

Participation in times of social crisis: Refugees from crisis countries as a case study

Neil Pembroke

Karol Wojtyła's philosophical articulation of "participation," or being-with and acting-for others, is employed to inform theological reflection on solidarity with refugees. The first step is to correlate human participation as construed by Wojtyła and participation in the life of the triune God. In the second half of the essay, use is made of the I-Thou and We dynamics, neighbor-love, and other central ideas associated with participation to theologically analyze selected cases of refugee support and advocacy. The focus is largely, but not exclusively, on the European context.

Introduction

In order to give this essay a sharp focus, primary attention is given to the European context. What is commonly known as "the European refugee crisis" reached its peak in 2016. Complex structural problems persist, but the "crisis" has now passed. I note, as the scare quotes suggest, that the term "European refugee crisis" is problematic. It communicates a sense that Europe at that time was a continent under siege (Baerwaldt 2018). Indeed, refugees were commonly viewed as dangerous invaders who put cultural identity and economic security under serious threat.

Though the "crisis" is over, it is useful to reflect theologically on how neighbor-love and solidarity were expressed at its peak. The concept that is employed to inform the reflection is "participation." This term can simply describe the act of taking part in an activity. My interest is in participation as a moral activity. In what follows, I draw on Karol Wojtyła's description of it (Wojtyła 1979a, 1979b). Stated succinctly, participation is being-with and acting-for others with the aim of advancing the common good.

There has been a significant amount of work done on contributions of personalist philosophy to care and neighbor-love (Noddings 2013; Lerner 2014; Pembroke 2002). Wojtyła's work on participation takes us further in this regard because he accounts for not only the I-Thou relation, but also the "We" or social dimension. Personalist philosophers such as Martin Buber (1961, 1970), Ferdinand Ebner (1967, 2001), and Gabriel Marcel (1964a, 1964b) construe a genuine person-to-person encounter as an "I" meeting a "Thou." What characterizes the I-Thou relation is intersubjectivity; the partners participate in the relation as subjects rather than as "its." An adequate ethical treatment of participation needs to begin at the level of the I-Thou relation, but it needs to progress to incorporation of a "We" dimension. That is to say, an adequate articulation of a participative ethic includes both interpersonal and communal elements. For this reason, Wojtyła's conception of participation has been selected to inform theological reflection on solidarity with refugees.

Wojtyła (1979a, 1979b) took a phenomenological approach to his topic; he wrote as a philosopher rather than as a theologian. Pope John Paul II was, of course, a capable theologian; he chose a strictly





philosophical method to articulate the nature of participation. My first task is to ground the concept in an explicitly theological construct. To do this, I refer to Mühlen's (1963) Trinitarian theology. He mirrors the progression in Wojtyła's work on participation from the I-Thou level to the communal or "We" level. He posits the Holy Spirit as the personal agency representing the extension of the divine self-love expressed in the mutuality of the I-Thou relation between the Father and the Son; the triune God lives and loves not only through an I-Thou relation, but also through a We relation. Human participation is an echo, the faintest of echoes, of Trinitarian participation. Mühlen was writing before feminist theology was well-established. In describing his approach below, I render his German terms for the Three—*Vater, Sohn, und Heiliger Geist*—as Mother-Sophia, Logos-Sophia, and Spirit-Sophia, following Elizabeth Johnson's suggestion in *She Who Is* (Johnson 1992).

In the second half of the essay, I use the I-Thou and We dynamics, neighbor-love, and other central ideas associated with Wojtyła's conceptualization of participation to theologically analyze selected cases of refugee support and advocacy. The focus is largely, but not exclusively, on the European context. Europe is of course a very diverse social, political, and cultural entity. Reference will be made both to countries with extensive welfare programs and a history of welcoming large numbers of refugees, and countries where this is not the case. I have also included a story from the US context and one with an Australian setting. The dynamics they reveal are universal in application; they certainly connect with experiences commonly reported in Europe. Issues touched on include a crisis of solidarity, truth-telling, hospitality as open friendship vs hospitality as power, and a care of person-care of social world paradigm.

The concept of participation has been introduced above. We now turn to developing it more fully.

