

Relocating Sinai in Los Andes

Post-colonial specificity toward a Subaltern / Liberationist Judaism

By Santiago H. Slabodsky*

Has post 1492-1942 white Judaism, Emmanuel Levinas's exterior other, become a crucial and ineludible component of the new 21st century colonial epistemology of knowledge?¹

In 1973, after returning from his scholarly journey in Europe and yet disturbed by his personal encounter, only two years before in Paris, with one of the most provocative Jewish intellectuals of the 20th century, the Mexican-Argentinean Enrique Dussel reflected, "Levinas... never has thought that *the other* in history would be the Indian, the African or the Asiatic American."² Along with a statement that eventually became a fundamental turning point not only in liberation philosophy, but also in the non-Jewish world deconstruction of Levinas' dialogical formulation, a question remained, and has not yet been raised: Have Jewish radical thinkers confronted the disturbing fact that one of their most brilliant representatives, first, reproduces, the colonial and euro/ego-centric project that oppressed the same Jews, between 1492 and 1942 (e.g. between the expulsion and the extermination) and, second, proposes the incorporation of Judaism into it?³

Furthermore, to what degree is this inability to understand what we will call the non-acknowledged "other others" (the outsiders) in Dussel's Levinas related to the reproduction of, first, Western World post-Holocaust philo-Semitism and philo-Zionism, and second the Jewish colonialism and empowerment after 1945?⁴ Is this impossibility to embrace the "other others" part of an epistemological project that, because of Dussel's "false dialogic method," forbids Jews to dialogue, in the Middle East, with "the Palestinian other," in North America with "the Afro-American or Latino other," in Latin American, with "the peasant or native other," and in Europe, with "the Arab or Magrebi immigrant other"? Is, on the one hand, Levinas, perhaps in spite of himself, recognizing that Jews became, finally and after a process of fifty years, white and western⁵ or on the

* Doctoral Fellow of the Center for American and Jewish Studies and the program of Religion, Politics and Society at Baylor University, MA in Religion and Modernity from Duke University (2002), Licenciado in Political Theory from the University of Buenos Aires (2000), and BA in Jewish Philosophy from the Latin American Rabbinical Seminary/Hebrew University of Jerusalem (1999.)

other hand, Dussel is, along with Rabbi Leon Klenicki, no more than an “anti-Semitic Christian?”⁶

These questions, perhaps crucial in deconstructing the network built to support the post-Holocaust epistemology of knowledge, were not raised, in general, by contemporary Jewish thought. In opposition to Klenicki, Dussel’s primary confrontation with Levinas is not related with Levinas’ Judaism, but Levinas’ Jewish Europeanism. I would like to evaluate as starting points in answering the questions above mentioned two central points of Dussel’s Levinas that lead to recognize that the latter’s project supports not only a lack of inclusion, but also the reproduction of the totality’s aim. First, Dussel attempts to demonstrate how a dialogic method (“the false dialogue”) that tries to comprehend the other from the totality leads to an inevitable association of the former with the latter through the reduction of both to “the same.” In its place Dussel proposes a “truth dialogic approach,” the ana-letic method that removes the totality as the center from which the other is understood.⁷

In second place, three “levels” of participants are recognizable in Dussel’s Levinas: the totality, the exteriority and the outsiders. Along with Walter Mignolo’s interpretation of Dussel, Levinas is able, as a consequence of the genocides perpetrated against Jews under the regimes of Hitler and Stalin, to “open a slot” and incorporate “the other”, the Jew, “the exteriority”, into the totality. However, Jews, the former “other” and currently “almost the same” with their incorporation to the totality have forgotten their links with the “other others”, the outsiders.⁸ Indeed, Dussel’s Levinas presents a dilemma not only to Levinas’ Jews, but also to Jewish subaltern thinkers. On the one hand, is likely to believe that Jews are, after their history of suffering, responsible to prevent the totality to repeat its paths. On the other hand, in a context of “subaltern” others, (e.g. oppressed who speak by themselves), the main question is what is the role of the Jews, the former others, in incorporating the others from a different place than the totality into the discussion without reducing them to “the same”?⁹ Even though this dilemma is provocative, post 1945’s Jewish thought has, simple, ignored the problem.

