

Politics, Ethics and Strangers in the 21st Century
Fifteen critical reflections on Jacques Derrida's concept of
hos(ti)pitality

Abstract

In contrast to the Kantian concept of conditional hospitality, which is a political and a diplomatic term, Jacques Derrida's concept of hos(ti)pitality is without a doubt a pure ethical and messianic experience of an encounter between strangers who at any moment could be perceived as each other's enemy. Since the 1990s, the French philosopher via this neologism put the human condition and especially the modern state sovereignty under question. From this point of view, hos(ti)pitality is conceived in this article as a phenomenological event; a miracle without religion; something that sharply interrupts the natural order of things by rearranging the world and its meanings in such a radical way that the householder becomes the guest and the stranger becomes the host. Hamletian-inspired hos(ti)pitality is first and foremost a Derridean hauntology of absolute Other which means a work of justice in a world full of pariahs. Derridean theory of hos(ti)pitality is without a doubt the proper way to explore in-depth the challenges of pure hospitality as an opportunity to make the messianic impossible become a historical truth. So, our main thesis here is that insofar as the conventional meanings of such keywords as refugee, exile, deportee, displaced person and foreigner have changed rapidly within the textual and contextual manner of the work of Derridean deconstruction as a work of mourning, the so-called Benjaminian and Arendtian pariahs in the 21st century take an important position in discourse analysis as a whole.

KEYWORDS: hos(ti)pitality, pariahs, gift, sovereignty, force of law, justice, undecidability, decision, performativity, Ereignis, unheimlich, personal responsibility

Spiros Makris

*Assistant Professor in Political Theory
Department of International and European Studies
University of Macedonia*

Refugee crisis, cosmopolitanism and hospitality in the 21st century

The so-called European migrant crisis or European refugee crisis which began in 2015 brought to the fore the critical question of *hospitality* as a Kantian principle of cosmopolitan ethics (Brown and Held, 2012, p. 15). For many specialists in Europe today, the new historical circle of refugee and immigrant crisis puts into question the well-known Schengen Agreement. Ben Antenore, the Editorial Assistant at the

European Institute, interrogates in this regard the following: Can the Schengen Agreement Survive the European Union Refugee Crisis? What does Europe without the Schengen Agreement look like in the future? Could the end of the Schengen Agreement mean the end of the European Union as an entire cultural, political and financial project? Having in mind that European citizens make 1.25 billion journeys within the Schengen zone every year we can obviously ask what does the euro mean without the freedom of movement of workers or without the freedom of the citizens to move or travel across the continent as they have been able to do up to now? (Antenore, 2016) At the same time, the current status of the Dublin Regulation leads other experts to speak about a totally unjust asylum seekers system which transfers all the responsibility on some member states of European Union's external borders, for instance Italy and Greece, instead of devising a burden-sharing system among all European Union countries. So, we could argue strongly as a *first* reflection on this critical topic that if the view of the "Dublin system is true, the collective challenge of the distribution of asylum claims therefore remains open. The Union still requires a mechanism to allocate processing responsibility between Member States, preferably in accordance with the precepts of solidarity and fair sharing of responsibility" (Mouzourakis, 2014, p. 28).

Actually, in order to come to terms with this enormous historical question of refugee crisis as a par excellence hospitality crisis we have to think of it first and foremost in philosophical, theoretical, ethical and political terms. As we know so well either in the Bible or in the Homeric epics hospitality constitutes the hard core of social solidarity. As Fred Dervin and Heidi Layne aptly point out *Odyssey* is the book of hospitality to the extent that it "shows how fundamental it has been in reflecting on the Other and intercultural encounters in the past" (Dervin and Layne, 2013, p. 3). More specifically, hospitality as a major human condition problem has been concerning humanity since the Late Antiquity. At the spiritual height of Enlightenment, the famous German philosopher Immanuel Kant puts hospitality in the heart of a totally new republican, international and global order and security system which he gave the name perpetual peace (Kant, 2005). The Kantian laws of hospitality are forming a whole legal terrain of invitation and visitation between countries and people which has been conventionally defined as state diplomacy. In accordance with the well-known French existential and ethical thinker Emmanuel Levinas hospitality constitutes our humanity from the very beginning (Wendland, 2016). In the Levinasian perspective, hospitality mostly means that "I welcome the Other who presents himself in my home by opening my home to him" (Levinas, 1969, p. 171). Aaron James Wendland clarifies further that Levinasian absolute and pure hospitality "is exemplified by the act of welcoming another into our home and sharing our possessions. Welcoming and sharing with others determines who and what we are as specific human beings. Levinas expresses this idea in a discussion of subjectivity in which the self is described as a host and hostage to others. We are hosts to others because welcoming them into our world is a precondition for a relation of identification and differentiation between us. And we are hostages because our personal identity is determined by how we respond to the demands others place upon us" (Wendland, 2016).

By paraphrasing to some extent Charles Taylor, it is worth noting that a number of trends in contemporary political and ethical theory turn on the need, sometimes the critical demand, for hospitality (Taylor, 1994, p. 25). In that sense, the demand for hospitality brings to the fore the thorny question of minority rights of immigrants and refugees and what is called today multiculturalism in general. From this standpoint, hospitality and multiculturalism constitute a common field of scientific research in the wider academic area of cosmopolitan politics and ethics in the era of globalization. Especially, Derridean theory of hospitality is a critical way to reexamine the Kantian cosmopolitan laws and seek through the method of deconstruction as justice a totally different kind of cosmopolitanism “that offers a more just response” to the significant modern problem of homelessness and statelessness (Brown and Held, 2012, p. 374). To put the matter differently, Jacques Derrida’s linguistic and conceptual neologism of *hos(ti)pitality* deconstructs the Kantian laws of diplomatic and state hospitality via a deconstructive, linguistic and hermeneutic approach which is inspired by the relevant work of the eminent French-Jew structural linguist and semiotician Émile Benveniste where the Latin word *hostis* takes at least three different but the same time closely related meanings: host as a householder; host as a stranger; and host as an enemy (Benveniste, 1973, p. 78; Derrida, 2000, p. 3). By deconstructing in-depth Kantian or conditional or diplomatic hospitality, the outstanding French philosopher endeavors to show clearly in a Nietzschean way how the possibility of impossible of the unconditional or pure or absolute hospitality could help us as individuals but most of all the contemporary states and governments particularly in the cultural and political region of the European Union to face sufficiently the question of alterity and the refugee crisis in an ethical and Levinasian way of thinking and acting. Having in mind the above, in this article we try to examine in detail how the discursive concept of Derridean *hos(ti)pitality* challenges sharply the ontological, political, ethical, religious and mainly nationalistic and racist dominant images of xenophobia and social exclusion in the 21st century (O’Gorman, 2006, p. 53).

Hospitality as *hos(ti)pitality* in the Derridean deconstructionism

Since the beginning of the 1990s, Jacques Derrida’s way of thinking has followed an explicit political and ethical ‘turn’ (Glendinning, 2011, p. 78) which thenceforth has put in the hard core of his theory of deconstruction the critical and sometimes controversial question of hospitality especially as we have seen above with regard to the Benvenistean, linguistically, deconstructively and etymologically, meaning of *hos(ti)pitality* (Reaves, 2016, p. 41). Nevertheless, it is worth noting that this Levinas-inspired theoretical, ethical and political ‘turn’ in Jacques Derrida’s later writings is articulated around the key-concepts of unconditional hospitality, *gift* and forgiveness (Glendinning, 2011, pp. 82-83). As it is mentioned above, the current European refugee crisis as a strong humanitarian crisis brings to light the moral and diplomatic question of Kantian *hostipitality* not as a problem of invitation and visitation of people between different countries but first and foremost as a problem of homeless and stateless citizens as denizens who are coming in our threshold as uninvited absolute strangers asking for help and refuge. According to a new United Nations report, “there are currently 19.6 million refugees worldwide, a 24 percent

increase over 2000. There are also almost 40 million internally displaced people, an 89% increase over 2000. In 2015, the number of international migrants and refugees reached 244 million, a 41 percent increase over 2000” (UN, May 2016). It is noteworthy that especially the refugee population, which reached 65.3 million at the end of 2015, is the highest number ever recorded. Although, “Syria is the single higher contributor to the global refugee population” today, it is unquestionably true that it is only the small tip of a huge iceberg. This new and strong wave of refugee crisis worldwide nowadays has affected enormously the ontological and ideological stances of people. Particularly, in the case of the European refugee crisis, this “unchecked migration has led to a surge in far-right sentiment across Europe, threatening the stability of Western democracy” (UN, June 2016).