Wojtyła: The I-Thou relation and the "we-attitude" in social life

In his book, *The Acting Person*, Wojtyła (1979a) is primarily interested in developing a theory of human subjectivity as it is constituted through existence and agency. However, this project eventually leads him into a consideration of the social life of the acting person. Here, participation is the central concept. By participation, he means the ability to act

with others in such a way as to simultaneously realize all that results from communal acting, on the one hand, and the personalistic value of one's action, on the other (Wojtyła 1979a, 271). That is, the person who participates is able to be-with and act-with others in such a way that she is also able to be herself and to fulfil herself.

Wojtyła (1979a) introduces another concept in order to extend our understanding of the acting person participating in social existence—namely, the neighbor. The neighbor is one who is capable not only of being-with and acting-with others, but also of participating "in the very humanness" of others (Wojtyła 1979a, 294). Wojtyła concludes that "this participation serves the fulfilment of persons in *any community* in which they act and exist. The ability to share in the *humanness itself of every man is the very core of all participation and the condition of the personalistic value of all acting and existing together with others*" (Wojtyła 1979a, 295: emphasis in the original).

Clearly, the notions of participation and neighbor are very significant ones in the context of communal life. However, Wojtyła (1979b) considers that what he offered in *The Acting Person* is not yet a theory of community. In an essay entitled, "The Person: Subject and Community," he sets out to rectify this deficiency. In order to develop his theory, Wojtyła (1979b) works with two profiles or dimensions of communal life. The first one is the interhuman or the interpersonal, and it is symbolized by the pattern "I-you." The second one has a character that is less interhuman than social; it is symbolized by the pattern "we."

In tracking the contours of the first profile, Wojtyła (1979b) begins with the well-established principle in dialogical or personalistic philosophy (Buber, Marcel, et al) that the "I" is constituted by the "you." His aim is to extend and develop this fundamental truth. He does so by making strong connections with a concept that is vitally important in his philosophy—namely, subjectivity. Through agency which is simultaneously self-determination, the human person experiences herself as a subjective structure of self-domination and self-possession. But more than this, in order for the personal subject to be truly herself, she must constantly move in the direction of transcendence. Self-transcendence is the state of the person who acts in accordance with the requirements of the true and the good.

The way in which Wojtyła (1979b) develops his understanding of the "I-you" relation in terms of transcendent subjectivity is as follows. He begins by

observing that the “you” is another “I,” different from my “I.” When I say “I,” I express a relation that reaches out beyond me, but at the same time comes back to me. “You” is therefore at once a term of distinction or separateness, and a term of communion or contact. The other, the “you,” helps me to more fully affirm my own “I.” “In its basic shape the relation ‘I-you’ does not lead me out of my subjectivity; on the contrary, it establishes me in it more firmly” (Wojtyla 1979b, 294).

Wojtyla (1979b) suggests that there is a normative dimension associated with a reciprocal affirmation of subjectivity. The “I” should reveal the “you” to herself in her deepest structure of self-possession and self-domination, and vice versa. In particular, what should be revealed is the tendency to self-fulfillment which witnesses the transcendence that is the true character of the human as a person. The “I-you” relation has the capacity to reveal the truth of each person’s personhood, but more is needed. In the interhuman encounter, a person needs to be accepted and confirmed in her authentic selfhood. When this is the case, community is forged.

Wojtyla (1979b) considers that it is vitally important in developing a theory of community to distinguish the interhuman from the social dimension. As we have seen, the social profile is symbolized by the “we.” The “we” indicates many “I’s” acting in common, and “in common” means that the existence and action of the collection of “I’s” is oriented to some value. This value is the “common good.” It is here that we see the way in which the “I-you” is distinguished from the “we”:

The relation of the many “I’s” to the common good seems to be the very core of the social community. Thanks to this relation, people who experience their personal subjectivity, and therefore the actual plurality of human “I’s,” realize that they are a definite “we” and experience themselves in this new dimension. Although the person remains himself, this is a social dimension. It differs from that of the “I-you,” for the direction of the dimension is changed and is indicated by the common good. In this relation the “I” and the “you” find their reciprocal reference in a new dimension: they discover their “I-you” through the common good which constitutes a new unity among them (Wojtyla 1979b, 298).