This presentation will recognize that Jews, along with Hannah Arendt, were not only, except for some intellectual and activist voices, co-opted by the colonial

epistemology of knowledge during the last fifty years, but they have also created a barrier in their understanding of “the other” utilizing sources that were created in the context of exteriority.¹⁰ Furthermore, along with historians such as David Biale and David Hollinger, we will understand that, from both sources emerge the current “assimilation” of Jews to the “White and Western” totality, probably, influenced by the guilt of the western colonial power participation lack during the Holocaust.¹¹ Nevertheless, this paper aims to think, through Dussel’s Levinas, beyond this problem. We will argue that Judaism “as a whole” became, borrowing Marc Ellis’s construction, Constantinian Judaism (a younger brother of Christendom), and there are, at least tiny rays of an alternative thought that would lead to a liberationist, and subaltern interpretation of Judaism.¹² To explore this problem we will reflect on three questions that will guide our paper: first, has modern radical Judaism contributed to the subversion or the support of the colonial and neo-colonial epistemology of knowledge? Second, have modern radical Jewish thinkers confronted Levinas’ limitation while they engage with a supposed subversion of the modern project? And third, what is the praxis from which it is possible to deconstruct post-Holocaust Jewish “whiteness” and engage not only with exteriority, but also with the outsiders toward a post-colonial and subaltern Jewish Liberationism?

Is modern Jewish thought counter-modern and counter-World-System? Diverse and opposite schools of thought have explicitly defined modernity with the attempt of implicitly installing a particular reading of this period. On the one hand, a liberal interpretation places the turning point of the period in the double European revolution of the 17th and 18th centuries,¹³ and, on the other hand, a radical trend locates its beginning with the incorporation of the Americas to the global market in 1492.¹⁴

In spite of what many thinkers, such as Karl Marx, believe - that there is a “natural suitability” between modernity and Judaism or that modern society itself “became Jew,”¹⁵ Jews both as a people and as individuals have arrived at both supposed modern turning points under inferior conditions. Following the first trend’s approach, Jews received their civil rights (and only as individuals) in France after heated debates;¹⁶ the second trend highlights that Jews were expelled from the center of power only two days before the departure of *Cristobal Colón* to the Americas.¹⁷ Furthermore, while the

same nation-state that made a claim for “liberty, equality and fraternity” was divided by the anti-Semitic Dreyfus affair less than one hundred years later,¹⁸ the second recalls that in June 1511, the first anti-Semitic event (an act that was not only religiously anti-Jewish, but with a racial component) took place when the Catholic kings of Spain asked for Christian “proof of blood” as a requirement to become officials of the kingdom.¹⁹

Paradoxically, this harsh welcoming to the Jews into modernity is not reflected in the quantity or quality of unmistakably Jewish thought that we are able to find during the 19th and early 20th centuries: Rose Luxemburg, Walter Benjamin, Moses Hess, Edward Bernstein, Leon Trotsky, Sigmund Freud, Martin Buber, and more recently, Noam Chomsky, Marc Ellis or Hanna Arendt, are only a few names that should be addressed to fully engage with modernity and, especially, the germ of its critic and, eventually, the euro-centric project criticism.²⁰ Several schools have tried to interpret this diversity in quantity and quality of Jews speaking on a counter-modern project. First, one line of thought addresses that Jews were practicing a deep dialogic method of thought in Talmudic studies through centuries and once the doors of the ghetto were opened, they were better prepared than “the white others”.¹ A second address the problem is not the Jewry intelligentsia but the post-1945 Western fascination for it as a way to re-create the colonial epistemology of knowledge. Refuting the other trends, a provocative scholarly interpretation reflects that Jews, understanding the “anti-Jewish face of Modernity” acted to subvert modernity. Consequently, there are a variety of Jews, such as Baruch Spinoza, Gustav Landauer or Walter Benjamin, and, in general, it is not easy to find Jews such as Rene Descartes, Immanuel Kant, or David Hume. This school would argue that Jews are “a relevant other”, but no different other than “other others” (e.g. other outsiders).²¹

