Derridean "Unconditional Hospitality" and New Image of European Borders

Basia Nikiforova[1]

Abstract:

Migration and borders are at the heart of critical, radical geography and new materialism. Jacques Derrida's concept of 'unconditional hospitality' helps us to rethink the past to the present and needs to be deconstructed according to current and future changes. While this ideal may not be fully attainable in practice, it can inspire border researchers to strive for more inclusive and empathetic ways of understanding and engaging with border issues. The notion of marginalising solidarity with refugees reflects the shift in priorities during the pandemic. What does marginalising solidarity mean for border researchers? First, the symbolic reconstruction of political entitlement and exclusion from social life; second, the intensification of internal and external borders; third, the growing priority of security over humanitarianism in public opinion and political discourse. The article highlights issues such as the duality of the migrant and the multiple paths to legal status. The race and religious affiliation of the migrant are important components of the Other.

Citation (APA):

Nikiforova, B. (2024). Derridean "Unconditional Hospitality" and New Image of European Borders. *Border and Regional Studies, 12*, 105-125.

> *An inheritance is never a given, but always a task. It is never gathered together, it is never one with itself. Its presumed unity, if there is one, can consist only in the injunction to reaffirm by choosing… If the readability of a legacy were given, natural, transparent univocal, if it did not call for and at the same time defy interpretation, we would never have anything to inherit from it.*
>
> *Jacques Derrida*

Introduction

In her book *Gilles Deleuze, Postcolonial Theory and the Philosophy of Limit*, Réda Bensmaïa poses a question that has puzzled philosophers for

---

1 Basia Nikiforova https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2774-4707, Senior Researcher at Lithuanian Culture Research Institute, Department of Contemporary Philosophy, Vilnius, Lithuania, e-mail: nikiforovaphilosophy@gmail.com

centuries: „How does one become a stalker in philosophy?" According to Deleuze, the answer lies in the concept of „becoming other". However, Derrida seemed to have discovered the secret of „becoming other", which involves distancing oneself from one's past spiritual life and becoming alienated from one's country. Derrida's alienation had multiple dimensions, including his place of birth, his mother tongue, the Western philosophical tradition and his Jewish heritage. This allowed him to analyse phenomena such as Western host culture, Algerian colonialism and post-colonialism independently, free from the constraints of language, culture and religion. Derrida cultivated his own monolingualism, adding it to a long list of other alienations, including familial, religious, geographical and political. In this sense, his personal biography and intellectual potential gave him the right to speak about the ‚other', hospitality and hostility in Europe, and all the contradictions and difficulties associated with appearing in it. But, as Seyla Benhabib has said, „he translated this sense of alienation into the pioneering discovery of the instability and creative playfulness of all language. Perhaps we understand each other because we so often fail to do so" (Benhabib 2005: 469).

Recent events in Europe, including the mass migration that took place between 2015 and 2017, the pandemic that led to the closure of national borders between 2020 and 2021, and the emergence of new forms of migration on the border with Belarus since 2021, as well as Russia's ongoing war against Ukraine, have highlighted the need for a paradigm shift. This shift should primarily involve embracing the idea of paradigm pluralism, which promotes a „matrix of alternatives" and encourages „critical practice". This approach was supported by the philosopher Jacques Derrida. Brian Massumi named this tendency as the complexity of the interlocking systems and describes that as a non-stopping exception:

> It's clear that crisis and catastrophe are no longer exceptional, they're the normal situation, as Benjamin famously said. The complexity of the interlocking systems we live in covers each of them we depend on for stability and is perpetually on the verge of tipping over into crisis, with the danger that there will be a sort of cascade of effects ... It's a very unstable, quasi-chaotic situation (Massumi 2012).

In this sense, border practice represents „the interlocking of systems and an unstoppable exception" that leads to situational and sometimes not always deliberate actions and decisions. The European integration process, which involves the EU in active border control, is beginning to become a „territorial state". For Timothy Snyder, „current developments suggest that the EU as a state-like entity is in the process of being born at its borders" (Snyder 2005).

The dynamic and rapidly changing nature of the border has altered its conventional perception as a static and fixed line in space. Instead, it is now seen as a fluid and ongoing process that evolves over time. It has led to the fact that the border is no longer perceived as a simple line on space but rather as a process. Claire Fox concludes that "border can be found anywhere; borders transcend physicality and become portable, especially wherever [stay] poor, ethnic, immigrant, and/or minority" (Fox 1994).

Derrida's concept of „unconditional hospitality" provides a profound lens through which to critically examine the issues surrounding borders, migration, and the relationship between host countries and refugees. His approach, deeply rooted in deconstruction, challenges the binary distinctions between legality and morality, exposing the complexities and contradictions inherent in these concepts.

> Derrida, affirming the Abrahamic law of hospitality and elaborating Kant's version of this right, which guarantees everyone a safe place to live on the surface of the earth, reflects on the possibility of a new localism that validates the ancient institution of „cities of refuge" (cosmopolites). (Hartman 2005: 479)

The significance of the external borders as such and the Eastern European borders is changing and globalization has, however, had its effect: contemporary borders appear to be more differentiated and it has altered: the functions of borders are rapidly transforming, "creating a situation that demands careful analysis, considering boundaries and cross-boundary interactions at different levels… as a single system" (Kolossov 2005: 628). During all stages of mass migration, the borders may become symbolically activist markers that encourage people to assume not only humanitarian, social but and political responsibility for „the pursuit of a decent life" that extends "beyond the borders" of separate countries.

Critical theory vs. practice

A critical practice as popular notion and approach, explores transformation processes in practice across different dimensions which include research, policy, community and individual practices (Cusset 2008: 44). Critical practice offers a substantially different approach from merely theorizing transformation, as it shifts our attention from transformation as something static or objective to be studied and described "from above and outside", towards something that is imagined, co-created and enacted in practice with others (Conradi 2015).