Doubtless, democratic toleration as a broader way of political and social life in the West is jeopardized by the growing racist hatred. From this standpoint, hospitality as hos(ti)pitality is just the most critical and thorny question in the 21st century. What is at stake exactly in this new state of affairs? In other words, what are the foundational ontological, political and ethical questions on hos(ti)pitality today? Let us pose some of them in a summarized way: What is assumed that the householder, state or government should do? In fact, how can he or she be sure that the strangers who come in the middle of the night do not threaten his or her life? Bearing in mind these crucial questions, it is clear that hospitality here is undoubtedly perceived as a conditional hospitality which is defined absolutely in relation to the strict diplomatic laws of state *sovereignty* and particularly to the intense necessity for state security and survival. To put the matter differently, we must first accept that hospitality as a Kantian theoretical principle despite its idealistic and universalistic form has a very powerful realistic reference and content. In this specific Kantian sense, we probably could speak about a *sui generis* cosmopolitan political realism. Therein, if we accept this Kantian thesis, hospitality can take place safely and without unpredictable consequences for individuals and states only under conditions because unconditional hospitality is risky and hazardous by definition. But this is the important point for the future of hospitality in the globalization era. Could it be easy to see it from another point of view? Actually, this controversial question is the Derridean point of departure in order to approach hospitality in-depth from a linguistic, deconstructive and discursive perspective by posing simultaneously very strong ontological, political and ethical stakes for the 21st century (Kakoliris, 2015, p. 144).

To sum up so far as a *second* reflection, we could argue that, in contrast to the Kantian concept of conditional hospitality, which is a political and diplomatic term, Jacques Derrida’s concept of hospitality is without a doubt a pure ethical and messianic event of encounter between absolute strangers who at any moment could be perceived as each other’s enemy. Not only state sovereignty but most of all our modern human condition per se is put under question (Stocker, 2006, p. 128). At this sense, according to the French thinker, hos(ti)pitality from the very beginning includes within it, linguistically, etymologically and metaphysically, the element of ontological threat. Therefore, hospitality, as Jacques Derrida points out emphatically, could be conceived actually as hos(ti)pitality (Derrida, 2000). However, as we have mightily noticed above, this linguistic, deconstructive and discursive analysis of

hospitality which brings to the fore the multiple semantic meanings of the Latin word 'hostis' (householder, stranger and enemy) could not make sense without the Levinasian metaphysical ethics of the absolute and infinite Other as a philosophy of exile (Doukhan, 2012, p. 82). Having in mind all the above, it is worth noting that Derridean hos(ti)pitality could not be conceived as a mere kind of deconstruction of the Kantian conditional hospitality but as a *sui generis* 'political theology' (Derrida, 2005) where the Otherness is a kind of negative divine entity or, in pure Levinasian terms, a kind of transcendental exteriority beyond the 'force de loi' and the logocentrism of state objectification and legal manipulation (Derrida, 2002, p. 230; Bradley, 2001, p. 133). From this Derridean perspective, the only way to reduce sufficiently the contingency of hazard and risk in hospitality [namely hos(ti)pitality] is to perceive the host (householder; sovereignty; state and so on) as homage of a stranger to come ('à venir' in Derridean terminology). Summarizing so far, as a *third* reflection, we could support that, in the *sui generis* Levinas-like politics and ethics of Jacques Derrida, hospitality is by definition unconditional, absolute and pure. Hospitality, as the French philosopher writes, is a messianicity without messianism (Derrida, 2006, pp. 72-74). In other words, a pure phenomenological event; a miracle without religion; something that in Benjaminian terms interrupts sharply the natural order of things by rearranging the world and its meanings in such a way (*Tikkoun*) that the householder becomes guest and the stranger becomes host. "So", Derrida underlines, "it is indeed the master, the one who invites, the inviting host, who becomes the hostage – and who really always has been. And the guest, the invited hostage, becomes the one who invites the one who invites, the master of the host. The guest becomes the host's host. The guest (*hôte*) becomes the host (*hôte*) of the host (*hôte*)" (Derrida, 2000a, pp. 123-125). This is what Jacques Derrida signifies under the neologism of hos(ti)pitality.

From state ontology to Hamletian hauntology

Is unconditional or absolute or pure hospitality possible or is it a kind of Derridean messianic without messianism utopia? Really, this is a very controversial question which brings to light the monstrosity of Jacques Derrida's thought itself as a whole project. What else could be the so-called 'Cambridge affair'? Derrida himself exemplifies strangeness as such (Smith, 2005, pp. 1-4). From a Shakespearean point of view, where Derrida is the Hamletian specter of the father or the peculiar Marxian ghost that haunts our everyday capitalist conformism, we could support that Kantian state ontology of conditional, political and diplomatic hospitality is deconstructed step by step by a Levinasian or Derridean hauntology of an unconditional, ethical, messianic and metaphysical hos(ti)pitality (Derrida, 2006, p. 10). No doubt, Hamletian hauntology is the locus classicus of Derridean hos(ti)pitality. Nobody knows for sure what the future could bring in our threshold late at night. Nobody knows safely what is hiding beyond Levinasian exteriority, Hamletian spectrality or Marxian hauntology. Infinity of the Otherness, as Emmanuel Levinas highlights, looks and sounds like Shakespearean Hamlet's dead father who is coming at midnight as a gothic-like specter to put the intense demand of justice for the sake of Benjaminian and Arendtian *pariahs* and for humanity as a whole. Is the Derridean stranger a Messiah without messianism? Obviously, hospitality as hos(ti)pitality is additionally a Jewish-

inspired theoretical form of Derridean messianicity without messianism (Khatib, 2013), which especially in the Bible and Torah has put next to poor, women and orphans the haunted persona of strangeness as an infinite exteriority and therefore as a definitely unknown being (Levinas, 1990). But nevertheless, the monstrosity and unfamiliarity of strangeness cannot be questioned. So, how can we be sure that this contingent stranger from nowhere approaching our threshold late at night is Jesus of Nazareth and not a serial killer? What lies behind the obscure and tricky mask is worn by this infinite specter knocking on the door of our house? In this vein, as a *forth* reflection on Hamletian hos(ti)pitality, we can say that Derridean hauntology of Other is the proper way to explore in-depth the challenge of hos(ti)pitality as an excellent opportunity to make the messianic impossible become a historical truth. As Penelope Deutscher points out “in Derrida’s work impossibility is not something that provokes idealization, nostalgia or abasement. Instead, it can open us up to possibilities of transformation” (Deutscher, 2005, p. 70).