Wojtyla’s rich philosophical analysis clearly identifies commitment to the common good as the factor that conveys the “I” and the “you” who share in interhuman relations to a new level of shared life—namely, one that is constituted through a new unity.

It is only when the plurality of “I’s” turn together toward the common good that they become a “we.”

It is interesting to note that Mühlen (1963) develops a Trinitarian theology that also has both an I-Thou and a “We” domain. According to Mühlen, Mother-Sophia and Logos-Sophia share in an I-Thou relation, whereas Spirit-Sophia is the mutual love between them. The Spirit is therefore construed as the “We”; it is the Spirit as Love that is the bond in the Trinitarian community. The Three participate in a communion of love in which all fully share, but the Spirit has a particular role in binding the persons together as a unity. In this way, Mühlen demonstrates that participation is a Trinitarian virtue.

I-Thou and “We” in the Trinity: Heribert Mühlen

Heribert Mühlen’s thought is significant for us because he explicitly develops a dimension that is only implicit in leading alternate relational Trinitarian theologies such as those of Moltmann (1981) and McCall (2014)—namely, the “We” element. In these other relational interpretations of the triune God, the I-Thou relation is posited as foundational.

Mühlen’s (1963) Trinitarian theology is helpful in the context of our project because it incorporates both the “I-Thou” and the “We” domains that are central in Wojtyla’s philosophy of subjectivity and community. He develops a theology of the triune God in which Mother-Sophia is the “I-statement,” Logos-Sophia is the “Thou-statement,” and the Holy Spirit is the “We-statement” (Mühlen 1963, 122–148). His first move is to discuss the “Ich-Du-Verhältnis” (the I-Thou relationship) between Mother-Sophia and Logos-Sophia. He points out that Parenthood suggests the existence of a Child. Mother-Sophia as “I” does not exist in “I-aloneness” (Ich-Einsamkeit); She is the source of the eternally begotten Child. Though Mother-Sophia does not possess any kind of priority in temporal terms (The First and Second Persons are both eternal), there is a logical priority implicit in the term “Mother.” Mother-Sophia is the unoriginated Source of Logos-Sophia. Mother-Sophia begets Logos-Sophia in an act of infinite love.

The relationship of the begotten Child to the begetting Parent is characterized by Mühlen (1963) as a Thou-relation. He uses an analogy with human relations to make his point. The “Thou” in a conver-



sation is that person from which the “first” person—the “I” who has addressed the “Thou”—expects a response. In the same way, Logos-Sophia is the response-in-person to the loving call of Mother-Sophia¹ (Mühlen 1963, 133). This mutuality in the loving relationship between Mother-Sophia and Logos-Sophia is an essential feature of the inner-Trinitarian life. According to Mühlen (1963), the love of Mother-Sophia for Logos-Sophia is directed to him as “the Child of the Mother,” and returns in the Beloved Child to Mother-Sophia herself. And this situation is fully reversible: the love of the Child for the Mother is directed to the Mother as his Mother, and returns in his beloved Mother to the Child.

Mühlen (1963) goes on to point out that this mutuality in the divine love extends beyond the relationship of Mother-Sophia and Logos-Sophia to include Spirit-Sophia. This reflexivity in the divine self-love is a central focus in his discussion. The circle of life in the Godhead is closed within itself. In an act of perfect love, the Mother begets the Child and the Mother and the Child together spirate, or breathe out, the Spirit. Following the lead of Thomas Aquinas, Mühlen states that with the procession of Spirit-Sophia the divine circle of life is closed; no third procession follows. It is in the Spirit that the divine self-love returns to itself. This is the essential meaning of the “We” in the Trinity. That is, the Holy Spirit can be characterized as the “We” because it is through the agency of the Spirit that the divine self-love returns to Mother-Sophia and to Logos-Sophia in the same moment² (Mühlen 1963, 142).