At the same time, critical practice is one of approach for explanation and deep investigation of the everyday social experimental and socio-spatial practices among others. Chantal Mouffe named this specific approach as "agonistics" (Mouffe 2013). From her view, politics in pluralist democracies includes contro-versial debate about such problems as migration, culture and border management. The critical practice perspectives are future-oriented ones where imagining an alternative future requires hearing different concepts and critical theories. In the condition of global crisis, it is important to give a voice to all agonistic groups when it comes to debating the future of our planet, and continents, and the creation of novel connections between politics, society, culture, and nature. Paradigm shift push humanitarians to re-framing colonial, national, migration and border thinking. Derrida was such public critical figure with agonistic, eternal doubting and not striving for simple solutions to contradictions. He wonders: "What is identity, this concept of which the transparent identity to itself is always dogmatically presupposed by so many debates on monoculturalism or multicul-turalism, nationality, citizenship, and, in general, belonging?" (Derrida 1998: 14). The Derrida's critical practice directed at himself, language, ethics of hospitality policy of state. The critical start laid down in his method of deconstruction that to be a "problematization of the foundation of law, morality and politics" (Derrida 1992: 8). Derrida critically examines the issues surrounding borders, migration, and the relationship between host countries and refugees. In short, Derrida's concept of unconditional hospitality serves as a powerful tool for critiquing the status quo and envisioning alternative modes of ethical and political engagement. By deconstructing the foundations of law, morality and politics, Derrida opens space for a more nuanced understanding of the complex issues surrounding migration and the relationship between host and refugee. Deeply rooted in decon-struction, this approach challenges the binary distinctions between legality and morality, revealing the complexities and contradictions inherent in these concepts.

Derrida can reduce the meaning of a text to a formula that can be understood by applying certain methods. Sometimes, however, this becomes a challenge. Michael Sells' phrase „to say what the text really meant to say but didn't" seems appropriate in such cases (Sells 1994: 4). The resulting alternation of meanings can be difficult for Derrida's opponents to present, since it involves multivalence, changeability, ineffability and uniqueness. Derrida himself was not constrained by a compulsive need to establish objective, extra-textual standards by which we could judge the accuracy or correctness of our interpretations (Rosmarin 1985, 88). In Sells's view, Derrida „unlike those philosophers who naively negate this question and thus remain closely and uncontrollably bound to it, confronts the philosophical quit for the ultimate foundation of a necessity". (Sells 1994: 4).

In three interviews, Gasché argues for a primarily philosophical approach to Derrida's thought. His starting point is a debate with Husserl and Heidegger. Gasché emphasises that Derrida's thought is unique in that it is „constantly vigilant against all self-evidences, dogmatisms and creeds" (Gasché & McCance 2008). Two key goals and guiding circumstances are fundamental to understanding why unconditional hospitality and the problems of the other are important to Derrida. The concept of hospitality is an aporetic definition that includes both hostility and hospitality. Derrida's understanding of this helps us to understand why Europe is so polarised in its attitude to the Other. It stands in solidarity with them and at the same time demonises or racialises them.

Responsibility

Derrida's philosophy and politics have always been inseparable. Scholars tend to focus on the aporetic concept of responsibility developed in Derrida's works, most famously in *The Other Heading: Reflections on Today's Europe* (1992), *The Politics of Friendship* (1997), *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness* (2001), *Philosophy in a Time of Terror* (2003), *The Gift of Death* (2008) and *The Beast and the Sovereign* (2009). As Agnes Czajka points out, Derrida's texts interpreted „the more spectacular suicidal tendencies of democracy with an exploration of the banality of autoimmunity and the quiet, everyday agony of democracy" (Czajka 2016: 6).

In one of the interviews, Derrida was asked whether he considered himself a ‚philosopher of the present', or at least one who ‚thinks his time'. Derrida responded that

> Like anyone else who tries to be a philosopher, I do not want to give up on the present or on thinking the presence of the present. I try not to forget that it is often the untimely intrusions of so-called actuality that are most ‚preoccupied' with the present. To be preoccupied with the present - as a philosopher, for example - perhaps means to avoid the constant confusion of presence with actuality (Derrida, Malle, Vermeren, Peretti, Sohm 1994: 31).

Derrida emphasizes that there is no responsibility without experiencing aporia as the possibility of the impossible. The meaning of undecidability, which makes responsibility possible is because undecidability haunts every kind of philosophical activity and interpretation. For every decision, we are responsible for the reason that our goal is impossible or never achievable. The decision to act is always incommensurable with the theoretical ground that justifies it. Derrida negates

argues that only a single conclusion leads inevitably to practical action. On the ground of a single conclusion having no necessary choices, doubts, and thus moral responsibility the outcome would not be a 'decision. In this sense, deconstruction opens up great opportunities and great difficulties. It allows us to remain neutral and not even make a specific action decision and, as it were, assumes the status quo as the only safe phenomenon. Nevertheless, for Derrida deconstruction is the only possible way to take responsibility and to make decisions.

> For if it is true that the concept of responsibility has, in the most reliable continuity of its history, always implied involvement in action, doing, a praxis, a decision that exceeds simple conscience or simple theoretical understanding, it is also true that the same concept requires a decision or responsible action to answer for itself consciously, that is, with a knowledge of a thematic of what is done, of what action signifies, its causes its ends, etc. (Derrida 1995:25).

