanity then an abstracted, individual, and ahistorical dignity.³⁷ It is this communal dignity which we must protect.

The Human Subject as Trans-Totality: Beyond Instrumental Reasoning

Given the emphasis that Dussel gives to the communal or collective aspect of the subject, how can we ensure that the unique particularity of an individual is not subsumed under a collective identity? What precludes this genuine danger from ever being fully realized is Dussel's insistence that any individual person also always exists beyond all systems and their instrumental logic or reasoning.³⁸ This understanding of the person as always 'more than' any Totality or Collective identity helps create a corrective to dismissing the ineffable quality of the individual person. It would be impossible to have *someone* become exclusively *something* (e.g. a mestizo, an African slave, a Hindu etc.). It is in this fashion that Dussel becomes equally critical of the fetishizing of a group identity.³⁹

³⁷ Enrique Dussel, *Ethics and Community*, Theology and Liberation Series, Trans. Robert R. Barr, (New York: Orbis Books, 1988). "But our "being" is more than our materiality, our corporeality, despite what some have thought. Our most radical being is our social being, our "being" in virtue of our being human (and not merely animal). The place we occupy in the social texture (see 2.4) determines (although not absolutely) our being...In authentic community, genuine individuality is fully actualized. In anticommunist, individuality is fetishized and ultimately destroys itself, by way of the death of the poor. It is this *death* that is now of interest to us." He also speaks to this issue in *Philosophy of Liberation*, chapter 2, entitled From Phenomenology to Liberation.

³⁸ *Philosophy of Liberation*, 40. "The face of a person is revealed as other when it is extracted from our system of instruments as exterior, as someone, as a freedom that questions, provokes, and appears, as one who resists instrumental totalization. *A person is not something, but someone.*" [italics added]

³⁹ Michael Barber, *Ethical Hermeneutics: Rationality in Enrique Dussel's Philosophy of Liberation* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1998), 119. "Abundant textual evidence exists that Dussel believes that every culture, including the former Inca and Aztec empires, is prone to a mistaken self-absolutization. Moreover, he repeatedly admits that "the people" are not free from inauthenticity, voices infrequent misgivings about popular religiosity, observes that the oppressed have often introjected the oppression they received, and refrains from any uncritical endorsement of populist spontaneity."

From Problems towards Solutions

The Theology of Johann B. Metz and the Philosophy of Enrique Dussel

It is clear that both of these intellectuals show deep concern for justice and the human subject within a pluralistic and complex world. They also share deep concerns for engaging the Other. The next section demonstrates how they respond to these concerns. This section has two sub-sections; the first introduces the Political Theology of Johann B. Metz, the second the liberation philosophy of Enrique Dussel.

The Interrupting Categories of Johann B. Metz

Political Theology is a term given to the theology which was created by many European theologians including Johann B. Metz, Jürgen Moltmann, and Dorothee Sölle. Given the incredible variety found under the banner of Political Theology, this project will only focus on the work of Johann B. Metz and even more particularly on two aspects of his work: his categories, and his understanding of religion as interruption.

One cannot understand the political theology of Metz without becoming conversant with his Categories. The Categories of Memory, Narrative, and Solidarity function as the *building blocks* from which he creates the edifice which is his theology. Each category, while wholly distinct, is nonetheless deeply connected to the other categories.⁴⁰

⁴⁰ *Faith in History and Society*, 167. "The Categories that are treated in the following part (their characterization as "categories" is meant in a very broad sense) stand in an inner relationship to one another. Only together are memory, narrative, and solidarity the basic categories for a practical fundamental theology. Memory and narrative do not have their practical character without solidarity, and solidarity does not attain its specifically cognitive import without memory and narrative."

Memory:

For Metz, there was much talk within contemporary theology of the human person as an historical subject. However, this never translated into theology immersing itself concretely in the historical events of its time.⁴¹ One of the major impetuses for creating political theology was to counteract this ahistorical element of much theological discourse. Metz's phrase *after Auschwitz* captures this desire to resist vacuous talk of the human person as historical subject without engaging in historical particularity.⁴² Yet this appreciation for history and memory is not neutral. Metz is clear that this ongoing struggle for remembrance will be a battle between the memory of the victors and the memory of *the vanquished*.⁴³

The remedy for this ongoing desire for the victors to 'forget the past' or remember it in some idealized form is to grant a particular epistemological privilege to certain memories. These are the powerfully *dangerous memories* of

⁴¹ *A Passion for God*, 39. Found in an essay entitled *On the Way to a Postidealist Theology*. "Because of the way Auschwitz showed up—or did not show up—in theology, it became (slowly) clear to me how high the apathy content in theological idealism is, how incapable it is of taking on historical experiences—despite, or even because of, all its talk about history and historicity."

⁴² *A Passion for God*, 25. Found in an essay entitled *The New Political Theology*. "Late (too late?) the new political theology became conscious of the fact that it is a theology after Auschwitz, that this catastrophe belongs to the inner situation of Christian discourse about God. In no way does this mean that Auschwitz should be stylized as a negative myth. Just the opposite! To be true to the situation, *after Auschwitz* means nothing other than this: finally to accept the fact that concrete history, and the theological experience of nonidentity connected with it, have broken into theology's logos. Confronted with Auschwitz theology, theology itself—as discourse about God—cannot maintain its historical innocence: neither by the division of labor whereby the theme is diverted into Church history, nor by the usual talk of human historicity (as a sort of anthropological constant) that, because abstract, is impervious to experiences of confusion or bewilderment; nor, finally, by a faceless universalism of history, seemingly devoid of human beings, by a kind of idealism of history endowed with a considerable amount of apathy when it comes to the misfortune of the other or to historical catastrophe or ruin." [italics in text]

⁴³ *Faith in History and Society*, 171. "It is a memorative solidarity with the dead and the vanquished, which breaks the spell of history as a history of victors—be it evolutionary or dialectically."

suffering. These memories which are ceded a unique authority are not merely the blanket suffering of an abstract humanity.⁴⁴ They are the *dangerous memories* of the suffering of the Other caused by those in power. This is, in part, what makes them dangerous. They function to subvert all dominant discourses.⁴⁵

This struggle for remembrance has a profoundly ethical edge precisely because it is in retrieving and safeguarding these *dangerous memories* that our human subjectivity is maintained.⁴⁶ This element is decisive in speaking to the authority of all theological and ethical claims⁴⁷ and helps explain why the category of Memory is so central to political theology.

Narrative:

⁴⁴ Ibid. 110. "A second explanatory point has to do with a more precise determination of what is understood here in the concrete under the title of "suffering." Is it not very dangerous to talk about "suffering in general"? Does not thereby the "memory of suffering" lose its critical, above all also its social-critical and political power? Is not suffering then completely privatized and internalized? Does not everyone suffer in one way or another? Where can we find the criteria, the starting points for a critical consciousness, especially in the interest of the oppressed and their suffering? Without them does not social and political engagement end up in that boring, indeterminate gray on gray that for the most part is the image that Christianity and the church present to the world today? And is it not true that this all boils down to a consolation that finally consoles *no one*, since it supposedly consoles *everyone* in the same way?"

⁴⁵ Ibid. 112. "It becomes apparent in light of the Christian memory of suffering, however, that social power and political dominion ought not simply to be accepted, but rather they have to continually justify themselves anew in the face of concrete suffering. The social and political power of the rich and the rulers must always allow the question to be posed to it concerning the extent to which it itself is causing suffering. It cannot dispense itself from giving an account of this by appealing to the suffering that the rich and the powerful themselves experience. This critical question of power and wealth belongs precisely to the consolation which the Gospel offers to the rich and the powerful. Thus, the memory of suffering, in its Christian sense, does not evade the issue in the gray areas of what is left to social and political discretion; rather it sharpens a social and political conscience in the interest of the suffering of others. It prevents the privatization and internalization of suffering and the flattening of its social dimension. The history of suffering and the social history of oppression are certainly not simply identical in this memory of suffering, but neither can they be separated in the concrete."

⁴⁶ Ibid. 172. "In connection with this, "remembering" ends up being fundamental for the theological understanding of how men and women are subjects: "remembering" as a category for salvaging identity."

⁴⁷ *A Passion for God*, 134. Found in an essay entitled *Theology and The University*. "In my view there is one authority recognized by all great cultures and religions: the authority of those who suffer. Respecting the suffering of strangers is a precondition for every culture; articulating other's suffering is the presupposition of all claims to truth. Even those by theology... The sole content of its universability is this: There is no suffering in the world that does not concern us."

For Metz, the desire to recover narrative structure as an authentic mode of theological discourse finds its impetus on two fronts; the first is based on a wish to de-link the connection made between theology and the epistemological presuppositions which are a carry-over from the Enlightenment; the second is a desire to move away from understanding all theological discourse, including theological ethics, as an activity which can be conducted only by elites or experts.

Metz asserts that Christianity betrayed one of its most authentic sources of authority when it allowed the technological, scientific, logic of the Enlightenment to dictate the terms of discourse by which *truth* is communicated, and measured. This allowed for a particular species of truth to be categorized as the only credible definition of truth. This paradigm shift allowed a narrow criterion for what constitutes all legitimate mode of knowledge to dominate.⁴⁸ In fully grasping what Metz desires it is important to realize that Metz is not defending an uncritical acceptance of all types of narratives. His desire for a renewal of the place of narrative within theological discourse is not a parochial or provincial anti-intellectualism.⁴⁹ He makes a clear distinction between stories which only

⁴⁸ *Faith in History and Society*, 203. "The question about the scientific character of theology also has to be posed anew in a theology that bases itself on life histories. What we have to bear in mind here is that the most important achievements in the history of theology and the church have always arisen from a scientifically "impure" theology, in which biography, imagination, accumulated experiences, conversions, visions, and prayers are woven inextricably together in a "system." Even today theology is not simply for professors; it is not identical with academic theology. All the more reason then for a biographical theology not to let itself be forced into the mold of some exact and regulated scientific language. The lived conviction and learned experience of faith cannot be adequately justified by metalogical rules and analytical modes of argument. This is also why it cannot let itself be made unconditionally subject to the vocabulary of exactness. Theology is not a natural science of the divine."

⁴⁹ *Ibid.* 193. "As a consequence, the emphasis on narrative that I am looking for here has to be defended especially against the misunderstanding that it would give a new legitimation to the usual "storytellers" in the pulpit, and the catechesis class for telling anecdotes, when what is

disguise or falsely ameliorate oppression and those dangerous stories which are, and lead to, a liberative praxis.⁵⁰

Solidarity:

Solidarity must first be understood as a category which demands an ethical position of concern for the Other.⁵¹ It is the enacting and embodying of the mission of the church in its most lucid manner.⁵² Furthermore this helps guarantee that Christianity will not devolve into a bourgeois Religion which, as stated above, is imbued with a disingenuous spirit of triumph over historical suffering. Solidarity does not take away our faith or hope in the Resurrection; instead, it is our faith in the Resurrection that allows us to engage in acts of solidarity within historical struggles for the defense of the dignity and subjectivity of the human person.⁵³ We are conscious that a faith in the Resurrection of the Lord and all its implications does not allow us to be merely 'spectators' as these

really demanded of them is to provide arguments. There is a time for telling stories and a time for providing arguments! Apparently this distinction too is one that still has to be learned and taken seriously.”

⁵⁰ Ibid. 193. “There are, to be sure, stories that pacify and soothe (like for example, telling jokes in a dictatorship). But there are also stories that are “clued in” that harbor a sense of freedom and move toward “discipleship.” These are the kind of stories that the immature (Unmundigen) tell, but also the wise, who “have eaten a second time from the tree of knowledge” (Kleist). The “little ones” tell them, as well as the oppressed: stories that do anything but mislead one into celebrating one’s oppression and immaturity. That is to say, they are dangerous stories, stories in search of freedom.”

⁵¹ Ibid. 208. “As a category in a practical fundamental theology, solidarity is a category of assistance, of supporting and encouraging the subject in the face of that which threatens him or her most acutely and in the face of his or her suffering.”

⁵² Ibid. 208. “Like memory and narrative, it [Solidarity] belongs among the fundamental determinants of a theology and a church that want to bring their liberating and redemptive power to bear within human history of suffering, not over people’s heads and not detouring around their painful sense of nonidentity.”

⁵³ *A Passion for God*, 41. Found in an essay entitled *On the Way to a Postidealist Theology*. “It is precisely because Christians believe in an eschatological meaning for history that they can risk historical consciousness: looking into the abyss. Precisely because of this, they can risk a memory that recall not the successful but the ruined, not only that which has been realized but that which has been lost, a memory that in this way—as dangerous memory—resists identifying meaning and truth with the victory of what has come into being and continues to exist”

struggles occur within history but rather impels us to engage with, and in, history.⁵⁴

The category of Solidarity requires engagement with historical struggles for justice as an extension of the love command. Solidarity also resists the aforementioned tendency to *privatize* the Gospel demand and make it a purely *interior* experience.⁵⁵ It seeks to move away from understanding human experience only through the lens of exchange and barter and requires a ‘commitment, without counting the cost, to shattered lives.’⁵⁶ Finally, this category of Solidarity has, for Metz, an inherent trans-temporal quality. It allows us to speak of being in Solidarity with all those marginalized subjects in our contemporary world but to extend this deep compassion for those that have been silenced within the larger historical narrative.⁵⁷ This also disallows a purely ‘materialist’ reading of historical suffering by giving a certain gravitas to the suffering which was experienced by subjects who can no longer impact social-political conditions.

While the three categories of Metz hold a unique authority within his corpus, he also uses the term Interruption as a key element in his theology. One way he uses this term is as a heuristic device to help illuminate the manner in which theology and religion should be held within public/political discourse.

⁵⁴ Ibid. 208. “The fact that Christians believe that the pain of death and guilt have been overcome in Christ in no way absolves them from the commitment to overcome the pain of oppression and injustice, in solidarity with those who are not yet able, or no longer able, to be subjects.”

⁵⁵ Ibid. 67. “Fighting against the radical interiorization and privatization of these pathic ways of expressing social praxis is integral to virtually every topic in this book.”

⁵⁶ Ibid. 209.

⁵⁷ Ibid. 67. “Solidarity is not least among these structures: a solidarity that is an openness to past suffering; a solidarity, thus that “looks backward”; a solidarity with the dead and vanquished.”

Messianic Discipleship as Interruption

So for Metz the concept of *Interruption* is both a heuristic device and a methodological construct. In both cases Interruption is one manner in which the Categories are embodied and applied.⁵⁸ Throughout his writings he seems to use this concept to speak both of theology and religion.⁵⁹ Theology, by introducing a conceptual category, seeks to de-absolutize all humanly constructed discourses. Because of this conceptual category, which he refers to as 'the idea of God,' any pre-existing Totality will experience theological insights as interruptive.⁶⁰

This understanding of theology or religion being interruptive has implications for all areas of our existence. He notes how this insight demands that we create an alternative view of history and subjectivity which challenges all dominant discourses.⁶¹ Practicing this alternative requires an ongoing metanoia for ourselves and the society in which we live.⁶² The position requires that we

⁵⁸ Ibid. 62. "Metanoia, conversion, and exodus are not just purely moral or pedagogical categories; rather they are thoroughly noetic. Therefore, stories of conversion and of exodus do not serve as dramatic window dressing for a preformulated "pure" theology. Rather, they belong to the fundamental way theology itself operates. This practical structure of the idea of God also explains why it is that memory and narrative are not just subsequent additions or ornaments to talk about God. On the contrary, talk about God has an essential and inalienable memorative and narrative structure."

⁵⁹ Ibid. 158. "The shortest definition of religion: interruption."

⁶⁰ Ibid. 62. "The idea of God is itself a practical idea. God simply cannot be thought without this idea irritating and disrupting the immediate interests of the one who is trying to think it. Thinking-God happens as a revision of those interests and needs that are directly organized around one's self."

⁶¹ Ibid. 107. "In addition, a kind of Darwinism rules the domain of history. Thus, it would be of great importance to narrate a kind of anti-history based on the memory of suffering. This would be a way of understanding history in which we would also always be thinking about the alternatives that have been defeated and destroyed, a history *ex memoria passionis* as a history of the vanquished."

⁶² Ibid. 107. "For the truth of the passion of Jesus and of humankind's history of suffering that is remembered under the name "God" can only be thought in such a way that the goals and intentions of the one who is trying to think it do not come away unscathed. The eschatological truth of the *memoria passionis* certainly cannot be derived from the historical, social, and psychological forces of any given time. This is really what makes it a liberating truth. But this is also what makes it something constitutively foreign within the prevailing cognitive structures."

highlight two aspects of all ethical discourse; the first is that we must have an ongoing interrogation of the authority of all moral claims; the second will be the acceptance of a certain element of improvisational, but not arbitrary aspect to ethical claims. When speaking from within a theological centered ethical perspective we must question how much of any moral systems authority is derived merely from the 'cognitive structures' of the ruling elite of that society. We must recognize how all human ethics is contextual and particular to its socio-historical limits. This does not mean we accept an indiscriminate relativism but rather that we apprehend the full depth of the *Interrupted* life which is called forth by the demands of the Gospel.

Enrique Dussel: The Sacred Other in Liberation Philosophy

Enrique Dussel is one of the original architects of what has been labeled Liberation Philosophy. Because of his prolific writing and his ability to traverse many disciplines (history, theology, philosophy, post-colonialist theory etc.) it will be necessary in this work to focus our discussion on a mere fraction of Dussel's corpus. We will focus on three aspects of his philosophy: his Anadialecical method,⁶³ his critique of modernity and postmodernity which is captured in the term Transmodernity, and finally his vision of the Other. Like Metz, he attempts to create a cohesive and coherent philosophy which has deep implications and application for our contemporary setting.

The Analectical Outlook: Beyond the Dialectic

⁶³ As I will note early on, Dussel uses both Analectical and Anadialecical in describing his method. I will also use the terms interchangeably. In citing specific quotes from various sources I will be consistent with the wishes of the authors.

Dussel's method is grounded in a deep appreciation for, but critical break with, the Western philosophical method of the dialectic.⁶⁴ What he sees within the traditional dialectical method is a circumscribed, binary mode of conceptualizing the world, a mode which, inadvertently, excludes the Other. The dialectic method precludes seeing the full autonomy of the Other precisely because all alterity is subsumed under a pre-constructed Totality.⁶⁵

This inability to fully see the Other is, for Dussel, the central sin of all Western philosophical and theological thought. It was the philosophical and theological justification that allowed for the wanton destruction of all manifestations of the Other.

Historically and actually this sin since the fifteenth century has taken the form of a “no” on the part of the North Atlantic centre to the Indian, the African, the Asian and to the worker, the peasant, and the outcast. It has been a “no” to the woman in patriarchal families, and a “no” to the child in the oppressor's educational system.⁶⁶

This sin allows for the ultimate sin of idolatry to poison all subsequent interactions between the “I” of Western philosophical and theological discourses and the Other.⁶⁷ It does this precisely because, in the negation of the Other, we

⁶⁴ Enrique Dussel, *Beyond Philosophy: Ethics, History, Marxism, and Liberation Theology*, Ed. Eduardo Mendieta, (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publisher Inc., 2003), 5.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.* 5.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.* 26.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.* 26. “Sin, beginning as a “no” to my neighbour, [sic] takes the form of self-deification, the exalting of self as an object of worship and leads to idolatry—“no” to the Creator... The most serious effect is that the other or the neighbour [sic] (the Indian, the African, the Asian, or the woman) is reduced to the level of an idea. The meaning of the other is formulated in terms of the “I” who dreamed it into existence. The other is made a separate entity, becomes a thing, is abstracted into a cogitatum.” It is important to note that this is one place

experience the world as merely a reflection of our own ontological horizon. We make the world, including the Other and his or her world, in our image. Dussel's solution to the inherent violence created by the dialectical method is to introduce that which is *beyond* (ana) the dialectic; the anadialectical method's point of origin does not begin with the traditional "I" but rather with the Other.⁶⁸ It is especially important to recall here that the other is not merely *an other* "I" but rather is also a people or community.⁶⁹ This aspect is all the more urgent because of the way in which traditional ontological discourse has been seen through the prism of the Western conception of the autonomous, monadic, and individual subject. The anadialectical method avoids this totalizing element by locating authority and ontological authenticity outside of the system's purview.⁷⁰

where Dussel makes some explicit connection between the Other and the Neighbor as well as the immanent other and the transcendent Other.

⁶⁸ Ibid. 142. "The ethics of liberation, in contrast, starts from the affirmation of the real, existing, historical other. We have called this trans-ontological (metaphysical) positive element of the impetus, the active starting point of the negation of the negation, *the analectical element*. The Greek prefix ana- is meant to indicate a "going beyond" the ontological horizon (the system, the "flesh"). This logos (ana-logos), a discourse which has its origins in the transcendence of the system, contains the originality of the Hebrew-Christian experience. If "in the beginning God created" (Gen 1:1), it is because the Other is prior to the very principles of the cosmos, the system, the "flesh." The metaphysical priority of the other (who creates, reveals himself or herself) also has historical, political and erotic elements. The poor, the oppressed class, the nation, on the periphery, the woman treated as a sexual object, have reality "beyond" the limits of the system which alienates, represses, and dehumanizes them."