In order to understand efficiently the Derridean concept of pure, absolute and unconditional hospitality as hos(ti)pitality it is necessary to indicate the special significance of gift in Jacques Derrida’s thought in general and particularly in relation to hospitality (Derrida, 1992). Gift’s impossibility like the impossibility of hospitality opens up sharply the contingent possibilities of the real everyday life (Wortham, 2010, p. 65). Unconditional hospitality and unconditional gift are the two faces of this Shakespearean and the same time Baudelaire-like face of deconstruction. In fact, hos(ti)pitality, in pure Derridean terms, is “a gift without present” (Derrida, 1992, p. 34). Expressed in a different way, ‘gift/hospitality’ is a gift where the donor never asks for a present in return. Is it possible as well? Actually, is it possible a householder to donate his or her house to the stranger who arrives at midnight to his or to her threshold without the Kantian conditions? To put the matter in a statecentric perspective, is it possible to open our borders to the absolute strangers without asking them, as Derrida repeats constantly, not even their names to the extent that this Lacanian onomatology of the ‘Names-of-the-Father’ is without a doubt just another expression of state violence? (Lacan, 2013, p. 53) As far as Derrida is concerned, hospitality is the end of onomatology. In others words, hos(ti)pitality is from a psychoanalytic point of view a patroctony of the Janus Father/State. In Derridean terms, “hospitality begins with the unquestioning welcome, in a double effacement, the effacement of the question *and* the name” (Derrida, 2000a, p. 29). So, is it possible to make hos(ti)pitality a messianic event of absolute, pure and unconditional gift of hospitality just from the side of the host (stranger)? In this point of analysis, Jacques Derrida brings to the fore the very critical concept of state sovereignty (Derrida, 2002, p. 230). Derridean hauntology is the metaphysical counterweight of state sovereignty. In order to understand adequately the significance of state sovereignty in Derridean exploration of hospitality as hos(ti)pitality, we must explore further what the French philosopher means by the paradoxical term *force of law*. According to Jacques Derrida, modern state (rule of law) is not the realization of *justice* but the embodiment of the force of state law in the form of Hobbesian Leviathan. Modern state as a rule of law is not a just state but only a state where the law (in this case the Kantian laws of hospitality) is based on brute force; on state power (*raison d’état*). By distinguishing keenly justice and law or justice and force of law, Jacques Derrida brings to fore the

contingent possibilities of unconditional hospitality in the contemporary global world system (Wortham, 2010, p. 55). As we know well, Derrida defines this new ontological, political and ethical project as 'the New International' by clarifying that the novelty of this new messianity without messianism refers to a profound transformation of international law against state brutality (genocides, death camps, Shoah, Gulag etc) (Derrida, 2006, p. 105). As a *fifth* reflection, we could support that Derridean concept of hos(ti)pitality by wholly deconstructing the Kantian conditional laws of state diplomatic hospitality is *as if* to deconstruct the Western instrumental modernity itself for the sake of a haunted, ethical and messianic justice or, from another point of view, as Hannah Arendt and Walter Benjamin argue, by reconstructing and rewriting the History (Angelus Novus) from the viewpoint of *conscious pariahs* (Benjamin, 2007, p. 253; Arendt, 2007, p. 275). How could I know for sure that this stranger who is knocking on my door after midnight is not this Derridean, Arendtian and Benjaminean angry and oppressed conscious pariah? History has shown us that sometimes state violence originates a huge wave of counterviolence. Frantz Fanon's 'wretched of the earth' exemplifies clearly this Derridean monstrous double-faced hos(ti)pitality where the semantic meanings of hostis are, in final analysis, contingent, obscure and unpredictable (Fanon, 2004, p. 52).

Between justice and force of law: The question of undecidability

Hos(ti)pitality stays always somewhere between justice and force of law. In genuine Derridean terms, it is a state of *undecidability*; a kind of aporia; the messianic experience of the impossible itself (Wortham, 2010, p. 15). It is quite difficult almost impossible to know confidently who is outside our door late at night. Hos(ti)pitality is always in a state of ambiguity and undecidability. It is a state of intensity; a state of a peculiar existential anxiety. In other words, it is important to note that hos(ti)pitality as a messianity without messianism could be conceived as a state of exception; an exceptional situation; a miracle in the way of Jesus of Nazareth. So, by lying always between justice and force of law, somewhere in the Derridean *Khôra* (Derrida, 1995, p. 89) or in the Levinasian *il y a* (Levinas, 1978, p. 54), hos(ti)pitality seems and sounds like the possible impossibility or the impossible possibility. Simon Morgan Wortham writes with emphasis that "the 'impossibility' of justice, in contrast to the already-possible possibility of the law, opens the very possibility of the future and the other to come (the only possibility worthy of the name)" (Wortham, 2010, p. 80). Is this state of exception and pure *decision* possible or does Jacques Derrida invent literally this exceptional situation between Kantian force of law and Levinasian justice in order to draw attention to how possible or not is the possibility of the impossible? So, is hos(ti)pitality just an ordinary kind of another Derridean neologism or is it a linguistic method to explore ontologically and etymologically the contingent meaning of words? The answer is obviously as follows: hos(ti)pitality is a conscious act of *performativity* of justice against the force of law. It is a deconstructive, discursive and, in last analysis, ethical and political method of disclose ($\alpha\text{-}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$) à la Martin Heidegger the hidden aspects of human condition (natality, mortality, Dasein, facticity and word) (Heidegger, 2008). No doubt, hos(ti)pitality could be perceived as the Heideggerian *Ereignis* itself (Derrida, 1991, p. 4). In other words, it could be conceived as the locus classicus of $\alpha\text{-}\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$. Perhaps, from a specific point of view, it would be no

exaggeration to argue that hos(ti)pitality is the Augustinian *Queastio mihi factus sum per se* (Arendt, 1978, *Two/Willing*, p. 51). In a concluding way, we can say that Derridean hos(ti)pitality exemplifies the Question of Being and History (Derrida, 2016). So, as a *sixth* reflection, it is not an overstatement to say that hos(ti)pitality is the dark or the other side of hospitality. Both of them are the two faces of the same ontological coin; possible and impossible within the human contingency of Heideggerian facticity. Each moment justice can reach the state of force of law and vice versa. Nothing is sure forever. There is no any Platonic certainty of this transcendental 'Form of the Good'. Infinity is the only ontological and metaphysical reality of Dasein. Every moment both Myself and the Other are whatever Sigmund Freud aptly defines as the diverse faces of *unheimlich*. Actually, the stranger à venir is just the repressed *Ego* who comes sharply to the surface as the Freudian *Id* itself; the absolute uncanny (Freud, 2003; Freud, 2010, p. 13).

In that Derridean sense, hos(ti)pitality challenges first and foremost the metaphysical foundations of modern state sovereignty (Derrida, 2005a). "In Rogues", Simon Morgan Wortham points out, "Derrida contrasts the unconditional with the notion of sovereignty. For him, the unconditional is not sovereign (and, indeed, extends beyond sovereignty's limits) to the extent that it does not license or empower a master, or arise on condition of the 'masterable-possible'. The unconditional, in other words, powerfully resists the principle of power, or is powerful precisely in its powerlessness. The unconditional leads instead to the 'experience of the impossible' (...) yet opens up the very possibility of the future and the other. Nevertheless, the unconditional must continually transact with and articulate its relation to sovereignty in the interests of the democracy to come" (Wortham, 2010, p. 232). If this Benvenistean, Heideggerian and deconstructive meaning of Derridean hos(ti)pitality puts under question the state sovereignty and the force of law in modernity as a whole could we argue that Jacques Derrida is a typical postmodern thinker who inevitably leads the contemporary ethical and political theory in the realm of Nietzschean relativism and nihilism? Actually, this is the ordinary criticism against Derridean project of hauntology (Zlomislic, 2007, p. 3). But probably this is not the focus point here. It makes no sense to classify his thought in the kingdom of postmodern 'anything goes'. Derridean concept of hos(ti)pitality is not a 'theory of chaos'. On the contrary, in a Benjaminian and Arendtian sense, hos(ti)pitality as an entire theoretical project is a high ethical and political argumentation in order to responsibly answer to the intense problem of a globalization from above where the force of state law is used as a pretext of justice to all these human beings who by losing citizenship come to a state of homeless, stateless and pariah people (Arendt, 2004, pp. 341-384).

