FROM MACRO TO MICRO AND FROM GLOBAL TO LOCAL – A SHIFTING PERSPECTIVE OF HOS(TI)PITALITY

Alina Nicoleta Mihai

PhD Student, University of Bucharest

Abstract: The concept of "hospitality" presupposes a delimitation of thresholds or frontiers, between spaces, places, countries, familiar and non – familiar, foreign and non – foreign, private and public, private and public law, the public or political space and the individual or familial home. Derrida brings the attention on the limitations or delimitations of the State, as the public authority, the public power to control, monitor, to "ban exchanges that those doing the exchanging deem private, but that the State can intercept since these private exchanges cross public space and become available there, then every element of hospitality gets disrupted"(Jacques, Derrida, *Of Hospitality, 2000). When focusing on hospitality and the nation states, Derrida argued that there is no country that has laws on unconditional immigration. Each individual may have the personal opinion as being and acting in the most hospitable way (just as we all witnessed Europe's first gesture to welcome the asylum – seekers from Syria, but once the situation developed into an unstoppable number of migrants, the European countries began to fear that they would not be able to handle them). Consequently, they will close their open doors to all the strangers who might approach them, and will not do anything without establishing a condition, a limit or a threshold, or even build a wall between them just as to further even more any possible sense of proximity.*

The fundamental topic of this article is crystallized by the reflection and the unlimited game, conditioned and unconditioned, by the irreversible fusion between hospitality and hostility. Once hospitality is offered as a gift, as an unconditioned attention, the host is caught, irrevocably chained in her/his own condition: of acting as the lord, the authority, the responsible, the boss. Derrida's attention with regard to Benveniste's analysis on the etymology of the concept of hospitality heightened the fact that even though it has a Latin root, derived from

the proto Indo-European words, the meaning refers to "stranger", "guest" and "power". Moreover, by mentioning Kant's "Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch", Derrida continues his argumentation highlighting that if the "foreigner" is to be received by the "host" in his space, the latter has the right of at least ask the name of the "foreigner", in order to guarantee his identity as one would act as witness in a court of law.

Therefore, as long as the "guest" occupies peacefully the given space, one may not treat him with hostility. This right is available only for a limited amount of time, a "temporary sojourn" that may accompany an inhabitant another right to associate, which "all men have" (Immanuel Kant, Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch, 1795).

Derrida put an emphasis on the fact that conditional hospitality takes place in the shadow of the impossibility of an ideal version of a hospitable gesture, reflecting on the conceptual possibility of unconditional hospitality just to "understand and to inform what is going on today in our world". In an age of mass migration, globalization, connectivity at all levels, the concept of hospitality shifts its parameters becoming a subjective, legal, protective or humanitarian term.

Keywords: Hospitality, globalization, intercultural communication, language, law(s).

"An act of hospitality can only be poetic"… A simple gesture can transform anything…The acceptance of an invitation, the openness of one's heart or home or place or thought can convert coal into gold and can make possible the first intention of passing over a barrier, a threshold, a limitation. Starting with the invitation, a game of hospitality begins to unfold in front of us, a puzzle, a challenge that tests our views, law(s), morality, understanding, acceptance, and openness towards something that presents itself as impossibility. Once the invitation is made, the participants gain the roles of host and guest. The host addresses a welcome, a calling and the guests can only accept their new status for a limited time. Imminently, the question that exists in both the guest and the hosts' minds is whether the host could offer the guest an unconditional invitation, an unlimited gift of entering a private space and of using everything that (s)he finds inside the host's home?

