

The Souls of Anglos

I cannot be if others are not; above all, I cannot be if I forbid others from being.

Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Heart* (1998)

One cannot deny the humanity of another without diminishing one's own: in the face of one's victim, one sees oneself.

James Baldwin, "White Man's Guilt" (1961)

Temo que la verdadera frontera la trae cada uno dentro. / I'm afraid that each of us carries the real frontier inside.

Carlos Fuentes, *The Old Gringo* (1985)

LOOKING BOTH WAYS AT THE BORDER

When we travel south toward Mexico, the wall at the U.S.-Mexico border stops our vision into life on the Mexican side. It protects citizens from taking in the disturbing vistas and intimate scenes that would otherwise readily display the relative poverty, insufficient infrastructure, drug-war violence, and militarism that plague border cities and towns. The wall acts to separate daily realities, placing the experiences of many out of Americans' sight.

Within American towns and cities, where internal colonialism thrives, social conventions between Anglos and Mexican migrants, usually marked by disparities in economic class, also function as walls, leaving few Anglos knowledgeable about the Mexican communities in their midst. To prevent these "walls" from deflecting the Anglo gaze, we must create windows and doors in them so that one can look both ways at these borders.

To rend the veil of racism that DuBois described, Anglos must locate themselves, find *themselves* as "others" on the other side of the "vast veil" of racism (DuBois [1903] 1989, 2). Here, on the far side, many whites enjoy the privileges of relative power and profit by virtue of inherited whiteness.

This is not to deny the vast and unjust socioeconomic divides among whites themselves, although this is not our current focus.

W. E. B. DuBois begins each chapter of *The Souls of Black Folk* with a bar of a Sorrow Song, spirituals that “welled up from black souls” during slavery and described the sufferings, resilience, and hope of those forced into servitude ([1903] 1989, xxxii). These songs are resonant with many Mexican *corridos*, ballads expressing oppression, difficulty, courage, and romance. When Anglos open their hearts and minds to the Mexican American borderlands, they begin to hear a needed lamentation, a “sorrow song” of their own, born of shame and long-delayed regret for grievous wrongs. Recovering the souls of Anglos has everything to do with listening for these tragic notes, slowly assembling them in one’s being until almost wholly new modes of relationship are created and offered to those who have been racialized by Anglos. As Anglo authors, we include ourselves as we speak about Anglos and address white consciousness.

In the previous chapter, we described the shadows that fall over the Mexican psyche in the United States by dint of internal colonialism and the racist “othering” that is its main ingredient. In this chapter, the focus shifts to the psychic and social toll this “othering” exacts from Anglos. We describe the psychic landscape of Anglos as they turn to find themselves as “others” in the Mexican imagination. Insofar as Mexican stereotypes of Anglos can provoke an honest self-examination of one’s stance toward Mexican migrants, as well as that of one’s own racial group, how might resulting feelings of shame be creatively metabolized? We want to draw attention to the psychic and social metabolization necessary for emerging from a self-serving collusion with dominant and dominating interests into a greater solidarity with those forced to leave their native homes to survive. We need to focus on a path of psychic decolonization for whites, one that moves from turning a blind eye to the sufferings of those deemed nonwhite to developing a color consciousness that allows whites to understand the racializing dynamics that undergird the misery so many of Mexican descent experience in the United States. The path we will plot begins at the point of finding oneself ashamed in the eyes of others or in one’s own eyes and the possibilities for using this shame in a restorative manner. In this chapter, we directly address Anglos such as ourselves.

DOUBLE VISION: SEEING ONESELF THROUGH THE EYES OF OTHERS

Malintzin, a Nahua woman, became Hernán Cortés’ translator, interpreter, intermediary, and intimate as the explorer conquered Mexico for Spain. To survive, she needed to learn “to look both ways”: the way of her indig-

enous people and the way of the conquering group. Under conditions of duress, she gave birth to the kind of double consciousness W. E. B. DuBois was to describe in *The Souls of Black Folk* almost four hundred years later.

Malintzin could see how she and her people saw the conquerors, and she could see how the conquerors saw her and her people. Malintzin came to collude with the colonialist forces, and she both survived and suffered by dint of this collusion. We can try to imagine Malintzin's thoughts and feelings as a way to see into the psychic, moral, and social challenges we face as (post)colonial exploitation displaces masses of people all over the globe.

How must our path toward consciousness and the retrieval of our soul differ from the kinds of paths for those trapped on the other side of the veil of racism, those whom we outlined in chapter 6? Whereas Mexicans, African Americans, and Native Americans cannot escape from seeing themselves through the eyes of the dominant society developing the double vision DuBois describes, Anglos must commit themselves to developing this vision. Just as Mexicans experience the sudden intrusion of an Anglo gaze that finds them wanting, Anglos, too, can find themselves cast as stereotypic "others" in the Mexican gaze. But Anglos can more easily defend against this. We can turn away from totalizing stereotypic assessments of ourselves, or our group, which only periodically break through the powerful wall of privilege that protects us. I acknowledge that many of us find ourselves on both sides of various kinds of divisive veils. At this historical moment in the United States, when we consider the veil that divides citizens from migrants without documents, we must acknowledge the differences between citizens who enjoy the full range of privileges within the United States, those who are in the process of losing their access to many of these privileges, and those who have been largely locked out because of conjunctions of race, ethnicity, and class.

To address "Anglos" is for the moment to give priority to race over class as a construct. Our overarching intention, however, is not to separate race and class, since Mexicans without documents suffer both from their relative poverty and from a history of being racialized in the United States.

It is easier to rest in one's own positive view of oneself than to turn toward the other and ask, "How do you see me/us?" Indeed, the mere thought that others can have an opinion of us can be surprising. Those who possess privilege have psychic barriers dividing them from those who view them negatively. Conversation is structured to protect them from others' negative views of them. We reconstruct history so that the parts that would betray the shortcomings of our group are left out.

To understand the "souls of white folk," or the souls of Anglos, we must understand how we arrange things to obtain advantages pernicious to oth-

ers. How do we arrange our eyes to look at history from a certain angle, occluding those parts that would give rise to shame and discomfort? How do we arrive at a narrative about our nation, city, or town that makes it seem as though Anglos have been here forever, dropping from daily memory and acknowledgment those who preceded us?