The “We” in the Godhead lives in and through infinite love. In human participation we find a vestige, a faint trace, of divine participation. It is interesting to note that David Cunningham also picks up on this idea (Cunningham 1998a, 1998b). He uses the term *participation* to describe an event of relationships. In using this descriptor, he indicates that the divine life is first and foremost an event of mutual indwelling. Further, participation is a virtue that we humans are also called to enact. If the doctrine of the Trinity has anything to teach us about authentic existence it is that communion rather than individualism is the goal of human life. “[T]he focus on *participation* suggests that human beings are

called to understand themselves, not as ‘individuals’ who may (or may not) choose to enter into relationships, but rather as mutually indwelling and indwelt, and to such a degree that—echoing the mutual indwelling of the Three—all pretensions to wholly independent existence are abolished” (Cunningham 1998b, 10). This reflection by Cunningham captures a central idea in Wojtyła’s thought—namely, the ability to share in the humanness itself of every person is the very essence of all participation. Participation is a trinitarian virtue that marks our human existence. Cunningham captures this fact with the metaphor of “paralleling” (Cunningham 1998a, chap. 3). Our human life parallels in a certain sense the divine life.

Neighbor-love, solidarity, and the refugee “crisis”

In this final section of the essay, use is made of the concept of participation to reflect theologically on how select individuals and communities have responded to massively large numbers of refugees from crisis countries entering Europe. At the outset, I want to acknowledge the limitation in my analysis. Solidarity and neighbor-love are necessary but not sufficient responses. The participation ethic needs to be both complemented and challenged by a decolonialization approach. Quite apart from political and practical responses, leaders and all people in Europe need to acknowledge their general failure to address their colonial histories. Turning a blind eye to this past is exacerbating the current situation for those who are migrating or seeking asylum. It is clear that colonialism had a significant impact in terms of producing the conditions in postcolonial states that led to large-scale displacement of people and the current refugee crisis (Bhambra 2017; Fonkem 2020).

I turn now to a general description of solidarity responses. From both an historical and legal point of view, the European Union has embraced the fundamental values of solidarity and human rights. The refugee crisis tested the commitment to these values to such an extent that the very identity of the EU has been under threat (Rizcallah 2019). The nature of the response to the influx of refugees varied significantly across EU countries. Solidarity with refugees was strongest in countries with an extensive welfare program and a history of accepting large numbers of immigrants (Koos & Seibel 2019). At the level of

1 “die Ant-Wort in Person auf den Liebesruf des Vaters”

2 “In diesem Sinne kann man sagen, daß im Hl. Geiste die göttliche Selbstliebe zum Vater und zum Sohne zurückkehrt, und zwar zum Vater und zum Sohne zugleich.”

the individual, people who are financially insecure, have little trust in public institutions, and embrace right-wing political ideology tend not to act in solidarity with refugees (Koos & Seibel 2019). Consistent with these findings is the fact that Central and Eastern European countries have shown considerable resistance to welcoming and supporting refugees. We have seen in some of these countries, for example, systematic abuse of migrants' right as part of an overall deterrence strategy. To give just two examples, the Bulgarian police apprehended arriving asylum seekers, fingerprinted them, and detained them prior to deportation; in Hungary it is also lawful to automatically detain such persons.

It is understandable that many who feel deeply threatened by what they see as an attack on their economic and social security, and, beyond that, on their culture and traditional religious identity, and who moreover hold the view that there are insufficient public resources and infrastructure to cope, will support calls to turn back the human tide and clamp down. However, the moral value of participation suggests that people of faith and all people of good will need to rise above such concerns and fears and enact neighbor-love. Authentic participation, striving with others to achieve just action, requires recognizing that we are all neighbors. Costello (2008) captures succinctly this call of Wojtyła to transcend narrow personal interest and a parochial view of the world: "True participation for Wojtyła... requires a certain kind of mutual recognition, a grasp of ourselves as committed to each other before and *beyond* all particular communities, before and *beyond* all solidarity and opposition [emphasis in the original]" (50). A Facebook post on the *No Borders* page on June 16, 2016 speaks to this sentiment. The post included photographs from a demonstration with the caption: "We live together. We fight together. Refugee squats and solidarity groups [sic] demonstration in Athens" (Cited in Siapera 2019, 257).