Derrida argued that the absolute alternative of an unconditional hospitality could only be grasped just before it is suffocated by conditional hospitality: "unconditional hospitality implies that you don't ask the other, the newcomer, the guest to give anything back, or even to identify

himself or herself. Even if the other deprives you of your mastery or your home, you have to accept this. It is terrible to accept this, but that is the condition of unconditional hospitality: that you give up the mastery of your space, your home, your nation. It is unbearable. If, however, there is pure hospitality, it should be pushed to this extreme" [1]. The gesture of accepting may be the key element that rests at the heart of hospitality. If one tries to find a definition of what the word itself may mean he/she may reveal only what is on the surface, just actions that imply acceptance (from Latin *acceptāre,* frequentative of *accipere*) thus implying to answer affirmatively, to accept an invitation, to agree to take (a duty or responsibility), to receive (something that was offered), either with gladness or approval, to admit to a group, organization, or place, to accept to be a part of that particular group, to regard as proper, usual, or right, to regard as true; believe in, to understand as having a specific meaning, to endure resignedly or patiently: accept one's fate, to be able to hold. Nevertheless, we must take into consideration the duality of *accepto*, frequentative of *accipio,* and of *recipio* as the former implies "being in the habit of receiving", of addressing a welcome, an invitation, and the latter denotes "take in return", yet still "accepting", "receiving", but underlying the binary postulation of "giving", "taking", of offering the gift of giving and of receiving what is expected to be received.

> **Hospitality gives and takes more than once in its own home. It gives, it offers, it holds out, but what it gives, offers, holds out, is the greeting which comprehends and makes or lets come into one's home, folding the foreign other into the internal law of the host [*hôte (host, Wirt*, etc.)] which tends to begin by dictating the law of its language and its own acceptation of the sense of words, which is to say, its own concepts as well.[2]**

Language for Derrida is exactly the threshold from which hospitality begins. Therefore, we may reflect upon what language can be used by the foreigner with his/her guest, in what linguistic manner can the guest address his/her host, what communication boundaries can

---

[1] Richard, Kearney, Mark, Dooley (Eds.),. *Jacques Derrida. Hospitality, Justice and Responsibility: A Dialogue with Jacques Derrida. Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy*, London: Routledge, 1998, 26.
[2] Jacques, Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, Anne Dufourmantelle invites Jacques Derrida to respond, trans. by Rachel Bowlby, Stanford California: Stanford University Press, 2000, 20.

appear? It may be admitted the fact that the language in which the foreigner addresses the questions or the way by which he/she is accepted, represents a sum of norms, customs and values. A conversation between the host and the guest, between the sender and the receiver of the message, between the one who launches all the questions, ideas and the one that receives them, accepts and comprehends, does not presupposes only a linguistic operation. The language can become the "hospitality" itself, the meeting point between cultures and expectations, and the very first attempt cu cross over the threshold. Again, "a threshold that is a threshold, a door that is a door".The moment of stepping over the threshold suggests the clear delimitation between the public and the private, the familiar and the foreign, the exterior and the interior also implying proximity in a gesture of coming. The guest becomes the liberator of his host as if the former holds the keys and the right of using as he wishes his power upon the goods and people around him. Still, the invitation holds on both the control and the hospitality in some accepted limits. The host may say 'come, make yourself at home', but this will not mean that the guest is freed from any sort of responsibilities.

> **If I say 'Welcome', I am not renouncing my mastery, something that becomes transparent in people whose hospitality is a way of showing off how much they own or who make their guests uncomfortable and afraid to touch a thing.**
>
> **'Make yourself at home', this is a self-limiting invitation…it means: please feel at home, act as if you were at home, but, remember, that is not true, this is not your home but mine, and you are expected to respect my property[3].**

Hospitality may begin with a gesture, with the invitation; nevertheless there are always traces of hostility in any invitation. Addressing the other with 'make yourself at home' does not eliminate the fact that the parties involved should always remember their status, privileges, if any, limits of acceptance, ownership and according the temporary rights of using somebody else's property. Once we have crossed the first level of understanding what the invitation

---

[3]John, D., Caputo, *Deconstruction In A Nutshell: A conversation with Jacques Derrida,* New York: Fordham University Press 2002, 111.