Too often, the white person occludes the experience and history of others by looking through the narrow lens of individualism. If we allow our gaze to widen, we find ourselves thrown into question by others—or, frankly, condemned. We find we need to deepen our perception—or perhaps discover for the first time—that we are, to borrow DuBois’s words, “a problem” to others. “Disappearing” the means by which Anglos got economic advantage naturalizes affluence, rejects reparative possibilities and responsibilities, and allows the unjust and harsh divisions of rights and resources to go on. Our greed must be problematized so that its grasp on us can be loosened and others in turn can be freed from being seen and treated only as cheap labor.

LOOKING IN THE MIRROR “THE STRANGER” HOLDS: HOW DO MEXICANS SEE ANGLOS?

Richard Rodriguez shares how Anglos are seen by Chicanos:

We didn’t have an adequate name for you. In private, you were the gringo. The ethnic albino. The goyim. The ghost. You were not us. In public we also said “Anglo”—an arcane usage of the nineteenth century—you-who-speak-English. If we withdrew from directly addressing you, you became *ellos*—They—as in, They kept us on the other side of the town. They owned the land. They owned the banks. They ran the towns—They and their wives in their summer-print dresses. They kept wages low They made us sit upstairs in the movie houses. Or downstairs. (1992, 64–65)

Shortly after 9/11, something promising happened in America. For a brief period, some Americans acknowledged their profound ignorance about Muslims, the range of Muslim religious and social beliefs, and the causes for the resentment some Muslim groups felt toward the United States’ policies and actions. This attempt at understanding how we are seen was short-circuited when the United States began waging war in the Middle East. Once the wars got underway, linking 9/11 with foreign-policy missteps was seen as unpatriotic. But seeing it this way did not make it so. To hold on to the question “Why do they hate us?” has been fertile for many. It has led them to learn more about Islam and its diverse practice,

as well as the American pursuit of self-interest in Muslim lands, and given them a greater understanding of the geographical and cultural diversity of Muslims; it has further led to some solidarities among Muslims, Christians, Jews, and atheists.

The question that comes right before “Why do they hate us?” is “How do they see us?” The answers to this question lead back into an examination, appreciation, and recuperation of history that is painful and necessary to the path I am outlining. To ask how Mexicans see Anglos opens us to generalizations: Which Mexicans? Which Anglos? But while stereotypes paint in broad strokes, they also bear lessons. Although some Mexicans who have the economic means to adopt Anglo lifestyles may be less critical of Anglos, even venerating and imitating them, those thrown into the scramble to survive in America as immigrants will—if it is safe to do so—voice a number of critiques. Who am I, as an Anglo, to Mexicans?

As we have discussed in chapter 5, U.S. history in the Southwest has gained Anglos a reputation for land grabbing, terrorization, and exploitation. Who moves onto others’ lands by invitation, but does so in large numbers, with the intention of stealing the land and displacing its residents? Who offers citizenship and the freedom to practice their religion to those trapped within the new national borders but then lynches and robs some of them? Who is this “other” who builds walls in people’s backyards? Who consumes drugs even when it brings murder and terror to one’s neighbors? Who exports guns, even to a neighboring country whose government has outlawed them?

While Anglos saw themselves as a civilizing force, as members of a God-blessed superior race, many Mexican Californios saw the Anglo frontiersmen moving westward in the 1840s as “grimy adventurers,” “exiles from civilization” (quoted in Takaki 1999, 167). The Mexican government had prohibited American immigration. Those who came anyway were seen as plunderers and likened to the bears, *los osos*, that preyed on the rancheros’ cattle (Takaki 1999).

One Mexican newspaper likened Americans to a “horde of banditti, of drunkards, of fornicators[,] . . . vandals vomited from hell, monsters who bid defiance to the laws of nature[,] . . . shameless, daring, ignorant, ragged, bad-smelling, long-bearded men with hats turned up at the brim, thirsty with the desire to appropriate our riches and our beautiful damsels” (quoted in Takaki 1999, 175). And even the man heading the forces that captured Mexico City, General Winfield Scott, admitted that American soldiers had “committed atrocities to make Heaven weep and every American of Christian morals blush for his country . . . Murder, robbery and rape of

mothers and daughters in the presence of tied-up males of the families all along the Rio Grande” (ibid.).

One hundred and sixty years later, I ask my Mexican friends what they think of Anglos. When I asked Cecilia, she blushed and paused, and then she leaned over to me and asked, with a mixture of anxiety, doubt, and attempted humor, “Are you a CIA agent? It is dangerous. I could be made to leave.” She is afraid that to communicate a negative impression of the so-called “hosts” could be grounds to deport even someone here legally. While this may sound paranoid, American history is strewn with efforts to get “others” (such as French Canadians) to pledge their fealty and harsh retaliations if they did not. With hearty reassurance and coaxing, Cecilia and others have shared with me what the Anglo shadow today looks like to the Mexicans over whom it falls.

Some of those I asked pointed to character traits, calling Anglos *cuadraditos* (rule driven and square minded); *infelices* (wretched); *malditos gringos* (damned, cursed, wicked gringos); *cursis* (vulgar, crude, ridiculous, exaggerated); *sosos* (insipid, dull, uninteresting, bland); *estúpidos*, *egoístos* (stupid and selfish); and *falsos* (deceitful). Others mentioned a status, attitude, or practice they viewed as common to the group: “The gringos take everything from the poor to crush them.” “Gringos think their race is best.” “They are rich.” “They have an ambition for expanding.” “They are greedy and they are liars [*mentirosos*] and abusive.” “They are bastards, *hijos de la chingada* [sons of bitches].” “They are *ventajosos* [unscrupulous], taking advantage of whatever they have.” “They are people who have misused their power [*quien ha abusado del poder*].” “Gringos do things that are inhuman.” “Their history is a series of abuses.” “They deserve the narcotics we bring them.”