By analyzing the so-called *plagues* in the new world order, Jacques Derrida writes with emphasis: "The massive exclusion of homeless citizens from any participation in the democratic life of States, the expulsion of deportation of so many exiles, stateless persons, and immigrants from a so-called national territory already herald a new experience of frontiers and identity – whether national or civil" (Derrida, 2006, p. 101). Undoubtedly, Derridean hos(ti)pitality is this new 'experience of frontiers and identity' that is declared by Jacques Derrida as the starting point of the 'New International' (Derrida, 2006, p. 107). As Hannah Arendt has shown so well, the

concept of unconditional hospitality as hos(ti)pitality is the proper way to narrate the failures of modern national state in the 20th century (Arendt, 2004, p. 341). When the Levinasian infinite Other is violently transformed to a stranger then justice is converted to the state of force of law. In pure Arendtian terms, hos(ti)pitality means the *right to have* (the) *rights* of life, property, respect, citizenship, equality and most of all the fundamental freedoms of mobility and speech. According to Derrida, the ‘New International’ “denounces the limits of a discourse on human rights that will remain inadequate, sometimes hypocritical, and in any case formalistic and inconsistent” (Derrida, 2006, p. 106). Here, as a *seventh* reflection, we can support the thesis that modern national sovereign state failed to be a householder (ξενοδόχος) worthy of the name (Benveniste, 1973, p. 78). Against the state power everybody is a potential stranger; a potential enemy; or, as Giorgio Agamben says, a *homo sacer* (Agamben, 1998, p. 71); someone who could be killed without punishment. In this vein, modern state is the realization of Creon’s *hubris* (Sofocles, 2005, p. 11). Sofocles’ *Antigone* is the personification of hos(ti)pitality. Creon and Antigone are the two interchangeable faces of Derridean hos(ti)pitality. From this point of view, Judith Butler stresses as follows: “Sofocles’ text makes clear that the two are metaphorically implicated in one another in ways that suggest that there is, in fact, no simple opposition between the two (...) to the extent that the two figures, Creon and Antigone, are chiasmically related, it appears that there is no easy separation between of the two” (Butler, 2000, p. 6).

In fact, Jacques Derrida coined this smart neologism in order to criticize creatively and performatively the decline of the nation-state and the tragic end of the ontological, legal and political regime of the ‘Rights of Man’ in modernity in toto. From this perspective, hos(ti)pitality brings to light the totalitarian elements of modern Westphalian state which led through racism, anti-semitism and imperialism to Stalinism, Nazism and every political form of authoritarianism in the 20th century (Arendt, 2004, pp. 593-616). The question of undecidability as a crucial human aporia in the modern world is first and foremost the question of state sovereignty and power against the naked human body, or, in Agambenian terms, *bare life*. As it has already been shown well by Michel Foucault, state power in modernity is by nature a *biopower* which aims to discipline human body to the norms of political subordination and social exclusion (Foucault, 1990, p. 133). So, state border or state threshold is just a bringing point between state normativity (Creon) and pariahdom (Antigone). Unconditional or absolute or pure hospitality as hos(ti)pitality is unquestionably a radical way to deconstruct discursively, politically and ethically the metaphysical and mythological foundations of modern state power and violence in the historical era of Totalitarianism, conformism and mass society (Arendt, 2004, p. 593). By doing so, Jacques Derrida and Judith Butler’s “purpose is to contest and destabilize the history of cultural categories, suspiciously sustained by totalizing and naturalizing discourses when it comes to defining identity, culture, ethics and politics” (Escudero-Alias, 2001, p. 138). As Seyla Benhabib points out, European refugee crisis brings to the fore the ontological question of *superfluous people* who are always entrapped between justice and force of law within that gloomy space of ‘No Man’s Land’ where human life is merely a cold demographical indicator of natality or mortality (Benhabib, 2016). As an *eighth* reflection, we can support that in the Derridean sense, hos(ti)pitality is a kind

of Aristotelian and Arendtian *phronesis* in the dingy era of authoritarian *thoughtlessness* against the homeless and stateless people (Arendt, 2006, p. 253).

Back to the Future: Derridean hos(ti)pitality in context

Derridean novel notion of hos(ti)pitality is raised as an entire ontological, theoretical, ethical and political project at the end of the Cold War (1989 onwards). This is the contextual environment of this Derridean neologism. More specifically, hos(ti)pitality is *the state of a debt* to Marx (Derrida, 1981, p. 37). In other words, hos(ti)pitality is *the work of mourning* for the Hamletian specter of Marx (Derrida, 2006). Hos(ti)pitality first and foremost means to *welcome* unconditionally the outstanding Marxian spirit in the historical era of what Francis Fukuyama has defined as the 'End of History' (Fukuyama, 2012). As Benoît Peeters, Jacques Derrida's biographer, points out, "*Specters of Marx* was not just a new reading, it was a thoroughly political intervention. In particular, it was a response to Francis Fukuyama, whose the *End of History and the Last Man* had been a great success the year before. Replying to the triumphalist discourses that had followed the fall of Communist regimes, Derrida numbered the gaping wounds of the 'New World Order': unemployment, the massive exclusion of the homeless, economic warfare, the aggravation of foreign debt, the arms industry and arms trade, the spread of nuclear power, inter-ethnic wars and reactionary nationalisms, mafia and trafficking ... No, history was not over" (Peeters, 2013, p. 464). Since 1995, Derrida's exceptional project on hos(ti)pitality was formed as a special 'bridge' between his preceding great theoretical works and the radical political demands that the new historical era had raised. As far as Benoît Peeters is concerned, "there were increasing bridges between his philosophical work and his political commitments. Hospitality, the topic of his seminar from 1995-7, became a recurrent theme, one of those to which his name would be most frequently attached. This was because the principle of hospitality concentrated within itself 'the most concrete urgencies, those most proper to articulate the ethical on the political'" (Peeters, 2013, p. 470). In Levinasian terms, hos(ti)pitality as culture itself brings to light the monstrous Derridean *ethos* of deconstruction as unconditional, pure, absolute and messianic justice (Derrida, 2002, p. 243). "Hospitality is culture itself", Derrida writes characteristically, "and not simply one ethic amongst others. Insofar as it has to do with the *ethos*, that is the residence, one's home, the familiar place of dwelling, inasmuch as it is a manner of being there, the manner in which we relate to ourselves and to others, to others as our own or as foreigners, *ethics is hospitality*; ethics is so thoroughly coextensive with the experience of hospitality" (Derrida, 2001, p. 16-17). To put the matter differently, when hos(ti)pitality welcomes the Levinasian Other without conditions is ethics by definition. So, to the extent that ethics is hos(ti)pitality and vice versa, hos(ti)pitality must be conceived as an ontological, linguistic and discursive overpass in order to articulate the ethical on the political (Peeters, 2013, p. 470). Although the obvious political point of reference of hos(ti)pitality is the Pasqua-Debré laws of immigration in France (1997), we can assert as a *ninth* reflection that the Derridean hos(ti)pitality constitutes an endeavor to put the plagues of neocapitalism under serious question. From an Hamletian point of view, it is no exaggeration to say that if really the new world order is *out of joint*, then Derrida himself took the courageous decision to bring

to the fore the challenge of unconditional hos(ti)pitality as justice (Derrida, 2006, p. 100).

