Review of: "I is Another"

Ivan Ortega-Rodriguez

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The author writes an interesting essay of identity within a postmodern (and, I would dare say: "post-rational") context. He does not only problematise identity, but he also seems to deconstruct it in a quite visible way. Thus, he does not just say that "I am the result of the influence of others", "I am who I am in the relationship with other" or even, in a Levinasian way, "I am the one called by the other to be responsible". As the title indicates, he says: "I 'is' Another".

For this, the author combines references to authors and his own experience. He shows how "he" (if the pronoun can be actually used) is those influences and those experiences. To enhance this theses, the author use the third person, "is", instead of "am": "I is Another", and not "I Am Another". From this standpoint, if I understand him correctly, he considers that this understanding of identity is liberating for all, particularly for those oppressed, like lgbtq people. Of course, in a dialogue with more "modern" perspectives (but also personalistic), the author should explain how can it be liberating to be "lost" in one's individuality. Particularly, he should entertain a more thorough dialogue with thinkers like Buber and Levinas, who seem to indicate that the inevitability, and even primacy, of the other, leads to a deepening of subjectivity. What is more, if we leave anti-theological prejudices aside (as many already know, theology is full of philosophical insights), the author should consider some bold ideas of Trinitarian ontology, especially the idea that relation can be subsistent, and understand that we, too, can be "ourselves" (in a "strong" sense) *inasmuch* as we are related to the other, in the sense that we are constituted in our "subjectivity" and "subsistence" precisely because of, and not in spite of, relation. But for sure, this is not so much an "objection" as an invitation to the author to continue the dialogue with other traditions of thought.

In any case, even the style of the author's writing conveys this notion of identity. The author seems to wilfully avoid coherence, the text seems to be deliberately fragmentary, as our identities are "fragments" and "others". However, sometimes this style makes it difficult to understand what is being said. There are leaps from one consideration to another that are not clear. Of course, I insist, this way of writing is coherent with the notion of identity and the critique of logocentrism presented in this text. Nonetheless, it is also true that language is a tool we need to use, and it has its own "logos", a certain "legality" that is necessary to say anything, even a critique of "logos"… I understand very well that this is maybe one of the hardest tasks for a proposal like the one presented here: how to criticise "logocentrism" by using a communication tool that imposes a certain logos and rules of coherence. Still, I encourage the author to work on this aspect and successfully criticise logocentrism with a "logic" tool.