Gringos are thieves, swindlers, invaders, and usurpers. We crucify and we swindle. We are the kind of people who make others aliens and strangers in their own land when we are the newcomers. We outlaw the languages of those who were here before us. We are racists and slave drivers, marked by greed, egotism, and selfishness. We are self-centered opportunists, parasitical to the body of the people, *el pueblo*. When it suits us, we suck the blood of migrants. When it does not, we clean them off our streets and throw them away without care, separating family members and depositing people in Mexican locations they have never been and where they know no one. At the border we act crazy and drunken, without moral principles.

In a transborder art project with children in Tijuana, Norma Iglesias-Prieto (2012) asked, “If the United States were an animal, which animal would it be?” One child answered, “A lion, because it wants to be the

king of the jungle.” Another, “A donkey, because they are stubborn and foolish.”

In *The Cultural Politics of Emotion* (2004), Sara Ahmed explains that whereas guilt generally springs from the violation of common standards, shame relates to some quality of the self. Ahmed says, “In shame, more than my action is at stake: *the badness of an action is transferred to me* such that I feel myself to be bad” (2004, 105). The one who is ashamed often tries to evade the eyes of those who see him or her as shameful. Indeed, walls of relative privilege can be slid into place to avoid the direct gaze of others. For Anglos, it is the exception when a Mexican looks at us and speaks his mind about us. We can look at workers in an agricultural field, but we do not experience their gaze back at us. If they were looking at us, we might experience ourselves as lazy, as people who avoid the hard work necessary to grow our own food, build our own roads, and even maintain our own homes.

BECOMING A PROBLEM TO OURSELVES: SOUL MUTILATIONS

Many of the defenses against others that we regularly employ and normalize not only cause great misery to those who are “othered” but diminish us as well. Those on the side of privilege in the current age of globalization suffer soul wounds of their own, injuries not dissimilar to the psychic mutilation Fanon and Memmi described for those who participate in colonialism. These wounds require their own phenomenological analysis.

To be in the present without rooting our selves in the past, to amputate our history: Having imposed the “melting pot” on others, we have come to suffer it ourselves. Many of us are paradoxically not unlike the descendants of slaves insofar as we are hard pressed to know where our families originated, how they got here, and what they sought to accomplish in coming here. We meet each other in the present, with little sense of our familial and cultural pasts. While some may search for their roots through tourism and genealogical research, roots discovered in these ways are far from those felt through direct family narratives and attention to history. We have some interest in history but no real devotion to it, for the histories we would encounter are deeply problematic.

To turn our backs on our neighbors: Whether we define Mexicans as not belonging here or we more simply follow social convention by avoiding conversations that would require us to recognize and witness their struggles and needs, we leave holes in many of our daily interactions, in our consciousness, and in the social fabric.

To assert false stature, to raise oneself through the diminishment of others: For Anglos, the long-ensconced and largely accepted diminishment of Mexicans results in a diminishment of ourselves as well. Every false note of assumed superiority carries an unconscious note of inferiority; every unjust action, a submerged sense of guilt and shame. The resulting inner cacophony puts Anglos ill at ease with themselves. The contradiction they impose on the Mexican, their habit of severing a person's labor from that individual's personhood, is of necessity mirrored by a fragmentation of their own selves. They are left with a fragmentary self-identification reproduced by mass culture, that of the "hearty consumer." The finer threads of discerning conscience and empathic connection are locked away from easy access.

To seal the situation, confining themselves and others into this unhappy state of affairs, many Anglos refuse to create paths to citizenship for those on whom they depend, thereby consigning millions to an underclass with little political representation and themselves to more of the same faulty self-evaluation.

To engage in excessive appetites and the abuse of "others": Consuming the labor of others to enhance convenience and comfort ultimately leaves us in a discomfiting world. We cannot solve this discomfort by claiming others' illegality while disavowing our own unexamined and often petty appetites. It is striking that, as we Americans watch the heightening violence in Mexico out of the corners of our eyes, few call for drug abstinence as an expression of solidarity with the Mexican people. Presumably, the relatively easy availability of marijuana balances out a situation where beheadings are used to terrorize a population, stray gunfire takes innocent lives, and ordinary places are turned into war zones. Individualism leaves unquestioned the shadow side of our appetites, increasingly removing the miseries of sweatshops and industrial plants to the other side of walls that make sight more difficult.

To take refuge in exaggerated outrage rather than accept responsibility for the shadows our actions cast on our neighbors: Even as we deny any responsibility for helping extend the human rights to adequate shelter, food, health care, and education to our neighbors who have come without legal sanction, we wantonly enjoy the fruits of our neighbors' labor. Split against ourselves, we take refuge in exaggerated and simple-minded outrage, wiping aside all the complexities of the situation. The frequent cry, "What don't you understand about the word 'illegal'?" does not acknowledge how U.S. policies help displace millions from Mexican farms.

To defend the right to profit, severing our own conscience regarding the means employed and the people exploited to create the excess gain: "Free"

trade that depends on labor exploitation ends up bearing little freedom for Mexican workers at the border or for the conscience of Anglos. Two hundred years ago, the Quaker John Woolman asked that “we look upon our treasures, and the furniture of our houses, and [our] garments . . . and try whether the seeds of war have nourishment in these our possessions” (1989, 255). Our neat lawns, clean houses, good foods, finely stitched clothes, and emptied garbage cans must also be considered as we calculate the human price paid to achieve them.

To take refuge in scapegoating blinds us to the deeper causes of our dilemmas: The wall, along with the rhetoric that accompanies it, encourages citizens to believe that the harms they face come from the outside rather than from the inside. This is particularly pernicious when people who have lost their jobs or fear unemployment in the currently precarious market are led to imagine that immigrants are stealing their potential jobs and job security. This misreading deflects their attention from the actual causes of the unemployment and economic instability.

To minimize the pain of displacement for others and thus for oneself: The Mexican sees the Anglo as a lonely person. Having left our own places, we have moved others off the land to which we came, erasing their history. We settle in places that we have severed from the past, doubly orphaning ourselves. We try to live as though it doesn't really matter, but we are afraid to put any root too deeply into the earth beneath us, as though touching the buried shards of Indian pottery and Mexican adobe would awaken us from our simple-minded dream that we own the land on which we dwell.