Following Levinas, he emphasizes that "the sameness of myself is derived from the other, as if it were second to the other, coming to itself as responsible and mortal from the position of my responsibility before the other, for the other's death and in the face of it. In the first place it is because the other is mortal that my responsibility is singular and "inalienable" (Ibid: 46). Derrida believes that the possibility of having an eschatological history is already tied with responsibility. "Is one responsible for what one says in an unintelligible language, in the language of the other? But, besides that, mustn't responsibility always be expressed in a language that is foreign to what the community can already hear or understand only too well?" (Ibid 1995: 74).

The language as such can be developed within discourses and circum-stances. In assuming responsibility, language is an important element that Derrida does not seek to diminish or exaggerate. Besides, one often speaks a language that one does not possess in its entirety, a language that belongs to others, a language that can be forced out of one, that time itself can give or its carrier takes meaning away.   For these and other reasons, language often acts as a brake on all kinds of critical practices and actions. Nevertheless, with a moral assessment of the respon-sibility of the individual for his activities and deeds, these qualities of the language do not bear semantic responsibility for both what he has done and has not done.

When the event of the decision is passed, it is part of our past, no longer present. This returns us to that is constant, that doesn't give us the possibility to reduce our past decision to a simple historical fact or put it in a different context. If Derridean unconditional hospitality is the possibility of welcoming others

depending on some conditions: a place, a language, or a locus in which to welcome the person. Derrida doesn't ignore the fact that a moment ago, they were not there, that their coming is contingent. Derrida describes new arrivals as "disarmed as a newly born child", and requires also a reciprocal vulnerability of the host.

It seems that from this moment begins a long journey of his ascent to Golgotha with the problem of "unconditional hospitality".

Philosophical surrenders

According to Derrida, „with regard to the history and future of the idea of Europe, these questions are inescapable, and whatever the answers may be, the question remains, beyond any answer" (Derrida 1991: 20-22/14-17). Among those who have attempted to provide answers and describe the present and future of Europe from a non-standard perspective is Étienne Balibar. In 2004, he argued that Europe should be seen as a frontier and not just a border. He pointed out that the traditional representation of the border, which is important for state institutions, is not sufficient to capture the complex reality of European history. Balibar also identified and listed some general characteristics of European borders: Europe has always had different identities, leading to different interpretations of history; the dominant political framework is that territories combine sovereignty institutions and population governance in a single entity; borders are no longer located only at the outer limits of territories, they are dispersed (Balibar 2004). Balibar concluded that in the metaphoric sense borders are starting to be a "transitional object" or an object of permanent transgression, and European citizenship is a "citizenship of borders".

Another is Jürgen Habermas, who focused on meanings such as „impression", „thing" and „event". The event consists of the „thing" itself (that which happens or comes) and the impression (itself at once „spontaneous" and „controlled") left by the so-called „thing". A „great event" should disturb even the horizon of the concept or essence on the basis of which we think we recognise an event as such. That is why all „philosophical" questions remain open, perhaps even beyond philosophy itself, as soon as it comes to thinking about the event.

In the interview *Philosophy in a Time of Terror*, Habermas and Derrida discuss the event of „11 September". Derrida's thoughts on „September 11" as a terrible event can be transferred to the years 2015-2017, when the mass migration movement reached its peak. In the political discourse of this „event" he wrote: „The concepts with which this „event" has most often been described, named, categorised, are the products of a „dogmatic slumber" from which only a new

philosophical reflection can awaken us, a reflection on philosophy, especially on political philosophy and its heritage. From the dominant discourse of official rhetoric on received concepts such as „war" or „terrorism", we can easily move on to „illegal migrants", „migration crisis" or „threat to security".

Such rapidly and unpredictably changing bordering processes show massive, randomization, and the unforeseen character of migration. The situation arose for all the players of this process, reminding the famous phrase Foucault can be defined as follows: „the right make live or let die". The image of modern migrants began to correspond to Levinas's words that the Other "does not constitute a number with me, does not obey the general concept, that is, does not constitute a totality". For him, "to know objectively is therefore to constitute my thought in such a way that it already contains a reference to the thought of others. What I communicate therefore is already constituted in function of others" or "when man truly approaches the Other, he is uprooted from history" (Levinas 1969: 210, 52).

Zygmunt Bauman finds Levinas's concept as an asymmetrical relationship with the Other that does not match "the symmetry of attitudes and responsibilities," preferring "attitudes before the relations; one-sidedness, not reciprocity; a relation that cannot be reversed" (Bauman 1993:48-49).

Derridean sovereignty versus unconditionality

For Derrida, sovereignty is a theologically grounded „phantasm". Sovereignty has three characteristics: the sovereign is above the law, the concept of sovereignty is inseparable from the idea of the nation-state, and the sovereign is God's authorised representative. Unconditionality means „the possible happening of the impossible unconditional, the completely other" (Derrida 2002:76). Derrida uses event in the root sense as something that comes, that arrives. As J. Hillis Miller pointed out, „we can't just undo this and invite the other or another possible unconditional, the wholly other. It comes of its own accord and in its own time. We can only say yes or perhaps no to it. We cannot call the totally different. It calls us. (Miller 2005).

Derrida's work on Europe and its borders, especially his book *The Other Heading: Reflections on Today's Europe*, is remarkable. This book combines the idea of Europe with the idea of borders and otherness. It also contains a prophecy about people knocking on the gates of Europe and landing on its shores. Other smaller texts by Derrida on Europe, such as his dialogue with Habermas, could also be mentioned. Derrida emphasises that in the European historical tradition, certain objects are „presented" at the cost of the removal or „absence" of the other. He is

primarily interested in how something is defined as an object to exclude its Other. For him, the goal of deconstruction is to recover this Other, because this exercise will discover the politics that underlie any supposed conceptualisation. Derrida emphasises that the critical tradition in European philosophy has always shown itself to be aware of the Other.