As we look at the profound challenges associated with large numbers of refugees entering Europe, and also other continents, what are some other expressions of, or proposals for, authentic participation? In order to move beyond the world of the "I-alone" and to enter the world of the "We"—that is, to move from the domain of stranger/enemy to that of neighbor/friend—essential requirements are truth-telling and confession. Writing with reference to the Swedish context and from a Lutheran perspective, Thompson (2017) suggests that in a meeting between Christians and Muslim immi-

grants "new avenues of connection among neighbors" are established through "truth practice" and confession of unjust and harsh critique of Islam (249–250).

A survey of newspapers and online posts unearths a host of everyday acts of neighbor-love. In the US context, we hear of church folk and other humanitarians who go out on patrol to offer food and water to Mexicans and others crossing the border and almost expiring in the hot desert sun. Groody (2009) supplies the following very telling report:

Along the U.S./Mexico border, a few groups offer humanitarian aid to immigrants who make the grueling trek of 40 miles or more across deserts, mountains, and other dangerous terrain. One summer in Arizona, as temperatures reached 120 degrees, a group called the Samaritans sent volunteers to keep watch for any immigrants who might be in need or distress. When a group of 20 immigrants came walking along a dry river bed, a volunteer called out to them from a ledge on a hill and asked, "Is anybody injured?" "Do you need any food?" "Do you have any water?" Suddenly the group of immigrants stopped. Unsure of who was speaking to them, they huddled together and deliberated awhile. Then slowly the leader began walking toward the Samaritan volunteers and said, "We don't have any more food. And we only have a little bit of water. But if you are in need of it, we will share what we have with you." (299)

The leader's answer serves as a reminder that Christian love should not automatically be interpreted in a one-way fashion. What characterizes participation as a Trinitarian virtue is mutuality and reciprocity. The ideal for *agape* is not the Christian person sacrificing her- or himself in serving others in need, but communion, giving and receiving (Post 1988; Pembroke 2007:147–156). Hospitality is a Christian virtue with a long history. Indeed, Jesus came as both host (inviting all to share in the Reign of God) and as guest (he came from above). Importantly, the open friendship practiced by Jesus—all are welcome to join him at table—presents an alternative to hospitality-as-power. The latter refers to a model of hospitality, often unconsciously adopted, in which the hosts set themselves over and apart from the vulnerable ones who are graciously invited in. When we forget this, the neighbor may remind us. The call of "Have you any food and water?" from the Christian group received the reply: "We have almost nothing, but we will share what we have with you."

Too often we see lawmakers and bureaucrats motivated primarily by fear, economic and political calculations, and self-interest. This is perhaps especially so when very large numbers of refugees are arriving.



These drives push toward isolation; they are the enemies of communion. When neighbor-love is strong enough, the threats of the authorities will not quash the impulse to hospitality and solidarity. In Vienna, thousands of people welcomed refugees in train stations, offering food and clothing. On the Greek island of Lesbos, volunteers used their own vehicles to ferry refugees from the shore to cities, and this under threat of arrest for “smuggling” offences (Evangelinidis 2016). A Greek Teachers’ Union, “Aristotle,” worked to get 45 children living at City Plaza to register in the infant and primary schools of the neighborhood. In the Union’s Facebook page, we find this post from 18 June, 2016: “No bureaucracies and no bureaucrats managed to stop us ... A hive of people, parents, and children, teachers, translators from City Plaza, sweets and fruits to welcome everyone, and the children with a great smile on their lips!” (Cited in Siapera 2019, 257).

Finally, let me offer a story of being-with and acting-for a refugee that highlights the two central dynamics in participation—namely, the I-Thou and the “We.” The refugee in question is from Iran and the story is recounted by my friend, Sue. I asked her to write up her narrative for me. What is most prominent in Sue’s ministry is her deep and passionate commitment to joining with others to work for justice, inclusion, peace, and ecological sustainability. Before commencing her vocation of ordained ministry, Sue worked for many years in disability care as a social worker. For a very long time now, the social work profession has worked with the “care of person, care of socio-political world” model that is now so well-established in pastoral theology (Pembroke 2017:125–137). Sue has naturally brought this approach with her into pastoral ministry. She knows that the disadvantage, exclusion, and injustice that many vulnerable people experience has structural and systemic roots. Working in concert with others for constructive change in socio-economic and political ideologies and systems is an absolutely central facet in her approach to ministry and mission. In Wojtyla’s terminology, the accent is on the “We” dimension: communal being-with and acting-for others in order to advance the common good. As we have seen, there is also an “I-Thou” dimension in participation. In this story, Sue highlights the significance of faithful being-with the neighbor in crisis.