An Anglo man passes a Mexican's yard on Sunday afternoon and sees him surrounded by family and friends. There is laughter; music blares. A cold beer, a piñata atmosphere. The Anglo goes home, too often alone. His mother and father are divorced, living far away; his children live far apart, as though thrown from a spaceship into different states or even countries. What the Mexican enjoys in his postage-stamp yard seems unavailable to the Anglo. The Mexican looks more at home than the Anglo. The Anglo tries not to give it a second thought.

The archetypal psychologist James Hillman says, “When we refuse the historical aspect in our complexes,” ignoring “how history reaches us through our complexes, . . . we create orphans” (1998, 143). While saving ourselves from feelings of guilt and shame, we end up orphaned in the very world where we want to feel at home. We need to become a problem to ourselves and feel the shame of our situation.

RE-VISIONING SHAME AS A POTENTIALLY FRUITFUL EMOTION

Allowing Shame, Inviting Shame

While psychologists offer ways to manage anger and navigate the stages of grief, they often omit shame from emotional literacy, implying that it is to be avoided, as though it were only a psychic sinkhole. We need to begin to differentiate the psychic landscape of shame so that we can better see how it affects our relationships to and public policies regarding migrants and others who are denigrated in our societies.

The dominant American ethos can be characterized as both guilt- and shame-avoidant. It is slow to acknowledge wrongdoing and even slower to acknowledge “wrongbeing.” The public space in which shame could be allowed and examined is almost nonexistent. Instead of feeling shame, we are prone to try to remove—even through violence—the presumed source of the feeling. One way of attempting to avoid shame is to remove the people who have suffered as the victims of shameful acts. For a stunning example of this, consider the white-led push to return former slaves to Liberia, Africa, after the end of the Civil War. Presently many want to return Mexicans to Mexico and erase the history of their treatment here through the removal of ethnic studies from school curricula. We must be empathic with the psychic dynamics that occasion such efforts of removal: upwelling feelings of shame, inadequate resources for establishing self-esteem, and paranoia. When we treat others badly, we suffer the “paranoia” of knowing that our actions may be turned back on us. The shame caused to others inevitably seeps back toward the self.

Certain sociocultural dynamics mitigate the ability to acknowledge shame. In considering Hannah Arendt’s work, Elisabeth Young-Bruehl (2009) underscores how shame can be blocked by the overcertainties of ideology. This is clearly the case in the United States today. For many, the phrase “what don’t *they* [immigrants without documents] understand about the word ‘illegal?’” blocks a deeper examination of the complex causes of migration. For others, an ideology of completely open borders can preclude taking up citizens’ legitimate concerns about employment and the management of state and local resources.

We need to find the means for nonviolently addressing shame, to appropriately acknowledge and apologize for wrongdoings, and to make restitution for harms committed. Acknowledgment, the bearing of shameful feelings, apology, and restitution will provide the material for building authentic self-respect, for retrieving a sense of worth. They are the steps of reconciliation that can begin to reweave torn social fabrics. To lock one’s

door against a neighbor's need causes shame for those on both sides of the door.

Metabolizing Shame

Not all cultures cut themselves off from the learning that can happen when there is a psychic and social space for shame. The Maori people consider shame to be one step removed from heaven. According to the Jungian analyst Joan Chodorow, the Korean system of understanding emotions casts shame as a “differentiated feeling” rather than a basic emotion. “The *capacity to experience shame* ‘in recognition of one’ s error’ is the first of four noble qualities leading toward the development of compassion” (Chodorow 2009, 5). We are unfamiliar with what it looks like and feels like to allow oneself to be suffused with shame in order to move toward greater compassion. Too often shameful feelings cause us to look away from those whom we have harmed rather than to reengage with them in ways that allow us to be seen as the cause of others’ suffering. As long as we avoid shame, our compassion is like a shriveled or amputated limb. To learn to work with our shame would allow us to experience shame not as an emotion that we loathe and avoid but as a differentiated feeling that can be used to inform our basic stance toward others. Indeed, for shame not to predispose us to defensive rage and violence, we need to bring consciousness to it, so that we can use it as a path to appropriate guilt, meaningful remorse, empathic connection, and concern for others. Hopefully, then, our actions will reflect our shifts in awareness, eventuating in more caring, compassionate, and just treatment of others.

Hannah Arendt addressed shame in 1945, before the end of the war:

For many years now we have met Germans who declare that they are ashamed of being Germans. I have often felt tempted to answer that I am ashamed of being human. This elemental shame, which many people of the most various nationalities share with one another today, is what is finally left of our sense of international solidarity; and it has not yet found an adequate political expression. . . . For the idea of humanity, when purged of all sentimentality, has the very serious consequence that in one form or another men must assume responsibility for all crimes committed by men and that all nations share the onus of evil committed by all others. (2003, 154)

We need to learn how to bear a double dose of elemental shame: first, for having helped to so greatly disrupt local economies that people are forced to migrate; second, for imposing on migrants the constant threat of a sec -

ond dislocation through detention and deportation. We must write shame into our vocabulary for communal and psychological health, seeing it as a step toward living with others with more compassion and integrity.

Reintegrative Shame

John Braithwaite, in *Crime, Shame, and Reintegration*, focuses on the use of shame to “provoke personal obligations to others within a community of concern” (1989, 84). Societal conditions that favor communitarianism at the societal level and interdependence at the individual level of analysis are most conducive to this use of shame. The interdependencies “must be attachments which invoke personal obligation to others within a community of concern. They are not perceived as isolated exchange relationships of convenience but as matters of profound group obligations” (85). If shame is to be reintegrative, however, one must denounce the offense but not the offender. Crucial opportunities must be provided for shame to be removed or transformed.

As Braithwaite carefully describes it, shame need not foreclose people from human relatedness. To avoid this, we must create rituals for remorse and repentance and paths of restitution and reparation that will facilitate integration into the common human family.