⁶⁹ See footnote 65 in chapter one.

⁷⁰ *Philosophy of Liberation*, 44-45. "The other is the exteriority of all totality because the other is free. I do not mean freedom here as just a certain possibility of choosing between diverse mediations depending on a given project. Freedom here is the unconditioning of the other with respect to the world in which I am always the center. Others as other—that is, as centers of their own worlds (though they be dominated or oppressed)—can point out what is impossible, unexpected, unpublicized, in *my* world, in the system. All persons, insofar as they are free, and insofar as they take part in a system, are functional, professional, or members of a certain structure—but they are not other. Others are other insofar as they are exterior to the totality (and in this sense they are suppliant human faces—persons). Without exteriority there is neither freedom nor personhood. The fact of freedom, of free choice, is discovered only in the unconditioning of the other's behavior."

*The Five Moments of the Anadialectic:*⁷¹

The Anadialectical method is Dussel's conceptual framework for realizing and understanding the encounter between the Totalities and the Other.⁷² This method consists of five moments: (1) originating in the quotidian (2) the entities involved in the encounter as having autonomous, ontological legitimacy, (3) the anadialectic as such, (4) the ethical self-revelation of the Other, and finally (5) an ethical praxis which is made manifest in *service in justice*.⁷³ Each of these moments allows for our ethical capacities to be configured in a manner which disallows the hegemonic tendencies found in most Totalities to have sway. This quality also demands that the anadialectical method is always an open-ended process that requires constant re-evaluation.

The First Moment: Originating in the Quotidian. The first moment within the anadialectical method holds a sustained tension between two poles: that of the quotidian existence of the human experience, and a more critical consciousness which allows a certain hermeneutical distance from this everyday existence.⁷⁴ We begin with the 'common sense' of everyday life, in the most literal meaning of this phrase; sensory reality which is held in common, while also acknowledging the ethical demand that we extricate ourselves from its totalizing horizon. We are always *a part of* the everyday but also *apart from* everyday reality. This gap engenders a crisis of consciousness which requires a critical

⁷¹ Much of the following information will be gleaned from many sources including Roberto Goizueta's *Liberation, Method and Dialogue* and Enrique Dussel's *Metodo para una Filosofia de Liberacion*, and *Philosophy of Liberation*.

⁷² *Liberation, Method and Dialogue*, 69.

⁷³ *Ibid.* 69.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.* 69.

evaluation on our quotidian existence and a concurrent response.⁷⁵ This separation is an a priori precondition to all authentic encounters.⁷⁶

The Second Moment: The Re-Configured "I". The second moment requires that the subject re-examine his ontological certitude in light of this new experience. The second moment becomes a corrective by disengaging ourselves from traditional ontology which will tend to inhabit a disembodied, ahistorical, and immaterial world. It will challenge us to view our *Beingness* as already and always existing within a 'being-in-the-world.'⁷⁷ This moment is essential because it begins to cipher the 'cognitive structures' of modernity which allows for the illusion of subjectivity to exist within an ahistorical and amoral world. It is a re-affirmation of the ethics before ontology position articulated by Levinas.

The Third Moment: The Other which is not of our World. The third moment is one in which our 'being-in-the-world' becomes challenged by an entity that cannot be mediated by any of our cognitive structures. It is the distinct Other. According to Dussel, traces of this understanding of the Other can be found in

⁷⁵ Ibid. 69. "Consequently, this first moment already involves a dialectical critique of the everyday-as-given and, hence, a movement towards the ontological horizon. This distanciation from the everyday represents an existential crisis in which one "dies to the obvious and ingenuous manner of living in the world."

⁷⁶ *Introduccion a una Filosofia de la Liberacion LatinoAmericana*, 118. "While someone inhabits a quotidian existence one is not "separated" and does not have any other criteria and makes no judgment. What changes in the separation is a movement which allows one to, from a 'transcendent' place; a different horizon to return to the quotidian and pass judgment on it. This crisis of which we speak is an existential crisis in that it is a crisis of everyday existence, a life crisis for the person who experiences it as a rupture in their lives. No one can truly be said to 'think' without first being "con-verted" away from the quotidian mode of 'thinking' which will signify suffering, and a rupturing of many habits, a 'con-version'; a new life" [all translations are the author's].

⁷⁷ Ibid. 124. "The first correction: The modern understanding which begins with the "I Think" is opposed by the assertion that one is first an "I-in-the-World." The "thinking" is grounded in a previous reality. The second correction: The "I" who thinks is second, in respect to the concrete "I"; the concrete, existential "I" is the "I" in the world; the I which is 'thinking' and reflecting is an I which must return to the everyday of this world."

the writings of both Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling and Soren Kierkegaard⁷⁸ However, for Dussel the most cogent expression and understanding of the true distinction and uniqueness of the Other is found in the writing of Emmanuel Levinas. He is, however, critical of how Levinas conceptualizes this Other.⁷⁹This third moment is the true moment of 'ana' (beyond) for Dussel. The Other is that which is 'beyond' all of our Totalities. It shares the transcendent qualities of the Levinasian Other but with the caveat of always having some explicit particularities.⁸⁰

The Fourth Moment: Distinction Negates Extinction. In the fourth moment the distinct and autonomous existence of the Other destabilizes and de-centers all our ontological categories. The distinction principle states that no matter how intimate is our encounter with the Other there is always an element of autonomy in relation to ourselves and the Other. It is clearly a moment of encounter; however, in it we are always conscious of the complete exteriority of this Other. It is in recognizing and acknowledging this other-centered world that we begin to touch our personhood.⁸¹ Prior to this moment in the anadialethical method there is some risk that the Totality can subsume the otherness of the Other. This would be an act of violence in that it would disregard the transcendent dignity of the Other. In this moment the Totality, in faith, gives over himself or herself to recognizing the Other qua Other.⁸² It is in this moment of epiphany of the Other

⁷⁸ Ibid. 128-129.

⁷⁹ Ibid. 129-130.

⁸⁰ Ibid. 129.

⁸¹ *Philosophy of Liberation*, 112. "It is openness to the other, to other-directedness, that enables a person to be a person, to be substantively properly so called."

⁸² Ibid. 41. "Among the real things that retain exteriority to Being is found that has a history, a biography, freedom: another person (4.1.5.5). Persons beyond Being, beyond the

that we are most fully awakened from our ontological slumber and set free. Paradoxically, we are freed by the Other, rather than us *granting* freedom to the Other.

Fifth Moment: The Distinct Prophet. The final moment occurs when this newly awakened subject is able to inhabit a place of sustained tension. He or She is conscious that they are not the Other, and yet he or she can no longer inhabit their previously held Totality. From this liminal space he can render the last moment “in the dialectical method: anadialethical praxis, or “service in justice.”⁸³ This *service in justice* requires that the subject begin an ongoing apprenticeship of sorts in how to relate to the Other. The Other is seen as distinct but analogously similar.⁸⁴ Through this process of ongoing conversion and apprenticeship⁸⁵ the subject takes upon himself or herself the task of ‘destroying the obstacles which impede the revelation of the other.’⁸⁶ This ongoing recognition of distinction and connection makes the embodied acts of solidarity truly authentic. This newly configured subject, who is part of the struggle for justice (for the Other), Dussel terms the Prophet.

The Anadialethical method allows us a process by which we can begin to engage the Other in a manner which is respectful of distinction but also acknowledges the commonality of experience between ourselves and the Other.

comprehension of the world, beyond the sense constituted by interpretations supplied by one’s own system, transcending the determinations and conditions of one’s totality, can reveal themselves as opposition to us, can rebuke us. Even in the extreme humiliation of a prison, in the cold of the cell and the total pain of torture, even when the body is nothing but a quiver wound, a person can still cry: “I am another; I am a person; I have rights.”

⁸³ *Liberation, Method, and Dialogue*, 72.

⁸⁴ *Metodo*, 195.

⁸⁵ The term which is most often used by Dussel is *Discipleship*.

⁸⁶ *Metodo*, 195.

This is central to any possibility of an authentic ethical encounter. This is so because it honors both aspects of our current milieu: the potency of particularity and our globalized interdependence.

The Transmodern Perspective: Beyond Modernity and Post-Modernity

While Dussel has deep admiration and respect for and interest in the projects of both Modernity and Post-Modernity, he holds that there are significant lacunae in both of these paradigms. For him, the central flaw can be found in an unconscious acceptance of certain assumptions held by both positions.⁸⁷ The trans-modern perspective allows us to take a world-systems perspective⁸⁸ toward historical events. This includes looking at moral discourse from within this perspective.⁸⁹ This vision allows us to navigate between the Scylla of naïve modern inauthentic universalism which does not honor the potency of particularity and the Charybdis of cynical postmodernism which disregards all commonality and leaves all communities in a balkanized and fragmented state. Dussel asserts that all ethical discourse, whether philosophical or theological,

⁸⁷ *The Underside of Modernity: Apel, Ricoeur, Rorty, Taylor and the Philosophy of Liberation*, xxii: “Interestingly, while Dussel himself already in the early seventies talked of liberation philosophy as a type of postmodern philosophy, inasmuch as it saw itself overcoming the philosophy of consciousness or its egological dialectic, more recently, since the vogue of postmodern brought on by the Lyotard et al., Dussel has opted for a different descriptive term: trans-modernity. The term trans-modernity underscores that Liberation Philosophy is not about either negating modernity or blithely accepting it, but about transcending it anadialectically; that is, to think the couplet of modernity and postmodernity not just from within, but also, and especially, from the perspective of its reverse, its underside, its occluded other.”

⁸⁸ While there are many who have written on the World System perspective, an excellent introduction to this concept can be found in *World-Systems Analysis* by Immanuel Wallerstein.

⁸⁹ *Ibid.* xxvi. “Here again are profiled two of the central theses of this book, and of Dussel’s most recent work, namely, that eurocentrism must be taken seriously as a *philosophical* problem, and that philosophy must abandon as no longer appropriate or useful notions or categories of universal history; instead it must appropriate for its methodology the more concrete methodological approach of world-systems.”

whether from the left or the right, is ensconced in the prison of seeing history as emanating from a center which is located in a certain time and a certain location.

There is a false premise that Modernity originated with the birth of the subject as articulated by Rene Decartes in his famous formulation of *cogito ergo sum*. With this premise, all modern philosophy occludes that this subject has a much older history that includes a long and violent history.⁹⁰ This fallacy leads us to view all history from within a linear framework. All people will eventually pass through identical stages of *development*, albeit during different historical periods. In this model the lack of reasonableness, rationality, and intelligibility is merely a lack of development on the part of the Other and never an intrinsic systemic shortcoming of its own Totality. This vision of developmental stages has historical precedents which must be illuminated and interrogated.⁹¹ It also understands postmodernity as merely a moment 'ahead' of modernity but does nothing to

⁹⁰ Ibid. 20. "The "I" which begins with the "I conquer" of Hernan Cortes or Pizarro, which in fact precedes the Cartesian ego cogito by about a century, produces Indian genocide, African slavery, and Asian colonial wars. The majority of today's humanity (the South) is the other face of modernity; it is neither pre- nor anti- nor post-modern."

⁹¹ Ibid. 52. "The argument was clearly developed by Gines de Sepulveda, in the Valladolid dispute of 1550 with Bartolome de las Casas. This argument can be summarized in the following way: 1) European culture is the most developed and superior to all other cultures. (eurocentric). 2) The other cultures abandon (the Kantian Ausgang) or exit from their own barbarity by means of the modern civilizing process constitutes their progress. 3) But the underdeveloped are opposed to the civilizing process, and therefore it is just and necessary to utilize violence in order to destroy such opposition. 4) On the other hand, the modern violent warrior (who exterminates Amerindians, enslaves Africans etc.) thinks that he is innocent because he exercises violence as a duty and a virtue. 5) And lastly, the victims of modernity in the periphery (the extermination of the Indians, the enslavement of the Africans, the colonization of the Asians) and in the center (the genocide of the Jews, the third holocaust) are the "responsible ones" for their own victimization. This irrational myth of modernity will be applied from the conquest of America (genocide of Amerindians), to the enslavement of the African, to the Chinese Opium War, to the invasion of Panama (1990) or the Gulf War (1991)." One might also recall the rather absurd logic spoken of and recorded by many, including war correspondent Peter Arnett, who attributed it to an unidentified army officer in Vietnam: "We had to destroy the village to save it."

challenge the fundamental premise and irrationality of the modern/post-modern paradigm.⁹²

The Dusselian Other

While Dussel's vision of the Other is deeply shaped by his encounter with Emmanuel Levinas, he seeks to transcend aspects of his teacher's conceptual framework. The Dusselian Other is similar to the Levinasian other in that both find that the Other originates beyond all totalities or ontologies. The dissimilarity is found in the more explicit and intentional formulation of the Dusselian Other as a political and historical subject.⁹³ Levinas was able to see that the totalizing vision intrinsic to European philosophy precluded (and occluded) the recognition of the Other. Dussel affirmed the insight of Levinas in saying that the place of Western ontology, particularly as formulated in the *cogito* of René Descarte, allowed for the violation of the Other by the Same. To Dussel, however, Levinas was not able to properly problematize the issue to allow for an authentic resolution. To do this Dussel had to cast the issue in much more communal and explicitly political terms. This included seeing the face of the Other not merely as the face of an individual person but rather as the face of communities, communities with their unique histories in relation to all other communities. To further develop this new conceptualization of the occluded Other Dussel began to

⁹² Michael Barber, *Ethical Hermeneutics: Rationality in Enrique Dussel's Philosophy of Liberation* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1998), 74: "Dussel sets off his position from postmodernism. Whereas postmodernism criticizes modern reason as reason, Dussel criticizes modern reason for concealing an irrational myth."

⁹³ *Underside of Modernity*, 82. "Soon enough, however, I realized that Levinas himself could not address our hopes. Levinas showed us how to formulate the question of the irruption of the Other, but we could not develop a politics (erotics, pedagogics, etc.) which placed in question the ruling Totality (which dominates and excludes the Other) and could develop a new Totality. This critical-practical question of a new Totality was exactly the question of "liberation." With this Levinas could not help us."

explore World-System, and Post-Colonial theories.⁹⁴ He realized that this new understanding required taking a radical skepticism in relation to virtually all Totalities.⁹⁵ This newly configured Other and practical atheism were the starting points of Liberation Philosophy.

⁹⁴ Ibid. 216-17. "The world system is a philosophical problem because Europe confused the evolution of subjectivity within the limits of Europe not only with universality (as much in the morality of Kantian autonomy, as in the supposed post-conventional stage), but also with globality. That is, what Europe came to realize as a center of a world system (using not only economic wealth, but cultural information) was attributed to its autonomous creativity as self-enclosed, self-referential, autopoietic system. It not only elevated as universality its European particularity (speaking like Hegel), but it also pretended that the work of humanity "in it" (Europe) was the product of its autonomy and exclusive creativity. Modernity, and modern philosophy with it, never abandoned its Eurocentric dream. It never defined itself as a hegemonic center where information is controlled, where learning of humanity is processed, where political institutions (political, economic, and ideological, etc.) which permits greater global accumulation of wealth in the center (economic, cultural, and all other types of wealth), thus "systematically" exploiting the periphery, are created."

⁹⁵ Ibid. 11. "Liberation Philosophy affirms that all Totalities can be fetishized: the political as in the empire of the State; as historical manifestations of the divinity; the erotic, as in the fetishist machismo, pedagogy, because ruling ideology is a historical manifestations of the divine, such as the "Western and Christian civilization" or the American way of life. All critique, then, ought to begin by negating the divinity of the fetishized absolute which negates the possibility of human realization. Atheism as a negation of the negation of the person (Feuerbach) is the first thesis of Liberation Philosophy. But, from a rational point of view (and from the popular cultures of peripheral nations), one can, however, affirm the Absolute only in the case that it would ground, justify or give hope (Bloch) to the oppressed in their process of liberation. Symbolically, the Pharaoh-god justified domination; the Yahweh of the slave of Egypt, led by Moses, gave motives for liberation. These symbolic structures (as in Ricoeur's "They symbols that make one think!") are metaphors of a rational discourse: if there is an absolute, it ought to be Other than every historical system (otherwise such a system would be unsurpassable; it would be an end of history). The negation of the divinification of every Totality (the anti-fetishism of Marx with respect to capitalism), as negation of the negation of the human person, is the negative and correlative moment of attention. If there is an absolute, it cannot be but the Other of every system, as the breath of life of all that lives. In this case, religion becomes a fundamental moment of praxis of liberation. It is not necessary to negate the popular religions of the peripheral world (especially in African and Asia, but in Latin America as well). It is necessary to negate the moments that negate the person, and to develop the moments that justify liberation. It is a hermeneutical task (of "tradition") to discern the (introjected by the dominators in said "traditions") in these religions their regressive elements of human affirmation. If there is an Absolute, it cannot but affirm and develop the person in justice, autonomy, and freedom. On this point Liberation Philosophy is inscribed within the popular traditions of the peripheral world and in the philosophical schools of Hamann, Schelling, Schleiermacher, Dilthey, Gadamer, Ricoeur and Levinas, without leaving to the side Kierkegaard, Marx, or Bloch. The hermeneutics of the symbol, politics and economics as cults, the utopian hope as horizon of popular praxis of liberation—this is an entirely new project for the "majority" of humanity (which lives in the South which dances in Africa; which contemplates in suffering in Asia, and venerates its traditions in Latin America). Secularization is the false name of fetishism; and the atheism of the left was a first dialectical moment, whose second moment is the affirmation of the absolute as liberation. Forgetting the second moment has distanced the left from the peoples who explain their daily lives, in the *Lebenswelt*, with symbols, rituals, and cults."

Lauds and Lacunae: A Critique of Political Theology and Liberation Philosophy

In bringing together Metz and Dussel I find that both are necessary to appreciate and engage our pluralistic and globalized world. However, I see shortcomings in both theorists. This section will be a review of the theories presented above with a critical lens that highlights the areas which I think are in need of development.

The Ahistorical Solidarity of Political Theology

While Political theology is much more sophisticated in engaging the Other within a globalized, and pluralistic world, two critiques can be made of it: its lack of development in the historical particularity of suffering, and its vague articulation of Solidarity.

Metz does speak to the need to precisely define whose suffering is most central to the liberative thrust of Political theology⁹⁶ but in subsequent writings he seems not to develop the particularities of the suffering of certain groups. When Metz compares Messianic or Bourgeois Religion, he clearly asserts that some communities' suffering should be held in higher regard than others.

It is possible that what love demands of us here may look like treason—a betrayal of affluence, of the family, and of our customary way of life. But it is also possible that *this* is the very place where the discernment of spirits is needed in the churches of the rich and powerful countries of this earth. Certainly, Christianity is never just there for the very brave. Yet it is not we who define the demands of love, nor is it we who fix the conditions under

⁹⁶ *Faith in History and Society*, 110.

which it is tested. So, for example, Christian love in periods of nationalistic thinking may well have to incur the suspicion of harming national honor. In situations of racism it will incur the suspicion of race treason. And in periods when the social contradictions in the world cry out to heaven it will incur the suspicion of class treason for betraying the allegedly necessary interests of the propertied. Did not Jesus himself incur the reproach of treason? Did not his love bring him to that state? Was he not crucified as a traitor to all the apparently worthwhile values? Must not Christians therefore expect, if they want to be faithful to Christ, to be regarded as traitors to bourgeois religion? True, his love, to which everything at the end was taken from him, even the whole majesty and dignity of a love which suffers in powerlessness, was still something other than the expression of a suffering of others, with the unfortunate and the oppressed, out of sheer solidarity. It was rather the expression of his obedience, an obedience that submitted to suffering because of God and God's powerlessness in our world. So must not Christian love in following after Christ continually strive toward that same obedience?⁹⁷

Part of the task of this project will be to articulate more fully who are the particular parties involved in struggles for justice within a specific context. This shortcoming of Metz's work is in part because his primary audience is still a European church. This is not an inherent weakness in his theory but more the intrinsic limit in theologies which honor the importance of location. Nonetheless,

⁹⁷ *The Emergent Church*, 14-15. This is found in an essay entitled *Messianic or Bourgeois Religion?*

he does at times speak in abstract categories which diminish the potency of particularity mentioned above. While Political theology speaks of the importance of honoring the place of suffering in ethical discourse it does not do enough to identify and prioritize the suffering in the world. How do we create a criterion by which we can *measure* the suffering in the world? How do we come to a decision about whose Memories and Narratives have ethical and epistemological privilege? Because all subjects experience some type of suffering as part of their creaturely existence, how can we mediate and judge the qualities of suffering? This critique is similar to that which Metz aims at his mentor Karl Rahner. According to Metz, Rahner spoke of the *historicity* of the human subject without explicitly engaging historical reality in his work. We can see that by speaking of suffering, as well as Memory, and Narrative in somewhat abstract terms they can become obstacles to engaging particular communities in ethical discourse. What is needed is not an abandoning of these categories or concepts but rather a refinement of them which renders them more precise and useful to the creation of a Christian ethic.