A young woman, N, was brought to Brisbane from the Nauru Refugee Detention Center requiring emergency medical support. Her mother and brother remained on the island.

Initial contact began on the psychiatric ward. I would visit and initially it was simply about being present and creating a safe space between us. Eventually she shared her struggles with being separated from her mother and brother and being in detention.

I would visit 2 to 3 times a week. I would listen, she would share, and then we would pray. After discharge she was transferred to Brisbane Immigrant Transit Accommodation (BITA). I continued to visit, until the regulations in BITA changed. We would sit over a coffee and chat. When visiting in the evening I would take a meal to share. Occasionally I would take in parcels with personal care items and also some activities that helped her with her anxiety, e.g. coloring books. Our visits always concluded with prayer. Six months after her initial transfer her mother and brother joined her and so the visits became visits to the family. Throughout the support there would be periods where she would be re-admitted and I would visit her in the hospital and simply sit with her.

I also provided support for their trial for refugee status. I continue to support from afar as they were transferred to Sydney. This has been by linking them in with Refugee support services and connecting them to friends of mine in Sydney. We stay in contact via phone, What’s App, etc.

I think the most important thing of all was building up the trust and being present. Never underestimate simply being present in a person’s life when they are in crisis.

Conclusion

In the thought of Karol Wojtyla, participation is being-with and acting-for others with the aim of advancing the common good. Wojtyla uses philosophical categories to discuss I-Thou and “We” forms of relationship. Heribert Mühlen mirrors the progression from the I-Thou level to the communal or “We” level in developing his Trinitarian theology. Mühlen posits the Holy Spirit as the personal agency representing the extension of the divine self-love expressed in the mutuality of the I-Thou relation between Mother Sophia and Jesus Sophia; the triune God lives and loves not only through an I-Thou relation, but also through a We-relation. Human participation is an echo, the faintest of echoes, of Trinitarian participation.

A central notion in participation is that everyone is my neighbor; the universal communion of human persons takes priority over narrow personal and local interests and commitments. Surveying print and online media reveals a myriad of practical expressions of neighbor-love offered to refugees from crisis countries. People of faith and other people of good-

will be exercising their moral commitment on the one hand, and their creative thinking on the other, to find ways to oppose the forces of repression and exclusion through being-with and acting-for the other in need. The main contribution of this essay to existing knowledge consists in using Wojtyła's concept of participation to shape a theological reflection on striking and illuminating cases of love and care of refugees. No attempt has been made to offer a particular template or model of compassionate care and solidarity with people fleeing persecution, oppression, and violence.