Nevertheless, this trend of thought, which Michael Lowy names “Liberationist Judaism,” and Arey Fishman would call supporters of “the natural suitability between Judaism and Socialism,” seems to die in Auschwitz (1942-1945) and, especially, its reading after 1967.²² The official lesson of the Holocaust, the “eruption of Barbarism,” according to George Steiner, disrupted Jewish subversion of the modern project.²³ The Post-Holocaust Jewish canon understands the Holocaust and its “never again” statement

as a license to survive even if its allies are the former enemies, and it implies not only participating in the reproduction of euro-centric epistemology, but also, for example, American-centric crusade in the Middle East through a Huntington's Clash of Civilization framework.²⁴ This school of thought, led by, among others, Emil Fackenheim who understands the empowerment as the last commandment, and the well-known holocaustic literalist Elie Wiesel, supporter of the American interventions in Afghanistan and Iraq, carries a consequence that would be even discussed by these authors: Jewish empowerment and the oppression of other people are an inevitable accident in order to protect after-Holocaust Jews.²⁵ In other words, the narrative that naturally links the Holocaust with the State of Israel replicates Levinas's narrow view of "the other as the Jews," that the only solution for anti-Semitism is the non-acknowledge of the "other others" in history.²⁶

In summary we ask, is radical Judaism inherently counter-modern? Even though in the origin (from 1492 to 1942) Jews, "the exterior other," were subverting the modern project as their rule and only left peripheral voices supporting it, after the Holocaust and, probably as a consequence of Dussel's "false dialogic method," Western inaction and guilt during the Holocaust, and Jewish reading of the Holocaust, Jews transformed the exception in rule and the rule in exception.

A variety of school of thought have argued that, during the first half of the century, the center of the colonial epistemology of knowledge started to move from Europe to North America. Have Jewish radical thinkers of this location of knowledge confronted Levinas limitation? In the new scenario and without the euro-centric pretension, but with other limitations American Jewish scholarship, as an exception have confronted, consciously or not, Levinas' limitations. In the paper from which this presentation is originated I discuss the advances and limitations of a neo-conservative Post-modern Judaism, a Liberal Multicultural Judaism and, a Liberationist American Jewish Liberationist Theology. However along with Gustavo Gutierrez understanding of "the German master of knowledge," states: "philosophy raises only at sundown." Hence, our focus is on the colonial praxis.²⁷

Consequently, In order to build a subaltern Jewish proposal is necessary to draw from the praxis of an alternative thought. Following the steps of the scholars present in this panel, my attempt is to re-discover and to re-evaluate sources of “a hidden” Judaism that offer a different solution to Levinas’ dilemma. This approach allows us to accept the validity of Dussel and, among others, Edward Said criticisms, but presents a Liberationist Jewish alternative as a resolution.²⁸ My intention is to re-discover three discredited, hidden and silenced projects understanding them as sources for a Liberationist Judaism. First, we will think new limits for inter-religious conversation from the hidden relations between Jews and, for example, *chapanecas* Indians. Second, we will assert the impossibility of a complete installation of a Jewish Constantine Project in Latin America through the case of *Republica Dominicana’s Colonia Sousa*. Finally we will reflect on the construction of a praxis for a Latin American Jewish Liberation Theology through the experience of the Argentinean *Masorti*.²⁹

The first source, the “Indians Jews,” forces to put into question, not because of its uncertain historicity, but because it was erased from Jewish history, the Jewish modern politics of alliances and identity after Auschwitz.³⁰ During the first years of the 16th century, Antonio Montezinos/Levi a *marrano* escaping from the Inquisition immersed himself in the mountains of *Los Andes* and reveled his true identity to “an Indian”. Following his version, the Indian reveled him his true identity also: “the native” was part of the tribe of Reuben, one of lost ten tribes of Israel, and started to not only to reveal the same story that *Montezinos/Levi* knew from his ancestors, but prayed one of the two main Jewish *tefilots* (prayers): the *Shema Israel*.³¹ Thought the story is deliciously provocative it shouldn’t surprise us. During medieval times there were hundreds of falsified proclaims asseverating that they knew how to find the lost Israelites tribes “beyond the river *Sambation*”³² and during modern times there are hundreds of versions for the American man origin from the wonderful Atlantida in colonial times until sympathetic aliens during the 60s or 70s.³³