The category of Solidarity also needs a more precise articulation to become useful in helping create an authentic encounter with the Other that embodies the love command in the current milieu of globalized pluralism. While it is clear that one of the demands posed by Political Theology is to be in solidarity with the Other it is much less clear what and how this Solidarity is to be embodied and enacted. Articulated in an even more particular question, it is this: how can we create a criterion by which we can authenticate the claims of

Solidarity with the suffering other? How do we know, or how can we verify, that we are indeed in Solidarity with the Other? Again, what is needed is a further development and refinement of this concept, not an abandoning of its imperative element. I believe that this can be done by a reworking the heuristic device of religion as interruption⁹⁸ that is found within Political theology. This assertion will be further articulated in the next chapter.

The Dusselian Other Revisited

While the Liberation philosophy of Dussel is indispensable in creating an ethic which honors the potency of particularity and yet seeks to honor the connectedness of our globalized world, the two areas which need clarification and amplification are: how the initial encounter between the Other and the Totality occurs, and how the Trans-Modern perspective inadvertently replicates aspects of the Modern/Post-modern vision.

In the Analectical Method 'I can only advance toward the Other 'to the extent that the Other receives me, or pleads for my aid.'"⁹⁹ Part of the concern with the articulation of this interaction is that it inadvertently limits the fashion in which the Other and the Totality initially encounter each other. The Totality may experience the initial contact with the Other more as interruption than invitation. This is particularly true when we realize that, for Dussel, the Other is always that which exceeds all of the cognitive structures or horizons of the Same. The invitation cannot come from a language with which we are completely familiar precisely because the language which the Totality would recognize would not

⁹⁸ *Faith in History and Society*, 158.

⁹⁹ *Liberation, Method, and Dialogue*, 70.

allow us to experience the complete otherness of the Other. Hence the ethical demand posed by the Other will be more of a disruption than an invitation. We will explore the implications of this issue in the next chapter.

Dussel's vision of Trans-modernity, while clearly superior to earlier ways of honoring the voices that have been previously marginalized within historical discourse, is still held captive to a vision of a 'timeless time.'¹⁰⁰ This vision is, for Metz, 'the secret Lord of late modernity.'¹⁰¹ In this understanding of time there is an uncritical acceptance of an evolutionary paradigm. This paradigm may have begun with our increased acknowledgement of the power of evolution within human history but how has taken on a pseudo-religious force in which even God is found within time rather than viewing God as being the 'lord of all' including time.¹⁰² The critique that Metz makes of modernity and to some degree post-modernity could also be made of the Trans-modern vision of Dussel. An important difference, however, is that Dussel's Trans-modernity does seek to subvert aspects of this evolutionary vision by introducing the transcendent Other, which would include a trans-temporal Other. There is, however, a very strong potential for Dussel with a trans-modern perspective to uncritically accept aspects of this eternal evolutionary paradigm. A solution Metz proposes is to retrieve the apocalyptic tradition found within theology. In this way we can speak of even the Trans-modern perspective finally having to come to terms with a judgment day that will have ultimate consequences.

Agapic Solidarity: A Model for Love in the Twenty-First Century

¹⁰⁰ *Love's Strategy*, 79. Found in an essay entitled *Theology Today*.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.* 79.

¹⁰² *Ibid.* 78-79.

Even with the shortcomings mentioned above I do believe that the Political Theology of Johann Baptist Metz and the Liberation Philosophy of Enrique Dussel are indispensable elements in the creation of any ethic for the twenty-first century. The way in which Political Theology problematizes the question of the Subject in modern and post-modern discourse illuminates so many of the obstacles that lead to the marginalization of all Others. The way in which Dussel re-visions the Other in a manner that does justice to the communal 'face' of the Other is central to living in a globalized, and pluralistic world. Their work is clearly worthy of much attention and development. The process of Agapic Solidarity which I introduce in the following chapter will seek to build on the work of these two authors. Agapic Solidarity seeks to accomplish two goals: it will be a corrective to the lacunas mentioned above, and it will also seek to respond to the original question mentioned earlier, namely, how does one accomplish the Love Commandment in the twenty-first century given the two major features of this historical period-- the potency of particularity and the interdependence of a globalized world?

CHAPTER 4

AGAPIC SOLIDARITY IN A FRAGMENTED WORLD

The Love Command in Three Moments

The previous chapter explained why a mono-cultural world is a thing of the past. The exact date of when pluralism began or its implications is not as germane as the question of how to deal with its undeniable reality.¹ This project asks: What are the implications of such pluralism for a contemporary Christian ethics? How do we practice our love of neighbor in encounters with the Other?

There are two potential pitfalls to ethical discourse about encountering the Other. The first is to see the various communities as so unique that any attempts at universal claims will be futile.² The second is to underestimate the *potency of particularity* which ultimately does violence to the Other.³ The alternative that we are seeking is a mode of engaging the Other which has the capacity to seek, create, and maintain common ground while concurrently seeking and maintaining a sacred distinction that honors the otherness of our neighbor, the Other.

Because of our new understanding of the importance of location and perspective, we are aware of the equal importance of honoring both poles within this

¹ *In the Pluralism of Religious and Cultural World*, 169: "We live, one might say, in a world of undeniable plurality. Pluralism is not simply the answer, but first of all the question and the problem."

² Enrique Dussel, *Frontiers of Theology in Latin America*, Ed. Rosino Gibblellini (New York, Orbis Books, 1975), 190. This is found in an essay entitled *Historical and Philosophical Presuppositions for Latin American Theology*. "In that case "pluralism" would be without unity...difference would really represent total ignorance of another."

³ *Ibid.* 196: "This refuse s to recognize creative "distinctiveness," stifling or suffocating the poor for the sake of a vaunted "Universality" that is only an absolutized "particularity."

spectrum: that of seeking unity and that of honoring particularity. We can no longer think of the role of Christian love as being to create an exclusive unity which may inadvertently stultify distinction or particularity for a 'vaunted "universality" that is only an absolutized "particularity." This is especially important because through liberation theology and philosophy's 'preferential option for the poor' we have become aware of how *the poor* are frequently at a distinct disadvantage in resisting this hegemonic impulse. This insight allows us to see how the principle of the 'preferential option for the poor' must be shaped to fit the particular socio-historical context.⁴

The model of Agapic Solidarity will facilitate such an application of the option for the poor sensitive to the contemporary global context. The first section presents the process of Agapic Solidarity. It includes some elaborations on how this process was influenced by the work of Johann Baptist Metz and Enrique Dussel. The second section briefly applies the process of Agapic Solidarity to the human dimensions introduced in chapter two. The final section will present some of the challenges and questions posed about this process. This section includes some responses to the challenges and questions posed.

Love for a Fragmented World: Introducing Agapic Solidarity

Agapic Solidarity is a process which seeks to engage the Other in a manner which avoids the pitfalls mentioned above. It is a process which seeks to honor particularity without being parochial and seeks to be universal without

⁴ Ibid. 58. "The poor person is poor because he or she does not share in the reigning value of the system; if the value of the system in the Middle Ages is honor, he or she has no honor; if the supreme power in the system is money, he or she does not have it; if in the future society the system has technology as its supreme value, he or she will be a person without technology."

being hegemonic. The Three *Moments* which comprise this process are: Disruption, Agapic Solidarity, and Emancipatory Praxis. In the first moment our lives and horizons are disrupted as we initially awaken to the Other. This encounter is unsolicited and shatters all our cognitive structures. Because of this it will be experienced as a 'disruption.' The second moment, Agapic Discipleship, requires that we not merely acknowledge the Other but make a three-fold commitment on the part of ourselves towards the Other. This three-fold commitment involves cultivating a solidaristic knowledge of the Other by coming to know the history, worldview, and engaging in a praxis of solidarity with the Other. The final moment of Emancipatory Praxis demands a manner of living that embodies an ongoing conversion with the Other.

The First Moment: Disruption

Disruption, the initial moment of Agapic Solidarity, has two noteworthy features: the first is the dialectic of continuity and discontinuity found within this moment, the second is a fundamental acknowledgement of the autonomous existence of the Other.

One Biblical example of "disruption" is the synoptic pericope describing Jesus' call to Simon and Andrew:

As Jesus was walking by the Sea of Galilee he saw two brothers, Simon, who was called Peter, and his brother Andrew; they were making a cast in

the lake with their nets, for they were fishermen. And he said to them, “Follow me and I will make you fishers of men.” And they left their nets at once and followed him. [Matthew 4:18]

Many elements of this pericope can be highlighted: the two brothers are defined by their activity as fishermen and their ordered existence as fishermen is profoundly disrupted by Jesus’ invitation. They leave their nets rather than simply tidying them away for the day; this signals radical discontinuity. Yet Jesus, by inviting them to be ‘fishers of men,’ indicates that there will be some continuity with their old lives. Some of their accumulated skill would be put to use in their new life.

Unlike the encounter of which Levinas speaks, this encounter with the Other is at first not completely asymmetrical; there are elements which speak to the autonomous character of the Other. In the pericope above we know that the fisherman could have rejected Jesus’ invitation. And Jesus could have chosen quite different people to help him at the beginning of his ministry. This rejection, however, would have had a deleterious effect on both parties, giving one’s life a degree of inauthenticity that ultimately would find its way into all aspects of one’s existence, or rendering the Other invisible. Instead, we read of an immediate response.

Immediate Response: “They left their nets at once”

There is an important distinction between Disruption and the manner in which Dussel views the initial encounter with the Other. Dussel insists that I can only advance towards the Other “to the extent that the Other receives me, or

pleads for my aid.”⁵ Disruption is much more of an impelling reality than an ‘invitation.’ Unlike an invitation which allows for a planned response (Please RSVP by...) a disruption demands a more immediate and spontaneous response (“And they left their nets *at once and followed him.*” italics added). Another distinction between invitation and disruption is that there is a lack of certitude about the outcome of the disruptive encounter (compare this with an invitation that informs: “The dinner will begin at 7:00 and will be semi-formal; dress accordingly”). In the pericope neither party knows for sure what will result from the disruption. This first moment of Disruption has a much more improvisational and open-ended quality for both the Same and the Other.

Metz speaks frequently about how a theology is interruption.⁶ For Metz one of the central features of Messianic Discipleship that distinguishes it from Bourgeois Christianity is its capacity to live with the ongoing tension of an interrupted life. However, the term interruption itself is problematic. The term interruption implies that one can ‘pause’ whatever one is doing and return to it at a later time. A disruption, on the other hand, implies the total dissolution of or change in all that came before. A disruption fundamentally alters the character of my existence. Therefore the term Disruption seems to have both longer lasting and more foundational implications.

In Disruption we assert the autonomous existence of both the Same and the Other. In the fishing pericope above we are aware of how both parties had a life before and will have a life after their encounter. This autonomous nature of

⁵ *Liberation, Method, and Dialogue*, 70. It is important to note that in some later writings Dussel has begun to reconsider other ways in which this ‘invitation’ occurs.

⁶ *Faith and Society*, 59.

both parties is important because it dislodges the Totality from having certain epistemological and enunciatory privileges. This will have immediate impact on how we experience the second moment of Agapic Solidarity: Agapic Discipleship.

The Second Moment: Agapic Discipleship

The second moment in Agapic Solidarity is that of Agapic Discipleship. This moment contains three inseparable but distinct *sub-moments*: Remembrance, Recitation, and finally Resurrection. Each sub-moment is indispensable in helping us to engage the Other. In this moment we and the Other surrender some degree of control and allow ourselves to be introduced to the world of the Other.⁷ These sub-moments are deeply influenced by the categories found in the political theology of Metz; Remembrance most closely resembles the category of Memory, Recitation the category of Narrative, and finally Resurrection resembles most closely the category of Solidarity. Prior to the completion of this second moment we can speak of an encounter but not an actual engagement with the Other. The Disruption was the shift in reality caused by the Other but the second moment is our response to this disruption. Only after we have fully immersed ourselves in the world of the Other can we speak of having some knowledge of the Other. I believe that it is only after we have gone through this period of 'pedagogic apprenticeship' that we can speak of knowing how to love the Other.

Remembrance

⁷ *Ethical Hermeneutics: Rationality in Enrique Dussel's Philosophy of Liberation*, 53: "To avoid such a univocal obliteration of the Other, one must commit oneself in humility and meekness to a pedagogic apprenticeship with the Other as master and to a following of the way that the Other's word traces, day in and day out."

The two imperatives that this sub-moment must not lose sight of are first, that the Other has a history which exists before our encounter with them, and second, that all remembrances must be done with a 'preferential option' for the dangerous memories of the innocent suffering of the Other.

The reality, as Levinas and Dussel assert, is that we awaken to the Other. We did not create, discover, or make the Other appear. The Other has an absolute and autonomous existence relative to ourselves. In the sub-moment of Remembrance we are called to learn about the history of the Other, not our history, nor even our history of interaction with the Other, but exclusively their history. This arduous process will require that we, with the help of the Other, become archeologists into the various discourses, terrains of understandings and epistemological paradigms that are operative in the world of the Other. This sub-moment will require that we learn the history *of* the Other *from* the Other. This will include learning a new language, in the broadest sense of this term. This sub-moment may include learning how we have injured the Other, both 'in what we have done and what we have failed to do.' This will require a fundamental metanoia on our part, a shift in our understanding of history of our memory of the Other.

The sub-moment of Remembrance, following the lead of early Liberation Theology and all Catholic Social Thought, will give a special epistemological privilege to *The Poor*. Their history and remembrance will take precedence in our focus and attention. Remembrance here is similar to Metz's notion of the

dangerous memory of innocent suffering that forces us to confront this suffering and then calls us to a discipleship to reduce it.

We recall that the definition of the poor in Agapic Solidarity is best understood using the lens of Dussel who speaks of the poor always within a contextualized framework.⁸ In this way Remembrance will always include ongoing development and change.

Recitation

In this sub-moment we are citing the narratives of the Other with the help of the Other. This action will entail two dialectically related elements. The first element is that of acknowledging that while we are reciting their stories and rehearsing their worldview, we are aware of how we are not the Other. Central is the distinction principle: we are absolutely distinct from the Other but not absolutely different. The second element is that as we become better versed in the stories and worldview of the Other, we begin to see the world with the eyes of the Other. It is through living the Remembrance and Recitation portion of Agapic Discipleship that we begin to inhabit a new, larger life. This new reality I entitle Resurrection. It is similar to the category of Narrative in that we are here speaking of the Other's 'stories,' in the broadest sense of this term.

Resurrection

The sub-moment entitled Resurrection consists in inhabiting a new reality that has both continuity and discontinuity with our past. The continuity consists in our maintaining aspects of our old identity. In our continuity we are not 'absorbed' into the world of the Other. We maintain our own Remembrances and

⁸ See footnote #4.

Recitations; and are much more keenly made aware of their content and connection with our worldview. This allows us to maintain our authentic personhood. The discontinuity comes in terms of our inhabiting a new world that is not merely a construction of an atrophied ego or cogito but rather allows us to exist in a 'world were many worlds co-exist.' Because this dialectical movement of continuity/discontinuity will from now on be a feature of our existence we must always understand ourselves as a 'pilgrim people.'⁹

The Third Moment: Emancipatory Praxis

In the third moment of Agapic Solidarity we bring the Remembrances and Recitations of the Other into our communities of origin. Two features which are imperative in this moment of the process are allowing the Other's radical critiques and allowing ourselves to radically critique the Other. This mutual critique can occur only after our due diligence has been fulfilled and we have some degree of mastery (as determined by the Other) of the memories and narratives of the Other. We must see and understand the Other as Other and this the Other must fully acknowledge in order for it to be verified. In doing this they acknowledge that we have truly engaged them and that we are not merely seeing a reflection of our ego which is circumscribed by our cognitive structures. Equally important to note is that we no longer accept prima facie all accounts and assertions made by the Other.¹⁰

⁹⁹ The language of a Pilgrim People from Vatican II would need to be mined here for its full implications.

¹⁰ *Ethical Hermeneutics*, 124: "Surely, too, Dussel could agree with Schutte that philosophy involves critical thinking, testing the validity claims, presenting phenomenological

This moment requires that we live always ready for metanoia. It is a call to inhabit the tension-filled existence of this ongoing apocalyptic moment. This emancipatory moment exists between the ever present and concurrently transcendent historical period that is the proleptic dimension of Jesus' ministry. This will place all who practice this process and particularly this Moment in a transitional location in relation to all human dimensions.¹¹ Because of this, the final moment will require that we live in an ongoing state of or openness to disruption.

The process of Agapic Solidarity is best understood as being circular rather than linear in its configuration. The emancipation that this process offers, for ourselves and the Other, allows us to live a life of ongoing Disruption which leads again to the moment of Agapic Solidarity and the ongoing life of Emancipatory Praxis.

The application of this process will always have an improvised, but not arbitrary, element to its enactment. In the next section we will apply this process to the Four Dimensions of human experience introduced in chapter two.

descriptions for scrutiny, and *not holding that claims are justified merely because they emerge from the Other*. It is the Other who invites self-criticism and the Other who asks that one justify one's positions and prove validity. One's responsibility for the Other, which precedes whatever stance one adopts, in a way precludes differing with the Other or criticizing the Other for the Other's sake. The nature of apology and the daring, risky character of discourse, which does not unfold like a prefabricated internal logic, *do not demand a mindless conformity with the Other, and it is always possible that radical disagreement with the Other springs from the deepest love for the Other.*" [italics added]

¹¹ *The Emergent Church*, 15: "It is possible that what love demands of us here may look like treason—a betrayal of affluence, of the family, and of our customary way of life. But it is also possible that this is the very place where the discernment of spirits is needed in the churches of the rich and powerful countries of this earth. Certainly Christianity is never just for the brave. Yet it is not we who define the demands of love, nor is it we who fix the conditions under which it is tested. So, for example, Christian love in periods of nationalistic thinking may well have to incur the suspicion of harming national honor. In situations of racism it will incur the suspicion of race treason. And in periods when social contradictions in the world cry out to heaven it will incur the suspicion of class treason for betraying the allegedly necessary interests of the propertied."

Agapic Solidarity in the Four Dimensions

To review how we arrived at this juncture: we began by realizing that two of the most salient features of our current reality are that of pluralism and of deep interconnection.¹² Given pluralism, we acknowledge that all ethical discourse must now be constructed and articulated within the context of various communities who look to different sources of authority and coherence. While this is clearly not a new issue, given the riven cultural clashes that seem so much of our discourse, this insight recently has taken on new urgency.¹³ The reality of our deep interconnectedness must also be kept in mind precisely because many issues seem now to have a globalized dimension. Like pluralism, globalism is not entirely novel but its implications are now being acknowledged with new force.¹⁴ These two features are important to keep in mind as we construct a moral expression of the love command in the twenty-first century.¹⁵

We began by using the work of Emmanuel Levinas to construct an answer to how, given these two features, we might live out the Love Command which is demanded of all Christians. In realizing the lacunae of the work of Levinas,

¹² See the various authors who were introduced in chapter 3.

¹³ Min, 228: "In this sense, solidarity of others in their dignity and praxis is not a new demand of our time. It has always been an implicit challenge of our social, historical, existence: how we live together with those who are different from us has been the permanent crux of our coexistence in history. What is distinctive of our time is that globalization has heightened our sensibility to the other as other, to the many differences in class, gender, ethnicity, tribal origins, nationality, religion, and culture to a degree unprecedented in history."

¹⁴ Ibid., 228: "Globalization compels us, with a likewise unprecedented urgency, to cooperate in the construction of a totality, a system of laws and institutions that would do justice to our shared dignity as others, under pain of a mutually destructive spiral of violence and alienation."

¹⁵ Ibid., 228: "The supreme challenge of our time and century is that of solidarity, solidarity of others that recognizes our common infinity and collaborates in the building of a totality that will do justice to that infinity at this particular stage of historical existence."

particularly his insistence on the transcendent otherness of the Other (which precluded our ability to respond to many of the moral demands of the Others) we created the concepts of human *Dimensions* of human experience. The Dimensions allowed us to create some parameters for interacting with the Other that safeguarded the transcendence of the Other by accepting that the 'identity' of the Other could not be subsumed by any one Dimension. The Dimensions do, however, allow us enough information about the Other to make a genuine moral response possible. The Other problematic quality to the Levinasian Other is his explicit non-political understanding of the Other. By articulating the collective subjectivity of the human person, the Dimensions allowed us to see how the Other inhabits a communal (or political) reality.¹⁶ The following section applies the process of Agapic Solidarity to each of the four dimensions introduced in chapter two. Conscious that the nature of a loving response towards the Other will always have a dynamic and context-sensitive quality, this application can only be drawn in broad terms with the specifics being filled in with the consultation of the Other.