The psychiatrist James Gilligan, who spent decades working with violent offenders in the Massachusetts prison system, has drawn on his professional experience to illuminate the link between shame and violence. He found that those who are most vulnerable to debilitating feelings of shame have no nonviolent means to ward off or diminish these feelings and little if any emotional capacity to experience guilt and love in ways that might inhibit violence. In the face of shame, they are more likely to use violence as a means to establish their personhood and demand “respect” (1997, 112).

Let us turn first to those Americans who suffer the burden of low social status and the shame that can arise from that, those who do not altogether blame themselves, for they understand that the hurdles facing them have been largely imposed by others. Gilligan points out that this combination of shame and innocence in members of low-status groups makes homicide more likely than suicide: “Those who are primarily exposed to feelings of shame and innocence would primarily blame and punish others, and thus would be more likely to commit homicide than suicide; whereas those who are statistically more likely to be exposed to feelings of guilt (and pride) would have a higher rate of suicide to homicide” (1997, 207).

On Staten Island and Long Island; in Phoenix; in Richmond, Virginia; in Coeur d’Alene, Idaho; in Boulder, Colorado—in all these places, hate crimes against Mexicans and other Latinos are on the rise. Some perpetra-

tors pretend to offer their victims jobs but deliver them to a Homeland Security office; others carve racist death threats in high-school cafeteria tables; still others stalk migrants, beating them while yelling racist slurs and sometimes even murdering them. These are not rare occurrences. Most racist incidences go unreported for fear of deportation.

Gilligan argues that all violence has as its aim the achievement of justice for oneself or those on whose behalf one thinks one is acting. For many men, it is also about the “maintenance of manhood.” The assaults on Staten Island have been carried out largely by poor African American teens and young adults. Gilligan describes poor whites’ discrimination against African Americans as “one of the few forms of self-esteem insurance that they are allowed” (1997, 199). In the present case, some African American youths are themselves attempting to rescue their own self-esteem by perpetrating hate crimes. The absence of nonviolent means of maintaining self-respect, such as education and employment, leaves violence as a last resource. Gilligan underscores that envy is itself a form of shame, causing us to feel inferior to those we envy. When jobs are in short supply, harassment and violence against the objects of one’s envy—in this case, the employed—is a sad self-defense. What these young people need is not a community free of Mexicans but a community that offers opportunities for self-respect through education, training, employment, and community leadership, the latter something rarely allowed youth.

Some African Americans accept the conservative right’s claim that their joblessness results from the presence of Mexicans and other Latino immigrants. What could be more convenient than for some in the black underclass in America to blame poor Mexicans for having created their problems? Horizontal violence—violence, that is, against those in one’s own or a similar group—keeps people in submission to ruling-class authorities who appear mainly in their absence. Histories of oppression become dissolved and invisible. Those whose self-love and self-esteem are most diminished are chilled by shame and humiliation before coming to reside in psychic numbness, that state in which violence fails to register its woeful cost. Gilligan describes the intentional strategy of dividing those without substantive power into groups of predators and prey, relieving some of the need for policing and suppression from those in control. This is a common strategy in American prisons, where some prisoners are allowed to suppress and abuse others.

Working-class and poor whites have been tutored by right-wing media and politicians to think in racial rather than class terms, to identify with their racial status rather than their working-class status, which they share with many people of color. Many are convinced that their interests are

pitted against those of color in a zero-sum game. Some such whites have used a sense of racial superiority to mitigate the psychic and very real daily assaults of working conditions and poor economic status. At the end of the march from Selma to Montgomery in 1965, Martin Luther King Jr. asserted that “the Southern aristocracy took the world and gave the poor white man Jim Crow. . . . And when his wrinkled stomach cried out for the food that his empty pockets could not provide, he ate Jim Crow , a psychological bird that told him that no matter how bad off he was, at least he was a white man, better than the black man” (2002, 124). “Time and time again,” says Michelle Alexander, “poor and working-class whites were persuaded to choose their racial status interests over their economic interests with blacks, resulting in the emergence of new caste systems that only marginally benefitted whites but were devastating for African Americans” (2010, 243).

This has led to voting patterns and to racial discrimination and isolation that have served to worsen the situation of poor whites. Where this racial identification has been even partly overcome, emerging transracial solidarities have improved the working and economic conditions for poor and working-class whites. Alexander (2010) urges us to remember Martin Luther King Jr.’s insight that we must move from a focus on civil rights to one on human rights. This shift helps us recognize that the economic insecurity of poor and working-class whites can be tragically harnessed to racial animosities even as we embrace the human-rights needs of Mexican migrants.

Indeed, in a globalized economic system, the causes of forced migration significantly overlap the causes of under- and unemployment, job insecurity, poor working conditions, and low wages. We must understand these common causes if we are to create a human-rights paradigm that is relevant to poor and working-class whites, Mexicans, and African Americans. Alexander argues that when the civil rights movement failed to adequately promote the link between the poor and working-class whites and African Americans, efforts at affirmative action were “like salt on a wound as African Americans leapfrogged over working class whites to Harvard and Yale and jobs in police and fire departments” (2012, 246).

But it is not only the poor and minorities who confuse the causes of their difficulties. Members of the white middle class, which is itself falling into an economic abyss, too often blame Mexicans for their own problems: rising unemployment, bad schools, inadequate health care, and poor policing and emergency services. This conservative right-wing account fuels several groups of citizens in their attempt to scapegoat Mexicans by intensifying a climate of hatred and division. According to this line of rhetoric, Mexicans

are taking away Americans' jobs and using up municipal revenues for their medical and educational needs. In short, it blames the current economic recession on Mexicans, who are seen as invaders and parasites. This scapegoating is a skillful sleight of hand that deflects attention from the excessive greed of many whose actions have caused millions to lose their life savings, housing, retirement, and jobs.