According to Derrida, „today" is a unique moment for Europe. Europe is trying to redefine itself, but it is ignoring its own cultural history. This happens for several reasons: it uses the past as a mechanism for creating difference, it suggests that the Europe of „today" is in danger of losing track of the Other, Europe uniquely fails to acknowledge the temporality of „today" and thus cannot distinguish itself from or determine itself by its past.

> To make ourselves the guardians of an idea of Europe, of a difference of Europe, but of a Europe that consists precisely in not closing itself off in its own identity and in moving forward in an exemplary way towards what it is not, towards the other direction or the direction of the other, yes - and this is perhaps something quite different - towards the other of the direction, which would be the beyond of this modern tradition, another border structure, another shore (Derrida 1992:29).

Derrida suggests that Europe has always protected itself as a universal and defined itself by its internal 'otherness', or 'exemplary' in its pluralism, intellectual and political; heterogeneous rather than homogeneous. From their biography, Derrida knows what it means the differentness, hospitality and its opposite. He was born to Jewish parents in 1930 in Algeria and was from birth a French citizen. In 1942 in wartime, his citizenship was revoked because he was Jewish The major effect of this was his expulsion from the school he had previously been attending. Following Derrida, being European means taking responsibility for the heritage as historically gifted and, at the same time, it means openness through its relation to the non-European Other and its heritage. The expressions of "hiding the inner", trauma, and secret were also important for him and were dominant in Central European literature and philosophy (Franz Kafka, Bruno Schulz, Ingeborg Bachmann, Paul Celan, Milan Kundera).

In his political philosophy, Derrida focuses on what happens when people who are excluded from any political system or law ask for asylum. Derrida built his own concept of unconditional hospitality on a radical basis. At the same time, it establishes a connection between unconditional hospitality and the necessary conditions for the realization of hospitality, which means rules, rights, obligations, conventions, borders, and laws on migration.

"Hospitality is a very general name for all our relations to the Other, it has to be re-invented at every second, it is something without a pre-given rule" (Derrida 1997). In other words, hospitality must be repeatedly reinvented, and rethought, requiring responsibility towards others. Derrida understands all the consequences of hospitality: being hospitable is not a simple duty. The problem lies in the disharmony between the two laws: the ephemeral law of unconditional hospitality and the legislation on the basis of which hospitality can be realized. Derrida analyzes the conflict between the law of hospitality as such and the legislation of hospitality (norms, duties, and laws in society that form the basis of habits, etiquette, boundaries of hospitality) and shows us all the difficulties for implementing this project.

Greeting the Other within the framework of codified tolerance, most often we are talking about conditional hospitality, which is limited by law and legislation. Derrida, realizing the potential difficulties of this situation, noted that "I am not talking as a rule, but sometimes, in exceptional cases, it can happen. I cannot regulate, manage or define these moments, but it can only happen as an act of forgiveness, pure forgiveness can happen. Unconditional hospitality cannot be established by anyone, but it can happen like a miracle, for one moment, no more than a moment, it can happen" (Derrida 2001:15-16).

Derrida uses the verb „may" repeatedly. He speaks to us not so much about reality as about possibility, not about necessity, but about potentiality. Derrida believes that only the belief in the possibility of the impossible will guides our decisions and actions. Derrida's attempt to redefine hospitality not only within the nation-state but also within the cosmopolitan state has been seen by many scholars and politicians as utopian and even damaging to political discourse.

There is a dilemma that Derrida claims to be an inescapable feature of the concept of hospitality, which we see vividly revived in every event of mass migration and discussion of immigration. The balance between these two aspects of the notion of hospitality, openness, and closedness, implies dependence on specific circumstances. Derrida is not a philosopher that offers definitive answers to these dilemmas. He just warns us that we are always in a situation where we have not done enough. In Derrida's opinion, unconditional hospitality cannot proceed without negotiating with the laws of hospitality and exercising sovereignty by choosing, who will be granted hospitality.

Richard Kearney critiques Derrida's position about hospitality addressing its other understanding, referring to Paul Ricoeur's, hermeneutical hospitality. For Kearney, the hermeneutics approach offers a different way of "addressing the need for critical practical judgments" (Kearney 2003: 100). It seems to me that in the last

years of his life, he felt psychological stress from the reason how reality was little compatible with his idea not with the idea of unconditional hospitality but with conditional too. Kearney citates famous words Derrida that,"deconstruction is not an enclosure in nothingness, but openness towards the other" (Kearney 2004:173).

> We know that there are numerous what we call 'displaced persons' who are applying for the right to asylum without being citizens, without being identified as citizens. It is not for speculative or ethical reasons that I am interested in unconditional hospitality, but in order to understand and to transform what is going on today in our world (Derrida 1998: 70).

Kevin O'Gorman, one of the theoretics of hospitality, reminds President Mitterrand the expression about threshold of tolerance in his discussion on immigration policy. France's traditional role as the terre d'asile (land of sanctuary) for political refugees. Mireille Rosello concludes that "the image of a welcoming France is now contrasted with France as part of Fortress Europe" (Rosello 1998).

The imaginary meanings

Nowadays such ideas as „eternal peace", "world without borders", "unconditional hospitality", and "open society" becomes euphemisms. It is on the same line as if today, in the context of the war against Ukraine, we started talking about pacifism or non-violence. Same the concept of the „open society" model is interpreted narrowly today, limiting it to the internal territory of the state. In the book *Global Citizen – Challenges and Responsibility in an Interconnected World* raises an important question: what is this "global citizenship"? how to live as a citizen in a global world? why do we need utopian visions?