Agapic Solidarity in the Economic Dimension

Disruption

The first moment of Agapic Solidarity within the economic dimension occurs when our quotidian experience is disrupted by having to acknowledge the 'invisible' labor that is part of our existence. It is uncomfortable to note that we

¹⁶ Both Anselm Min and Enrique Dussel make this critique of Levinas and propose similar solutions to the Dimensions.

owe our day-to-day existence to a multitude of people whom we do not see. Few people have been able to capture the remarkable degree of interconnectivity that is part of our existence as well as did Dr. Martin Luther King:

It really boils down to this: that all life is interrelated. We are caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied into a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one directly, affects all indirectly. We are made to live together because of the interrelated structure of reality. Did you ever stop to think that you can't leave for your job in the morning without being dependent on most of the world? You get up in the morning and go to the bathroom and reach over for the sponge, and that's handed to you by a Pacific islander. You reach for a bar of soap, and that's given to you at the hands of a Frenchman. And then you go into the kitchen to drink coffee for the morning, and that's poured into your cup by a South American. And maybe you want tea: that is poured into your cup by a Chinese. Or maybe you're desirous of having cocoa for breakfast, and that's poured into your cup by a West African. And then you reach over for your toast, that's given to you at the hands of an English speaking farmer, not to mention the baker. And before you finish eating breakfast in the morning, you've depended on more than half the world. This is the way our universe is structured; this is its interrelated quality. We aren't going to have peace on earth until we recognize this basic fact of the interrelated structure of all reality.¹⁷

¹⁷ *A Testament of Hope: The Essential Writings and Speeches of Martin Luther King Jr.*, Ed. James M. Washington, (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1986) "A Christmas Sermon on

In this period of globalized capitalism, no one community can claim anything resembling an autonomous economic existence. Yet capital surreptitiously occludes the living labor of the human person. The Other in a globalized capital system is that which is 'other than' capital.

The illusory reality which claims that all wealth is not socially produced (prior to distribution) should be abandoned. The disruption should occur at the level of production because otherwise we will find ourselves arguing about just distribution. Framing the question in terms of "Why should we give that which is 'ours' to any *Other*?" is not an intrinsically anti-capitalist bias but merely seeks to assert a more realistic reflection of the economic dimension. To live a Disrupted life in the economic dimension is to inhabit this reality on an ongoing basis and to make our moral decisions and responses from within this location.

In awakening to this new paradigm, We are not diminishing our labor in the entire process. We are realizing that we are always already part of a larger network of activity.¹⁸ There are two fundamental losses that will occur as part of this disruption. The first loss is the death of what is popularly referred to as the "Horatio Alger" myth of the self-made man or woman. We can see how we are intimately connected and how we owe an aspect of our existence to the Other

Peace," 253. Elizabeth Warren recently articulated a similar sentiment: "You built a factory out there? Good for you. But I want to be clear: you moved your goods to market on the roads the rest of us paid for; you hired workers the rest of us paid to educate; you were safe in your factory because of police forces and fire forces that the rest of us paid for. You didn't have to worry that marauding bands would come and seize everything at your factory, and hire someone to protect against this, because of the work the rest of us did. You built a factory and it turned into something terrific, or a great idea? God bless. Keep a big hunk of it. But part of the underlying social contract is you take a hunk of that and pay forward for the next kid who comes along."

¹⁸ While I may have some concerns about how they view capitalism in its current configuration, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri in their works *Empire*, *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*, and *Commonwealth* do an excellent job of addressing a new way of understanding capitalist production in its current formation.

and they to me. The second loss will be a loosening of the grip of our economic identity in such a way that acknowledges how production itself is more a 'web of creation' than distinct communities of self-interest.¹⁹

It is important here to take seriously the cautionary tone struck by Levinas and never to lose sight of the transcendent quality of the Other. Even as we can now see how the Other is 'a baker,' 'a farmer,' or 'a sponge harvester,' etc. who is always part of life (not just 'our' life), so too we can never merely reduce the Other to the role they play in the economic dimension.

Agapic Discipleship

Remembrance

By learning the history of the Other who, we now realize, has always been in our midst, and by using the imagery of Dr. King, even in our home we begin the process of Remembrance. The two central insights to highlight from this moment are, first, that the Other has a long history prior to our encounter with the Other, and second, that we will always give a 'preferential option' to the remembrances of those who are marginalized within any economic discourse. Returning to the images from King's narrative, we can say that while we first encountered the Pacific Islander through the sponge in our shower or the West African through the cocoa which we drink in our kitchen, the reality is that these communities have a long and rich history which we must come to view from their

¹⁹ Ibid. 253: "Our loyalties must transcend our race, our tribe, our class, and our nation; and this means we must develop a world perspective. No individual can live alone; no nation can live alone, and as long as we try, the more we are going to have war in this world. Now the judgment of God is upon us, and we must either learn to live together as brothers [sic] or we are all going to perish together as fools."

perspective. It is their history we are learning, not solely our history with them. Also recalling the way in which capitalism occludes the place of labor within economic discourse gives a certain epistemological and enunciatory privilege to the workers in this sub-moment. This remembrance may include ways in which the current economic arrangements have impacted the Other in ways of which we were not aware before.

Recitation

In the second sub-moment of recitation we take seriously the various threads that comprise this 'single garment of destiny' mentioned at the beginning of the King passage. We will see who are the key figures, moments, and events that have shaped the economic existence of the Other. What is also crucial in this sub-moment is becoming aware of how a figure, moment, or event may be recalled or held differently by the Other than by ourselves.²⁰ In the economic dimension this will include challenging some of our basic assumptions and categories (economic development, productivity, wealth, poverty etc.). There will be a moment in the process when we can interrogate the perceptions, positions, assumptions etc. of the Other. However, first we must be a student of the Other, checking and rechecking our perceptions in light of their understanding and interpretations of figures, moments, and events.

Resurrection

We will find ourselves in this stage of the process existing in a larger 'more abundant' world. This would be particularly true in our apprehension of our

²⁰ This insight is expressed in the dictum of Walter Benjamin that, "Every great work of civilization is at the same time a work of barbarism."

economic existence. We may still choose to drink coffee, tea, or cocoa but we will now live in a world where the origins of these 'economic' items more accurately reflect the world of the Other (and ourselves). We will have an ongoing recognition of how each economic activity is intimately and foundationally dependent on many others. This will not negate or diminish our contribution to this dimension but rather enlarge the world towards the vision offered by the Zapatistas, of a 'world where many worlds co-exist.'²¹ Because of the inherent tendency of capitalism to occlude the living labor of the Other, we will constantly have to be on guard so that our resurrected life does not atrophy. Such resurrection leads to the final moment, that of Emancipatory Praxis.

Emancipatory Praxis

Emancipatory Praxis in the economic dimension is difficult to address precisely because it would be powerfully shaped by one's position within the economic dimension. We can speak of three activities which would be impacted as we move into this moment; production, distribution, and finally consumption.²²

Our task in this moment is to constantly challenge any production pattern that does not take into full account the place of the Other *from the perspective of the Other*. The measure of a just or 'good' production pattern is not efficiency, cost, or even profitability but rather the wellbeing of the newly resurrected life. This desire for continuing cultivation of this resurrected life will entail not only careful interrogation and attention to how commodities or products are created

²¹ *The Idea of Latin America*, Mignolo.

²² The example offered in the Appendix clarifies this moment.

but also how they are distributed. This will in part necessitate that we pay close attention to the common good on issues of distribution. Finally our consumption patterns will be shaped, in great part, by our living in the world with the Other. This may entail restraining our patterns of conspicuous consumption, which are frequently cultivated for the sake of capital and not for the sake of the Other (or ourselves).

Agapic Solidarity in the Cultural Dimension

Disruption

For us to perceive how the Disruption moment manifests itself in the cultural dimension we must first recall the concept of the *colonial wound*. This concept seeks to address how the subjectivity of the Other was dismissed and or deformed within the cultural dimension. The two manifestations of the colonial wound on which we focused were the privilege of enunciation and the privilege of epistemic authority. The privilege of enunciation is defined as having ultimate prerogative in the various categories (e.g. spatial, temporal etc.) from which claims about reality are addressed. The epistemic privilege deals with how and what constitutes knowledge. This is particularly true in terms of what constitutes rational and logical discourse.

The disruption in the area of enunciation will require that we envision all traditional categories from the vantage point of the Other.²³ One specific

²³ There are many examples of this occurring in scholarly and popular writings. I would recommend the following titles, though I am conscious that it is a very incomplete list: *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World* by Vijay Prashad; *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges and Border Thinking* by Walter D. Mignolo; *Borderlands/Frontera:*

expression of this disruption will come in dismissing the myth of *culture* in general and *civilization* in particular as originating from one location.²⁴ This critique, which goes by many names, should not be seen as merely a crude ‘anti-European/American’ or ‘anti-Western culture’ perspective but rather desires for us to see all of history as ‘part of a piece.’²⁵ The disruption will require that we accept that we have always inhabited a plural-cultural world.²⁶ This reconfiguring

The New Mestiza by Gloria Anzaldua; *Feminism without Borders: Decolonizing Theory, Practicing Solidarity* by Chandra Mohanty; *Global History: A View from the South* by Samir Amin, *The Inventions of the Americas: The Eclipse of the Other and the Myth of Modernity*; and *The Underside of Modernity: Apeal*, and finally Ricoeur, Rorty, Taylor and the *Philosophy of Liberation* by Enrique Dussel.

²⁴ Enrique Dussel, *World Systems and “Trans”-Modernity*, Project Muse, <http://muse.jhu.edu>, *Nepantla: Views from the South* 3.2, (Duke University, 2002) 234: “That is to say, exteriority is a process that takes off, originates, and mobilizes itself from an “other” place (one “beyond” the “world” and modernity’s “Being,” one that maintains a certain exteriority, as figure 2 indicates) than European and North American modernity. From this “exteriority,” negated and excluded by hegemonic Europe’s modern expansion, there are present-day cultures that predate European modernity, that have developed together with it, and that have survived until the present with enough human potential to give birth to a plurality that will emerge after modernity and capitalism. These living and productive cultures, creative and in otherness [diferentes], are not just post-modern, since “postmodern” only labels a final stage of modernity. Rather, they are cultures that have developed on a “trans”-modern horizon, something beyond the internal possibility of simple modernity. This “beyond” (“trans-”) indicates the starting point from modernity’s exteriority (arrow E in figure 2), that is, from what modernity excluded, denied, or ignored, as “insignificant,” “senseless,” “barbarous,” as a “nonculture,” an unknown opaque alterity, but at the same time evaluated as “savage,” uncivilized, underdeveloped, inferior, merely “Oriental despotism,” the “Asiatic mode of production,” and so on. These are diverse names given to the nonhuman, the unrecoverable, the “historyless,” to what will be extinguished by the sweeping advances of Western “civilization” in the process of globalization.”

²⁵ *The Idea of Latin America*, xvi-xx.

²⁶ *World Systems and “Trans”-Modernity*, 236: “All of this outlines a multi-polar twenty-first century world, where cultural difference is increasingly affirmed, beyond the homogenizing pretensions of the present capitalist globalization and its supposedly universal culture, and even beyond the postmodern affirmation of difference that finds it difficult to imagine universalities from a millenary tradition outside of Europe and the United States. This “trans”-modernity should adopt the best of modern technological revolution has to offer—discarding antiecollogical and exclusively Western aspects—and put it at the service of differentiated valorized worlds, ancient and actualized, with their own traditions and ignored creativity. This will allow for the emergence of the enormous cultural richness and the transnational capitalist market now attempts to suppress under the empire of “universal” commodities that materially subsume food (one of the most difficult things to universalize) into capital. The future “trans”-modernity will be multi-cultural, versatile, hybrid, postcolonial, pluralist, tolerant, and democratic (but beyond the modern liberal democracy of the European state). It will have splendid millenary traditions and be respectful of exteriority and heterogeneous identities. The majority of humanity retains, reorganizes (renovating and including elements of globality), and creatively develops cultures in its everyday, enlightened horizon. The cultures of the majority deepen the valorative “common sense” of their

begins to release us from our myopic vision of the past and begins to allow us to encounter the cultural Other in a more authentic manner. This disruption provides us a space to view all cultures, including our own and the Other's, in a manner which is historically situated. It is from this new location that we can critically interrogate all cultural discourse.²⁷

Agapic Discipleship

Remembrance

The seriousness of this sub-moment is found in how much cultural conditioning has the inadvertent effect of creating epistemic categories that prevent us from viewing the history of the Other. At times we will view their history, but only from within the horizons offered by our cultural lens. This level of ignorance, however, is an unacceptable position for an appropriate ethical response,²⁸ because we cannot love the neighbor if we do not first have an

participants' real and particular existences, countering the exclusionary process of globalization, which precisely because of this process inadvertently "pushes" towards a "trans"-modernity. It is a return to the consciousness of the great majorities of humanity of their excluded historical unconscious!"

²⁷ *The Underside of Modernity*, 144-146: "By necessity, the telos or good of a culture, or a Totality, cannot be the last foundation of the morality of our acts. It will only be "for now" while the negated Other is not discovered in this type of system...The empirical is not abandoned ideally or transcendently (as Habermas does from an "ideal speech situation," or as Apel does in a "transcendental pragmatics," i.e., ideal communication community); instead the horizon of the system is "perforated" ("transcended) in search of the excluded Other...Furthermore, since at this level no one can be excluded, it is necessary to recognize transcendently or ideally each "participant" as a distinct person; the Other of everything else, the principle of every possibility of "dissent"(origin of new discourse). This respect and recognition at the transcendental or ideal is the point of departure that allows the Other "participation" in the community into which she has factually irrupted as a new Other."

²⁸ *The Inventions of the Americas: Eclipse of "the other" and the Myth of Modernity*, Enrique Dussel (Consejo Latinoamericano de Ciencias Sociales, 1996/2002), 10: "One must break with this reductionist horizon to open to a world and planetary perspective—and there is an ethical obligation toward other cultures to do so." This book is a wonderful example of the work of Remembrance on the part of one thinker.

authentic encounter with this neighbor, the Other. This encounter will lack substance if it is limited by our cultural categories

The work of Enrique Dussel in general and in particular his book entitled *The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of "the other" and the Myth of Modernity* is an exemplar of this sub-moment. I summarize it here only briefly. In this work Dussel begins to create a 'counter-narrative' to the traditional historical narrative of modernity.²⁹ He accomplishes this in part by speaking of the experience of those who were the co-creators, albeit in a dialectical manner, of modernity.³⁰ He begins by noting how some important figures (particularly Hegel and Habermas) were and are deeply immersed in a Eurocentric perspective.³¹ In this work he demonstrates the liberationist 'strand' by privileging the poor in both an epistemological and enunciatory manner.³² In this project Dussel is 'awakening,' us, in the Levinasian sense, to the history of the Other.³³ This remembrance of

²⁹ Ibid. 9. "My undertaking here differs from theirs, since I argue that while modernity is undoubtedly a European occurrence, it also originates in a dialectical relation with non-Europe. *Modernity appears when Europe organizes the initial world-system and places itself at the center of world history over against a periphery equally constitutive of modernity.*" [italics added]

³⁰ Ibid. 26. "They make up the other face (te-ixtli in Aztec), the alterity, essential to modernity."

³¹ Ibid. Part One: From the European Ego: The Covering Over

³² Ibid. Part Three: From the Invasion to the Dis-discovery of the Other.

³³ Ibid. Preface, "As Richard Bernstein has shown so well in *The New Constellation*, we face a new historical moment and a new constellation of philosophical problems and questions. In this book, I consider constellations which European and United States thinkers often neglect and which involved far more than what Ihab Hassan has called an "ideological commitment to *minorities* in politics, sex, and language." I focus on the *immense majority* of humanity, the seventy-five per cent of the world situated in the southern hemisphere, the excolonial world. These exploited, excluded and poor peoples, whom Fanon termed the "wretched of the earth," consume less than fifteen per cent of the planet's income. Their history of oppression began five hundred years ago. This history of world domination originates with modernity, which thinkers such as Charles Taylor, Stephen Toulmin, or Jürgen Habermas consider as an exclusively European occurrence, having nothing to do with the so-called Third World. The expositions of these thinkers explain modernity by referring *only to classical European and North American authors and events.*" [italics in original text]

the Other in general and the 'marginalized' Other in particular is the central feature of this sub-moment.

Recitation

The recitation sub-moment is the stage where we are made familiar with the symbols, language systems, imagery, and general Weltanschauung of the Other. We must be conscious of becoming involved in this sub-moment while addressing the Other. We need constantly to be asking the Other; 'Are we doing justice to your story and experience?' This allows us to further surrender the epistemic and enunciatory privilege which was part of the colonial wound. An element which is important to highlight here is that of the distinction principle. Here we recall that ultimately we are to seek clarity and authenticity rather than merely similarity. Beyond celebrating diversity we are respectfully acknowledging distinction. We must see the Other as distinctly other than ourselves in order to fully honor them.

Resurrection

In this moment of Agapic Solidarity we inhabit a cultural existence that is being reborn as we encounter anew both the Other and a new cultural understanding of ourselves. This sub-moment will always have to it an element of the unknown precisely because we no longer have the certitude that came with the epistemological and enunciatory privilege that was part of being the cultural center. This sub-moment is ambiguous precisely because it requires that we live in the 'already but not yet' existence of a people who are waiting for the full fruition of the Reign of God.

Emancipatory Praxis

One of the ways we will manifest this moment in the cultural dimension is by working against all the damage done in the past, present, and future by the colonial wound. Recalling that all cultures tend to move towards self-referential totalities, this praxis must always be done with reference to the other previous moments so as to ensure that we do not fall again into any pattern of cultural hegemony. This will mean living in a constant state of metanoia. This conversion will mean that that we will revise and evaluate all our cultural discourses, patterns, and practices with one eye towards the abolishing of all past patterns of oppression and another eye towards creation of conditions which *allow for human flourishing as understood by ourselves and the Other.*

Agapic Discipleship in the Political Dimension

Disruption

In the political dimension, where citizenship constitutes subjectivity, the subjectivity which must be accounted for is that of the non-citizen. However, that is only one component of this disruption. The other component which needs to be disrupted is the pervasive loyalty to the nation-state that seems to be impervious to critique.³⁴ This loyalty manifests itself in three particular areas: military action,

³⁴ In an issue of Sojourner magazine the founder and editor Jim Wallis asks the very pointed question: "To Whom Do We Belong?" In this editorial Wallis challenges the place that loyalty to the nation has in relation to loyalty to our Faith. This he does in the context of U.S. involvement in the Middle East. Others, such as Oscar Romero and Dorothy Day, have raised this question as well.

the incapacity to view non-citizens as fellow human beings, and the ahistorical framework through which we view the creation of nation-states.

The loyalty to one's country is particularly pronounced in the citizenry's loyalty to its military. This is especially true given that all countries intentionally downplay the costs that their military has wrought on citizens from another country.³⁵ The second disruption occurs in the area of awakening to the way in which the ideology of "National Security" in our political discourse had taken on an almost divine status.³⁶ The power of this ideology is particularly troubling because in some cases it leaves no room for political beliefs to be challenged, thus rendering political change impossible. This allows all assertions of the political threat posed by the Other to go unchallenged without those making the assertions feeling a need to create a cogent argument for their position.³⁷ The final disruption occurs as we awaken to the historical reality that the civilizing process of nation-states always already includes the element of silencing the Other.³⁸ The importance of this disruption is that it will allow us to continue to hold on to our national identity, albeit with a much looser grip. We are awakened to the full cost to the human family of the creation of this identity and its accompanying ideology.

³⁵ One of the most powerful critiques of militarism in the United States, but also part of a larger critique of militarism in undermining the political, democratic process, can be found in the writings of Chalmers Johnson's trilogy: *Blowback*, *Sorrows of Empire*, and *Nemesis*. See also *Indefensible Weapons: The Political and Psychological Case Against Nuclearism* by Robert Jay Lifton and Richard Falk, as well the writings of Arundhati Roy.

³⁶ There are many critiques of this reality. Particularly helpful are those by Jose Comblin, Jack Nelson-Pallmeyer, Ched Meyers, Walter Wink, Franz Hinkelammert, and Arundhati Roy.

³⁷ This will become more evident in the Appendix but can also be seen in the recent discourse around the 'illegal alien' in the United States.

³⁸ There are many great works that demonstrate this; *Bury My Heart at Wounded Knee* is a classic. The spate of "People's History" books is also a way of creating this disruption.

Agapic Discipleship

Remembrance

This sub-moment will entail a comprehensive re-telling of the human experience from the side of the non-citizens of each historical period. While this may appear to be an impossible task, many authors and scholars are already tackling it.³⁹ It is here that the principle of “preferential option for the poor” would need to be strongly asserted. If the victors write the history of a country, we as people of faith must allow ourselves to hear, read, and know the history of the vanquished. This allows us to inhabit and articulate the *dangerous memories* of innocent suffering within history.⁴⁰

Recitation

This sub-moment will include the active dissemination of these new histories. It includes, however, an introduction to many more themes, topics, and categories than just the history of the Other. This sub-moment will function in a dialectical manner affirming aspects of the political dimension while concurrently negating them. For many of us the language system created by the nation-state and its apparatus is given a ‘natural’ veneer. When terms like ‘security,’ ‘prosperity,’ ‘development,’ ‘democracy,’ ‘freedom,’ etc. are used, we all assume that we are speaking of the same experience. The tutelage of the Other makes it

³⁹ While Howard Zinn’s, *A People’s History of the United States* is still the premier exemplar of such historical revisionism, we can see that there are now many others. In Appendix I include some of the ‘alternative’ historical texts which are more focused on Latin American experience.

