

Christian MAHOUKOU

*Philosopher, Independent Researcher
in Phenomenology of Interpellation*

**Phenomenology as Praxis:
Toward a Philosophy of Engaged Interpellation**

What the Mahoukou Law Demands of Philosophy Itself



2026

Introduction: Philosophy Confronting Its Own Diagnoses

The six articles preceding this one have produced a philosophical mapping of contemporary forms of dialogal obstruction. This mapping is rigorous: it identifies, moment by moment across the triad of Appeal–Response–Resonance, the mechanisms by which violence de-addresses the Appeal, digital saturation drowns Appeals in indifference, domination constrains the Response, the difference of lived worlds renders Resonance uncertain, the fragmentation of the subject weakens the very capacity to interpellate, and naturalization simulates interpellation without producing its phenomenological substance.

But a map, however precise, is not yet action. A philosophy content merely to describe obstructions without contributing to the creation of conditions for their resistance runs a serious philosophical risk: that of becoming complicit in what it denounces — by endowing forms of obstruction with philosophical visibility while offering them no equivalent philosophical force in return. This risk is inscribed in the very tendency of contemporary academic philosophy to close in upon its own internal debates, to address its analyses to a community of specialists who already share its categories, to produce rigorous diagnoses that do not resonate beyond university walls.

The Productive Tension Between Description and Engagement

The tension between the descriptive vocation of phenomenology and the demand for engagement that runs through its history is not a contradiction to be overcome — it is a productive tension to inhabit. Husserl wanted to make philosophy a rigorous science — which is already a form of engagement against relativism. Heidegger thought that philosophy must wrench Dasein from its dispersion into the inauthenticity of the “One.” Lévinas affirmed that philosophy is first and foremost an ethics — a response to the call of the other's face. Ricœur thought that hermeneutics should contribute to the constitution of narrative subjects capable of answering for their own existence.

Rigor without engagement produces a philosophy that is formally correct but existentially hollow. Engagement without rigor produces a philosophy that is passionate but conceptually fragile. It is the conjunction of both — rigor in the service of engagement, engagement anchored in rigor — that defines what we propose to call the engaged phenomenology of interpellation.

What the Mahoukou Law Demands of Philosophy, and the Article's Thesis

The Mahoukou Law, by formalizing the eidetic structure of authentic interpellation and identifying its forms of obstruction, implicitly formulates a demand upon philosophy itself. If authentic interpellation is a task — something that must be reconquered against the contemporary forms of its obstruction — then the philosophy of interpellation cannot be content to describe this task from a distance. It must contribute to accomplishing it. It must itself be a form of interpellation — an Appeal addressed from what it truly is, an engaged Response from its deepest convictions, an aspiration toward transformative Resonance rather than mere academic reverberance.

The thesis this article sets out to defend may be formulated as follows: the phenomenology of interpellation, as the Mahoukou Law formalizes it, implies an engaged conception of philosophy — not a philosophy that observes forms of obstruction from afar and describes them with rigor, but a philosophy that actively contributes to creating the conditions for authentic interpellation — in its methods, in its forms of expression, in its institutional practices, and in its relationship to the city. This engaged philosophy does not abandon rigor — it places rigor in the service of a task that exceeds it and that gives it its deepest meaning.

To develop this thesis, we will examine successively what the structure of the Appeal demands of philosophy (Part I), what the structure of the Response asks it to accomplish (Part II), and what the structure of Resonance assigns it as horizon (Part III).

Part I — Philosophy as Appeal: Thinking from Engagement

§ 1.1 — What It Means to Philosophize from the Structure of the Appeal

The Mahoukou Law defines the Appeal through three interdependent properties: it is addressed to a singular “you,” it is in excess of itself, and it opens a dialogal space in which the other’s Response is possible as a free and unpredictable act. These three properties do not concern only ordinary interpersonal exchanges — they concern philosophy itself as an act of address. For philosophy is always, fundamentally, an Appeal: an Appeal addressed to precise existences in a precise world, bearing a demand that overflows what can be formally stated, opening a space in which the thought of the other can respond freely.

A philosophy that takes the structure of the Appeal seriously is therefore a philosophy that constantly interrogates its real addressee: who is this singular “you” to whom it speaks? What are the real questions this “you” poses in the world it inhabits? What demand does this

philosophical Appeal carry that overflows what concepts can formally grasp? And what dialogal space does this Appeal open — a space in which the addressee's thought can respond freely, without being enclosed in the categories philosophy imposes in advance?