Partly on this question give answer Paul Ricoeur adding that "We cannot imagine a society without utopia, because this would be a society without goals" (Ricoeur 1986: 283). The simply word "utopia" seems now as disappeared from the political dictionary and it seems that in the coming years, few people are going or intend to return it to public discourse. Nevertheless, today researchers state that "Almost 70 years later the visions have been reduced to pragmatic, sometimes cynical, realism. And "utopia" has become a word that signals something negative, even hopelessly out of reach" (Moxnes 2014:7).

These meanings, like other „utopian" constants, cannot be derived from facts from the reason that they are not generalizations. They have a different purpose - to serve as the basis and criterion for explaining the facts that contradict them, to find the reasons for the deviation of the latter from the „absolutes". They

are not facts and cannot be refuted by them. Here we are dealing not with what is, but with what should be. Such imaginary meaning as a global community does not yet exist from the view of international affairs, statehood, capital, and passports.

In recent years, one of the main questions in philosophy has been the question of the Other: how and to what extent are we able to accept and welcome the radical Other? The debates about our hospitality, our willingness, and ability to offer it to the Other are of great importance today, although their discourse has changed markedly[2]. For Derrida, the due is not something that is chosen among other possibilities that are independent of any different external conditions. Early philosophical treatment of hospitality can be found in the 'Third Definitive Article of a Perpetual Peace: Cosmopolitan Right shall be limited to Conditions of Universal Hospitality' in Immanuel Kant's *Perpetual Peace* (1795):

> Hospitality (a host's conduct to his guest) means the right of a stranger not to be treated in a hostile manner by another upon his arrival on the other's territory. If it can be done without causing his death, the stranger can be turned away, yet if the stranger behaves peacefully where he happens to be, his host may not treat him with hostility. It is… rather a right to visit, to which all human beings have a claim, to present oneself to society by virtue of the right of common possession of the surface of the earth (Kant 2004: 82).

For Kant, the "conditions of universal hospitality" means the "condition of perpetual peace" and the peace as such cannot be guaranteed without some conditions: being a citizen of another country, he must behave peaceably in another country; he is only allowed to visit but not to stay. Kant limits the right to hospitality to a right to visit, not to the right to stay, which demands that the stranger or foreigner be a citizen of another country. For him, hospitality is a legal issue. In contrast to Kant, Derrida maintains that only an "unconditional hospitality can give meaning and practical rationality to a concept of hospitality" (Derrida 2005: 84).

The body and language as stigmata

Derrida deconstructs the relationship between host and guest through the question about belonging to a linguistic group is an important source for identity. Derrida understood language as the heart of identity construction. Thinking about

---

2   Derrida develops the question of hospitality mostly in the following articles and essays: *Of Hospitality* (2000); *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas* (1999); *"Shibboleth" in Midrash and Literature* (1986), 307–47; *The Gift of Death* (1995).

his own life, he analyses such notions as maternal language, mother tongue, and the language of the other. The colonial and post-colonial experiences that placed his cultural identities under severe threat gave rise to defense mechanisms that try to defend him against a repetition of this traumatic past. At his view, the guest is tried to ask for hospitality (for asylum) in a language which, in a broad sense, is not his/her own.

The case of "Judeo-Franco-Maghrebian situatedness" for many post-colonial researchers is the attempt to rethink the relations to otherness and the processes of identification that exceed a self/other binary. Robert Young underlines the significance of such fact that "Sartre, Althusser, Derrida, and Lyotard were all either born in Algeria or personally involved with the events of the war" (Young 1990: 1).

The "Algeria Thing" involves Derrida and his lifelong childhood friend Hélène Cixous in a reflection on their Franco-Judeo-Maghrebian identity. For both, memories of Algeria are linked to the violence of the Vichy regime, the status of Jews and anti-Semitism during World War II. When Cixous recalls their common past she writes: "We do mirror a number of precise and dated stigmata: Algeria 1940. … Expulsions, naturalizations, de/citizenships, exclusions, blacklistings, doors slammed in your face … that constitute the archives of what he calls my 'nostalgeria' and what I call my 'algeriance'" (Cixous 2004: 5). In her book *Stigmata* she described her own and Derrida's trauma. She wrote: "Jews truly wanted to love France. But it was love by force. We wanted to love Algeria. But it was too early or too late" (Cixous 2005: 133).

If we describe postcoloniality as a situation and problem that has followed decolonization whether in the formerly colonizing or colonized country that possible to find similarities between the trauma, which refers to the perception of own otherness and exclusiveness in a mostly negative sense. In this sense, Emilie Kutash named Derrida as a marked man, who as Jew used to examine the numbers on his left arm that witnessed his concentration camp experience. (Kutash 2019: 10). The attention to the experience of world-famous philosophers, sociologists and writers can help us today better understand what migrants feel through bordering practices.

Security versus humanitarianism in the crisis discourse

The assertion of state sovereignty thus relies on certain binaries: the citizen vs. the non-citizen, the national vs. the foreigner, and the insiders vs. the outsiders. The concept of the "state of exception", most famously developed by Carl Schmitt and Giorgio Agamben, is central to understanding how sovereign power

is built but also how this is closely related to the creation of particular representations of refugee identity and subjectivity.

The crisis discourse that is commonly mobilized to describe refugees and their movements testify to this suspension and to the location of the figure of the refugee in a space of exception. From Agamben view, "the exception does not subtract itself from the rule; rather, the rule, suspending itself, gives rise to the exception and, maintaining itself in relation to the exception, first constitutes itself as a rule. The 'force' of law consists in this capacity of law to maintain itself in relation to an exteriority" (Agamben 1998:18). The category of the refugee (in this case Other) and its associated characteristics (depoliticized, silenced, or framed as threatening) reflect the desire to control this part of human activities that is potentially capable of disobeying the state.