⁴⁰ *A Passion for God: “On the Way to a Postidealist Theology,”* 41. “It is precisely because Christians believe in an eschatological meaning for history that they can risk historical consciousness: looking into the abyss. Precisely because of this, they can risk a memory that recalls not only the successful but the ruined, not only that which has been realized but that which has been lost, a memory that in this way—as dangerous memory—resists identifying meaning and truth with the victory of what has come into being and continues to exist.”

patently clear that this is not the case. With the help of the Other, this sub-moment creates a space for us to critically interrogate some assumptions that we have heretofore accepted.⁴¹ In this sub-moment we will not a priori condemn or accept any category, image, theory etc. Rather, in dialogue we will revisit all of them. We are not aiming to be ‘anti’ development or ‘anti’-democratic; rather, we will acknowledge that these concepts cannot be fully realized until we grasp how the Other understands, enacts, and holds them.

Resurrection

The resurrection sub-moment may take on many forms or embodiments. There will, however, be two general elements to this ‘new life’: an altered understanding of citizenship, and a qualitatively different relationship to the military. The first feature is a more porous and flexible understanding of our loyalty to the nation-state. This does not, however, entail a complete rejection of our country. This newly resurrected life leads to our holding much more loosely to our identity as citizens of a specific nation. This new life allows us to challenge

⁴¹ One can see that part of Dussel’s project is to have us interrogate many of these assumptions, particularly the ‘logic’ of modernity, which is to say its epistemological foundation. *Philosophy of Liberation*, Preface: “What follows is addressed to the neophytes of philosophy of liberation. It does not claim to be an exhaustive exposition. It is a discourse that proceeds by elaborating one thesis after another, using its own categories and its own method. It is a provisional theoretical philosophical framework...Written from the periphery, for persons and peoples of the periphery, this book nonetheless also addresses readers in the center of the present world system. It is like the alienated child who protests against the overbearing father; the child is becoming an adult. Philosophy, the exclusive patrimony of, first, the Mediterranean world and then of Europe, now finds an origination that allows it to be authentically worldwide for the first time in the course of human history. It is my hope that the theoretical philosophical framework that I am proposing—an ensemble of theses calculated to foster a certain type of thinking—will spark a worldwide philosophical dialogue. It sets out, of course, from the periphery but, for the most part, it uses the language of the center. It could not do otherwise. The slave, in revolt, uses the master’s language; the woman, when she frees herself from the dominant male, uses macho language. Philosophy of liberation is postmodern, popular (of the people, with the people), profeminine philosophy. It is philosophy expressed by (“pressed out from”) the youth of the world, the oppressed of the earth, the condemned of world history.”

not only the perceptions and assumptions of the nation-state but our fellow citizens. To some degree this would be in direct opposition to an essentialist reading of any community. This essentialist framework is the kind that was found most pronounced in the conflict model presented above. In the resurrected sub-moment we will see that the Nation-State was a socially constructed reality which has its usefulness but can no longer take the place of deeper and more foundational affiliations in general and ethical demands in particular. The second shift will be the disentangling which will need to occur between our identification with the nation-state and its military. In common parlance, we speak of how the members of the military are 'our' men and women serving in the military. This is important because we do not speak with the same level of commitment to other communities that are part of our nation-state.⁴² This understanding of who is part of 'our' community and who is not is important because it tends to fetishize the military and make all interrogation of its practices more difficult because more suspect. What is especially important is that it is not uncommon for 'our' military to be involved in the killing of 'the Other' as part of their duty. Here we see how the faculty to identify who is us and who is Other has life and death consequences.

Emancipatory Praxis

⁴² Many authors have written about our 'overzealous' allegiance to 'war' in general and the military in particular. The writings of John Howard Yoder and Stanley Hauerwas speak eloquently to this point. I would also cite the work of Walter Wink, particularly his *Powers* trilogy, as well as the work of Ched Myers, and the political theology of Dorothee Sölle.

The moment of Emancipatory Praxis has a two-fold dialectical quality. It seeks to stay attuned to two functions within the political dimension. The first is that it must be on guard to assure that our loyalties to the nation-state, and to its various apparatuses, do not mitigate our larger and deeper connections, particularly to the Other. The second is to allow the correct use of the nation-state, and its various apparatuses, to construct a society that deepens, supports, and protects the wellbeing of the Other. In the more traditional nomenclature of Catholic social thought we can say that Emancipatory Praxis makes certain that the principles of Subsidiarity and the Common Good are honored within this dimension.

Agapic Solidarity in the Theological Dimension

Given that we spoke earlier of the religious lens or theological vision being shaped within the categories of authority, morality, and salvation we can assume that it is within these categories that the process of Agapic Solidarity would occur.

Disruption

Because it is in this dimension that the tendency for self-referential totalization is most pronounced, the most profound disruption will occur in the category of authority. The shift from self-referential authority to Other-referential authority will be the central shift that must occur.

In the area of *authority* it will mean that all that we term 'natural' or 'divinely sanctioned' will have to be interrogated through the eyes of the Other.

This is important because in this dimension we are in a slumber that gives us the illusion that our universe is ordered through divine sanction. In the newly disrupted reality, even our most cherished and sacred traditions must be held accountable to and by the Other.⁴³ This disruption will lead to a radical 'atheism' vis à vis all of our *divinized systems*. This atheism is grounded in our faith in the immanent Other in our midst and the Transcendent Other— God.

Similar to the area of authority our *morality* will also undergo a thorough interrogation by the Other to arrive at a more authentic grasp of the *Summum bonum*. We move from a relative morality which, while appearing absolute, is truly just a reflection of the morality sanctioned by the religious authority of that time and space. This ethical praxis is more improvisational but it is not arbitrary, for it is guided by a deep concern for the Other.⁴⁴ In this disrupted life we will never be completely sure of how 'good' we are being from within a self-referential morality.

⁴³ *A Passion for God; "Theology and the University,"* 134: "In my view there is one authority recognized by all great cultures and religions: the authority of those who suffer. Respecting the suffering of strangers is a precondition for every culture; articulating others' suffering is the presupposition of all claims to truth. Even those made by theology." [italics added]

⁴⁴ *Ethics and Community*, 49-50: "To many, Jesus' ethical demands have seemed paradoxical. Are these "obligations' not impossible to understand or fulfill? If "paradoxical" (Gk., para "alongside of, beyond"; doxa, "opinion, decree") be taken to mean something opposed to the prevailing moral opinion, then Jesus' teaching is indeed paradoxical. It flies in the face of the whole of morality, in the name of the absolute, transcendent, critical horizon of all morality: the "ethical." It consists in praxis as activity directed toward, and relationship to (1.2) the other as other, as a person, as sacred, as absolute. The ethical is not governed by moral norms—by what the system proclaims to be good (3.7). The ethical is governed by what the poor require, by the needs of the oppressed, by the struggle with the domination, the structures, and the relationship established by the Prince of "this world" (2.10). Thus the ethical transcends the moral. Moral systems are relative. Latin American history has witnessed the Aztec, the colonial, and the capitalistic morality. Each of these systems has sought to legitimate the praxis of domination as good, each in its own way. Ethics by contrast, is one, and absolute—valid in every situation and every age."

It is in the area of *salvation* that the *ana-* or *beyond* of the analectical method is most explicitly applied. For it is here that we see that salvation can only occur to the degree that our praxis calls us 'beyond' our reigning systemic moral codes and laws and toward the Other who is still suffering. In the disruption moment we make the connection between our salvation and that of working towards ending all oppressive systems. In this way we come to realize how intimate and interdependent is the salvation of ourselves and the Other. This is particularly unsettling and disruptive because it reminds us that our religious fate is intimately tied to that of the Other. No longer can we earn 'heaven' by our 'selves.' We live with a degree of uncertainty when it comes to our salvation.⁴⁵ This degree of uncertainty need not be seen as a curse or even a punishment, but rather as a vocation of living an ethical love of neighbor life this side of the fully realized Reign of God.

Agapic Discipleship

Remembrance

The remembrance aspect of the theological dimension demands that we pay singular attention to the *dangerous memories* of the innocent suffering of the victims of history. These dangerous memories can become a corrective in the religious dimension precisely because it can so easily fall prey to reading history from the perspective of the victors and not the vanquished. We are, however, called always to surface these uncomfortable and dangerous memories during

⁴⁵ *A Passion for God, "Theology as Theodicy,"* 56. "There is a hint of something unreconciled in Christianity. To banish this would be an expression not of faith, but of smallness of faith."

this discipleship period.⁴⁶ It is here that we place position ourselves as “Hearers of the Word” so that we can remember and begin to learn the language of the Other.

Recitation

In the theological dimension what is revealed to us is what aspect of the Other’s Weltanschauung they ascribe ultimate authority. Remember that this recitation period always has the twofold element of both reciting the worldview of the Other to the Other, and concurrently inviting critique and dialogue to see if we are in fact hearing their reality correctly. This gives a greater sense of authenticity to our theological claims, insights, and assertions.⁴⁷ It also allows us to be in the liminal space from which ongoing conversion is possible and from which the seduction of a reified, divinized order is less likely to occur.

Resurrection

The Resurrection sub-moment in the theological dimension is one that recalls the ‘house of many rooms’ spoken of in the Gospel of John. It allows for a religious vision in which pluralism is not merely ‘tolerated’ but rather understood as a more accurate reflection of the Reign of God. In this way it shares similarities to the insights brought forth from the cultural dimension. Like the cultural dimension, here we will seek to inhabit *a world in which many worlds can coexist* and in this way we will seek to create a world ‘as it is in heaven.’ Because

⁴⁶ *Love’s Strategy: “In the Pluralism of Religious and Cultural Worlds,”* 172: “ The Obedience cannot therefore be glossed over by the Church. Actually it can become a basis for a profound critique of the Church action itself...for me, therefore, this authority alone manifests the authority of the judging God in the world for all humanity. The moral conscience is formed by obedience to this authority, and what we call the voice of conscience is our reaction when the suffering of the other strikes home.”

⁴⁷ *Love’s Strategy*, 8. “ We must act and do theology while touching the victims.”

of this *Eschatological Proviso*⁴⁸ we must always be conscious of how we will never have full access to all the “rooms.” Here again we will recognize and appreciate the need for ongoing metanoia. This is even more true as we discharge the final moment of Emancipatory Praxis.

Emancipatory Praxis

The fundamental goal of this moment is to work in everything for the creation of the Reign of God and the embodiment of the love of neighbor command. This will always entail seeking the wisdom, insights, and experiences of the Other, and particularly of the poor. This moment is particularly difficult to inhabit because one has to tread a fine line between being a servant to the Other and not being a slave to the Other. We are not seeking to be held ‘hostage’ to the demands of the Other, in the Levinasian sense, but rather to understand the intimate relationship between our ultimate loyalty to God, and specifically the love command of the Lord Jesus Christ, and our provisional albeit essential loyalty to serving the Other in our midst.⁴⁹ It is, however, important to note that this loyalty and love of God and neighbor has embedded in it a demand that calls us to continue in every situation to reduce unjust suffering and engage in emancipatory praxis.⁵⁰

⁴⁸ This is a term used by Metz to indicate how we are truly living in an apocalyptic timeframe. He feels that an aspect of this vision was lost as we became beholden to the ‘evolutionary vision’ found with modernity. See chapter three for the details.

⁴⁹ 1 John 4:20: “Yes, we love him because he first loved us. If a man says, “I love God” and hates his brother, he is a liar. For if he does not love the brother before his eyes how can he love the one beyond his sight? And in any case it is his explicit command that the one who loves God must love his brother too.” New Revised Standard Version Catholic Edition.

⁵⁰ A Passion for God, “Theology as Theodicy,” 55. “The question immanent to this discourse about God is first and foremost the question about the salvation of those who suffer unjustly. *The truth that guides it is known only in committed resistance against every form of injustice that creates suffering.*” [italics added]

Conclusion: Ancient Text in Contemporary Context

The process of Agapic Discipleship begins with the ethical injunction made to all Christians: love your neighbor. This injunction must now be understood within a globalized, pluralistic social reality. In this new reality the neighbor is none other than the Other in our midst. The love of neighbor or the Other needs to contain two essential elements; that of honoring our deep interconnectedness that is so much a part of our current milieu,⁵¹ and also to honor the potency of particularity. Agapic Solidarity grew out of my desire to create a process which would allow a love of neighbor that did not fall into either one of the two common errors found in some contemporary ethical discourse. The first is the premature claim to universalism that is merely a particularity elevated to a false universal. This has the effect of blunting and silencing particularities and diminishing the dignity of the Other. The second error can be found in some of the most extreme forms of essentialist or post-modernist thinkers who speak of differences that are so profound as to be insurmountable. I believe that the process of Agapic Solidarity allows for the creation and revelation of deep interconnectedness between and among communities without surrendering the uniquely particular contribution that each would bring to all the dimensions of human experience.

⁵¹ Min

CONCLUSION

AGAPIC SOLIDARITY: A *KAIROS* RESPONSE FOR A *KAIROS* MOMENT

Agapic Solidarity: A *Kairos* Reponse for a *Kairos* Moment

This project began as an exploration of the love command found within Christian ethical discourse. Specifically, how are we called to love our neighbor within the contemporary world, which is necessarily a shifting, and therefore confusing, social/cultural/historical context.

The process of Agapic Solidarity grew out of an appraisal of the current milieu of pluralism. The process attempts to navigate between the Charybdis of an inauthentic and premature sense of unity and the Scylla of an irremediably fragmented social reality. We are entering a Kairos moment in which the need to acknowledge our interdependence while at the same time maintaining our particularity has reached the level of species survival. Benjamin Franklin's observation that "We must, indeed, all hang together or most assuredly we shall all hang separately" is apt. The old models of how to engage communities that are different than us have become ineffective and perhaps even destructive. We must find a way to construct a new vocabulary to deal with this new reality. Agapic Solidarity will help move this conversation forward.

This conclusion has three sections. The first section is a brief re-articulation of the situation in which we find ourselves. This will include some clarifications of the more extreme positions currently proposed as solutions to the situation of pluralism. The second section is a brief explanation of the project

itself and highlights the contribution made by both Johann Baptist Metz and Enrique Dussel to the creation of this process. The final section speaks to some of the ways and some of the places in which the process of Agapic Solidarity may be applied in the future.

Solidaristic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century: Who is My Neighbor?

In his seminal work “The Soul of Black Folk” W. E. B. Dubois asserted that “The problem of the twentieth century is the problem of the color line.” Dubois was trying to focus attention on what he saw as the central quandary in the body politic of the United States, and the world. We can speak of the problem of the twenty-first century as the problem of the *Other* line. The Other in all his or her manifestations is now part of our world. This is, in part, due to what Gustavo Gutierrez called the ‘irruption of the poor onto the world stage.’ This irruption of not only the ‘materially’ poor but all marginalized voices is now part of our quotidian existence, as are its repercussions and causes. A by-product of this reality is an awareness of a new level of pluralism. Whether this pluralism is seen as a problem, a question, or as something worth celebrating varies; what is undeniable is that it is now part of all social reality. One could argue that the recent rise of some forms of fundamentalism is a reaction to this new pluralism. It seeks a misguided desire to ‘go back’ to a bygone era. Yet recent events have reminded us that we can no longer close our eyes to the Other in our midst. If we do those Others will insinuate themselves into our world in some form. The insinuation will be experienced by us as a disruption which awakens us from our

ontological slumber, though this pluralistic reality has not caught everyone unaware, particularly not the Others themselves. When we study history with the lens of the Other, we realize that the voiceless were not without voice but rather that they were systematically silenced. One of the things that Agapic Solidarity calls us to do is to cultivate the skill of listening to the Other.¹ For this to occur we

¹ I will cite two examples that suggest how we have been asleep to the Other.

9/11: A Morning Wake Up Call

While it is easy for many people in the United States to believe that our interaction with people in the Middle East in general and Muslim people in particular began on this tragic date it would be naïve to the point of negligence not to see how our remarkable history with the many communities involved in this incident extends back many, many years. It would also be naïve and simplistic to try to speak of one or even two ‘causes’ of this profound human tragedy. In the old model it would be easy to attempt to explain the event as caused by one conflict (i.e. Muslim Terrorist vs. Christian Nation-States, Modernity vs. Religious Fundamentalist etc.). In the reality of a pluralistic world we must look at multiple causes and multiple agents to understand this event.

Illegal Immigrants in the South-West: “History repeats itself, first as tragedy, then as farce”

Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger addressed the issue of the need for people in the United States to take seriously the question of language, and specifically the need to understand the importance of learning English in the

must create a process by which the various communities can have an encounter that does not lead to either premature unity or extreme postmodern fragmentation.

Premature Unity

In the premature unity position, the categories and paradigms that are used to explain and contend with reality gloss over real differences and divisions. We saw how the post-colonialist theorists spoke of this as an aspect of the colonial wound in general. When such theorists speak of the privileges of enunciation and epistemology, this is part of the issue they are addressing. Yet whether such speech is well intentioned or nefarious, we will never resolve the real conflicts and contradictions that are part of social reality if we allow our

United States. What was most ironic about this event was that he was speaking in a city named Sacramento. He also said that he was going to speak to a different group on this important issue in the city of Los Angeles. When we speak of the issue of undocumented workers (particularly from Mexico) it is staggering to see how we allow ourselves to stay asleep to brute historical facts. What is most problematic about this particular issue is that we are asking them to honor 'our past,' especially the documents by the Founding Fathers, but to willfully ignore certain historical periods when the United States 'interacted' with Mexico. Not only do we not wish to wake up to the reality of the Other but we are asking them to join us in our dream state. Yet the reality is that for the most part our dream has been their nightmare. I hope that the Appendix helped illuminate this position.

discourse to be dictated by the fallacious reasoning and perceptions found in this paradigm that see all division and difference as divisive and places a premium on peace over justice. When this group speaks of seeking peace they frequently mistake a quietism in which all dissent is silenced for actual authentic peace. Such discourse seeks to create and maintain a universalism at all costs, specifically at the cost of recognizing the autonomous ontology of the Other.

Postmodern Fragmentation

Richard Rorty asserts that a fundamental feature of post-modernist thought is a deep suspicion of all 'meta-narratives.'² If the premature unity position suffers mostly from a misguided vision of how, when, and who is connected, then the Postmodern Fragmented position suffers from a vision which disallows all assertions of similarities or connection. When we speak of the Postmodern Fragmented position we are not speaking of all postmodernist philosophies but rather some of the more extreme forms of 'us/them' thinking as well as any vision which sees all attempts at expressing a 'universal' reality as a hegemonic power play.³ This position posits that the chasm that separates the various communities is so large that all attempts at some larger, unifying 'meta' vision is doomed to failure. Agapic Solidarity opts for a different response. This more nuanced response can be constructed using the work of Enrique Dussel and Johann B. Metz.

² Seyla Benhabib notes this critique in her work *Situating the Self: Gender, Community and Postmodernism in Contemporary Ethics*.

³ I use the work of Samuel Huntington and Dinesh D'Souza as examples of this type of extreme us/them thinking. I believe that they would not self-identify as Postmodernist but nonetheless they speak in terms reminiscent of this 'hardened post-modern' position, particularly in the way they view 'culture' in a highly 'essentialist' and static manner.

Prophetic Voices: Johann B. Metz and Enrique Dussel

The Analectical Method of Enrique Dussel: "Justice can never be Just Us"

Influenced by the work of Immanuel Levinas, Enrique Dussel confronts the question of how to respond to the Other by asserting that ethics is prior to ontology. Prior to any 'beingness' (including, and especially my own) comes the Other. This ethical demand posed by the Other is both disturbing and intriguing. To accept that the Other has an autonomous existence beyond my recognition of her is a powerful realization. To know (and accept) that we will never be able to fully 'capture' the Ultimate Mystery which is an aspect of *all* Others is a challenge. It requires us to understand that an ethical response toward the Other requires, in part, an acknowledgement of the Other's transcendent reality and also a defense of this reality when it is attacked. It is difficult for us to accept how actively acknowledging differences is, in part, a way to become closer to the Other. In the Analectical Method of Dussel we find a way of engaging the Other which allows us to honor the Otherness of the Other while also seeking common ground. However, we are still left with a quandary: if in fact this Other was truly and completely other than myself, then where and how could we begin to create any connections? While this problem is most accurately and beneficially articulated in the writings of Dussel, part of the resolution would be found in the categories of Johann Baptist Metz.