Additionally, hos(ti)pitality's argumentation took place as a *work of mourning* with regard to Emmanuel Levinas's death at the end of 1995. Since then and until Jacques Derrida passed away on Saturday 9 October 2004, at the age of seventy-four (Peeters, 2013, p. 540), he never stopped to face *adieu* to his beloved teacher and friend Emmanuel Levinas as a great ontological, spiritual, ethical and most of all political opportunity to handle with the thorny question of hos(ti)pitality, especially by having the name of this Levinasian infinite and absolute Other (Derrida, 1999, p. 8). From this contextual perspective, hos(ti)pitality is a remarkable way to welcome Emmanuel Levinas himself. One year later, on December 1996, Jacques Derrida delivered a special lecture at Paris-Sorbonne University as *homage* to Emmanuel Levinas with the emblematic title 'A Word of Welcome' (Derrida, 1999, p. 15). Ho(m)age sounds like ho(st)age. From a Benvenistean viewpoint, homage could be a form of hostageship. So, in a Derridean sense of deconstruction as justice and hos(ti)pitality, it could be supported that homage to Emmanuel Levinas is first and foremost the hard work of hostageship (ho-ma-ge/ho-sta-ge) which takes place in the messianic, fuzzy and ambiguous Heideggerian-inspired event (*Ereignis*) of hos(ti)pitality, where the householder becomes hostage of the guest. Actually, this sui generis Derridean 'word of welcome' is a proper Benvenistean and Levinasian mode to speak with the risky and dangerous language of hos(ti)pitality. The French philosopher declares publicly this Janus of hos(ti)pitality as follows: "To dare to say welcome is perhaps to insinuate that one is at home here, that one knows what it means to be at home, and that at home one receives, invites, or offers hospitality, thus appropriating for oneself a place to *welcome* [*accueillir*] the other, or, worse, *welcoming* the other in order to appropriate for oneself a place and then speak the language of hospitality – of course, I have no more intention than anyone else of doing this, though I'm already concerned about the danger of such a usurpation" (Derrida, 1999, p. 16). This Derridean almost messianic and miraculous event of hos(ti)pitality is the contingent moment where the guest becomes the master of the host (homage/hostage). Therefore, ethics of hos(ti)pitality is indeed a new politics of hos(ti)pitality beyond the conditional, one-dimensional and forcible power of modern state sovereignty. As Jacques Derrida writes "the one who welcomes is first welcomed in his own home. The one who invites is invited by the one whom he invites. The one who receives is received, receiving hospitality in what he takes to be his own home, or indeed his own land" (Derrida, 1999, p. 42.)

Derridean hos(ti)pitality in this pure Levinasian-like sense is a deconstruction of the modern force of state law. Insofar as the head of the household, the master of the house or the so-called Hobessian Sovereign is already a received host, a guest in his own home or country or state, then hospitality is that meta-empirical and post-metaphysical ontological radicality (see monstrosity) which completely overturns the modern ontology of Westphalian sovereign state for the sake of a totally new or postmodern metaphysics of hos(ti)pitality (Leitch, 2007, pp. 229-247). Kantian state hospitality as a relation of hierarchy, power and control is not truly worthy of the name of hospitality. By choosing the Levinasian way of thinking the event of welcome,

Derrida goes on step forward of the conditional mode of hospitality. In this vein, unconditional, absolute and pure hos(ti)pitality as an opening without conditions to the wholly Other or even more to the wholly Stranger is a condition of making the impossible possible; in other words, a possibility to reformulate the interstate and international laws of hospitality in such a way that it leads us to reform greatly the existing forms of sovereignty, right and law concerning the homeless and stateless people (Wortham, 2010, p. 72). So, as a *tenth* reflection thus far, we have to support indisputably here that unconditional hos(ti)pitality is actually an ontological, ethical and most of all political yardstick of Kantian-like conditional, state and diplomatic hospitality.

From 1997 to 2001, Derrida wrote numerous very significant texts on hospitality that have prepared his equally important articles and seminars on the concept of hos(ti)pitality. Especially his Levinasian 'face to face' dialogue with Anne Dufourmantelle on hospitality has shown us clearly that the question of unconditional hos(ti)pitality is undoubtedly a foreigner question by definition; which means a question that is coming from abroad; from the foreigner itself (Derrida, 2000a, p. 3). In this famous dialogue, unconditional hospitality is defined by Derrida as an absolute hospitality which breaks with the laws of Kantian hospitality as a diplomatic and state procedure of visitation or invitation. Absolute hospitality beyond state power and sovereignty is by definition a way of opening our house to the absolute, unknown and anonymous Other without posing the violent question of foreigner's name. So, according to Derrida, the language of pure hospitality deconstructs the language of state violence or force of law on homeless and stateless people (Derrida, 2000a, pp. 25-26). It is worth asking what Jacques Derrida should write concerning the current European refugee crisis? Is this contemporary humanitarian crisis a clear sign of hospitality as hos(ti)pitality, which helps us to reveal this complex and perplexed relationship between absolute enmity and absolute generosity at this *sui generis* double-faced game of hos(ti)pitality? Probably, French philosopher would answer once more by using this argumentation which shows the etymological proximity between hospitality and hostility (hos-ti-pitality), where both words of them are derived from the Latin word foreigner/stranger (*hostis*). So, Derridean hospitality as hos(ti)pitality, by bringing to the fore this etymological confusion between host as a householder, host as a stranger and host as an enemy, it gives us the opportunity or the possibility (of impossible) to investigate in-depth the power relations between ourselves, our states or political communities in general and mainly with regard to our guests as strangers and homeless people (Derrida, 2001, p. 19).

By showing Jacques Derrida how closely hospitality intertwined with hostility is like to show us how it is easy from a state-centric point of view to treat guests or refugees as enemies. To put the matter differently, Derrida by problematising, just in a Foucauldian sense, the relation between hospitality and hostility shows us via the proper methodological language of deconstruction that the possibility of rejection, suspicion and violence is already there deep inside the humanitarian, at first glance, act of welcoming. As an *eleventh* reflection, we can say that hospitality inherently bears within it the opposite ontological condition of enmity or the ever present possibility of absolute hostility towards the Other, who a few moments ago was

welcomed at the threshold of our home or our state. This etymological ambiguity of hos(ti)pitality brings to light first and foremost the ontological and ethical uncertainty of the human Being (Dasein) per se. This is what is defined by Emmanuel Levinas as infinite Other or what is defined by the phenomenological perspective of Martin Heidegger and Hannah Arendt as *facticity* or *natality* respectively (Arendt, 1998, p. 9). In an earthly world where everybody is a newcomer and so a stranger by definition is quite difficult to give strong property rights to anybody. In Derridean terms, this ontological, ethical and post-metaphysical (*as if* a first philosophy in Levinasian terms) human condition “implies a transformation of law, of the languages of law”; or in other words, “it touches upon the history and the most fundamental axioms of international law” (Derrida, 2005, p. 68).

This etymological, ontological, ethical and political ambiguity of hos(ti)pitality signifies not only the liberation of the house master of his power but first and foremost the liberation of the human condition itself from the oppression of the (state) power in general. So, to the extent that “the master, the ones who invites, the inviting host (...) becomes the hostage (...) And the guest, the invited hostage, becomes the one who invites the one who invites, the master of the host” (Derrida, 2000a, pp. 123-125), Derridean unconditional or pure or absolute hos(ti)pitality is a deconstructive form of justice in action. In other words, hos(ti)pitality is a kind of practical or political ethics “that offers the gift without reservations”. Absolute hos(ti)pitality as an absolute praxis of donation constitutes the experience of the impossibility itself (Derrida, 2000a, p. 135). This deconstructive route of justice is the only way to disintegrate the established conventions or norms of modernity and all these state obligations, programmes or rules of law that devalue the event of hospitality as an absolute gift. Through the possibility of impossible, French philosopher gives hospitality the name it deserves. As Simon Morgan Wortham summarizes on, this hospitality “worthy of the name must remain open to the wholly unwelcomable other” (Wortham, 2010, p. 76). So, as a *twelfth* reflection we could claim unquestionably that absolute hos(ti)pitality is not a way to paralyze action-taking or delegitimize conditional, political and diplomatic possibilities of hospitality in advance. Instead, by reminding us the impossibility of hospitality, Derrida brings to the fore the question of the stranger as a way to take the problem of state power in modernity seriously. Or, it is like asking us to rethink and transform thoughtfully the conditional in the name of the unconditional, especially in the critical fields of politics, law, citizenship, human and minority rights (Wortham, 2010, p. 76).