However, this time, the story might be different. In 1523 a Spanish priest from the Dominican order started to proclaim the veracity of the story. On the one hand is likely to believe that it could be useful for the conquistador’s plan: whether the Indians were Jews

they were humans born with the original sin and it “invites” the conquistador to reach the “evangelization” in order to redeem them; even, as it was happening in Europe, torments were necessary. On the other hand, the name of the Dominican would cause surprise: *Fray Bartolome de Las Casas*.³⁴ One century later *Rabbi Menashe Ben Israel*, a well-known Jew from the “Portuguese” nation in Amsterdam (probably teacher of Baruj Spinoza), wrote an entire book proclaiming the veracity of the story.³⁵ Ethimologies, customs, symbols and traditions shared between, for example the mesoamericans’ *chapanecas* and the XII century B.C.E’s Jews were the premises to think that, perhaps, the story was not a total falsification.³⁶ However, the only authors who mention the case are Latin-American historians such as Boneslao Lewin or Ricardo Feierstein.³⁷

This case is not a source for Liberationist Judaism because of the uncertain veracity of the story, but because the reasons of its hidden: would this source defy the tripartite religious dialogue between “Abrahamic religions” to open it to a conversation among “the others” who started modernity being persecuted by the first “global institution of repression”, *el Santo Oficio de la Inquisicion*? Become a vast part of Jewish scholarship in particular and Judaism in general so white, so modern, so Constantine and, perhaps, so Protestant that is imperative to avoid the identification with those groups of Indians? Is this case a source of identification with “autochthon people” that would defy the Jewish perspective not only in the Americas, but also in the Middle East respecting Palestinians? And finally, is Mariategui’s works on Judaism influenced by this case through his reading on Bartolome de las Casas and is the thought of the Peruvian (or the PeruvianS) the new alliance that Jewish philosophy would start to consider?³⁸

The second source, *Colonia Sousa*, addresses that sometimes the logics thought in a colonial power failed in the periphery. In 1938 when nearly all the nation of the world closed their doors for Jewish refugees from the “Europe on fire”, the Gral *Rafael Trujillo* decided to open the immigration of “his” *Republica Dominicana*, extending around 5000 visas and finally receiving 645 of those German and Austrian Jews. Those refugees found a colony in the maritime port of *Sousa* and with the help of a well-known Jewish institution (the Agro-American Jewish Joint Distribution Committee), and despite their class origin (most of them were young professionals) created an agricultural and livestock cooperative that took the name of *Productos Sousa*.³⁹ The main question of the case is

why a genocide's perpetrator such as Trujillo was "so generous" to invite those Jews to integrate into Dominican society. The plan was *a priori* useful for each part involved. First, Trujillo after massacring 25.000 of afro-Caribbean (most of them Haitian) only a year before saw an opportunity of "upgrading" the island skin color. Second, the Jews of the colonial power, remembered their responsibility with their relatives. Third, to the American Government was an opportunity to show Jewish community its solidarity without both receiving immigrant (thinking about Saint Louis' tragedy) and being "contaminated" by the European conflict (or by the Jews.)⁴⁰ Finally it was useful to the Central European Jews because they, simply, save their lives.

However, in Jewish scholarship the case has been a footnote in the texts or simply erased and the question is, simply: why? The case was elaborated as a model: a Jewish organization supports ideologically and financially the installation of a Jewish colony in the periphery. However, an astute Trujillo extended visas to almost all young males and, naturally, most of them married with local women. On the one hand it was Trujillo's triumph in order to "upgrade" the skin color of his population. On the other hand Jews became transgressors of the most important Jewish modern sin: exogamy and presumable assimilation.

Moreover, the same generation tried to emigrate to the United States becoming, as Polish, Israelis and Argentinean immigrants well know, transgressors of the most important Jewish modern sin of peripheral areas: becoming citizens of the Colonial Power through the support of a zealous central board of the American Jewry.⁴¹ This double transgression (exogamy and immigration to the Colonial power) caused that *Colonia Sousa's Project* has become a triumph for each part involve (Trujillo who attracted whites, the American government which derivated the problem of German Jews and the last group of immigrants because they save, simply, their lives), except for the central institutions of the Jewish American community. Naturally, the case was silenced. However, it was a "witness case" that shows that colonial locations host their own logic and what is pretended to be a "model case" would become in a source of an alternative Judaism.