The Categories of Johann B. Metz: A Liberating Language

In Metz's categories of *Memory*, *Narrative*, and *Solidarity* we find the necessary building blocks for constructing a 'grammar' that would facilitate the beginning of a language with which to communicate with the Other. We are able to see that the first step to doing this was by releasing all pretense of our understanding of reality. We begin by learning a new language. This was particularly true in the area of historical reality. In dealing with *Memory*, first we are again reminded of how frequently we have to look back to move forward. This looking back, however, was not with the lens of our understanding but rather with the lens of the Other. It was their history which we must study, not our history with/of the Other. The place of *Narrative* would entail seeing and, to the degree that one can, experiencing the world of the Other. Here it would be imperative to recall the distinction principle of which Dussel speaks. In simple terms the Distinction Principle states that no matter how close we get to the Other (in *Solidarity*) we will never be able to fully experience the world as the Other. The continued honoring of the transcendent otherness of the Other is actually a demonstration of love and an embodiment of deep connection and understanding. Finally, *Solidarity* was about actively engaging in the Other's struggles using some of their strategies and honoring their goals. In a real sense it meant that we, as a Christian, are bearing not my cross, but the cross for and with the Other.

Accepting the Dusselian perspective which asserts a built-in limitation to Humans (as a species) which is always trapped within the horizon of our own

being and then using the Metzian Categories as a heuristic device to find ways to break free from this ignorance brought forth the process of Agapic Solidarity.

New Language/New Lands: Agapic Discipleship as Counter-Hegemonic Discourse

The Many Faces and Places of Agapic Discipleship

Because of the novelty of the process, speaking of its 'application' has an intentionally vague quality. Agapic Solidarity could be used in many areas of life. This process has enough *elasticity* to allow for the application to have a highly improvisational quality. In this final section we will only hint at some possible places in which to apply this method.

In exploring the many arenas that Agapic Solidarity could be applied, we can rely on the work of David Tracy. Tracy introduced the idea of the three *Audiences* which all theologians must address in doing theology; Academy, Society, and Church.⁴

Academy:

We must broaden the category of the Academy to include all educational institutions, public and private. Some components of this process were originally developed as part of a curriculum to teach principles of social justice to high school students. It is in these types of settings that we could most actively address the question of *Remembrance* and *Recitation*. To the degree that in these institutions we transmit a worldview to our 'students' we must ask

⁴ Both of his works; *The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism*, *Blessed Rage for Order: The New Pluralism in Theology* speaks to addressing these three audiences.

ourselves to whose worldview are we giving primacy? Whose stories are being told? Dussel's "The Invention of the Americas" is a great example of how the Academy could ensure that Agapic Solidarity would be practiced in the Academy.⁵ As its title suggests, in this work Dussel reconfigures the 'discovery' of the Americas narrative so popular in modern discourse and allows the vision of the Other to create a more authentic narrative. It is only one example but there are many others.

Society:

Society includes all forms of cultural discourses. Part of what has occurred in recent times is what is sometimes termed the 'commodification of culture.' An element of this process is the privatizing (specifically for profit) of all aspects of social reality. We should resist this movement precisely because it occludes our ability to see the Other outside of the 'for profit' lens of the market. This resistance would entail making more public practices available. One way to ensure this is by making a conscious effort to publicly fund cultural and artistic practices rather than simply letting 'market-forces' dictate terms of engagement in this area. We saw one aspect of this issue debated in the recent presidential race, when Mitt Romney was counter-posed to Big Bird in terms of representing different 'value systems.' It is not as though Mitt Romney was 'against' Big Bird, but rather, he opposed a certain understanding of public cultural practices, that the values portrayed through Big Bird and his puppet colleagues merited *public* television funding. When Henry Ford said that, "What is good for Ford is good for

⁵ I believe such tomes were always being written, so this project may necessitate a retrieval process as a creating process.

America” he was creating a ‘lens’ by which to view all notions of *progress*, *development*, and even *success*. We can no longer suggest that any ‘corporate entity’ or private individual speaks for all people. Rather, the Other will tell us what is good for them. Agapic Solidarity helps create a social space for this discussion to begin.

Church:

The Church as a possible repository and guardian of the “dangerous memories” of innocent suffering beginning with Jesus Christ would be the most natural place from which to practice the spirit of Agapic Solidarity. It must also be a place which creates ‘sacramental practices’ that embody the various ‘moments’ of Agapic Solidarity. One of the things that must occur for this ideal to be realized is a reawakening of the Prophetic Voice within the Church. This may at times require the institutional Church to practice a much more militant, oppositional, and consciously counter-cultural stance.

Conclusion

All theological reflection comes forth from the intersection of a faith that is gift and a specific historical context.⁶ The gift of faith is made manifest in

⁶ *A Theology of Liberation*, Gutierrez, Gustavo (New York: Orbis Books, 1985) 3
“Theological reflection—that is, the understanding of the faith—arises spontaneously and inevitably in the believer, in all those who have accepted the gift of the Word of God. Theology is intrinsic to a life of faith seeking to be authentic and complete and is, therefore, essential to the common consideration of this faith in the ecclesial community. There is present *in all believers*—and more so in every Christian community—a rough outline of a theology. There is present an effort to understand the faith, something like a pre-understanding of the faith which is manifested in life, action, and concrete attitude. It is on this foundation, and only because of it, that the edifice of theology—in the precise and technical sense of the term—can be erected. This foundation is not merely a jumping-off point, but the soil into which theological reflection stubbornly and permanently sinks its roots and from which it derives its strength.”

Jesus Christ; his life, ministry and message. One component of his life, ministry and message was the call to love our neighbor. This project as a form of theological ethical reflection seeks to articulate that command within a very specific historical context.

The question that I began the project with was; what does love of neighbor look like in the 21st century? In order to address this question we first must analyze our contemporary context. Two qualities which are crucial to our grasping the current world we inhabit are the features of interdependence and the potency of particularity. We live in a world in which our growing interdependence is evident in every dimension (theological, economic, political etc.) and yet we are aware of how each community seeks to be recognized within its own terms. If we are to learn to love our neighbor we must do it in a way that fully grasps these elements.

The process of Agapic Solidarity attempts to create such a bridge. In accepting the otherness of the Other and beginning with their perspective we allow ourselves to be form (and informed) by a vision greater than ourselves. In the first moment of Agapic Solidarity; Disruption all our epistemological and enunciatory privileges are called into question. In the second moment; Agapic Discipleship we begin the long and arduous process of constructing a love ethic with the Other. The final moment; Emancipatory Praxis seeks to realize that the call of Christian ethic is not merely to transform individual relationships but to move towards what is now called structural change. It means we are called to change, challenge and affirm all communities, including to those which we

belong. The hope is that many will use this project to illuminate the face of the Other and bring us ever closer to the Reign of God.

APPENDIX

METHODOLOGY AND TERMINOLOGY

In a project of this size it would be impossible to deal with all concerns, questions, or objections that the development of a new process engenders; however I would like to address some of these within this section. The three issues which I will address are:(1) A concern (and clarification) of the various terms involved in this project, particularly the Other, the poor, and the neighbor; (2) An objection to the absence of traditional ethical discourses (utilitarianism etc.) within the project; and finally (3) The question of how one can interrogate the worldview of the Other within the process of Agapic Solidarity.

The Concern: Terms of Clarification

The three terms which are used somewhat interchangeably in this project are the Other, the poor, and the neighbor. Because this may lead to some confusion I would like to do a retracing of the terms within this project. I began this project with the question of what the ethical demand of *love of neighbor* look like within our current context. Because my initial entry into this question is the biblical text, I felt the need to utilize this term. I am conscious that there are many ways to conceptualize the neighbor. For me the best understanding of who is the neighbor within our midst, and how to best understand the demand made by this love, is found in the writings of Emmanuel Levinas. Through his understanding of the Torah and Talmudic traditions, Levinas helps cement a bond between the

neighbor and the Other.⁷ Levinas' understanding of the Other is a more precise conceptualization of both who the neighbor is and what Jesus asks of his disciples. Levinas properly problematized the issues of identity and proximity. He realized that the love demand as articulated in the teachings of the Gospel must now engage the absolute questioning of all our totalities, including: Who is the neighbor? and, How is love to be understood? However, Levinas' understanding of the Other seemed to lack a properly political dimension. While he was very much opposed to the egocentric mode of discourse found in traditional philosophical ontology, he could not rid himself of an anthropology that focused too much on the individual. This anthropology does not do justice to the anthropologies found in non-European, non-Western discourses. I found some relief from this myopia in the writings of Enrique Dussel. He was able to articulate the proper responsibility we have to the Other and was able to cast this question in light of a more communal understanding of the self and the Other. Like most liberation thinkers he spoke of the Poor as a 'collective' identity. However, even Dussel realized that 'the poor' is a term that is in constant need of contextualization. Specifically by properly understanding how power is defined within any given context we can speak of the poor as those who lack 'power.' In my project the poor, the Other, and the neighbor are all understood from within the context of the dimensions.

The Objection: Familiar Themes, Unfamiliar Visions

⁷*Of God Who Comes to Mind, Totality and Infinity*, et al.

The objection that this project of creating a theological ethical process of how to love our neighbor does not draw upon many of the traditional resources for ethical discourse is one that operates at a more foundational level than mere word choice. I will seek to address this issue by speaking of the intentional absence as stemming from a theoretical consideration that is crucial to my argument and position.

The fundamental assertion that I make in my creation of Agapic Solidarity is that we cannot know how to love the neighbor or the Other without first consulting them *on their terms*. It would be very difficult to create an ethic of love that begins with any of my previous held ethical paradigms. I am conscious that I could have begun my project using some more traditional perspectives and schools of thought. I am certain that traditional virtue ethics or a form of social ethics would have much to contribute to the discussion of love of neighbor. However, to begin to speak of the imperative quality of viewing the Other as other within their own *Weltanschauung* and then simply to retreat to our theoretical sources and conceptual frameworks seems to me misguided. For this reason I found that I had to situate the origins of my reflections in other locations. The two locations that I found most promising as sources for beginning my theoretical framework were the liberationist tradition and the post-colonial theorist schools. I would like to speak a bit more about each of these traditions and particularly about how they do, in fact, intersect with some more traditional ethical perspectives.

Enrique Dussel has always critically engaged the traditional ethical positions of his time.⁸ One of the insights that Dussel repeatedly demonstrates is how Modernity and particularly its claim to *Rationality* betrays a fundamental irrationality in its inability to confront its violent, exploitative history along with all its implications.⁹ This critique of rationality is part of why it would be difficult for me to begin with any of the traditional, mainstream, or rational perspectives on ethics (Virtue, Natural Law etc.). I, like Dussel, do not believe that one should reject modernity and all of its intellectual underpinnings wholesale but rather that one cannot begin from their perspective. I found this to be imperative in the creation of Agapic Solidarity precisely because of its focus on the love element in the Christian injunction. To me, an essential element of this love must be a true acknowledgement of the autonomous ethical authority of the Other.

Post-Colonial theory is a broad and fruitful area of intellectual discourse. Because of the limits of this project, here I will focus only on the writings of Walter Mignolo. Like liberation philosophy, postcolonial studies seeks to situate all studies, disciplines, and projects within a framework that is reflective of a

⁸ He has done this in virtually all of his works. However, some central texts are *Philosophy of Liberation*, *Thinking from the Underside of History: Enrique Dussel's Philosophy of Liberation, Ethics and Community*, and *Etica de La Liberacion en La Edad de La Globalizacion y De La Exclusion*.

⁹ The Invention of the Americas: Eclipse of 'the other' and the Myth of Modernity, 12: "In this book, I will seek the origin of the 'myth of modernity,' which justifies European violence and is distinct from modernity's rational emancipative concept. Postmoderns, such as Lyotard, Vatimo, and Rorty, criticize modern rationality as an instrument of terror, but I criticize it for concealing its own irrational myth. I endeavor to overcome modernity through 'transmodernity, a project of the future'—which could serve as an alternate title to this book. The birthdate of modernity is 1492, even though its gestation, like that of a fetus, required a period of intrauterine growth. Whereas modernity gestated in the free creative medieval European cities, it came to birth in Europe's confrontation with the Other. By controlling, conquering, and violating the Other, Europe defined itself as discoverer, conquistador, and colonizer of an alterity like-wise constitutive of modernity. Europe never discovered (des-cubierto) this Other as Other but covered over (encubierto) the Other as part of the Same: i.e. Europe. Modernity dawned in 142 and with it the myth of a special kind of sacrificial violence which eventually eclipsed whatever was non-European."

different reality than what is sometimes referred to as *the center* (read: Western Europe and the United States). Like Dussel, it claims that the colonization project has not only occluded aspects of human history but also colonized inner space in terms of engaging in the creation of certain models of *Subjectivity*. If in some traditional ethics we speak of 'human flourishing' as the *telos* of ethical and moral discourse, post-colonial theory would begin by interrogating who gets to decide what constitutes humanness. Similar to the project of Levinas we can speak of an ethic that exists before ontology. Mignolo also has spoken extensively about one arena in which this contestation must occur, in part because the arena in which the subjugation occurred is in the creation of knowledge spaces.

The desire to reflect in my intellectual praxis what I seek to explicate in all area of my life is in great part why I have intentionally moved away from citing more traditional school of thoughts found in contemporary ethical discourse. I wish again to state that this objection is not unimportant to me and I welcome further development in this area by being in dialogue with other traditions.

The Question: The Privileged Other Dilemma

The final question is posed by many who find that the process of Agapic Solidarity seems to leave no particular space where the Other's assumptions, perspectives, conceptual frameworks, worldview etc. can be properly interrogated. This objection or question is serious in that without a safeguard of some kind one could allow for the inadvertent reification of the Other that would merely replace one hegemonic pattern for another. In my understanding of the

process of Agapic Solidarity I see the sub-moment of Resurrection and the later moment of Emancipatory Praxis to be the locations in which this dialogue and interrogation aspect would be found. I also would agree with Anselm Min that we can to some degree speak of a world in which we are all *Others* to each other.¹⁰ My concern with aspects of Min's work is that he does not focus sufficiently on the historical implications of colonialism. This can lead to an inadvertent 'leveling' of responsibilities in terms of creating conditions of justice. By this I mean that we have to deal with issues of accountability and responsibility in a way which shows a clear preference for the poor within traditional historical discourse. This nuanced thought is found in the authors from the post-colonialist traditions, among others. However, even with this caution vocalized, I still believe that we have always to be cautious not merely to replace one Same or Totality with another.

¹⁰ *The Solidarity of Others in a Divided World: A Postmodern Theology after Postmodernism*, Min.

CASE STUDY

THE UNDOCUMENTED MIGRANT IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

AN APPLICATION OF THE METHOD OF AGAPIC SOLIDARITY

Undocumented Migration within the Economic Dimension

In this case study I provide a practical illustration of Agapic Solidarity,¹ with the United States representing the Same, or the Totality, and the undocumented migrant of Latin America representing the Other or the Neighbor.² The case study will focus on the economic dimension. My fundamental assertion is that all other dimensions are ultimately mediated through the economic dimension.³ Roberto S. Goizueta has made a similar argument, drawing on the example of the Eucharist:

Before these physical objects are religious symbols, they are economic products. Their religious meaning is mediated not only by their physicality in general, but by the specifically economic character of that physicality.

¹ Please see footnote # 1 in the Introduction.

² Latin America is a term that needs some unpacking and clarification. This is true for several reasons: the first is because some parts of the American continent were Latin American long before they were the United States of America. The second reason is that many of the people in Central and South America feel a deep connection with one another, particularly in their historical relation to the United States of America, and this creates a sense of common identity. The former President of Mexico, Porfirio Diaz, famously said, "Pity poor Mexico, so far from God and so close to the United States." The sentiment expressed in this saying is felt by many people throughout Latin America. This is particularly true when it comes to how the capitalist class of the United States has had similar economic policies towards all of Latin America. This is, in part, why throughout this chapter as we go through the process of Agapic Solidarity in the economic dimension I will use examples from various historical periods and countries of Latin America. This identification of themselves as one unity entitled 'Latin America' rather than solely individual nation-states more clearly reflects their experience of the economic dimension.

³ Much of my argument in this section is based on the writings of Roberto S. Goizueta and Enrique Dussel.

The bread is not merely a physical object like any other; it is ‘fruit of the earth and *work* of human hands.’⁴

Precisely because we are human, even this dimension of our existence — the religious, that is, the most transcendent— must be mediated by a “material” dimension: the economic. Precisely as “sacrament,” the eucharist is the material mediation of the transcendent. The sacramental character of all human existence is particularly important in an ethical method that takes seriously the incarnational character of the Gospel. What can be said about the theological or religious dimension can be said with equal force about all other dimensions.

The Economic Dimension: The Invisible Hand of “Living Labor”

In chapter two I claim that the economic system that has asserted hegemonic status is an advanced (globalized) capitalist system. There are many peripheral features within this specific historical epoch of Capitalism that do make it unique; however, the central features remain the same.⁵ Within the current version of Capitalism, as with all previous versions, the Other appears as the invisible ‘living labor’ of the human person. This means that within the relations between the United States of America and the countries of Latin America the

⁴ Goizueta, S. Roberto, *Caminamos Con Jesus: Toward a Hispanic/Latino Theology of Accompaniment*, 121-22.

⁵ While there are many forms of capitalism, we can sketch out some basic characteristics that many aspects of capitalist economies share: a belief that the private sector is the best arena (or indeed the only arena) in which the human person thrives; a belief that the government has a limited role in the economic dimension of life, specifically that of protecting private property and rights; a belief in the autonomous existence of capital as apart from labor; a belief that the means of production are best administered through private ownership; and finally the capitalist understanding that the primary ‘value’ of a product is its ‘surplus value’ rather than its ‘exchange’ or ‘use value.’ Clearly, this is a very general portrait of capitalism and would need to be greatly nuanced within each particular context.

undocumented migrant becomes one of the embodiments of this 'living labor' which is consciously and systemically occluded in all discourse. This conscious and systemic occlusion precludes any authentic encounter between the Totality and the Other. This exclusionary quality, which is endemic to this type of Capitalism (and maybe even intrinsic to Capitalism?), disallows any type of authentic love of neighbor to occur. Solidaristic Engagement makes it possible for us to break free from this hegemonic 'slumber.' In explicit terms, any United States citizen who claims to want to love, in a Christian fashion, the undocumented migrant in an authentic encounter must first break free from the stranglehold which limits their ethical horizon. Agapic Solidarity is one of the ways in which this break can occur.

Agapic Solidarity: A Method of Encounter with the *Other*

Before we begin with the case study, a very brief review of each of the moments of the method is in order. This method honors and takes seriously distinction, diversity, and difference while also taking equally seriously the common ground of human experience. The method of Agapic Solidarity is composed of three separate but interconnected 'moments.' The first moment is entitled Disruption, which indicates how we experience our coming to consciousness about the presence of the Other in our midst. The second moment, which is called Agapic Discipleship and is composed of three discreet sub-moments entitled Remembrance, Recitation, and Resurrection, is the moment in which we begin to fully engage and learn from (and about) the Other.

The final moment, entitled Emancipatory Praxis, is the moment which speaks to our return to the communities of our origin with a new more enlarged vision.

With this brief summary of Agapic Solidarity behind us, we can now move to an actual application of the method. We will walk through each of the moments of Agapic Solidarity as it pertains to the Other within the economic dimension. More specifically, we will look at the issue of the undocumented migrant of Latin American origin within the United States of America. How does one encounter and have authentic discourse with and about this particular issue? Even more specifically, how can one love the Neighbor in our midst? What specifically is the content of this love? How can one apply the method of Agapic Solidarity in order to create conditions for an appropriate ethical response? In more specific terms, how might one use the method of Agapic Solidarity to love the Neighbor, in this case the undocumented migrant from Latin America who finds himself (or herself) in the United States?

The Economic *Other*—The Undocumented Migrant in the United States

Disruption: “Do You See What I See?”

The moment of Disruption begins when one realizes that the *American way of life* has been created at the cost of massive misery for many people in Latin America. The American way of life has been produced, created, and maintained by the labor and resources of many “non” Americans.

The tin can is, after all, as much the emblem of the United States as the eagle or apple pie. But the can is not merely a “pop” symbol; it is also, if

unwittingly, a symbol of silicosis in the Siglo XX and Huanuni mines: Bolivians die with rotted lungs so that the world may consume cheap tin...Most of the tin refined in the world is consumed in the United States: according to Food and Agricultural Organizations figures, the average U.S. citizen consumes five times more meat and milk and twenty times more eggs than the inhabitant of Bolivia. And the miners are well below the national average.⁶

This disruption takes on even more force when we recall the actual lived experiences of the workers that have made *our* way of life so convenient and pleasurable.⁷ This understanding of the real cost of the “American way of life” must be fully grasped before we can begin any authentic discourse with the

⁶ *Open Veins of Latin America*, 165. The ‘tin can’ symbol was used by Andy Warhol as a way of creating an indigenous symbol of the American Way of Life.

⁷ *Open Veins of Latin America*, 166-67.