Gilligan understands collective violence, exemplified by the Holocaust, as resulting from many of these same factors. Hitler rose to power in 1933 on the heels of the Depression and promised to reverse the "shame of Versailles." According to Gilligan, members of the lower middle class supported Hitler in an attempt to free themselves from the shame that unemployment, loss of homes, and downward social mobility had left them feeling. "The members of this group felt in danger of losing their capital and suffering a loss of social and economic status, a degradation, by becoming part of the humiliated, inferior, poverty-stricken lower class, or felt they had already suffered that humiliating sea-change into something poor and strange, and were eager for revenge—for a way of re-establishing their status or power" (Gilligan 1997, 67). Jews were the scapegoat, seen as the cause of this threatening situation. They were envied, falling prey to those who felt diminished and thus sought to diminish others in their stead. The claim of cultural superiority and an imagined racial superiority appear to alleviate the threat of shame. We see it in the United States and throughout Europe, where foes of immigration fear a loss of the host culture and language. Some Anglos fear the Hispanization of the United States. The fear of finding one's group a minority fuels their xenophobia. The call to restore honor, engineered by individuals such as the conservative radio talk-show host Glenn Beck, bespeaks the loss of self-respect that is an ingredient of xenophobic racism. Too many Anglos feel frustrated, invisible, and devalued in their own country.

They can alleviate some of these feelings not only by seeing the Mexican migrant as a stupid, lazy parasite but also by exerting unconscious pressure to make the migrant feel this about him- or herself. Shame itself migrates into the migrant. As shame is transferred from citizen to noncitizen, particular others—lovers, husbands, fathers, sons, daughters, mothers, and friends of the newly shamed subject—are conglomerated and reduced to lawbreakers.

Sadly, many in the United States now occupy a position similar to that of lower middle-class Germans in the 1930s. They have lost their homes and their jobs or fear they stand on the brink of doing so. They and their children may lack adequate education and health care. They no longer have adequate retirement funds or even the hope of obtaining them. They no lon

ger feel that an adulthood of success, security, and self-respect is achievable, and for this they feel ashamed. This shame, moreover, largely stems from the trope of American individualism, the notion that all are solely responsible for their own success or failure, however the playing field might tilt.

So scapegoating can indeed temporarily address shameful feelings, but unfortunately it always moves toward greater violence. The atrocities committed against the victims of scapegoating are themselves shameful, but they must be justified by rhetoric that falsely elevates the crime to a virtue, as in the notion that one is “cleansing” the population. Scapegoating also distracts us from seeing where our troubles are actually rooted. It is utilized and fueled by leaders who have hidden motivations and intentions that are more likely to succeed if groups are divided from one another.

We need a conjunction of psychology and history to understand why many Anglos experience the Mexicans in their midst as interlopers who are causing high unemployment and dwindling local and state budgets. Those who are victims of history have come to be seen as perpetrators of fraud, abuse, and violence. Nowhere in this narrative is it acknowledged that Anglos were themselves interlopers in the mid- 1800s, that their nation’s policies have substantially contributed to the present mass migration, that Anglos have profited from the presence of low-cost labor, and that many Anglo businesses have colluded with and even encouraged false documentation. In part, these gaps in the narrative are due to historical and social amnesia—to a failure to examine the shadows our walls cast, to address racism, and to make the study of history essential to our efforts to know ourselves.

Scapegoating is understandable in such a situation, but we need to see through it and disrupt it. Failures in education, health care, and employment opportunities do not occur simply because “others” have taken up residence in a new homeland. Getting rid of these “others” will not solve these problems. The complex global forces and unbridled greed that have caused forced migration of unprecedented proportions are the same as those that have eroded the self-confidence and self-respect of the people involved in scapegoating. In the present case, scapegoating is a diversion from critically attending to the massive betrayal of ordinary Americans by those who use their power and position for excessive personal gain. The economic catastrophes wrought by the exercise of excessive greed have so disrupted the lives of ordinary Americans that our possibilities for hospitality are tragically overwhelmed by fear of inadequate resources for ourselves. The illegality of the Mexican crossing the border is far easier to protest than the illegality of money schemes within the banking system that even regulators don’t sufficiently understand.

Encouraging Collective Shame and Remorse

But the day that people will have understood who you were, they will bite the earth with sadness and remorse, they will water it with their tears, and they will build temples to you.

Vercors (pseudonym of Jean Marcel Bruller),
inscription on the Mémorial des Martyrs de la Déportation, Paris

A group or culture that can begin to practice historical memory instead of social amnesia, that can collectively acknowledge and sincerely apologize for events in the past that have harmed others, that can make amends, and that claims its shadow of exclusion and abuse is a culture that is creating nonviolent ways for people to live together, to be reconciled as neighbors rather than polarized as enemies. Margaret Gilbert (2001, 231) points out that collective remorse does not rule out individual remorse, but it also does not require it. One may feel no personal responsibility for offenses that harmed others yet still acknowledge membership in the group that was responsible.

Gilbert describes membership remorse as a group member's remorse over the act of a group of which he or she is a member. The group member need not have participated in the acts or even known about them at the time. Gilbert says that group "members all bear some relevant relation to the act of their group" because of their "participation in the underlying joint commitment" (2001, 227). Group remorse may be suffered secretly, she says, with others not knowing. Membership and group remorse pave the way not only for "backward-looking forgiveness" but also for "a renewal of forward-looking trust" (218). Moving from shame to remorse allows a shift from defensive and hostile relations to the possibility of a desire for making amends, restitution, and reparations.

Engaging History

The borderlands theorist Gloria Anzaldúa (1999) urges us to take an inventory of the histories that have shaped us and then to put them "through a sieve" so as to "winnow out the lies" (104). James Baldwin put the dilemma bluntly in his essay "The White Man's Guilt," printed in *Ebony* magazine:

People who imagine that history flatters them (as it does, indeed, since they wrote it) are impaled on their history like a butterfly on a pin and become incapable of seeing or changing themselves, or the world.

This is the place in which it seems to me, most white Americans find themselves. Impaled. They are dimly, or vividly, aware that the history

they have fed themselves is mainly a lie, but they do not know how to release themselves from it, and they suffer enormously from the personal incoherence. (1965, 47)

Arizona's recently passed law banning ethnic studies in that state is bad for those of Mexican descent and bad for Anglos.¹ A sensitive Anglo reading the books on Arizona's banned list might well feel a sense of shame at the history of land grabs, violent displacements, lynchings, rapes, and exploitation that has marred Anglos' presence in the American Southwest. The removal of Chicano history from American schools is akin to the removal and deportation of Mexican migrants themselves, for both involve removing a source of shame from the American landscape.