The situation of the crisis only facilitates this task. Cecile Cantat focuses on the relation between crisis as a set of discourses, practices and governance of migration and looks on that "the naming of a crisis s authorizes a set of strategic actions. The discourse of crisis frames recent mobilities towards Europe as exceptional and out of the ordinary and calls for and justifies emergency interventions – indeed the redeployment of brutal strategies of bordering – in order to restore a putative normality" (Cantat 2016:12)

Her „non-crisis" approach allows us to perceive such existing forms of the political community as transcending the citizen/non-citizen dichotomy and opening up a look at them as a non-territorial imagination of identity and belonging. The crisis discourse is performative. It produces representations of the world as politically normal and desirable that fulfill particular functions. It relies on a set of binary distinctions between what is orderly and desirable and what is out of the ordinary and in need of rectification. The framing of mobility as a crisis allows and justifies the deployment of emergency measures up to the reassertion of national borders within the Schengen Area.

On the phone of these geopolitical concepts, the idea that migrants and refugees represent a crisis and a threat to Europe has legitimated a set of bordering practices including detention, deportation, and forms of psychological pressure or pushback. The nation-state and its territorialized sovereignty are seen as the primary political categories of the modern era. They provide an answer to the question of what constitutes political legitimacy, a political authority and a political subject. This answer relies on a process of territorialization of political and social life: the state is sovereign over a national body of citizens within the borders of its own territory.

The discourse of crisis precisely at moments when the state's incapacity to control and discipline movement gains in visibility is in this sense an operation aimed at the reassertion of the binaries on which "sovereignty relies in the face of autonomous mobilities which escape its logics" (Ibid 15).

Cantat notion about marginalizing solidarity with refugees reflected the shift in priorities during the pandemic time. What mean marginalizing solidarity for border researchers? First, the symbolic reconstruction of political entitlement and exclusion from social life, second, the intensification of its internal and external frontiers, third, in the public opinion and political statements the growing priority of security vs humanitarian.

In *Other Hearing*, Derrida uses the meaning of navigation as a metaphor. He is convinced that in times of crisis and difficulty, correct navigation in the air or on the sea is linked to the problem of direction, and that „it is necessary to remember not only the other direction, and above all the direction of the other, but perhaps also the other of direction, that is to say, a relation of identity with the other that no longer obeys the form, the sign or the logic of direction, nor even the antidirection - of beheading, of decapitation". (Derrida 1992: 15).

Religious dimension of hospitality

In my view, one of the strongest Derridean influences on European thought has been his notion of the „wholly other" (tout autre). The „other" was called otherness because it belonged to racial, ethnic, gender or class differences. However, this did not exclude the possibility that the personality of another human being, whoever he or she might be as a friend or neighbour, might also be a bearer of otherness. In general, the total other became a prominent motif in Derrida's work. Religious attitudes and actions play important roles in both causing and responding to forced migration. The scale of migration has undergone changes over time, but migration remains a phenomenon that is intricately connected with religion. The Derridean case looks multilevel from such reasons as his Jewish and Algerian origins. The Islamic origin of most migrants starts to be a more visible and important part of their identity.

Examining migration with a particular focus on religion has now become essential for many reasons but what is new that "the influence over both migrant and settled populations in ways that were almost inconceivable before the twenty-first century". The discussions about migration are helping to concentrate on ethical and political aspects of religion at the surface of public life. Issues about migration are helping to force ethical and political debates about religion to the

surface of public life. In many countries, it contributed to the discussion about the appropriate ways of regulating public expressions of religion in liberal or secular states.

The religious normality of society depends on relations between migrant minorities and the rest of society and the relationship between members of migrant minorities. Nowadays raised more often the fundamental question about the capacity of the liberal state to separation between religions and resolve the tensions in the growth of religious and social diversity in the condition of mass migration to Europe. In the view of Silvio Ferrari's "The secular state proved to be an effective tool for regulating religions when Europe was still a Christian continent" (Ferrari 2019). As a result of significant changes in the European religious landscape, today the question arises whether European society is able to soften part of its Christian or secular systems of regulation between the religious majority and minorities.

The past experiences with mass migration are helpful for us the overcoming the lure of exceptionalism conveyed by the crisis framing. The stories about historical migration events help us overcome historical amnesia that the refugee issue is something new and only a recent phenomenon in globalization and make visible its trajectory.

The book *Refugees and Religion. Ethnographic Studies of Global Trajectories*, edited by Birgit Meyer and Peter van der Veer, is interesting from the attempt to find the place of the current trajectories of people who flee from conditions of oppression and conflict, and who are seeking refuge in Europe in a broader historical and comparative perspective. (Meyer & van der Veer 2021:334) The different narratives point to the ongoing interplay between flows and border closures in which general actors are not only refugees but also the societies from where they flee and those they reach out to. Birgit Meyer's chapter *Mobilizing Theory. Concluding Thoughts* is important because she started from the problem of exploring religious roles in ways that lead beyond well-trodden stereotypes about religion in modern, secular society. From her view, the neglect of religion in relation to the study of refugee issues is not simply an empirical lack, but also a conceptual one. This is a result of the secularist approach according to which religion is a private belief and marginal to the problem of mass migration and refugee crisis. She concludes that "taking the refugees-and-religion nexus as a focal point reveals a lot about the legal, political, and symbolic operations through which nation-states, and the EU at large, seek to retain their boundaries and regulate the role and place of religion in society, in a world in motion" (Ibid 257).

 Today we have dealt with such issues as the double vision of immigrants and different ways to legal refugee status. The immigrant's race and religious belonging as components of others' vision is one of the important reasons for

this differentiation. However, as rightly pointed out by a number of researchers that "recent works in critical race theory and the study of cultural boundaries in national belonging, we argue that Muslims are distinct in being excluded on racial, religious, and civic grounds at the same time" (Gerteis 2020). The growth of such tendencies and interpretations largely depends on historical and social narratives and context taking shape in a given era.