“We were deep down inside the Juan del Valle mountain. Hours earlier the siren that shrilly summoned workers of the first shift had resounded through the camp. Going from gallery to gallery inside the mine, we had passed from tropical heat to polar cold and back again to the heat, always—for hours—in the same poisoned air; humid, gas filled, dusty, smoky. Breathing it we could understand why miners lose their sense of smell and taste in a few years. They all chew coca-leaf and ash as they work, and this too is part of the annihilation process, for coca, by deadening hunger and masking fatigue, turns off the alarm system which helps the organism stay alive. But the worst of it was the dust: circles of light from the miners’ helmets danced dimly in the gloom, showing thick white curtains of deadly silica. It does not take long to do its work. The first symptoms are felt within a year, and in ten years one enters the cemetery. Late-model Swedish drills are used in the mine, but the ventilation system and work conditions have not improved over time. Up on the surface, independent workers use twelve-pound wooden sledgehammers to conquer the rock, just as they did a century ago, as well as antique pumping devices and sifters to collect the mineral. They work like dogs and are paid in pennies, but they have the advantage of fresh air over the underground workers, prisoners sentenced without appeal to death by asphyxiation...Death in the mine can also be quick and thunderous: it is enough to miscount the number of detonations or to leave a wick burning longer than it should. Or a loose rock, a *tojo*, may crash on your head. Another form of death is by bullet: St. John’s Night of 1967 was the latest bead in a long rosary of massacres. At dawn soldiers took kneeling positions on the hillsides and fired volley after volley into mining camps lit by bonfires for the fiesta. But slow, silent death is the mine’s speciality [sic]. Vomiting blood, coughing, the sensation of a leaden weight on the back and acute chest pains are the first signs that herald it. After the medical diagnosis, pilgrimages to an endless chain of bureaucrats. You are allowed three months before eviction from your house.”

migrants from Latin America. Such a disruption in our economic understanding of life comes from the transformed historical perspective that is part of engaging the Other. The different perspective allows us to reconfigure the manner in which we view the creation of that “American Dream” so central to the current discourse surrounding immigration.

One of the enduring conventions of the literature of Mexican migration to the United States is the tendency to equate European and Mexican migrations. Indeed, virtually every study of Mexican migration since the theme first appeared in the early twentieth century has interpreted that migration to be an example of various European peoples escaping harsh economic conditions particular to their homelands and moving to the United States to enjoy its benefits—in the mythical “American Dream.” While some scholars contend that Latinos may not be as successful as their European counterparts, the majority argue that Mexican migration largely replicates the critical features of European migrations.⁸

The standard understanding of undocumented migration from Latin America to the United States sees it as a continuation (albeit with some significant difference) of the ongoing immigration journey that has been part of the history of the United States since its inception.⁹ A new, and more accurate, understanding of exactly how this *American Dream* of endless opportunity and untold wealth was created leads one to view the ‘desire’ for it in a very different

⁸ *Guest Worker or Colonized Labor?: Mexican Labor Migration to the United States*, Gilbert G. Gonzalez (Paradigm Publishers: Boulder/London, 2006), 15.

⁹ Samuel Huntington speaks of this, including the distinct qualities of the new influx of immigrants, in his book. *Who Are We?: The Challenges to America's National Identity*.

light. The myth of the United States as a 'nation of immigrants' all seeking a better life is characterized by a *remembrance* and a *recitation* that allows for the citizens of the United States to discount entire historical events. Specifically, the myth discounts economic arrangements that have disrupted the lives of the Other in a way which continues to have a powerful impact on their current economic reality, as well as our own. The myth makes it possible for us in the United States to live in a state of epistemological slumber that ignores imperialistic actions of the United States. The Disruption of this myth would require that we revisit the history of Latin America and the United States in order to understand how this history continues to influence present day reality.¹⁰ Such a Remembrance is necessary not to impute guilt but rather to make possible an authentic conversation about what we (United States) are 'obligated' to do for them (undocumented Latin Americans), since such a conversation is not possible without first coming to terms with what they have done for us. We must also come to grips with what we have done and continue to do *to them*.

The disruptive 'awakening' by the Same (i.e., the United States citizen) towards our Neighbor (i.e., the undocumented migrant) at the economic level must also contain a more authentic understanding of the profound reliance on invisible labor which is still part of all people living in the United States.

Contemplating a day in Los Angeles without the labor of Latino immigrants taxes the imagination, for an array of consumer products and services would disappear (poof!) or become prohibitively expensive...Both

¹⁰ There are many, many books that deal with this issue. I cite only a few in this project.

figuratively and literally, the work performed by Latino and Latina immigrants gives Los Angeles much of its famed gloss. The Los Angeles economy, landscape, and lifestyle have been transformed in ways that rely on low-wage, Latino immigrant labor.¹¹

What Pierette Hondagneu-Sotelo states about Los Angeles could be said about virtually every large city in the United States. It is not an exaggeration to say that, in any given day, one will come in contact with some aspect of this invisible labor. The contact occurs not only in the 'public' arena of work but also at increased rates in the 'private' arena of home life.¹²

There are many implications to this labor but the first is our ability to live in a manner that we all too frequently take for granted.

The proliferation of such labor-intensive services, coupled with inflated real estate values and booming mutual funds portfolios, has given many people the *illusion of affluence* and *socioeconomic mobility*. When Angelenos, accustomed to employing a full time nanny/housekeeper for about \$150 or \$200 a week, move to Seattle or Durham, they are startled to discover how "*the cost of living that way*" quickly escalates. Only then do they realize the extent to which their affluent lifestyle and smoothly

¹¹ *Domestica: Immigrant Workers Cleaning and Caring in the Shadows of Affluence*, Pierette Hondagneu-Sotelo (University of California Press, 2001), 3.

¹² *Ibid.* Part One: "Suburban homes are increasingly replacing inner-city factories as the places of economic incorporation for new immigrants. While leafy streets and suburban homes are easier on the eyes than poorly lit sweatshops, it takes a lot of sweat to produce and maintain carefully groomed lawns, homes and children...In the United States and elsewhere, the "new economy" not only runs on high-tech information services but also depends on the reorganization of how cleaning and care work are performed"

running household depended on one Latina immigrant woman.¹³ (Italics added)

This *lifestyle* is the very lifestyle that must be disrupted in order to begin a process of engagement with the Other. A disrupted life is rooted in the acknowledgement that our quotidian existence is deeply connected with, and indebted to, the Other. Our point of departure would no longer be what we are obligated to do for them but, rather, how we can forge a truly just relationship in light of what they have done and continue to do for us. It would also ask how we can forge a just relationship in light of what we have done too them.

This disruption demands, in turn, that we become loving disciples of the history and stories of the Other. In doing so, the disruption leads to the second moment of Agapic Solidarity, the moment of Agapic Discipleship.

Agapic Discipleship: Submitting to the Tutelage of the Other

In this second moment we become disciples of the Other. A disciple is someone who 'is a pupil or 'an adherent of the doctrines of another.'¹⁴ The disciple not only learns from but also adheres to the Other. To adhere is 'to stay attached; stick fast; cleave; cling...to hold closely or firmly...to be devoted in support or allegiance; be attached as a follower or upholder'¹⁵ In Agapic Discipleship we connect all our ethical questions, answers and concerns with those of our Neighbor. This would mean that we would not be able to speak of that which is 'good,' 'right,' 'just,' or even 'natural,' without first consulting the

¹³ Ibid., 4.

¹⁴ <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/Disciple>

¹⁵ Ibid.

reality of the Other. This discipleship 'awakens' (in the Levinasian sense) ourselves to how our realities are already deeply connected. This moment entails the tripartite process of remembrance, recitation, and resurrection. Each of the 'sub-moments' is inseparable but not identical, and as such must be treated in a discreet manner.

Remembrance

One way that capitalism occludes the sources of wealth and poverty is through the systemic cultivation of 'forgetfulness' that covers (*ocubrir*) the Other. Specifically, this forgetfulness unfolds in a dialectical fashion. The first strand of this forgetfulness is the role played by Latin America in general, and Mexico specifically in the creation of wealth for the United States. The second strand is the way in which this very same history concurrently produced poverty for the Other. This dialectical vision is central to fully grasp the one history which is being 'remembered' from the perspective of the Other.¹⁶ Remembrance is, among many things, a process of 'dis'-covering (*descubrir*) the Other, especially this occluded history. We must acknowledge that this history is occluded from most United States citizens but is, at the same time, all too familiar to the Other. Although there are many examples of how this dialectical historical movement of wealth creation/poverty creation has worked out between the United States and Latin America we will use only one event as an exemplar. The historical event which we will use as a way of understanding how Remembrance will reconfigure

¹⁶ This insight is best expressed in the dictum of Walter Benjamin that "Every great work of civilization is at the same time a work of barbarism."

our understanding of the economic Other is the so-called “Mexican/American War”¹⁷ and more specifically, the ensuing peace treaty.¹⁸

This example has two facets and these demand some clarification. The history of the relationship between Mexico and the United States, like all histories between countries, is unique unto itself. At the same time, the interaction between these two countries has features which are all too common from the perspective of many in Latin America. We will see that this juxtaposition is played out throughout much of the history of U.S./Latin America relations.

The unique interaction has to do with the particulars of how much of the Mexican country is now part of the United States. In this sense we can say that the vast majority of the ‘power’ and economic wealth of the United States has been uniquely *contributed* by (this is a benign term; more aptly it might be spoken of as having been forcibly wrested from) the people of Mexico. This is not only a contemporary reality as noted above in the *Disruption* moment, but also a fact of history. The feature which this Remembrance moment will try to contradict is the almost pathological denial by many in the United States of the history of interaction between the United States and all of Latin-America. One of the areas in which this is especially true is the way in which the United States sees itself as a land in which the Law is so central to our identity.¹⁹

¹⁷ It is important to note that even to speak of it as a ‘war’ is to betray a certain bias in the remembrance of the event. It is clear that for many historians this was more precisely a case of invasion.

¹⁸ There are now many wonderful histories of Latin America that are more authentic and entail viewing history from the perspective of the Other.

¹⁹ *Who Are We?* Samuel Huntington sees this respect for law as a central feature of the U.S. character.

The use of this particular historical period is important because it holds a special place within the contemporary discourse of ‘undocumented migrants’ in the United States. One of the common complaints lodged against undocumented migrants is that they seem to show an utter contempt for ‘the law’ and this is frequently cited as the reason for why they should not be treated with respect or care. In fact it is not uncommon to speak of the undocumented migrant as ‘illegal.’ This is an acceptable position only if one is willing to ‘bracket off’ entire decades of United States history. This is not merely a matter of being *politically correct*. It is important to understand that for many Mexican people (and their descendents) as well as many United States citizens²⁰ their lived experience is that of a country (in this case, the United States) and its citizens who have shown utter contempt for all law. Our (undocumented migrant and more generally Latin American) Neighbor’s remembrance is of a United States and its citizens practicing a ‘selective’ remembrance that borders on the pathological.

Mexican/U.S. History from the eyes of the Other: The “Real” Illegal Immigrants:

It is not uncommon for us in the United States to speak of ‘illegal immigration’ as a contemporary phenomenon. The reality is that migration, both legal and illegal, has been a part of this geographical area for many years. A central feature of Remembrance is that it is the history of the Other. It is not ‘our’ history with the Other, but rather their history, and so any remembrance of ‘illegal

²⁰ A wonderful summary of the various United States ‘voices’ of resistance to this invasion may be found in the work of Howard Zinn, *A People’s History of the United States*.

immigration' in this continent must begin not with our historical horizon but rather theirs. There are many places we might begin for the purposes of this project, but because so much of the focus of illegal immigration is on the Mexican *illegal immigrant* we will begin with an analysis of U.S. economic development in the early nineteenth century. "In the early 1800s many Anglos entered Texas as economic refugees from the depression of 1819."²¹ These immigrants were welcomed with open arms by the Mexican government because the Mexican government wanted that part of Mexico to become more densely populated. It is important to understand that this is not simply a case of the Americans being 'greedy' expansionists or the Mexican government being 'friendly.' As is typical, both parties had a multitude of motives for their conduct.

Settlers agreed to obey the conditions set by the Mexican government—that all immigrants be Catholics and that they take an oath of allegiance to Mexico. However, Anglo-Americans became resentful when Mexico tried to enforce the agreements. Mexico, in turn, became increasingly alarmed at the flood of immigrants from the U.S.²²

What is important to note is how quickly these 'law abiding' Americans ignored the Mexican laws. It is easy to see why this contempt for national laws seems to be easily (and conveniently) forgotten among current citizens of

²¹ *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*, Rudolfo Acuna (New York: Harper Collins, 1988), 7.
²² *Ibid.* 7.

America. It is not easily forgotten among many Mexicans.²³ This ongoing tension eventually precipitated a war between the two countries.²⁴ The sources of the tension were manifold.²⁵ The ensuing military invasion on the part of the United States to protect these *illegal immigrants* ended with a treaty that would have remarkable implications for the economic state of both countries. These implications are still central to understanding the economic Other in general and the Mexican undocumented migrant in particular.

The Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo and the Occlusion of History:

On February 2, 1848 the Mexican government ratified the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. This treaty would end open hostilities between the United States and Mexico. It was a treaty that, from the outset, was riddled with problems.²⁶

During the treaty talks Mexican negotiators, concerned about Mexicans left behind, expressed great reservations about these people being forced to “merge or blend” into Anglo-American culture. They protested the

²³ This is particularly troubling when you have a scholar on the level of Samuel Huntington speak of the American ethos as being characterized for a ‘respect for the law.’ This is seen as a travesty among many people who have a more accurate ‘remembrance.’

²⁴ Obviously what is seen by the United States as a ‘war’ is seen by the majority of Mexicans (and Latin Americans) as an ‘invasion’ by the United States. It is central to any engagement to learn the history of this time period. This disruption would be most experienced in the Cultural Dimension...it would challenge the privilege of enunciation and the epistemic privilege that are part of ‘colonial wound.’

²⁵ Chapter 2 of *Race and Class in the Southwest: A Theory of Racial Inequality* by Mario Barrera gives a wonderful summary of each of the motives for the ‘conquest.’

²⁶ For a more detailed account of the history of this document, see Rudolfo Acuna’s *Occupied America*.

exclusion of provisions that protected American citizens' rights, land titles, and religion. They wanted to protect their rights by treaty.²⁷

There were many articles in the treaty that allowed for protection for those Mexican people who chose to stay behind.

Article IX of the treaty guaranteed Mexicans “the enjoyment of all the rights of citizens of the United States according to the principles of the Constitution; and in the meantime shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property, and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction.”²⁸

Article X had ‘comprehensive guarantees’ which would protect “all prior and pending titles of property of every description.” In the final draft of the treaty this Article was omitted and the Mexican government protested. To reassure the Mexican government of no ill intent by this deletion the United States drafted a “Statement of Protocol” which read:

The American government by suppressing the Xth article of the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo did not in any way intend to annul the grants of lands made by Mexico in the ceded territories. These grants...preserve the legal value which they may possess, and the grantees may cause their legitimate (titles) to be acknowledged before the American tribunals.

Comformable to the law of the United States, legitimate titles to every description of property, personal and real, existing in the ceded

²⁷ *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos*, 19.

²⁸ *Ibid.* 19.

territories, are those which were legitimate titles under the Mexican law of California and New Mexico up to the 13th of May, 1846, and in Texas up to the 2nd of March 1836.²⁹

This good faith assumption made on the part of the Mexican Congress made it possible for the Treaty to be accepted by both parties. Further assurances were also granted: “The Statement of Protocol was strengthened by Articles VIII and IX, which guaranteed Mexican rights of property and protection under the law. In addition, court decisions have generally interpreted the treaty as protecting land titles and water rights.”³⁰ In time, “nearly every one of the obligations discussed above was to be violated.”³¹ Historian Leonard Pitt notes that many means—some legal and some illegal-- were used to steal land from Mexicans:

No set pattern emerges in these land transformations, but the eroded claims of the original claimants washed away steadily and flowed into the hands of the newcomers—financiers, railroad developers, town promoters, cooperative colonizers, and irrigation companies.³²

Pitt is not the only historian who notes this transference of rights, property, and privilege, nor was this an exclusively Californian phenomenon. What Pitt

²⁹ Ibid. 20. Acuna states; “Considering the Mexican opposition to the treaty, it is doubtful whether the Mexican Congress would have ratified the treaty without this clarification. The vote was close.”

³⁰ Ibid. 20.

³¹ *Occupied America*, 20.

³² *The Decline of the Californios*, Leonard Pitt (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970), 275.

shows as occurring in California was also occurring in Texas and throughout the Southwest.

There is some truth that many Mexican landowners, especially the small ones, were robbed in south Texas by force, intimidation, or chicanery. But what is usually ignored is the fact that the hacendado class, as a class, was stripped of property perfectly legally, according to the highest traditions of U.S. law.³³

A Mexican diplomat who commented after the ratification articulated this growing disappointment:

Our race, our unfortunate people will have to wander in search of hospitality in a strange land, only to be ejected later. Descendents of the Indians that we are, the North Americans hate us, their spokesmen depreciate us, even if they recognize the justice of our cause, and they consider us unworthy to form with them one nation and one society, they clearly manifest that their future expansion begins with the territory that they have take from us and pushing [sic] aside our citizens who inhabit the land.³⁴

The penetration of the United States into the various parts of the Southwest resulted in an astounding increase in wealth on the part of United States. This wealth was evidenced in numerous aspects of life, among them, in agriculture, railroads, mining, and finally slavery.

³³ *Lone Star: A History of Texas and the Texans*, T. R. Fehrenbacher (New York: Macmillan, 1968), 510.

³⁴ *Ibid.* 20.

The agricultural component took many forms; some of them are the beautiful lands of California which created (and continue to create) remarkable wealth through the production of fruits and vegetables. Texan cotton was also an incredible source of wealth for the new Republic. Inseparable from but not identical to this enterprise was the need for slave labor to pick cotton. This became increasingly important given the rising industrial demands that the new technology (read: Cotton Gin) generated. When Mexico outlawed slavery, the class conflicts became even more pronounced. Finally, there was the shepherding on the lands of New Mexico. This shepherding land was held in 'Common' under Mexican law, so it could not be used for private gain (which was necessary for the needs of the new capitalist class).³⁵ The displacement of many small farmers all over the Southwest the U.S. deemed necessary so that the land could be used for many other 'ventures.' Central among them was the creation of the nascent railroad system.

Virtually all the railroad that was laid down in the Southwest and all the natural resources that became part of the United States came from a form of 'thievery.'³⁶ The economic interests of some in the United States became

³⁵ Much of this information is gleaned from various sources including: *Race and Class in the Southwest: A Theory of Racial Inequality* by Mario Barrera; *Occupied America: A History of Chicanos* by Rudolfo Acuna; *A People's History of the United States* by Howard Zinn; *Empire's Workshop* by Greg Grandin; and *Guest Workers or Colonized Labor: Mexican Labor Migration to the United States* by Gilbert G. Gonzalez.

³⁶ *Empire's Workshop*, 20. Most of the fortune building was done legally, with the collaboration of the government and the courts. Sometimes the collaboration had to be paid for. Thomas Edison promised New Jersey politicians \$1000 each in return for favorable legislation. Daniel Drew and Jay Gould spent \$1 million to bribe the New York legislature to legalize their issue of \$8 million in "watered stock" (stock not representing real value) on the Erie Railroad... The first transcontinental railroad was built with blood, sweat, politics and thievery, out of the meeting of the Union Pacific and Central Pacific railroads. The Central Pacific started on

intimately connected with an expansionist mindset. This expansionist mindset included almost all of Central and South America, along with other parts of the hemisphere.³⁷

Another interesting aspect of this expansionist history is not only how it demonstrated a very fundamental disregard for the 'law of the land' (albeit, in many cases, the law of the Other) but also the astounding amount of government 'aid' that was given to the newly developing wealthy class.³⁸ This moment of remembrance has in its own way a profoundly ironic character when we speak of how the 'illegals' are draining the system given all of the 'help' they are receiving from the United States government. Though common, this myth is fallacious at

the West Coast going east; it spent \$200,000 in Washington on bribes to get 9 million acres of free land and \$24 million in bonds, and paid \$79 million, an overpayment of \$36 million to a construction company which really was its own. The construction was done by three thousand Irish and ten thousand Chinese, over a period of four years, working for one or two dollars a day.