§ 1.2 — Against Philosophy as an Orphaned Appeal

Contemporary academic philosophy runs the risk — real and documented — of becoming an orphaned Appeal in the sense of the Mahoukou Law. Not because philosophers lack talent or rigor, but because the institutional conditions under which philosophy is produced tend to disconnect the philosophical Appeal from its real existential addressee. Academic journals address experts. Colloquia gather specialists. Monographs are evaluated according to criteria that do not include the question of whom they address or what they might transform in the existences that read them.

Edmund Husserl had himself sensed this danger in his Vienna lectures of 1935, published under the title *The Crisis of European Sciences*. He denounced the loss of meaning (*Sinnverlust*) of philosophy and the sciences — their growing inability to respond to the vital questions posed by human existences in their lived world. Read through the Mahoukou Law, what Husserl denounced was precisely the orphaning of the philosophical Appeal: a philosophy that has lost contact with the real addressees of its address, that has closed itself within its own technical problems at the expense of the existential engagement that should be its source and its destination.

§ 1.3 — Engaged Philosophy as the Restoration of the Singularity of the Appeal

Restoring the singularity of the philosophical Appeal does not mean abandoning rigor for popularization. The engaged philosophy that the Mahoukou Law calls for is a philosophy that maintains the rigor of its analysis while remaining anchored in the singularity of its address to concrete existences in a real world. Simone de Beauvoir, in *The Second Sex*, does not renounce philosophical rigor — she mobilizes Husserl, Heidegger, and Sartre with genuine mastery. But she speaks from a precise existential urgency and to precise existences. Her philosophical Appeal is singular, and it is precisely this singularity that enabled her to produce a Resonance of a depth and duration that few philosophical texts of the twentieth century can equal.

Emmanuel Lévinas, in *Totality and Infinity*, speaks from the historical reality of extreme violence — without ever saying so explicitly, but in a way that every attentive reader

perceives in the existential density of his philosophy. Paul Ricœur, in *Memory, History, Forgetting*, addresses those who inhabit societies traversed by unresolved historical traumas. In each case, rigor and engagement mutually condition each other and produce a work of a power that purely academic philosophy could not achieve.

§ 1.4 – The Mahoukou Law and the Collection as Forms of Engaged Philosophical Appeal

The collection *The Interpellation of the World* is itself a form of engaged philosophical Appeal – an Appeal that takes the singularity of address seriously by speaking from a precise urgency: that of the contemporary forms of dialogal obstruction that weaken the capacity of human existences to meet authentically. This Appeal is addressed to those who live these forms of obstruction – to those who feel that something is missing in their digital exchanges, that intercultural dialogue is more difficult than it should be, that their own inner fragmentation prevents them from speaking from what they truly are.

Part II – Philosophy as Response: Engaging from What One Is

§ 2.1 – What It Means to Philosophize from the Structure of the Response

A philosophy that takes the structure of the Response seriously is a philosophy that responds – one that does not merely pose questions with rigor but engages from what it truly is in the face of the questions the world poses to it. It is a philosophy that assumes the constitutive vulnerability of the authentic Response: it takes the risk of speaking itself, of exposing its deepest convictions, of affirming positions that can be contested, poorly received, misunderstood. It is not protected by academic neutrality as by a shield – it accepts being exposed as every authentic Response is.

§ 2.2 – Academic Neutrality as Surface Response

Contemporary academic philosophy is often tempted by what we have called the surface Response: a response that has the appearance of engagement without its substance, that says the expected words of rigor without taking the risk of truly speaking itself. The ideal academic philosophical article, according to these implicit norms, presents authors' positions with equanimity, analyzes their arguments with rigor, identifies their limits with precision, and concludes with a modesty that leaves questions open. This model has its genuine merits. But it also produces, in a structural way, surface Responses: texts that have the form of philosophical engagement without its constitutive vulnerability.

Cornel West, in *The American Evasion of Philosophy*, analyzed how American philosophy had tended to avoid the most urgent existential and political questions in favor of a technicality that shielded it from controversy. Read through the Mahoukou Law, this philosophical evasion is precisely the tendency to prefer the surface Response — technically impeccable, existentially neutral — to the authentic Response that exposes itself.

§ 2.3 — Engaged Philosophy as Existential Risk-Taking

An engaged phenomenology of interpellation is a philosophy that takes the risk of responding from what it is. This risk is real: an engaged philosophy can err in its analyses, can be poorly received by those it interpellates, can be accused of partiality. But it is precisely this risk — this constitutive vulnerability — that makes engaged philosophy an authentic Response rather than a surface Response.

Simone de Beauvoir had formulated this demand in *The Ethics of Ambiguity*: the human being who assumes freedom cannot take refuge in abstraction or neutrality to avoid the responsibility of choices. bell hooks had embodied this responsibility in a particularly eloquent manner in *Teaching to Transgress* and in her philosophical essays. Her philosophy did not conceal its origin — it rose explicitly from the existence of a Black woman in a society marked by racism and sexism. This origin was not a bias to correct — it was the existential signature of her philosophical Response, what gave it its irreducible singularity and its power of Resonance.