The double vision or practice of double standards was implemented also in the situation of African Christian refugees from Congo, Kenia, and other countries. A legitimate question arises: African refugees belonging to Christian denominations (Protestants, Catholics, Evangelicals, or Jehovah's Witnesses) can count for hospitality or welcome?

Laura Zanfrini in article *Europe and the Refugee Crisis: A Challenge to Our Civilization* realistically wrote that "immigration is a phenomenon that, by definition, challenges the borders of a community; not only the physical and political boundaries, but also those which define its identity, hence putting into question the principles and values upon which a society is based, both those shaped by a shared history and those imposed by nationalistic myths" (Zanfrini 2021). She puts into circulation meaning "alarmist reactions" and by them, she explains the situation in the countries of Eastern Europe. "In this light, we can also understand why the young East-European democracies, fresh from a history of forced relocations and ethnic cleansings and the difficult shift to the post-communist era, are reluctant to open their frontiers to ethnic and religious minorities" (Ibidem). In her view, the other reasons are the absence of direct experience with them and knowledge by alarmist declarations, and the fear of terrorism.

From my point of view, this is not so little, given the openness of the modern world and the mobility of the Eastern European population. The author attributes this reluctance to factors such as a history of forced relocations and ethnic cleansing and "alarmist" reactions. The case that occurred on the Polish-Belarusian and Lithuanian-Belarusian border in the 2021- 2022 years partly witnessed these "alarmist reactions". The concept of unconditional hospitality by Derrida helps us rethink the past to the present, that so much needs to be deconstructed according to current and future changes. Derrida just warns us that we are always in a situation where we not have done enough.

Conclusion

The concept of „unconditional hospitality" by Jacques Derrida helps us rethink the past to the present, that so much needs to be deconstructed according to

current and future changes. While this ideal may not be fully attainable in practice, it can inspire border researchers to strive for more inclusive and empathetic ways of understanding and engaging with border issues.

What does marginalizing solidarity for border researchers? First, the symbolic reconstruction of political entitlement and exclusion from social life, second, the intensification of its internal and external borders, third, in the public opinion and political statements the growing priority of security vs humanitarian. The notion of marginalizing solidarity to refugees reflected the shift in priorities during the pandemic.

Derrida focuses on what happens when people who are excluded from any political system or law ask for asylum. In his opinion, unconditional hospitality cannot proceed without negotiating with the laws of hospitality and exercising sovereignty by choosing, who will be granted hospitality. What is very important that his critical practice wide directed at himself, language, ethics of hospitality and policy of state. The discussion around crisis notion provoked us to look on contemporary situation from different sides including the idea that migrants and refugees represent a crisis and a threat to Europe has legitimated a set of bordering practices.

Derrida warns us that the important question of Europe must be asked in a new or maybe heretical way. He considers himself more with age someone who not quite European by birth, since I come from the southern coast of the Mediterranean, somewhat over-acculturated, over-colonized European hybrid" (Derrida 1992: 6-7). Derrida believes "that this is taking place now ... I believe, rather, that this event takes place as that which comes, as that which seeks or promises itself today, in Europe, the today of a Europe whose borders are not given - no more than its name. Europe being here only a paleonymic appellation. I believe that if there is any event today, it is taking place here" (Derrida 1992: 30-31).

Literature

Agamben, G. (1998). *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Daniel Heller-Roazen (trans.). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Agamben, G. (2005). *State of Exception.* Kevin Attell (trans.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Balibar, E. & Swenson, J. (2004). We, the People of Europe? Reflections on Transnational Citizenship. *Journal of International Affairs. 57, 2*, 190-192.

Balibar, E. (2004). Europe as Borderland. The Alexander von Humboldt Lecture in Human Geography. http://www.ru.nl/socgeo/colloquium/ Europe%20as%20 Borderland.pdf.

Barad, K. (2003). Posthumanist Performativity: Toward an Understanding of How Matter Comes to Matter. *Signs Journal of Women in Culture and Society 28, 3,* 801-831 https://doi.org/10.1086/345321.

Bauman, Z. (1993). *Postmodern Ethics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Benhabib S. (2005). The Legacy of Jacques Derrida. PMLA, Vol. 120, No. 2 (Mar., 2005), pp. 464-494.

Bensmaïa, R. (2017). *Gilles Deleuze, Postcolonial Theory, and the Philosophy of Limit*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Borradori, G. (2002). *Philosophy in a Time of Terror: Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cantat, C. (2016). Rethinking Mobilities: Solidarity and Migrant Struggles Beyond Narratives of Crisis. *Intersections. EEJSP 2, 4*, 11-32. DOI: 10.17356/ ieejspv2i4.286

Cixous, H. (2004). *Portrait of Jacques Derrida as a Young Jewish Saint*. Beverly Bie Brahic (trans). New York: Columbia University Press.

Cixous, H. (2005). *Stigmata*. London and New York: Routledge Classics.

Conradi, E. (2015). Redoing Care: Societal Transformation through Critical Practice. *Ethics and Social Welfare, 9,2*, 113–129. doi:10.1080/17496535.2015.1005553.

Cowan, D-E. (2007). Religion on the Internet, in Beckford J.A. and Demerath III (eds). *The SAGE Handbook of the Sociology of Religion,* London, Sage, 357-376.

Cusset, F. (2008). *French Theory: How Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze, & Co. Transformed the Intellectual Life of the United States*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Czajka, A. (2016). *Democracy and Justice. Reading Derrida in Istanbul*. London & New York: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1986). *"Shibboleth," in Midrash and Literature*, Geoffrey H. Hartman and Sanford Budick (eds). New Haven: Yale University Press, 307–47.