³⁷ Ibid. "By the mid-nineteenth century, the United States had incorporated nearly half of Mexico into its territory. It had sent warships into Latin America ports a staggering 5,980 times between 1869 and 1897 to protect American commercial interests and, increasingly, to flex its muscles to Europe. In 1893, the United States quietly backed both a revolution in Hawaii instigated by American sugar barons that eventually led to the annexation of those islands and, with more bluster, a counterrevolution in Brazil, when at the behest of Standard Oil's William Rockefeller, Washington man-o'-wars steaming into Rio de Janeiro's harbor to defeat rebels believed to be hostile to U. S. economic [read Capitalist] interests. In 1898, the United States took Puerto Rico and the Philippines as colonies and Cuba as a protectorate and established a series of coaling stations and naval bases throughout the Caribbean. In 1903, Theodore Roosevelt teamed up with J. P. Morgan to shave the province of Panama off of Colombia, turning the new nation into an important global transit route and, as the eventual home of Southcom headquarters, the forecandle of America's hemispheric might...Over the course of the next thirty years, U.S. troops invaded Caribbean nations at least thirty-four times, occupied Honduras, Mexico, Guatemala, and Costa Rica for short periods, and remained in Haiti, Cuba, Nicaragua, Panama, and the Dominican Republic for longer stays. Military campaigns in the Caribbean and Central America during these decades not only gave shape to the command and bureaucratic structure of the American's modern army (what eventually became known as the Joint Chiefs of Staff, for example, was put into place soon after the 1898 Spanish-American War) but allowed soldiers to test their prowess, to sharpen their senses and skills for larger battles to come in Europe and Asia."

³⁸ An extraordinary examination of this aspect of United States history can be found in *Passionate Declarations: Essays on War and Justice* by Howard Zinn.

many levels.³⁹ The point is not merely to note the ‘bad behavior’ of the United States or the ‘good behavior’ of the Latin American countries. To create a Manichean worldview filled with characters or communities that are “all good” or “all bad” is not to see the complexity of the historical reality. None of these actions could have taken place without the collaboration of communities in both the United States and Latin America. What is of equal importance in this moment of remembrance is that there was much resistance to this imperialist action and subsequent injustices from within the United States as well as Mexico.⁴⁰ This is also part of the remembrance that the Other can share with us.

Recitation

In the recitation stage we begin to rehearse the ‘stories’ of the Other. We learn to articulate their significant moments of remembrance. The profound effect of this part of Agapic Discipleship is that it dislodges us from our place of privilege. This is especially true in terms of the two privileges which were discussed earlier; the privilege of enunciation, and the epistemic privilege. As we ‘voice’ our grasp of the remembrance of the Other (under their watchful tutelage) we once again affirm, in dialectical fashion, how we are “not” the Other (**it is their remembrances we are articulating**) and concurrently what we have in common. What we create, and awaken to, is that our lives and the lives of the Other are intimately intertwined. They have been intertwined for much longer

³⁹ Sojourners Magazine has done some wonderful work in this area.

⁴⁰ There are many examples of resistance to imperialist goals of the United States from within the United States. Some can be found in the writings of the Henry David Thoreau, Mark Twain, and the other is the interesting history of San Patricio (St. Patrick’s) Battalion. In more recent times we might hear of the heroic efforts of Benjamin Yellin M.D or Henry P. Anderson and his struggle against the University of California and the ruling elite in the agribusiness industry.

then we sometimes wish to acknowledge and in ways that both surprise and disturb us. With this new knowledge we can begin to create a different reality that allows both the United States and Undocumented Migrants to inhabit a different world. We can begin to reconfigure the world of 'us' and 'them' in new terms.⁴¹

It is important to recall that this expansionist program of the United States was replicated beyond Mexico⁴² and, as such, influenced other migrations from Latin America. This pattern continues into our current economic reality. The other aspect of this new recitation is that we can begin to critically interrogate any simplistic version which sees this reality in the categories of "evil U.S' and 'virtuous Latin America', or even more commonly in today's discourse "evil" immigrants who do not respect the law and 'virtuous' law-abiding citizens of the United States. We can see both the imperialistic motives of some in the United States and the accommodation practiced by some members within the community of the Other. In this way, we cultivate further the vision so central to authentic connection and engagement, the vision of distinction. We are not the other; but we are connected. In the economic sphere, this will be manifested

⁴¹ *Race and Class in the Southwest: A Theory of Racial Inequality*, p. 29.

"One of the more interesting aspects of this process stands out clearly in the Santa Fe Ring, which was able to exercise power effectively because of the alliances it forged with the wealthy Hispano elite, the *ricos* (McWilliams, 948, p. 122; Knowlton, 1967, p. 5; Larson, 1968, p. 144). In effect there was an interethnic class alliance, which however, was dominated by the Anglos. Actually, such an alliance had long been in existence. Brayer has described the manner in which Cornelio Vigil and Ceran St. Vrain, prominent residents in Taos, combined to petition Governor Armijo for a substantial land grant in 1843. The grant was made in that same year. Within two months, the two recipients of the grant had deeded a one-sixth interest to Armijo, to Donanciano Vigil (Armijo's territorial secretary), and to Charles Bent and Eugene Leitensdorfer, important merchants and traders (Brayer, 1974, pp.127-29)."

⁴² One of the most incredible works documenting this history can be found in *Open Veins of Latin America: Five Centuries of the Pillage of a Continent* by Eduardo Galeano.

especially in our understanding of the various inter-connected communities beyond the traditional nation-states.

This recitation version does not consist in merely replacing a nation-state or racial 'lens' with one that privileges class interest (though it does place a certain privilege to this heretofore neglected understanding). The new understanding allows for a more complicated, 'thicker', and more accurate telling of the history of the Other (from the perspective of the Other), and also of our own history. We begin to see that both the Other and Ourselves have members of our respective countries who resisted and continue to resist the injustice being done to the Other.⁴³

The moment of recitation includes not only a grasp of the history of the Other but also some understanding of the present reality of the undocumented migrant.⁴⁴ This contemporary understanding would allow one to live the experience encapsulated in the phrase used frequently by the Zapatista

⁴³ There are many examples of this resistance but one that is particularly powerful is found in *A People's History of the United States* by Howard Zinn, 158.

"Posters appealed for volunteers in Massachusetts: "Men of old Essex! Men of Newbury! Rally around the bold, gallant and lion hearted Cushing. He will lead you to victory and to glory!" The promised pay of \$7 to \$10 a month, and spoke of a federal bounty of \$24 and 160 acres of land. But one young man wrote anonymously to the Cambridge Chronicle:

"Neither have I the least idea of "joining" you, or in any way assisting the unjust war waging against Mexico. I have no wish to participate in such "glorious" butcheries of women and children as were displayed in the capture of Monterey, etc. Neither have I any desire to place myself under the dictation of a petty military tyrant, to every caprice of whose I will I must yield implicit obedience. No sir-ee! As long as I can work, beg, or go to the poor house, I won't go to Mexico, to be lodged on the damp ground, half starved, half roasted, bitten by mosquitoes and centipedes, stung by scorpions and tarantula –marched, drilled, and flogged, and then stuck up to be shot at, for eight dollars a month and putrid rations. Well, I won't...Human butchery has had its day...And the time is rapidly approaching when the professional soldier will be placed on the same level as a bandit, the Bedouin, and the Thug."

⁴⁴ There are many wonderful documentaries and examples of literature which give us a 'peek' into the world of the immigrant. Two documentaries which are excellent in portraying this experience are *El Norte* and *Alambrista*. There are others which also show some of the imperialist actions of U.S. foreign policy in Latin America. The Panama Deception is an excellent example of this.

movement, that of a 'world where many worlds co-exist.' Our experience of this new world is that of living a new life. This new life would, with some accuracy, be called a life of Resurrection.

Resurrection

Resurrection implies new life, a life in continuity with the past that embraces a new, expanded reality. But this Resurrected life also embraces a radical discontinuity. This new life has both a quantitative and qualitative element. The quantitative element is that it now must always include the Other. The qualitative element is that we can no longer identify ourselves, in the same manner, with our previous communities. In this 'moment' of agapic discipleship we experience both continuity with our previous economic reality and a radical discontinuity. However, our inability to occlude the real and imperative element of human labor of the Other, in this case the undocumented migrant, brings to our life a radical discontinuity. In time, this new life will affect our patterns of production and consumption; this change appears as a byproduct of remembrance and recitation. We will continue to live in the United States, though in a United States intimately connected to the world of the Other, now understood and known as a fully human person within the economic order—as more than the invisible labor of a Capitalistic regime that we have euphemistically termed 'The American Way of Life.' The economic dimension of our life has now been enlarged to include the economic life of the Other. This economic dimension has both a temporal aspect and a spatial aspect.

The Temporal Aspect:

The temporal aspect allows us to see that much of what allowed (and continues to allow) the United States to have a hegemonic status in the world economy is the direct result of massive violent, coercive, and illegal activity. Acknowledging this would completely reframe the responsibility that the United States has to share *‘their’* current wealth with Latin America in particular and the world in general. This reconfiguring would have implications at every level of society.⁴⁵

The Spatial Aspect:

The spatial aspect would allow us to see how the Other has been an important part of our economic reality, in terms of the space we have used and continue to use (*their space*). In this sense the ‘spatial’ dimension of migrants cannot just be reduced to any contemporary context which obfuscates and obliterates entire historical epochs for the ‘convenience’ of United States discourse on undocumented migration. It can no longer be assumed that the present ‘space’ occupied by the United States came down ‘ready made’ from some Deity which had a *Manifest Destiny* design for its people. We must live in a

⁴⁵ One evening after a night out with some friends I went to my local bank to take money out of my account. It was very late at night and as I pulled money out of the ATM I noticed there were some people in the bank. I thought it a bit strange that people were in the bank at this hour, I then realized it was the cleaning crew. These were the people that cleaned the bank (vacuuming, emptying trash cans etc.). I cannot say for sure if any of them were ‘undocumented’ but I did realize that throughout all of the United States there are many people who do this type of work; and some are undocumented. It also occurred to me that this was the ‘invisible labor’ that is so much a part of our lives as United States citizens. It is important to note here that I was in a very wealthy area of town. It is highly probable that many of the clients of this bank would not see the people cleaning the bank in their quotidian existence. In a Resurrected existence we can no longer pretend that our capacity to create wealth is, in great part, made possible by the ‘invisible labor’ of the Other. It is also ironic that I was in a city named **San Francisco** after a man who quite explicitly turned his back on his inherited wealth. In my Resurrected existence, I can no longer speak of the ‘riches’ of the United States without acknowledging the history of exploitation that was part and parcel of its creation.

world where the 'place' occupied by the United States of America is brought into a very different perspective.

Emancipatory Praxis: From Migrant to Pilgrim

In its most basic form, the final moment of Agapic Solidarity, Emancipatory Praxis, entails a return to our communities of origin, so that we can share with our community our newly resurrected existence that has been created through our period of agapic discipleship. We return to our various United States 'audiences' in order to speak with the new knowledge gained from going through the previous 'moments' of Agapic Solidarity.

This reverse evangelization requires, however, that we maintain contact with the Other. Although we are finished, in some form, with the second 'moment' of Agapic Discipleship, we cannot return to our parochial view of the world; our work is not done. The need for ongoing *metanoia* is always part of the ethical journey. Metz speaks to this need of being in ongoing contact with the Other when he states; "We must act and do theology while touching victims."⁴⁶ Likewise, we must always be sensitive to the danger of speaking 'for' the Other in a manner that evacuates their agency. We must honor the 'distinction principle' that is so central to Agapic Solidarity. *No matter how close we get to the Other we will never be the Other.* No matter how large our world becomes in this new resurrected reality, we will never fully inhabit the world of the Other. This is not because we are inadequate, defective, or morally inept. Rather, it is because we are never 'omniscient' about any aspect of reality, including the world of the

⁴⁶ *Love's Strategy*, "Risking Memory", 8.

Other, and we will never fully grasp the Other in his/her totality.⁴⁷ This distinction is important because it will allow us to love the Other as Other without subsuming them into any Totality. Even our noblest aspirations could become oppressive:

The ethos of liberation is structured around an axis that is not compassion (as for Schopenhauer) or sympathy (as for Scheler)—given that both are positions of functional parts toward other parts (to suffer-with one's equal)—but commiseration: placing oneself with (*cum*) someone in misery (*miser*). The ethos of liberation is other-directed pulsion or metaphysical justice; it is love of the other as other, as exteriority; love of the oppressed—not, however, as oppressed but as subject of exteriority. The traumatic condition of the human being endowed with freedom, the other reduced to being an instrument in a system [or Dimension] is rightly called misery. To discover the other as other and place-oneself-together-with that person's misery, to experience as one's own the contradiction between being free and having to endure slavery, being distinct and someone and at the same time only a different internal part; to hurt from the pain of this cleavage is the first attitude of the ethos of liberation. It is not friendship or fellowship (among equals) but love of the oppressed because of their real dignity as exteriority.⁴⁸

This love of the Other is predicated upon seeing the Other as Other. This is one of the more radical aspects of Agapic Solidarity because it seeks to

⁴⁷ "Now we see but a poor reflection as in a mirror; then we shall see fact to face. Now I know in part; then I shall know fully, even as I am fully known" (1 Corinthians 13:12).

⁴⁸ *Philosophy of Liberation*, 64-65.

subvert the current discourse of love. The current understanding of love imagines love as moving towards some 'abstract' notion of *Universal Oneness*. Instead, we acknowledge that authentic Love ends with a clear sense of Distinction. Such an understanding of love is much more Trinitarian in structure, acknowledging the difference within the various communities.

In this last moment we ask the question, "What will Emancipatory Praxis look like with respect to the undocumented migrant as 'living labor'"? Because this moment requires that we know the specific context of our praxis, we are unable to give a definitive answer that would do justice to all of the unique conditions of every situation. Simply put, we can never give a 'one size fits all' answer to the question of what Emancipatory Praxis will look like or what love of neighbor looks like. We can only give a broad outline or approximation that may help to create a trajectory or direction for our praxis. The specifics would be contingent on which 'audience' is being addressed. Emancipatory Praxis is always concrete and particular:

If there is such a virtue, we must know how to distinguish it from the vices masquerading as virtues in the prevailing totality. The ethos of liberation is not just the habit of repeating the same thing. On the contrary, it is an aptitude or capacity, become character, for innovation and creation. Inasmuch as it emerges from serving the other (2.6.7.3), and the other is always a concrete person in a unique situation of oppression and

exteriority; only someone who is responsible and faithful to someone else's uniqueness can be a liberator.⁴⁹

Conscious of how all Emancipatory Praxis is configured and implemented based on context, we now understand how we can never give a full description of what this would look like 'in action.' What we can do, as Catholics, is to suggest at least three arenas in which we might engage in Emancipatory Praxis. I believe the work of David Tracy enables one way to speak of how and where Emancipatory Praxis would occur can be found. Tracy asserts that all theologians, and I would argue all people of faith, must be conscious of addressing three communities: Academy, Church, and Society. I believe that we can use this three audience paradigm to help us discern the areas in which Emancipatory Praxis would occur.

Academy

In the academy we must be cognizant of surfacing the invisible labor found within the academy. This ought to be done at every level of the institution; curricular, administrative, faculty and staff training, even the manner in which the 'business' of the school is conducted. What is especially important here is to ask ourselves whose Remembrance and Recitation are we privileging? This would be especially important in the broad area of the Humanities (Economics, Sociology, Political Science etc.). I would like to give just two examples. The first is in the arena of history I believe that we should privilege in a particular way the period of colonialism (and neo-colonialism) from the perspectives of its 'victims.'

⁴⁹ Ibid., 64.

This should include hearing their voices, visions, perspective of those most deeply impacted by colonialist patterns. We need to move away from thinking that there is 'a' U.S. history and then that there is concurrently a history of U.S. colonialism. Each country has periods and people who were engaged in aspects of exploitation of the Other and those that resisted this exploitation. I think we should also privilege the voices among our own (What we have termed the Same or the Totality) that resisted the seduction of power; these would be what Dussel calls the Prophets.⁵⁰ A second example is to view all economic development from within a World Systems perspective.⁵¹ This would allow us to have a more accurate understanding of capitalism and specifically a more accurate read on its true benefits and costs. As mentioned above this is not to be done in a way which replicates a binary reality that reverses the roles of the exploiter and the exploited but rather seeks to show the multi-layered quality to all relationships.

Church

In the church we must ask ourselves: Are we in ongoing, intimate contact with the 'victims' of Capitalism in general and the undocumented migrant humans that make up the 'invisible labor' matrix of our collective existence? In this area it is especially important that we not fall into the familiar pattern of what we can do for 'them' but rather fully live with the implications of living with all they have done for us. In more simplistic terms we move from Charity to Justice.

⁵⁰ *Ethics and Community*, chapter 9.

⁵¹ There are many authors who could be used: Immanuel Wallerstein, Enrique Dussel, Walter Mignolo, Samir Amin, Arundathi Roy, Tariq Ali, and Greg Grandin among others mentioned in this project.

In parallel fashion, Metz speaks of the Catholic Church coming to grips with the reality not of being a Church which has a presence in the Third World but rather of being a Third World Church. This shift must be accounted for in the economic dimension. I believe that this shift will be as profound as the shift which occurred when the church became a Vatican II church. In the terms of this project we are not longer a church who must engage the Other but rather a Church of Others.⁵²

Society

In society we must be willing to reconfigure the discussion on the undocumented migrant away from an ahistorical narrative, which simply perpetuates the colonial wound in general, and the enunciatory and epistemic privileges spoken of earlier in particular. We must be willing to subvert these privileges and allow Emancipatory Praxis to eventually dislodge and discard these privileges. This will entail speaking from a perspective that is not popular in much of the common discourse on this subject.⁵³

⁵² Anselm Min does a beautiful explication of how we must now live in a world in which we are all “others” to some communities. Hence for him we must engage in ‘Solidarity of Others’ not merely with Others.

⁵³ Along with many authors mentioned earlier I would add that the entire history of U.S. Imperialism is never spoken of within ‘popular’ discourse. I mean specifically in relation to the issue of undocumented migration in what is now the United States. We speak of ‘illegal’ migration with a very skewed historical understanding. We also speak of the wealth of the United States as though it ‘fell from the sky.’ This creates an incomplete understanding of the issue of migration in the United States. It intentionally occludes the place of the Other within the economic dimension. This is precisely what the method of Agapic Solidarity is attempting to subvert.

Conclusion: Making the Invisible Visible....New Eyes and New Ears

The hearts of these people have no feeling. They do not hear well with their ears. And they have shut their eyes. They do not want to see with their eyes. They do not want to hear with their ears. They do not want to understand in their hearts. They do not want to turn to me. If they did turn, I would heal them."

¹⁶God is blessing your eyes because they see. God is blessing your ears because they hear.

¹⁷I tell you the truth. Many prophets and good men wanted to see what you see, but they did not see them. They wanted to hear what you hear, but they did not hear them. (Matthew 13:15-17)⁵⁴

We can speak of the gift of Faith as granting us the capacity to see and hear the Other. This is a gift which should not be taken for granted, but rather must be cultivated. It is my belief that we are called, as a people, to see the Other in our midst, specifically to awaken to the Other in our midst through all dimensions of our humanity. This would include the economic.

In discussing the economic dimension of life we spoke of how capitalism in its present form occludes the invisible labor which creates our material existence. In doing this it systemically occludes the bearer of that labor. In the

⁵⁴www.biblegateway.com/

discourse of the Undocumented Migrant in the United States this has a specific configuration. I believe that Solidaristic Engagement allows us to see and hear the Other, including the invisible labor which has always been, and continues to be, a part of the United States. This encounter with historical reality is an *a priori* demand that must be met before any authentic claim to 'love of neighbor' is properly fulfilled.

In discussing a volatile issue such as undocumented migrants in the United States of America it is easy to move in one of two directions. The first is to speak of the incommensurability of the two communities involved; the United States of America and the Latin American Migrant. This incommensurability can be seen as so insurmountable that all attempts at creating any form of unity or commonality between them seems futile. This perspective is made manifest in such movements as the building of the fence between United States and Mexico. It is also seen in the rise of vigilante groups at the border. This is not seeing the Other, but rather, projecting our worst fears and bigoted perceptions onto the Other. It also prevents us from seeing how many people in both countries economically benefit from fanning the flames of this ignorance and fear. It may also show up in extreme forms of overly *essentialized* multi-cultural discourses that reify the concept of culture in celebration. The second mistaken direction is to frame the discourse in terms of seeing us all as being *in the same boat*. This perspective obscures the manner in which the construction of 'the boat' has both historical roots and present day implications. This is seen in many well-meaning,

but misguided programs and documents.⁵⁵ This does not allow us to see the Other but only a projection of our 'past' as being the past of the Other. What Solidaristic Engagement demands is that we fully 'see and hear' the Other, for it is only like this that we can begin to have a true encounter with the other, which in turn allows us the possibility of loving the Other. This Love, like all authentic Christian Love (Agape), will call us to surrender all privilege and power, including economic power. We are called to live with this Cross precisely because we know that it is only through living the pain of Good Friday that will we arrive, with the Other, at the Glory of Easter Sunday.

⁵⁵ One that comes to mind is the Bishops' Encyclical, "Strangers No More." The document seeks to create a meta-narrative that shows how much we have in common. While this is noble and has its place it can also, inadvertently, negate the particular and varied historical details of the people involved in the United States; to speak of an African Slave, an Indigenous person, a Chinese Coolie, a Mexican farmer in the Southwest, and a Anglo who came invited by Mexico to certain parts of the United States all as 'immigrants' is to create a similarity of experience that does violence to the particulars of each community.