References

- Baerwaldt, Neske. 2018. "The European Refugee Crisis: Crisis for Whom?" Available at: <https://www.law.ox.ac.uk/research-subject-groups/centre-criminology/centreborder-criminologies/blog/2018/03/european-refugee> (Accessed 16/07/2021).
- Bhambra, Gurinder K. 2017. "The Current Crisis of Europe: Refugees, Colonialism, and the Limits of Cosmopolitanism." *European Law Journal* 23:395–405.
- Buber, Martin. 1961. *Between Man and Man*. Translated by Ronald McGregor Smith. London: Collins.
- Buber, Martin. 1970. *I and Thou*. Translated by Walter Kaufmann. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- Costello, Peter. 2008. Pope John Paul II's "Participation" in the Neighborhood of Phenomenology. In *Karol Wojtyła's Philosophical Legacy*, edited by Nancy Mardas Billias, Agnes B. Curry & George F. McLean, 45–60. Washington, D.C.: Council for Research in Values in Philosophy.
- Cunningham, David. 1998a. *These Three are One: The Practice of Trinitarian Theology*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Cunningham, David. 1998b. "Participation as a Trinitarian Virtue." *Toronto Journal of Theology* 14, no. 1: 7–25.
- Ebner, Ferdinand. 1967. "Word and Personality." *Philosophy Today* 11, no. 4: 233–237.
- Ebner, Ferdinand. 2001. *Mühlauer Tagebuch 23.7 – 28.8.1920*. Commentary by R. Hörmann & M. Seekircher. Vienna: Böhlau Verlag.
- Evangelinidis, Angelos. 2016. "The Greek State's Response to the Refugee Crisis and the Solidarity Movement." *Contemporary Southeastern Europe* 3, no. 1: 32–36.
- Fonkem, Achankeng. 2020. The Refugee and Migrant Crisis: Human Tragedies as an Extension of Colonialism, *The Round Table* 109, no. 1, 52–70, DOI: 10.1080/00358533.2020.1717089.
- Groody, Daniel. 2009. "Jesus and the Undocumented Immigrant: A Spiritual Geography of a Crucified People." *Theological Studies* 70: 298–316.
- Johnson, Elizabeth. 1992. *She Who Is: The Mystery of God in Feminist Discourse*. New York: Crossroad.
- Lerner, Akiba. 2014. "Otherness and Liberal Democratic Solidarity: Buber, Kaplan, Levinas and Rorty's Social Hope." In *Thinking Jewish Culture in America*. Edited by Ken Koltun-Fromm, 31–70. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Koos, Sebastian & Seibel, Verena. 2019. "Solidarity with Refugees across Europe: A Comparative Analysis of Public Support for Helping Forced Migrants." *European Societies* 21, no. 5: 704–728.
- McCall, Thomas. 2014. "Relational Trinity: Creedal Perspective." In *Two Views on the Doctrine of the Trinity*. Edited by J. S. Sexton, 113–137. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Marcel, Gabriel. 1964a. "Phenomenological Notes on Being in a Situation." In Gabriel Marcel, *Creative Fidelity*. Translated by Robert Rosthal, 82–103. New York: The Noonday Press.
- Marcel, Gabriel. 1964b. "Belonging and Disposability." In Gabriel Marcel, *Creative Fidelity*. Translated by Robert Rosthal, 38–57. New York: The Noonday Press.
- Moltmann, Jürgen. 1981. *The Trinity and the Kingdom of God*. London: SCM Press.
- Mühlen, Heribert. 1963. *Der Heilige Geist Als Person*. Münster: Aschendorff.
- Noddings, Nell. 2013. "Freire, Buber, and Care Ethics on Dialogue in Teaching." In *Paulo Freire's Intellectual Roots: Towards Historicity in Praxis*. Edited by Robert Lake and Tricia Kress, 89–94. London: Bloomsbury.
- Pembroke, Neil. 2002. *The Art of Listening: Dialogue, Shame, and Pastoral Care*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Pembroke, Neil. 2007. *Moving Toward Spiritual Maturity: Psychological, Contemplative, and Moral Challenges in Christian Living*. Binghamton: Haworth Pastoral Press & New York: Routledge.
- Pembroke, Neil. 2017. *Foundations of Pastoral Counselling: Integrating Philosophy, Theology, and Psychotherapy*. London: SCM Press.
- Post, Stephen. 1988. "Communion and True Self-Love." *The Journal of Religious Ethics* 16: 345–362.
- Rizcallah, Cecilia. 2019. "Facing the Refugee Challenge in Europe—A Litmus Test for the European Union: A Critical Appraisal of the Common European Asylum System through the Lens of Solidarity and Human Rights." *European Journal of Migration and Law* 21: 238–260.
- Siapera, Eugenia. 2019. "Refugee Solidarity in Europe: Shifting the Discourse." *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 22, no. 2: 245–266.
- Thompson, Deanna. 2017. "Lutheran Subjectivity and Costly Neighbor Love in Secular Sweden: Confronting the Refugee Crisis through Alethurgy." *Dialog* 56, no. 3: 244–250.
- Wojtyła, Karol. 1979a. *The Acting Person*. Translated by A. Potocki. Dordrecht: D. Reidel Publishing Co.
- Wojtyła, Karol. 1979b. "The Person: Subject and Community." *The Review of Metaphysics* 33, no. 2: 273–308.