§ 2.4 — The Philosopher's Responsibility in the Face of Contemporary Forms of Obstruction

Faced with the six forms of dialogal obstruction that the collection has analyzed, the philosophy of interpellation bears a specific responsibility that flows directly from the structure of the Response in the A-R-R triad. This responsibility is not to resolve the forms of obstruction — those tasks belong to political, legal, and social action. But philosophy has a proper and irreplaceable responsibility: to name with precision what obstructs, to analyze with rigor how and why it obstructs, and to formulate the phenomenological conditions under which resistance becomes possible.

Part III — Philosophy as Resonance: Transforming and Being Transformed

§ 3.1 — What It Means to Philosophize from the Structure of Resonance

Resonance is the most demanding moment of the triad — and the most revealing of what engaged philosophy must be. It is retroactive, transformative, deferred. A philosophy that takes the structure of Resonance seriously is a philosophy that accepts being transformed by what it analyzes. Not a philosophy that descends toward the realities of the contemporary world with its prefabricated categories in order to apply them and then depart unchanged — but a philosophy that allows itself to be affected by what it encounters, that lets contemporary forms of dialogal obstruction resonate within it and modify its own questions, its own methods, its own categories.

§ 3.2 — Philosophy Closed upon Itself as an Obstruction of Resonance

A philosophy that closes itself within its own traditions and debates — that allows the realities of the contemporary world to penetrate it only insofar as they can be integrated into its preexisting categories — is a philosophy that auto-immunizes itself against Resonance. It produces formally rigorous but existentially impermeable analyses. This closure takes multiple forms: commentary that devotes itself principally to interpreting its own founding texts, methodological quarrels that devote most of their energy to debating their own presuppositions, disciplinary compartmentalization that defines itself so narrowly that questions from the sciences, art, or ordinary life cannot enter without losing what makes them urgent.

Heidegger had thematized, in *What Is Called Thinking?*, the necessity for philosophy to expose itself to what radically questions it — not what confirms its existing categories, but what endangers them, what demands transformation rather than mere deepening. This radical questioning is precisely what philosophical Resonance requires: a readiness to be called into question by what one analyzes, an acceptance that philosophy itself may emerge transformed from its encounters with contemporary realities.

§ 3.3 — Resonance Between Philosophy and World: A Reciprocal Transformation

The engaged phenomenology of interpellation aims at a reciprocal Resonance between philosophical thought and the realities it analyzes. Philosophy brings to its objects

conceptual rigor, reflective distance, the placement in relation to a tradition of thought that enriches the understanding of each singular phenomenon. And worldly realities bring to philosophy the existential density of real questions, the urgency that compels new thinking, the resistance of what does not fit into preexisting categories.

It is precisely this double transformation that the Mahoukou Law itself underwent in the course of the collection. Initially conceived as a phenomenological law bearing on the structure of interpellation, it was transformed through contact with each analyzed territory: it produced the concepts of orphaned Appeal, de-addressation, phenomenological trauma, social trauma of the Response, auto-immunization against Resonance, unilateral Resonance, intercultural closure, constitutive misunderstanding, being-always-beside, obstruction by excess, existential signature of the Appeal, existential signature of the Response, and existential trace of Resonance. None of these concepts existed in the law's initial formulation. They were produced by the encounter between the eidetic structure of the triad and the specific resistance of each analyzed territory. The law resonated with the world — and this Resonance transformed it.

§ 3.4 — The Collection as Existential Trace of Philosophical Resonance

The collection *The Interpellation of the World* is, as a whole, an aspiration to Resonance. It does not aspire to reverberance: it does not seek to be widely distributed, to produce immediate reactions, to accumulate citations or shares. What the collection aspires to produce is something deeper and more fragile: an existential trace of Resonance in the existences that truly read it — not those who browse it to extract information, but those who allow themselves to be traversed by it, who accept allowing its analyses to resonate within them and modify something in their way of understanding what happens to them in their daily exchanges.

General Conclusion — Authentic Interpellation as Task and Horizon

Summary of the Article: What Engaged Philosophy Requires

At the conclusion of this seventh and final article, the thesis we have defended may be reformulated in its full precision. The phenomenology of interpellation is not simply an analytical tool — it is a demand addressed to philosophy itself: the demand to philosophize from the very structure of what it analyzes — from the engagement of a singular Appeal,

from the vulnerability of a Response that exposes itself, from the aspiration toward a Resonance that transforms both parties.