The third source, *Masorti*, proclaims that Latin-America is a favorable scenario to not only reject the colonial network, but also construct a “Jewish Liberation Theology.” In 1983, one year after the beginning collapse of the Argentinean military dictatorship and its genocide, an Argentinean rabbi who became director of Inter-religious relations of the anti-Defamatory league of Benei-Brith/New York, Leon Klenicki, published an article entitled “The Theology of Liberation: A Latin American Jewish Exploration.” In his article he not only attacks diverse thinker such as Gutierrez, Boff and Dussel, but also especially (and almost literally) “shoots” against an unknown, at least in 1983, Jewish Liberation Theology.⁴² Until now there is no research explaining the motives of this article; was someone offering a Jewish Liberation Theology that should be silenced? Why does he not name it?

In 1959 an American rabbi opponent of US’s intervention in Asian Wars, Marshall T. Meyer, arrived to Argentina for “two or three years” in order to avoid his service as a chaplain for the US army. In 1985, more than 25 years later, he left Argentina after being the only foreign member of the commission of truth (*CONADEP*) that researched the disappearance of 30.000 voices and bodies during the military genocide and one of the most relevant religious activist against the military process despite Argentinean Jewish board’s wishes.⁴³ In addition, he founded the only Latin American Rabbinical Seminary in order to break “the civilizational mission spirit” through the generation of autochthon leadership.⁴⁴ Today, more than 60% of the Jewish communities in Argentina are part of this movement.⁴⁵ A few years after the article of Klenicki and the work of Marc Ellis and Dan Cohn Shebrok on Jewish Liberation Theology Meyer a confess lover of Spinoza, Nietzsche and Marx, reflected:

Today in Latin America there is a struggle class. As a result of my association with the struggle for Human Right I was denominated the communist or red rabbi... many Jews see themselves involve in a type of a Jewish Liberation Theology, we can support it with the argument that the first liberation theologians were the prophets of Israel.⁴⁶

In spite of some voices that have tried to reflect on the work of *Masorti* in Latin America,⁴⁷ the movement has been ignored by Judaism worldwide and the answer is easily found: Constantine Jewish project understood, perhaps before and better than the

movement itself, the liberationist character of what was emerging.⁴⁸ *Masorti* implies a radical change in Jewish praxis and thought. It became the first Jewish modern movement that, AS A MOVMENT, struggled against the oppression of a complete population without difference. Remembering Dussel's Levinas argument: the movement struggled for "ALL the others". The movement was able to justify their action through a reformulation of the "Jewish trinity: Torah, God and Israel:

According my teacher's lessons, one leg on the Torah and the other on the street.⁴⁹

In Judaism the world has not been created, it is an ongoing process, and you and I, and every human being is invited to participate with God in the re-creation. All too often, human beings choose destruction, hatred, killing, bigotry, racism, prejudice" "I have no right to be silent in the face of injustice! I cannot claim to believe in God and remain inactive when God's image is destroyed... when Human are denigrated, humiliated and persecuted, the sanctity of human life is threatened everywhere.⁵⁰

I am Zionist. I think the peace process in the Middle East is, perhaps, the most important task that I, as an American, Jew and as Zionist can work within the Jewish arena... There must be peace if there is to be an Israel congruent with the Values of Jewish History. There must be an end to occupied territories if the Jewish soul is to remain intact.⁵¹

Analyzing the three paragraphs invites us to recognize two clear sections on them. The first corresponds to a consensus of the liberal synagogue rabbinical paradigm and the second a Liberation Theology that emerges from not only the context, but also what Marc Ellis calls "a dissident Prophetic Jewish line of thought".⁵² The first part is the consensus with rabbinical sources: 1) oral and written Torah is ortopraxis and guide life (*halaja*), 2) God an Human beings as partners in the creation and redemption (*tikun olam*), and 3) natural connection of Israel as a people and as a land (*Zionut*). However, the most provocative lesson is the second one: 1) Torah means structural condition to struggle (the street), 2) the connection between God and human being as the first step as the struggle against the social injustice and its negation is the negation and profanity of Divinity and 3) Zionism is not an in-conditionality, but an imperative in support any oppressed people and the risk of loose "Jewish soul" through the occupation and oppression of "the other".