Of hos(ti)pitality and cities of refuge in the era of globalization

Can we rethink without banisters (Arendt’s famous expression) the thorny question of refugee crisis within this Derridean and deconstructive manner of hos(ti)pitality? Is it possible to reflect in this way? Or, in other words, is hos(ti)pitality a mere linguistic and etymological ambiguity which lacks any cultural and/or ethical reference? To put the matter differently, is it possible to welcome the Levinasian infinite Other; the absolute stranger; someone who could threaten our lives? What would Derrida say after the terrorist attacks in Paris (2015), Brussels (2016) and Berlin (2016)? Is hostility manifested only by the side of the sovereign state (the Hobbesian

Leviathan) or as an ontological aspect of evil always within the hidden intentions of the uninvited guests who approach our home in the middle of the night? From this special point of view, is hospitality as hos(ti)pitality therefore a double-faced threat? An open or a floating signifier? (Howarth and Stavrakakis, 2000, pp. 1-23) Actually, a Janus? This ancient deity who stands at the doorway or threshold of our home or our state by looking at the same time backward and forward not only as a precious house protector but simultaneously as a potential killer? These are some of the very critical interrogations that arise from the exploration of the question of hospitality as hos(ti)pitality in the Derridean way of thinking. Questions that must be honestly answered if we want to investigate in-depth the actual possibilities of impossible or unconditional or absolute or pure hospitality in a totally globalized world. This is the only active and theoretical route we have to pass through if we really want our common home Earth not to be plagued from the threat of concentration or death camps, as the biopolitical paradigm of modernity is defined by Giorgio Agamben (Agamben, 1998), and to be transformed into a 'city of refuge' in this Derridean and above all Levinasian way of thinking within the ethics of hospitality in the texts of the Bible and Torah (Makris, 2015, pp. 177-194).

In his academic sessions on hos(ti)pitality in the beginning of 1997, Jacques Derrida put the question of hospitality first and foremost as a *sacred hospitality* following very closely Louis Massignon's specific approach (Derrida, 2002, p. 373). If the guest is the messenger of God to Abraham then hospitality has a flavour of sacrifice by definition. God Himself is at once Guest, Host and Home. From this point of view, as the French philosopher has shown explicitly in these seminars, hos(ti)pitality via this Christian figure of Holy Trinity is manifested simultaneously both as a *substitution* and as a *hostageship*. This absolute stranger who comes at midnight at my threshold is God. God Himself who brings as an absolute donation the gift of sacrifice: a double-faced sacrifice which in the name of forgiveness asks me to sacrifice my house's sovereignty. This double-faced substitution between me and God; me and the stranger; me and the absolute Other; just into my home; at midnight; without any warning; is by definition the whole challenge of Derridean hos(ti)pitality (Derrida, 2002, p. 375). As a *thirteenth* reflection here, we can assert that by offering ourselves as hostages to others, which means by substituting ourselves with strangers, it is like opening our home to God Himself. In other words, it looks like transforming, *as if* a miracle, our home or our state into a biblical *city of refuge* (Makris, 2015, p. 178). So, insofar as the Derridean unconditional hospitality is a way of making the impossible possible, hos(ti)pitality has the meaning of a messianic *miracle*; an event which rapidly and sharply changes the conventional order of human things. From this point of view, it is worth noting that the concept of hos(ti)pitality constitutes the argumentation of a political theology of justice in a historical era of secular atheism and the same time a historical conjuncture of radical religious fundamentalism. The well-known contemporary American philosopher John D. Caputo describes Derrida's work in the 1990s as a "religion without religion". As he points out emphatically, the Derridean "*deconstruction itself is structured like a religion* – it leaves and breaths a religious and messianic air; like religion it turns on a faith, a hope, even a prayer for the possibility of the impossible". In this sense, Caputo summarizes as follows: "deconstruction may look more like poison/remedy, a gift/Gift, a promise/threat, a

monster instead of a Messiah”, by revealing in this very specific way the contradictory structural features of unconditional hospitality as hos(ti)pitality (Raschke, 2002).

In a Derridean viewpoint, we could claim that hos(ti)pitality is an unconditional hospitality without (state) sovereignty. A kind of negative theology where in God’s position Jacques Derrida has put the concept of *différance*. Derridean *différance* obviously is not God but is the justice in the name of hos(ti)pitality. From this perspective, hos(ti)pitality does not match the phenomenological horizon of expectation. As Derrida says in his famous article on the topic, it is a wait without waiting. Each moment of the day we wait without knowing who exactly we await for. Perhaps we wait for the Messiah but simultaneously we wait for anyone who might come for good or bad; for radical good or radical evil (Derrida, 2000, p. 10). By not knowing who arrives (*l’arrivant*) it looks like justice per se. Jacques Derrida’s locus classicus of justice is our threshold. It is this Arendtian or Buberian (from Martin Buber) *in-between* where the Janus of hostis as host, stranger or enemy appears (Derrida, 2000, p. 15). In his eulogy on Derrida’s death, John D. Caputo underlines that the French philosopher was the personification of deconstruction and hos(ti)pitality as justice. Derrida himself was a Socratic Messiah. Without a doubt he was that stranger or foreigner who arrives in the middle of the night in the city’s threshold. In other words, Derrida is “the philosophical figure of the ‘to come’ (à venir), the very figure of the future (l’avenir), of hope” (Caputo, 2004, p. 8). Caputo’s adieu to Derrida is a work of mourning as hospitality or, in a better sense, as hos(ti)pitality, if we have to take seriously Derrida’s deconstructive and messianic monstrosity (Smith, 2005, p. xv).

Hos(ti)pitality as Hamletian justice or deconstructing force of law

To think the im-possible as possible means, in Derridean terms, to rethink justice, or the ethics of hospitality or the hos(ti)pitality itself, as ethics beyond the conventional image of positive law or particularly far beyond the state force of law (Derrida, 2005b, p. 79). In that sense, hospitality as an ontological and linguistic condition of possible impossibility brings to light the messianic and miraculous event of hostis as host, stranger and enemy. So, it makes sense, that, hos(ti)pitality is defined by the French philosopher as a state of aporia; a state of undecidability; a state of exception between hospitality and hostility (Derrida, 2005b, p. 90). Derrida by deconstructing state force of law in the name of justice is likely to uncover explicitly the inherent contradictions of political and legal modernity in the face of nation-state (Derrida, 2005b, p. 125). It is via this argumentation that Jacques Derrida, as Hannah Arendt did in her *Origins of Totalitarianism* (Arendt, 2004, p. 341), is asking us to rethink seriously the question of stateless people and especially refugees. From this standpoint, he underlines that “*unconditional hospitality is inseparable from a thinking of justice itself*” (Derrida, 2005b, p. 131). So, as a *fourteenth* reflection on the concept of Derridean hos(ti)pitality, we can argue that insofar as the traditional meaning of keywords as refugee, exile, deportee, displaced person and even foreigner has changed rapidly within the textual and contextual frame of the work of deconstruction as a work of mourning, the so-called Benjaminian and Arendtian *pariahs* take an important position in Jacques Derrida’s discourse analysis as a whole. This is not just a new theoretical and practical response to the crucial humanitarian problems of

neoliberal globalization in the 21st century but it is nearly a radical way of thinking and acting beyond the modern historical horizon and especially totally against what we understand in conventional terms as politics, ethics, citizenship, human rights, freedom, equality and most national state as a basic unit of power and law in the era of modernity (Derrida, 2005b, pp. 131-132).