Derrida, J. (1991). *L'autre cap, suivi de La démocratie ajournée*. Paris: Minuit.

Derrida, J. (1992). *The Other Heading: Reflections on Today's Europe*, translated by P-A Brault and M. Naas, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Derrida, J. (1992). Force of Law: The Mystical Foundation of Authority. In Drucilla Cornell et al (eds.) *Deconstruction and the Possibility of Justice*. Oxfordshire: Routledge.

Derrida, J., Malle, E., Vermeren, P., Peretti, Ch. de, Sohm, B. (1994). The Deconstruction of Actuality. An Interview with Jacques Derrida. *Radical Philosophy, 68*: 28–41.

Derrida, J. (1995). *The Gift of Death*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Derrida, J. (1996). *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning and the New International*, trans. Peggy Kamuf, New York: Routledge.

Derrida, J. (1997). *Politics and Friendship: a Discussion with Jacques Derrida.* Edited by G. Bennington. Centre for Modern French Thought, University of Sussex. Available from: ww.sussex.ac.uk/Units/frenchthought/derrida.htm

Derrida, J. (1998). Hosρítalíty, Justice and Responsibility: A Dialogue with Jacques Derrida. In Richard Kearney & Mark Dooley (eds.). *Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Phílosophy*. London: Routledge.

Derrida, J. et al. (2001). A Discussion with Jacques Derrida. An Exchange between Jacques Derrida and Sydney seminar participants. *Theory and Event, issue 5.1*, 15-16.

Derrida, J. (2002). *Inconditionnalite ou souverainet?: L'universit? Aux fronti?res de l'Europe.* Allocutions by Dimitris Dimiroulis and Georges Veltsos. Athens: Patakis.

Derrida, J. (2005). *Rogues. Two Essays on Reason*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Ferrari, S. (2019). The secular state in a declining Europe. Beyond the end of the European universal dream. *Journal of Law, Religion and State, 7*, 13-30.

Fox, C. F. (1994). The Portable Border. Site Specificity, Art and Representations at the U.S-Mexico Border. *Social Text, no. 41*, 61–82, 1994, https://doi.org/10.2307/466832.

Fox, M. J. & Reece, A. (2013).The Impossible Decision: Social Tagging and Derrida's Deconstructed Hospitality. *Knowledge Organization. 40(4)*, 260-265.

Gasché, R. (2007). *Views and Interviews: On ‚Deconstruction' in America*. Austin: The Davies Group Publishers.

Gasché, R., & McCance, D. (2008). Crossings: An Interview with Rodolphe Gasché. *Mosaic: An Interdisciplinary Critical Journal, 41, 4.* https://www.fabula.org/actualites/27468/mosaic-vol-41-no-4-decembre-2008.html

Hartman, S. (2022). *City of Refuges: The Story of Three Newcomers Who Breathed Life into a Dying American Town*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Kant, I. (2006). *Toward Perpetual Peace and Other Writings on Politics, Peace, and History (Rethinking the Western Tradition)*. New Haven: Yale University.

Kearney, R. (2003). *Strangers, Gods and Monsters: Interpreting Otherness*. London: Routledge.

Kolossov, V. (2005). Theorizing Borders. Border Studies: Changing Perspectives and Theoretical Approaches, *Geopolitics 10, 4*, 28.

Kutash, E. (2019). Jacques Derrida: The Double Liminality of a Philosophical Marrano. *Religions, 10, 2*, 68. https://doi.org/10.3390/rel10020068

Levinas, E. (1969), *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority,* Alphonso Lingis (trans.), Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Massumi, B. (2012). Affective Attunement in a Field of Catastrophe. Interview Brian Massumi with Erin Manning. (June 6). https://www.peripeti.dk/2012/06/06/affective-attunement-in-a-field-of-catastrophe/

Meyer B. & Peter van der Veer (eds.). (2021). *Refugees and Religion. Ethnographic Studies of Global Trajectories.* London: Bloomsbury Academic. DOI 10.5040/9781350167162

Miller, J. H. (2005). *The J. Hillis Miller reader.* Julian Wolfreys (ed.). Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Mouffe, C. (2013). *Agonistics. Thinking the world politically.* London and New York: Verso.

Moxnes, H. (2014). Global citizenship – why do we need utopian visions? In Aksel Braanen Sterri (ed.) *Global Citizen – Challenges and Responsibility in an Interconnected World.* Rotterdam, London, Taipei: Sense Publishers, 5-14.

Murray, S-J. (2006). Thanatopolitics: On the Use of Death for Mobilizing Political Life. *Polygraph: An International Journal of Politics and Culture, 18*, 191- 215.

Ricoeur P. (1986). *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia.* George Taylor (ed.). New York: Columbia University Press.

Rosello, M. (1998). Representing illegal immigrants in France: from clandestines to l'afaire des sans-papiers de Saint-Bernard'. *Journal of European Studies 28*, 137–151.

Rosmarin, A. (1985). „On the Theory of 'Against Theory.'" *Against Theory: Literary Studies in the New Pragmatism.* Ed. W. J. T. Mitchell. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1985. 80-88.

Sells, M. A. (1994). *Mystical Languages of Unsaying.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Snyder, T. (2005). *The Wall around the West*, Eurozine. http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2005-01-06-snyder-en.html

Twyford, E. (2021). A thanatopolitical visualization of accounting history: Giorgio Agamben and Nazi Germany. *Accounting History,* (Online First), 1-23.

Young, R. (1990). *White Mythologies. Writing History and the West.* London and New York: Routledge.

Zanfrini, L. (2021). Europe and the Refugee Crisis: A Challenge to Our Civilization," *United Nations Academic Impact*, https://www.un.org/en/academic-impact/europe-and-refugee-crisis-challenge-our-civilization.