In the light of it, we can easily recognize why *Masorti* was a risk for Constantine Judaism. Thus, is not hard to understand why their partners in America did not recognized until few years ago the movement and the seminary as legitimate Jewish institution but, as Antonio Gramsci would explain, they invited its rabbis –the organic intellectuals- to be part of their rabbinical assembly.⁵³

I would like to finish this brief proposal of re-evaluation of modern Jewish thought through post-colonial critique and resolution that invites to reflect on the relationship between Judaism, Race and Empire with a personal story. It was on a hot day of the Summer 2002 when this student was arriving for the first time, at least with a student visa, to a port entry of the Colonial Power. The border officer received me with an ample smile in his face (perhaps because of the white color of my skin in a flight of Mexican Airlines) when I showed him my Argentinean passport. His smile disappeared for few seconds when he was pronouncing, with a New Yorker's accent, my "Latino" first name, Santiago. Suddenly, he saw my unmistakable family name, Slabodsky, and he asked me: are you Jewish? Thinking, in Walter Benjamin and "his border" (too much European Marxist thought in my background) I answered timidly, waiting for the worst... yes. He replayed me with one of the biggest smiles that I have ever saw and said: it is all right, welcome to America! When I was leaving the box and perhaps for my deficient listening in English I heard only the last part of his sentence that finished with a shout: Go Devil! During the following three hours I was convinced in searching the roots of how a nice white, middle age, presumable protestant American/ Colonial Power citizen would reproduce, as a joke, the medieval Christian identification of the Jews with the Devil. However, a few hours later, arriving to Durham, NC and visiting the famous Cameroon Stadium of basketball home of the Blue Devils (Duke University's Basketball team) I realized of my mistake:

When and why the same "red Devil Jews" (in both senses) that were a danger for all the western Christian Empires became today a "blue Devil Jew", it means integral part of the western Christian Empire? Is it possible to deconstruct this narrative and build a new one with the silenced and subversive projects? Paraphrasing a Jewish writing of the

second or third century, “nobody is forced to finish the work, but nobody is extent of, at least, attempt to begin it.”⁵⁴

Muchas gracias en espanol, ***Toda Raba*** behibirt and ***thank you very much*** in English

Santiago H. Slabodsky

Waco, TX October 2003

¹ See different interpretations of this the conception of epistemology of knowledge (*epistemologia del conocimiento*) in Edgardo Lander ed. *La Colonialidad del Saber: eurocentrismo y ciencias sociales. Perspectivas Latinoamericanas* (Caracas, Venezuela, UNESCO-FACES/ UCV, 2002).

² Dussel Enrique “El metodo analectico y la Filosofia Latinoamericana” in *América Latina, Dependencia y Liberación* (Buenos Aires: Garcia Cambeiro, 1973), 111-113. This work is an original criticism to Emmanuel Levinas, *Totalité et infini ; essai sur l'extériorité*. (La Haye, M. Nijhoff, 1961.)

³ Based on 1511's first anti-Semitic act in Spain (See Langmuir Gavin, *Toward a Definition of antisemitism* (Berkeley: University California Press, 1996), 17-19, it is possible to place the beginning of modern Jewish history in 1492 instead the 18th century through the turning point of this event in confronting Racial anti-Semitism against Religious anti-Judaism.

⁴ Marc Ellis, “The Next fifty years: Remembering the Holocaust and the Future of Jewish Life at the Dawn of the 21st Century”, in Recent Essay on *the Holocaust, Israel/Palestine and the Future of the Jewish People* (Waco, TX: Center for American and Jewish Studies, 2002), 1-17.

⁵ David Biale, Michael Galchansky and Susannah Heschel ed. *Insider/outsider: American Jews and multiculturalism /* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), 1-12.

⁶ Leon Klenicki “ The Theology of Liberation: A Latin American Jewish Exploration” in *American Jewish Archives H.U.C.* (Cincinnati, April 1983), p 37.

⁷ Enrique Dussel “El metodo anlectico y la Filosofia Latinoamericana,” 111-120.

⁸ See commentary and critique on Walter Mignolo, *Capitalismo y geopolítica del conocimiento* (Buenos Aires: Ediciones del Signo/Duke University, 2001), 27-34.

⁹ Ranjit Guha, *Subaltern Studies* (Delhi: New York: Oxford University Press, 1982), 12-18.

¹⁰ Hanna Arendt, *The origins of totalitarianism* (New York, Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1973), 16-18.