Indubitably, the proper way to rethink hos(ti)pitality through this messianic and miraculous event of the possibility of the impossible is Derridean critique of force of law or law as state force. When Derrida puts justice against force of law or justice against modern Westphalian nation-state is because he wants to disclose the inner contradictions of state sovereignty in times of modernity. Nation-state is like a Janus. The more the modern national state articulates its identity (*We*) around the concept of hospitality the more it is prepared by using the state institutions as apparatuses of hostility (pogroms, persecutions etc) to exclude the strangers as enemies (*They*) beyond the city's walls and threshold. From a specific psychoanalytical point of view, this is a state of *schizophrenia*. Hamletian justice brings to the fore the deeper antinomies of state's power uses and abuses in modernity. From this perspective, this Derridean deconstructive justice looks like a *patricide*. By deconstructing the Lacanian Names-of-the-Father, Jacques Derrida liberates the desire of hospitality as a constantly unconditional encounter and communication of absolutely different individuals or people beyond the conditional political and diplomatic restrictions of Kantian laws of visitation or state force of law. In other words, by alternating radically the accustomed relations between the householder and the guest, the host and the stranger or the friend and the enemy, the French philosopher is *as if* to liberate signifiers from their conventional meanings (signifieds). As a pure performative procedure, this Derridean way of thinking, acting and judging is justice per se. Hos(ti)pitality therefore is a specific political and ethical action of an ontological and linguistic liberation or a realization of human freedom through deconstruction as justice. As far as Derrida is concerned, there is not black and white in empirical life as well as in symbolic forms of language. Actually, we live in the twilight zone of grey (Derrida, 2004, p. ix). Everything is in a continuous and contingent state of undecidability (Janus). Everything is taking place in a state of aporia. In fact, hospitality and hostility or justice and force of law are the two facets of the same coin (hos-ti-pitality). In Christopher Norris terms, this Derridean double-faced deconstruction "proposes the idea of justice as inherently transcending any given set of legal provisions and enactments" (Norris, 2006, p. 166).

Since 1989, Derrida brought to the light a kind of hospitality as hos(ti)pitality especially with regard to the nation-state force of law or whatever he defines as the *mystical foundation of authority* (Derrida, 2002, p. 230). In order to understand in whole this specific form of modern state authority, we have first and foremost to conceive that justice in the Derridean manner presupposes hospitality, particularly this miraculous and messianic event of hos(ti)pitality. This is exactly what the French thinker means by defining deconstruction as a hard work of justice, which signifies simultaneously "equivocal slippages between law and justice" (Derrida, 2002, p. 231). Justice is realized always through the ambiguous act of hos(ti)pitality. In this vein, justice presupposes the coming of the stranger or the foreigner (*à venir*). But what is

precisely the content of this law of hos(ti)pitality? According to Jacques Derrida, “it is hard to say whether it is a rule of decorum, politeness, the law of the strongest, or the equitable law of democracy. And whether it depends on justice or on law” (Derrida, 2002, p. 232). It is worth noting that for a long time Derrida himself was considered from academia (having in mind for example the so-called ‘Cambridge affair’) as a Socratic or Hamletian foreigner strolling out of our academic threshold with the strange face of a trully open Academy or a *university to come* (Smith, 2005, p. 73). The hospitality he enjoyed in many conferences during his life was accompanied by enduring hostility. So, it is no exaggeration to say that hos(ti)pitality was primarily for Derrida an unceasing experimental process of altering the conventional meanings of modernity. Therefore, within the justice of hospitality there is always the law of force or, in Derridean terms, the hostility of the force of law (hos-ti-pitality). In this perspective, as a *fifteenth* reflection, we could assert here that “it is the force essentially implied in the very concept of *justice as law*, of justice as it becomes law, of the law as law (...) there is no law that does not imply *in itself, a priori, in the analytic structure of its concept*, the possibility of being ‘enforced’, applied by force” (Derrida, 2002, p. 233).

Some concluding remarks

By summarizing all the above, we can support that the Derridean concept of force of law is actually the hidden force of the modern rule of law which is not a rule of justice. Rule of law is not by definition a just state. Without a doubt, rule of law is the famous Weberian form of modern state power which legitimizes the brutal force as a political and ethical practice on the enforcement of law (legality). By his neologism of hos(ti)pitality, Derrida has shown us in a very radical and sometimes heretical way that the force of law takes place primarily in the symbolic level of language when the stranger enters the threshold of our home or our state by addressing the newcomer with the question of all questions: *what is your name?* (Derrida, 2000a, p. 27) From this point of view, justice ontologically differs from law. “Justice as law is not justice. Laws are not just in as much as they are laws. One does not obey them because they are just but because they have authority” (Derrida, 2002, p. 240). This is what Jacques Derrida defines as the mystical foundation of authority. Derridean deconstruction aims mainly to uncover this mystical foundation of modern state power as an unjust rule of law. In that sense, deconstruction is justice and above all deconstruction is possible as a powerful and constant experience of the impossible. Justice itself is the messianic and miraculous experience of the impossible (Derrida, 2002, pp. 243-244). By paraphrasing Derrida’s words, we can say that the definite meaning of hos(ti)pitality as an ambiguous difference (see *différance*) between law (hostility) and justice (hospitality) remains always open over an abyss (Derrida, 2002, p. 247). However, according to Derrida, this ontological and linguistic abyss of hos(ti)pitality does not imply a pessimistic image of the human condition. On the contrary, this Hamletian undecidability signifies a state of aporia; a state of *decision*; in other words, a state of *personal responsibility* in a post-Totalitarian world which is endangered by the evil of political and ethical paralysis (Derrida, 1999a, pp. 65-83). No doubt, Derridean hos(ti)pitality helps us pass “*beyond the possible*” (Derrida, 1992a, p. 343) towards this sui generis Benjaminian pariahdom where hospitality and hostility are just the two

faces of Angelus Novus: good and evil or in Benjamin's words "there is no document of civilization [hospitality] which is not at the same time a document of barbarism [hostility]" (Benjamin, 1969, p. 256). As Simon Critchley writes, hos(ti)pitality constitutes the *hiatus* (abyss) between ethics (hospitality) and politics (hostility) where ethics in a pure Levinasian way is defined as the welcome of the Other and politics in a Kantian manner is conceived as an act of state force against the unknown guest who approaches our home late at night from nowhere (Critchley, 1999, p. 274). John D. Caputo points out emphatically that hos(ti)pitality is an enigmatic experience of *madness* (Caputo, 1997, pp. 112-113). Finally, we could support that Derridean hos(ti)pitality looks like Platonic Khôra or Levinasian *il y a* (there is) which at the same time means a place full of *promise* (hospitality) and *terror* (hostility) (Derrida, 1998, pp. 71-73).