In order to avert hostile defensiveness, which distorts and perverts history, school authorities must craft educational environments that allow for respectful dialogue and eschew false histories more consoling to those in power. Otherwise, those who suffer from a heritage of inequality and violence are perversely presented as criminals, as aliens attempting to undo the society they are seen as invading and exploiting. Sensitively allowing for shame and providing ample ways for students to live more equitably with their Mexican neighbors help ensure that defense against shameful feelings does not lead to rage and violence. The reduction of what Gilligan calls "shame-provoking inequalities" is crucial, for shame accrues on both sides of the veil.

Restorative History, Restorative Shame, Restorative Justice

Sadly, our challenge is not to reintegrate those who were once part of our common fabric and then expelled. It is to decisively build relationships with those neighbors who have never been included, relationships distinguished by justice and respect. It is also to realize that we ourselves are on the outside of the common, in need of integration.

We have a choice regarding how we treat the immigrants who enter our communities. America has successfully integrated many immigrant groups, allowing them to climb the ladder of success and to enter professional jobs. We have failed with respect to other groups. Do we make an internal colony of those who come, or do we learn from our history and commit ourselves to extending human rights to those who labor in our communities? With forced migrations reaching unprecedented proportions, the right to live in particular places has become ever more contested, sometimes with history rewritten to justify present claims. Others may become defined not simply as in the way but as out of place, in the wrong place. As multiple claims on the same place intensify, those in one group may believe they would be bet

ter off if the other group were eliminated. This may be the case, even if the latter group had prior claim to the place and a history of habitation in the area. Unfortunately, ill-treatment and even violence may be used to displace a group from the place they now call home.

America has used brute power not only to legitimate its interference in other people's homelands but also to define others in terms that justify expelling them from a land that we have conveniently claimed as our own place, forgetting that it belonged to ancestors of these same others. Across the globe, uprooted by the effects of transnational globalization and its attendant violence and ecological devastation, people are being forced to become migrants, leaving their homes, communities, and often families. Our hope is that engendering restorative shame at a history remembered and taken to heart can help heal the ways we greet and treat our neighbors.

A discourse based on shame also has perils. One may feel better after apologizing, but the victim may derive no real benefit from it. Indeed, apology without altered behavior serves to further disrupt the possibilities of trust and repair. Reflecting on white Australians' creation of "Sorry Books," which apologized for abuses against Aborigines, Sara Ahmed warns that we should apologize only to help those who were harmed and not principally to feel better about ourselves by relieving our guilt and shame—or worse, to bolster our self-image with pride in our new insights. Only when the acknowledgment of shame is paired with a new mode of being with others that seeks to repair what can be repaired, and that commits us to never again causing the sufferings previously caused, does shame bear restorative fruit.

To address our soul loss, we must begin to look carefully at the images in the mirrors that our Mexican neighbors hold up to us. How are we seen? What truth is there? We must grapple with these starkly negative—though often hidden—assessments. We will need to acknowledge that the actions of our people—and perhaps our own actions—have sown this derision, mistrust, and disdain. We must desire to act in ways that will give rise to more just realities. In time, these seeds will generate wholly different images, though this is not to be sought as an end in itself. This is a place to begin walking toward being a neighbor, a place to start anew in full awareness that the past will not be erased and that generations of undue hardship thrust on people in the past will require generations of integrity to gain the trust of those in the present and the future so that we can make common cause. Over a century ago, DuBois said that "the nation has not yet found peace from its sins" ([1903] 1989, 5). Indeed, it is still a peace we need to seek.

May we want to reckon up our debts, acknowledge them, create formal apologies, and commit to reparations and remembrance. These restorative actions will not only help us retrieve the Anglo soul but also, and more

important, help grace the world of which we are but one part with increased justice and peace. By walking these pathways, Anglos can cease holding themselves apart from the arms of the world in which they were born.

DuBois says,

Through all the sorrow of the Sorrow Songs there breathes a hope—a faith in the ultimate justice of things. The minor cadences of despair change often to triumph and calm confidence. Sometimes it is faith in life, sometimes a faith in death, sometimes assurance of boundless justice in some fair world beyond. But whichever it is, the meaning is always clear: that sometime, somewhere, men will judge men by their souls and not by their skins. Is such a hope justified? Do the Sorrow Songs sing true? ([1903] 1989, 186)

Will Anglos find access to their own lamentations and sorrow, so that hope for those consigned to racial and economic castes and for Anglos themselves can be justified?

The Mexican migrants who struggle with poverty know they enter a foreign and hostile land. The wall announces the United States' will to assert control over their movements. They will soon learn that their labor is desired, but not their personhood—if they have not already fully learned this in Mexico. They will be treated as entirely expendable. They discover that they are to express no needs, and certainly no demands to meet those needs. If they are to remain, they must attempt to be invisible while seemingly tireless in the service of others. Even so, this unjust arrangement cannot be trusted, for their newly constructed home can be dismantled at any moment. Indeed, the system keeps an eye on them, even far from the border. It keeps them on edge. Such a situation does not merit the word *hospitality*. It is exploitation, pure and simple. Is it any wonder that the children of these migrants grow up to carry a resentment and bitterness in their hearts that is equal to their sense of futility about rising to a place of personhood in the eyes of Anglos? How dark the shadow we have cast; how arbitrary the diminishment they find themselves born under.

In colonialism, those settlers who found colonial arrangements inhumane could leave the colony. In the neocolonialism wrought by globalization, colonial arrangements happen all around us in our own community, so that our transformation of relationships and arrangements of power must begin here. As Americans, the wall we encounter is of our own making. We see the door we have shut on others. We can notice how we turn away from it and look elsewhere.

To restore our souls, we “norteamericanos” need our own medicine his-

tory, to put this in Aurora Levins Morales' s (1999) language. This is a bitter herb, but without it we are doomed to repeat a savage history of exploitation and self-aggrandizement at the expense of others. Without it, we cannot develop the “double consciousness” of which DuBois spoke. It will be acquired through effort. When we hear how others see us, we will feel shame, and we must be ready to bear it, understanding that it will be the humus of another form of consciousness, more empathic, more soulful.