¹¹ See for example David A. Hollinger, *Postethnic America: beyond multiculturalism* (New York: BasicBooks, 1995) and *Science, Jews, and secular culture : studies in mid-twentieth-century American intellectual history*(Princeton, N.J. : Princeton University Press, 1996).

¹² See Marc Ellis, *Out of the Ashes. The Search for Jewish Identity in the Twenty-First Century* (London; Sterling, Virginia: Pluto Press, 2002), 69-73.

¹³ See in general Charles Taylor, *Sources of the Self. The Making of the Modern Identity* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989) and for the Jewish case the classic Simon Dubnow *History of the Jews* (South Brunswick: T. Yoseloff, 1967-73).

¹⁴ Anibal Quijano and Immanuel Wallerstein “Americanity as a Concept, or the Americas in the Modern-World System”, *International Social Sciences Journal*, No. 134, 1992. and, humbly, my work for the Jewish application, Santiago Slabodsky, “ Relocalizando Sinai en Los Andes. Especificidad Latinoamericana en un duelo Judio Post-Holocausto: Liberacionismo Judio vs. Judaismo Constantiniiano” in *Majshavot* Ano XL No 4 (2002): 72-93.

¹⁵ See Karl Marx, *Early Writings* (New York, Vintage Books, 1978), p. 35-45 and add the critique in Abraham Leon, *The Marxist Question: A Marxist interpretation* (Pathfinder Press: New York, 1970). Take into account, especially, the commentaries of Enzo Traverso, *The Marxists and the Jewish question: the history of a debate, 1843-1943* (Atlantic Highland, NJ: Humanities, 1993).

¹⁶ Mendes Flohr, Paul and Jeduha Reinharz. *The Jew in the modern world: a documentary history* (new York-Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995), 118.

¹⁷ *Ibid*, 125.