References

- Agamben Giorgio (1998), *Homo Sacer. Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Antenore Ben (2016), Can the Schengen Agreement Survive the EU Refugee Crisis?, *The European Institute*, <http://www.europeaninstitute.org/index.php/ei-blog/276-february-2016/2129-can-the-schengen-agreement-survive-the-eu-refugee-crisis-2-18>.
- Arendt Hannah (1978), *The Life of the Mind*, San Diego, New York, London: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- Arendt Hannah (1998), *The Human Condition*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Arendt Hannah (2004), *The Origins of Totalitarianism*, New York: Schocken Books.
- Arendt Hannah (2006), *Eichmann in Jerusalem. A Report on the Banality of Evil*, London: Penguin Books.
- Arendt Hannah (2007), *The Jewish Writings*, New York: Schocken Books.
- Benhabib Seyla (2016), Legal Confusions and Political Calculations: The European Refugee Crisis, <https://medium.com/amor-mundi/legal-confusions-and-political-calculations-the-european-refugee-crisis-6679e38877df#.ptszw76iv>.
- Benjamin Walter (1969), *Illuminations*, New York: Schocken Books.
- Benjamin Walter (2007), *Illuminations*, New York: Schocken Books.
- Benveniste Emile (1973), *Indo-European Language and Society*, London: Faber and Faber Limited.
- Bradley Arthur (2001), Without Negative Theology: Deconstruction and the Politics of Negative Theology, *The Heythrop Journal*, Vol 42, Issue 2, pp. 133-147.
- Brown Garrett Wallace and Held David (eds) (2012), *The Cosmopolitan Reader*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Butler Judith (2000), *Antigone's Claim. Kinship Between Life and Death*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Caputo John D. (ed.) (1997), *Deconstruction in a Nutshell. A Conversation with Jacques*

- Derrida, New York: Fordham University Press.
- Caputo John D. (2004), Jacques Derrida (1930-2004), *Journal for Cultural and Religious Theory*, Vol. 6, No. 1, pp. 6-9.
- Critchley Simon (1999), *Ethics, Politics, Subjectivity*, London and New York: Verso.
- Derrida Jacques (1981), *Positions*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida Jacques (1991), *Of Spirit. Heidegger and the Question*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida Jacques (1992), *Given Time: I. Counterfeit Money*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida Jacques (1992a), *Acts of Literature*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Derrida Jacques (1995), *On the Name*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida Jacques (1998), *Monolingualism of the Other; Or, The Prosthesis of Origin*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida Jacques (1999), *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida Jacques (1999a), *Hospitality, Justice and Responsibility* In Richard Kearney and Mark Dooley (eds), *Questioning Ethics. Contemporary debates in philosophy*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Derrida Jacques (2000), *Hostipitality, Angelaki. Journal of the theoretical humanities*, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 3-18.
- Derrida Jacques (2000a), *Of Hospitality (Anne Dufourmantelle invites Jacques Derrida to respond)*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida Jacques (2001), *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Derrida Jacques (2002), *Acts of Religion*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Derrida Jacques and Roudinesco Elisabeth (2004), *For What Tomorrow ... A Dialogue*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida Jacques (2005), *The Politics of Friendship*, London and New York: Verso.
- Derrida Jacques (2005a), *Rogues. Two Essays on Reason*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida Jacques (2005b), *Paper Machine*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida Jacques (2006), *Specters of Marx. The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Derrida Jacques (2016), *The Question of Being & History*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Dervin Fred and Layne Heidi (2013), A guide to interculturality for international and exchange students: an example of Hostipitality?, *Journal of Multicultural Discourses*, Vol. 8, Issue 1, pp. 1-19.
- Deutscher Penelope (2005), *How to Read Derrida*, London: Granta Books.
- Doukhan Abi (2012), *Emmanuel Levinas. A Philosophy of Exile*, London, New Delhi, New York, Sydney: Bloomsbury.
- Escudero-Alias Maite (2001), Antigone's Claim. Kinship Between Life and Death (Judith Butler), *Miscelánea: A Journal of English and American Studies*, 24, pp. 137-140.
- Fanon Frantz (2004), *The Wretched of the Earth*, New York: Grove Press.

- Foucault Michel (1990), *The History Of Sexuality. Volume 1: An Introduction*, New York: Vintage Books.
- Freud Sigmund (2003), *The Uncanny*, London: Penguin Books.
- Freud Sigmund (2010), *The Ego and the Id*, USA: Pacific Publishing Studio.
- Fukuyama Francis (2012), *The End of History and the Last Man*, London: Penguin Books.
- Glendinning Simon (2011), *Derrida. A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Heidegger Martin (2008), *Being and Time*, New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, Inc.
- Howarth David and Stavrakakis Yannis (2000), *Introducing discourse theory and political analysis* In David Howarth, Aletta J. Norval & Yannis Stavrakakis (eds), *Discourse theory and political analysis. Identities, Hegemonies and Social Change*, Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Kakoliris Gerasimos (2015), *Jacques Derrida on the Ethics of Hospitality* In Elvis Imafidon (ed.), *The Ethics of Subjectivity. Perspectives since the Dawn of Modernity*, New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Kant Immanuel (2005), *Perpetual Peace*, New York: Cosimo.
- Khatib Sami (2013), *Derrida & Sons: Marx, Benjamin, and the Specter of the Messianic*, <https://anthropologicalmaterialism.hypotheses.org/1810>.
- Lacan Jacques (2013), *On the Names-of-the-Father*, Cambridge: Polity.
- Leitch Vincent B. (2007), *Late Derrida: The Politics of Sovereignty*, *Critical Inquiry*, 33, 2007, pp. 229-247.
- Levinas Emmanuel (1969), *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*, Pittsburgh: PA Duquesne University Press.
- Levinas Emmanuel (1978), *Existence and Existents*, The Hague and Boston: Martinus Nijhoff.
- Levinas Emmanuel (1990), *Nine Talmudic Readings*, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Makris Spiros (2015), *Jacques Derrida and the Case of Cosmopolitanism: 'Cities of Refuge' in the Twenty-First Century* In De La Rosa Sybille and O'Byrne Darren (eds), *The Cosmopolitan Ideal. Challenges and Opportunities*, London, New York: Rowman & Littlefield International.
- Mouzourakis Minos (2014), *'We Need to Talk about Dublin'. Responsibility under the Dublin System as a blockage to asylum burden-sharing in the European Union*, Working Paper Series No. 105, Oxford: Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford Department of International Development, University of Oxford.
- Norris Christopher (2006), *Deconstruction*, London and New York: Routledge.
- O'Gorman Kevin (2006), *Jacques Derrida's philosophy of hospitality*, *The Hospitality Review*, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 50-57.
- Peeters Benoît (2013), *Derrida. A Biography*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Raschke Carl (2002), *Loosening Philosophy's Tongue: A Conversation with Jack Caputo*, http://www.jcrt.org/archives/03.2/caputo_raschke.shtml.
- Reaves Jayme R. (2016), *Safeguarding the Stranger. An Abrahamic Theology an Ethic of Protective Hospitality*, Eugene, Oregon: Pickwick Publications.
- Smith James K. A. (2005), *Jacques Derrida. Live Theory*, New York, London: Continuum.
- Sofocles (2005), *Antigone*, Clayton, Delaware: Prestwick House.

- Stocker Barry (2006), *Derrida on Deconstruction*, London and New York: Routledge.
- Taylor Charles (1994), *The Politics of Recognition* In Amy Gutmann (ed.), *Multiculturalism*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- UN seeks to reframe refugee crisis (May 2016), www.yahoo.com/news/un-seeks-reframe-refugee-crisis-172925814.html.
- UN: Refugee Population Hits 65M, Highest on Record (June 2016), <http://www.epictimes.com/06/20/2016/united-nations-refugee-crisis/>.
- Wendland Aaron James (2016), What Do We Owe Each Other?, *The New York Times, The Opinion Pages, The Stone*, http://opinionator.blogs.nytimes.com/2016/01/18/what-do-we-owe-each-other/?_r=0.
- Wortham Simon Morgan (2010), *The Derrida Dictionary*, New York, London: Continuum.
- Zlomislic Marko (2007), *Jacques Derrida's Aporetic Ethics*, Lanham, Boulder, New York, Toronto, Plymouth, UK: Lexington Books.