We must suffer becoming “other” to ourselves, a problem to ourselves. This will place us as kin to Malintzin. We will be seen as “race traitors.” We will find there is a hidden room in the heart of our house. We have been locked out. The stranger shows us that we are locked out of the inside of our home (Derrida 2000). He provides us a necessary reorientation that should elicit our gratitude. This is a reorientation to our neighbor . We would cease to demand his invisibility , cease to throw him out, to blame him for inequalities and lack of opportunities that have nothing to do with him. This reorientation allows us to see him with respect—indeed, with gratitude as well. The migrant has come a long way . Being more aware of his history and his burdens, let us welcome him in and in so doing come closer to the heart of our home.

SOUL RETRIEVAL

Let me now consider the kind of neighbor each of us is to the migrant, to the stranger. The psychoanalyst Eric Santner argues that “it is precisely [our] answerability that is at the heart of our very aliveness to the world” (2001, 9). While Freud was oriented to the “various ways we remove ourselves from the midst” of life, defending against aliveness, says Santner, we need to create a psychology of the possibility and the actuality of encounter to open to “the uncanny presence” of our neighbors (ibid.). To nourish our imagination about such encounters, we can turn to the Bantu principle of *ubuntu*, which guided many South Africans during the proceedings of the post-apartheid Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC). In traditional African society, a person may have some riches and authority but if they do not have *ubuntu*, they are not respected. *Ubuntu* is hospitality; it is a welcoming and open attitude, a generosity and caring, a willingness to share. *Ubuntu*, says Michael Battle, is the “development of a person who proves to be a neighbor to strangers and welcomes them as friends” (1997, 65). I become a person through you, as you do through me. Bishop Desmond Tutu, who presided over the TRC, says that “in the spirit of ubuntu, the central concern is the healing of breaches, the redressing of imbalances, the restoration of broken relationships” (2000, 54). The South African psy-

chologist Pumla Gobodo-Madikizela, speaking from her experience working on the TRC, clarifies how we can go about dissolving “the apartheid of the mind” from which our societal apartheid ensues: “To humanize the other and to act in ways that humanize us for others are the corollary acts that are needed” (2003, 109).

When we fail to focus on our broken relationships, we trigger an autoimmune attack. In our failure to grasp the deep level of our interbeing, the pursuit of what appears to be our own self-interest compromises our existence. For this reason, the philosopher Jacques Derrida described our current inhospitable and unjust approaches to immigration as autoimmune attacks, destroying the common body by turning mistakenly on one part.

The kind of restorative and generative shame at issue in this chapter calls us to a new self, one that acknowledges the poverty of hoarding, the ignorance born of separation, and the lovelessness bred by overattachment to self-interest. This self is enlivened by protest and resistance to that which undermines *ubuntu*, understanding the risk of loss of soul and connection. It responds to the psychic gravitational pull that the migrants’ forced movement away from his or her home exerts on us, causing us to cross our own borders of reserve and alienation and create forms of mutuality that are graced by an integrity we have almost forgotten is possible.

The pilgrimages required of us are both intrapsychic and interpersonal, for they must entail those shifts that enable us to enter into relations with those whom we have previously ignored, minimized, derogated, denied, or forsaken. Once disturbed by finding ourselves “others,” we who enjoy many fruits of privilege must breach our group’s social conventions in order to inquire further, leaving the safety of the walls—metaphorical and literal—that we have within and around us. That which has been cast out is now encountered anew. Without our knowing the history on which our present moment rests, we cannot ask ourselves the questions we need to address. We sacrifice the possibility of knowing ourselves, of finding our true roots. Without finding our place in history, we cannot wholly forge our integrity. When we amputate history so that it comes out just “right,” we also amputate our hope for forming a community that is graced by bridges connecting its member groups. We condemn ourselves to the alienation, loneliness, and paranoia that accompany all apartheid-like arrangements between groups.

It is not just Mexican migrants who are “up against the wall”; Anglos are as well. Paulo Freire, the Brazilian pedagogist and leader of Brazil’s literacy movement, describes phenomena such as the literal and psychosocial walls at stake here as “limit situations.” He reminds us of Alvaro Vieira Pinto’s definition of a limit situation as not “the impassable boundaries

where all possibilities end, but the real boundaries where all possibilities begin; [they are not] the frontier which separates being from nothingness, but the frontier which separates being from being more” (quoted in Freire [1970] 1989, 89). The limit situations we confront require our careful and sustained critical reflection so that we can begin both to see how situations that seem inevitable and fixed are actually constructed and to determine who and what they serve so that they can be reimagined and created otherwise. This decade has delivered us to another dark chapter in the history of Mexican migration to the United States, where the physical wall at La Frontera has slid into place behind people who had anticipated being able to move more freely across the border. Ironically, the wall has trapped people who might otherwise have gone home, because for now, the wall and the impediments to crossing it creates have blocked the self-regulating flow of migration. Freirean pedagogy would have us critically decode the limit situations in our lives and encourages us to imagine more humane possibilities. This process of annunciatory or prophetic imagination guides our actions in the present as we together remake the problematic aspects of our shared world. The following chapters of this book will address the creative options that have arisen from such processes. While some may argue that we are further than ever from a wider adoption of any of these alternatives, it is vitally important to keep our imagination alive at this difficult juncture, for otherwise we will lose the vision of what will be possible and merely react to the stricter limits that have been more recently imposed.

For shame to become generative and restorative, we must undertake alternative actions that play a role in setting relationships right. To open our imagination to these alternatives is to engage the work of what has been called alterglobalization, an altogether different form of globalization, for its *teloi* are the spread of justice and sustainability. An adequate alterglobalization must address psychic decolonization and work toward forms of global citizenry that reject policies that diminish our humanity with one another while creating forms of transborder solidarity that begin to release us from the walls we have created. Such decolonization requires us to engage in an intentional set of practices that succeeds in placing us into direct relationships with those who have been separated from us. Only then can the empathic linking of communities proceed, and the valuing of each human being—whether Anglo or Mexican—become unquestioned.