This demand translates concretely into three orientations. The first is orientation toward the real addressee: philosophizing by speaking to concrete existences in a precise world. The second is orientation toward existential engagement: philosophizing by taking the risk of saying what one truly thinks, with the vulnerability that authentic Response requires. The third is orientation toward reciprocal transformation: philosophizing by accepting being transformed by what one analyzes, by allowing the realities of the world to resonate within philosophical categories. These three orientations define a posture: the posture of a philosophy that takes seriously what it analyzes, that does not shelter itself from its own conclusions, that accepts being interpellated by the realities it interpellates.

Summary of the Collection: A Phenomenological Cartography of Obstruction

The seven articles of the collection have together produced something whose scope exceeds the sum of its parts: a coherent and unified phenomenological cartography of contemporary forms of dialogal obstruction, and of the conditions of their resistance. This cartography is unified by the Mahoukou Law — which provides each article with the same analytical tool and thereby allows one to see, through the diversity of the analyzed territories, the unity of a single eidetic structure threatened in multiple ways.

The collection has also produced, through its analyses, a constellation of new concepts that now constitute the enriched conceptual heritage of the Mahoukou Law: the orphaned Appeal, de-addressation, phenomenological trauma, the high-silence Response, social trauma of the Response, auto-immunization against Resonance, unilateral Resonance, epistemicide as obstruction of Resonance, consented vulnerability, constitutive misunderstanding, existential translation, the co-transformative presence of horizons, phenomenological astonishment, the triad within the triad, role Appeal and existential Appeal, the distracted Appeal, the proletarianization of attention, the surface Response, experience without sedimentation, being-always-beside, obstruction by excess, the existential signature of the Appeal, the existential signature of the Response, the existential trace of Resonance, and the phenomenology of the dignity of interpellation. This conceptual constellation is the most tangible proof of the heuristic fecundity of the Mahoukou Law — one of the three criteria of its epistemological validity.

The Final Synthetic Formula

Authentic interpellation — Appeal addressed from an engaged existence, free Response from a vulnerable existence, transformative Resonance in mortal existences — is the most fundamental form of human connection. To reconquer authentic interpellation against the contemporary forms of its obstruction is not merely a philosophical task: it is an existential, political, and, in the deepest sense of the term, spiritual task. The Mahoukou Law provides its conceptual instruments. The collection *The Interpellation of the World* has explored its territories with the rigor and engagement that an authentically engaged philosophy owes to its addressees. It now falls to each existence to accomplish it — in its daily exchanges, in its resistances to forms of obstruction, in its encounters with the other. For it is there, and only there, that the philosophy of interpellation finds its completion: not in the texts that formalize it, but in the existences that live it — imperfectly, courageously, one Appeal after another.

Bibliographical References

- Beauvoir, S. de (1949). *Le Deuxième Sexe*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Beauvoir, S. de (1947). *Pour une morale de l'ambiguïté*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Heidegger, M. (1954). *Was heißt Denken?* [Eng. trans.: *What Is Called Thinking?*, New York: Harper & Row, 1968.]
- Heidegger, M. (1927). *Sein und Zeit*. [Eng. trans.: *Being and Time*, New York: Harper & Row, 1962.]
- hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom*. New York: Routledge.
- Husserl, E. (1936). *Die Krisis der europäischen Wissenschaften*. [Eng. trans.: *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*, Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970.]
- Lévinas, E. (1961). *Totalité et Infini*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Lévinas, E. (1974). *Autrement qu'être ou au-delà de l'essence*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Mahoukou, C. (2025). "La Loi phénoménologique de l'interpellation: Appel-Réponse-Résonance." Founding article. Collection *L'interpellation du monde*.
- Mahoukou, C. (2026). "L'interpellation empêchée." Collection *L'interpellation du monde*.
- Mahoukou, C. (2026). "L'Appel orphelin." Collection *L'interpellation du monde*.
- Mahoukou, C. (2026). "Le dialogue sous emprise." Collection *L'interpellation du monde*.
- Mahoukou, C. (2026). "Horizons incommensurables." Collection *L'interpellation du monde*.
- Mahoukou, C. (2026). "Le sujet dispersé." Collection *L'interpellation du monde*.
- Mahoukou, C. (2026). "L'interpellation simulée." Collection *L'interpellation du monde*.
- Ricœur, P. (1990). *Soi-même comme un autre*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Ricœur, P. (2000). *La mémoire, l'histoire, l'oubli*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Sartre, J.-P. (1948). *Qu'est-ce que la littérature?* Paris: Gallimard.
- West, C. (1989). *The American Evasion of Philosophy: A Genealogy of Pragmatism*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.