-
- ¹⁸ See especially description of Shmuel Along, *Nationalism and anti-Semitism in Modern Europe*. 1815-1945 (Oxford: Pergamone Press, 1990), p. 35-56.
- ¹⁹ Langmuir Gavin, *Toward a Definition of antisemitism* (Berkeley: University California Press, 1996).
- ²⁰ Of special importance the definition and survey of Liberationist Jews in Michael Lowy, *Redemption and Utopia* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988), 1-26.
- ²¹ Michael Lowy, *Redemption and Utopia. Jewish Libertarian Thought in Central Europe* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1998).
- ²² Fishman Arey "Moses Hess on Judaism and its Aptness for Socialist Civilization" in the *Journal of Religion* 63 (1983), 143-158.
- ²³ George Steiner, "The long life of Metaphor: An approach to the Shoa" in Berl Lang ed. *Writing and the Holocaust* (New York: Holmes and Meyer, 1988), 154
- ²⁴ Samuel Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the remaking of the world order* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1996).
- ²⁵ See the beginning of this line of thought: Elie Wisel, *The gates of the forest* (New York: Avon, 1967) *Dimensions of the Holocaust* (Evanston, Illinois, Northwestern University Press, 1977). Emil Fackenheim *God's Presence in History: Jewish Affirmation and Philosophical Reflections* (New York: New York University Press, 1970) and *To Mend the world: Foundations of Future Jewish thought* (New York: Schocken Books, 1982). Irvin Greenberg, "Cloud of Smoke, Pillar of fire: Judaism, Christianity and Modernity after the Holocaust" in Eva Fleishner (New York: KTAV, 1977), 9-19.
- ²⁶ See critics of the opposite line of thought: Richard Rubinstein, *After Auschwitz*, Marc Ellis, *Faithfulness in the Age of the Holocaust* (Amity, New York: Amity House, 1986), and Marc Chmiel, *Elie Wiesel and the politics of Moral Leadership* (Philadelphia: Temple University, 2001).
- ²⁷ See especial significance of this footnote of Hegel in Gustavo Gutierrez, *A theology of Liberation* (Maryknoll, NY, Orbis Books, 1995), 9.
- ²⁸ Edward Said, *Freud and the non-European* (Verso: 2002), 11-13.
- ²⁹ Development of each case in Santiago Slabodsky "Relocalizando Siná en los Andes. Especificidad Latinoamericana en un duelo teológico post-holocausto: *Judaísmo Liberacionista vs Judaísmo Constantiniiano*" (Buenos Aires: Majshavot, 2003), 72-93.
- ³⁰ We will utilize the term "Indian" along with Irene Silverblatt, "Becoming Indians in the Central Andes of the Seventeen century" in Prakash Gyan, *After Colonialism: imperial histories and post-colonial displacement* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995) 37-43.
- ³¹ Ricardo Feierstein *Historia de los Judios Argentinos* (Buenos Aires: Planeta, 1993), 16-23.
- ³² *Ibid.*, 18.
- ³³ See Pablo Schvartzman, *Judios en America* (Buenos Aires: Instituto del libro Argentino, 1963), 42-67.
- ³⁴ Ricardo Feierstein, *Historia de los Judios Argentinos*, 18.
- ³⁵ *Ibid.*, 18
- ³⁶ See Adan Quiroga "Huellas Judaicas en la civilizacion Quechua", *Judaica* (w/d: 1939)
- ³⁷ Ricardo Feierstein, *Historia de los Judios Argentinos*, 17-20.
- ³⁸ Juan Carlos Mariategui, "Judaismo y Nacion" Comentario (1964), 37-44.
- ³⁹ Howard M. Sacher, *A History of the Jews in America* (Vintage Books: New York, 1993), 540 and 548
- ⁴⁰ See *Ibid*, 546 and Henry Kissinger, *La Diplomacia* (Mexico: FCE,1996) 11-21.
- ⁴¹ Marshall Sklare, *Conservative Judaism; an American religious movement*. (Glencoe, Ill: Free Press, 1955), 23
- ⁴² Leon Klenicki, " The Theology of Liberation: A Latin American Jewish Exploration" in *American Jewish Archives H.U.C.* (April 1983): 37-45, answers and conversation Padraic O'Hare, "Liberation Theology: Romantic Ideology? Teacher or Contempt. An exchange between Padraic O'Hare and Leon Klenicki," in *Cross Current* (Spring 1990): 109-119, Leon Klenicki, "I stand My Ground" in *Cross Current: Religion and Intelectuall Life*, (Spring 1990: p 121) and Daniel Cohn Sherbok, "Latin American Theology and Jewish-Christian Dialogue: a replay to Leon Klenicki" in *American Jewish Archives*, 36 (1984) : p.57-61
- ⁴³ Gerdy Tratcham, *Marshall Meyer, rabbi who change the face of Latin American Jewry* (Baltimore: w/p), 34
- ⁴⁴ *Ibid*, 46
- ⁴⁵ See original work on Santiago Slabodsky & Victoria Kandel, " Especificidad Latinoamericana en el surgimiento del Movimiento Tradicionalista Liberal en la comunidad Judeo-Argentina. Teología de

Liberación o Reconstruccionismo? In Congreso de ciencia de la religion del Mercosur (Buenos Aires, 2000), CD ROM.

⁴⁶ Marshall T. Meyer, "Consideraciones sobre América Latina", in *Majshavot* (Buenos Aires, Jan-Mar 1987), p 6. The reflection is the most comprehensive expression of several articles of Marshall T. Meyer that were published between 1970 and 1985 by Latin American Rabbinical Seminary's journal Majshavot. The main point is that his reflection comes from a practice what converts the experience in praxis for a JTL.

⁴⁷ See the only works on the subject in Gerdy Tratcham, *Marshall Meyer, rabbi who change the face of Latin American Jewry*. Richard Freund "Somos Testigos- We are Witnesses': The Jewish Theology of Liberation of Rabbi Marshall T Meyer", in *Conservative Judaism*, n. 47 (Fall 1994) :30.

⁴⁸ Richard Freund, "The Rabbinical Seminary of Latin America : The First Thirty Years" in *Conservative Judaism* 44 (Winter 1992): 67-78, and contradiction in Santiago Slabodsky, "Relocalizando Sinai en los Andes", 82-83

⁴⁹ Tratchman, Marshall Meyer, rabbi who change the face of Latin American Jewry, 46

⁵⁰ Ibid, 52

⁵¹ Ibid, 54

⁵² Hans Kung, *Judaism, pasado, presente y futuro* (Madrid: Trotta, 1990), 1-3.

⁵³ Richard Freund, "The Rabbinical Seminary of Latin America : The First Thirty Years": 73,

⁵⁴ Pirke Avot 4:17