315

encapsulates in itself from the perspectives of both the host and the guest, we continue our journey stepping over another limit. With this step, another kind of unlimited game reveals itself, with conditional and unconditional features that incorporate the overlap between hostility and hospitality. With this first action, an intention of offering hospitality as a pure gift, as an unconditioned attention, the host is irrevocably caught in his/her own condition of acting as a lord, an authority. The step was made with the intention of crossing over a boundary that separates the exterior world from the familiar one and/or of putting an end to the host's waiting, of releasing him/her from his/her own space, own privacy, own limitations.

With or without an invitation, the master of the house can be liberated from his own imprisonment, his own "subjectivity" as well as the guest, the invited one, the "hostage" may become "the one who invites the one who invites".[4]

As the guest approaches a new territory, comes closer to a space in which he was invited or not, expected or not, the host is entitled to perform (entitled by his own beliefs, laws, morals) his role as a receiver of his new visitor. In case the receiver offered no previous invitation, an invitation that would reflect a first gesture of defining the conditional hospitality, then the guest could negotiate for a limited visiting time, thus transforming any attempt of granting a pure type of hospitality. According to Levinas, as the guest approaches the receiver, he is not obliged to welcome or accept the conditions that appear once the guest in getting closer to his host.

> **As a subject that approaches, I am not in the approach called to play the role of a perceiver that reflects or welcomes, animated with intentionality, the light of the open and the grace and mystery of the world. Proximity is not a state, a response, but a restlessness, null site, outside of the place of rest. (…) Proximity, as the "closer and closer", becomes the subject. It attains its superlative as my incessant restlessness, becomes unique, then one,**

---

[4]Jacques, Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, *Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond*, trans. byRachel Bowlby, Stanford California: Stanford University Press, 2000, 125.

forgets reciprocity, as in a love that does not expect to be shared[5].

The impossibility of a pure type of hospitality originates in the existence of proximity that generates the lack of acceptance, in other words the **closeness** and the **closed**. The proximity does not imply the elimination of any territorial laws, beliefs or boundaries that the people of the place created in order to defend themselves from any exterior threat. An open heart does not necessarily mean an open border, just as Levinas compared proximity to love that "does not expect to be shared" or, it may create, at the very most, some understanding toward the other, acceptance even if it lasts for moments. Those moments, ephemeral and transitory, create the pure incorporation of what hospitality could mean. When hospitality becomes conditioned, thus it develops into an action that is governed by rules and is limited by the law "or the laws in the plural" it is instantly transformed into an impossibility. The reflection and the continuous game between the two possibilities (conditional and unconditional) is profoundly destined to be restricted by rights, obligations, fashions, beliefs. The assertion of the law(s) is overwhelmed by the existence of an oxymoron since the laws cannot give and take at the same time, simultaneously, cannot exist and disappear, cannot traverse a space and not be noticed when they already exist. The guest enters the host's territory without renouncing of something and without being deprived of something. Perceived from the point of view of a state of familiarity, from inside his home, the host, the master is inside and is ruling over his space, but, at the same time, he gets to recognize and contemplate upon his territory through his guest, who came from the outside, from an external territory that is unfamiliar to the host but familiar to the guest. Derrida proposed a clear distinction between the "law of hospitality" and "the laws of hospitality" in the plural, meaning that hospitality is characterized by the unlimited acceptance, an acceptance without asking the guest's name, status, privileges, by the total giving of oneself and one's home of never questioning the other. On the other hand, the reverse of this utopian type of hospitality is represented by the laws – in the plural, the rights, obligations which are always "conditioned and conditional"[6]. They may be freed from these restrictions, but only for an instance. In the long run, people are controlled and controllable, their actions are judged according to norms,

---

[5] Emmanuel, Levinas, *Otherwise than Being or Beyond Essence*, trans.Alphonso Lingis, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991, 82.

[6] Jacques, Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, *Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond*, trans. Rachel Bowlby, Stanford California: Stanford University Press, 2000, 77.

regulations, codes that are social, juridical, moral or ethical and their judgement is done according to an imposed legislation. What if "the guest is offered not merely temporary shelter but residence, not a place at the table but the head of the table, not the use of one's home but possession of it"[7]? Derrida put an emphasis on the fact that "the possibility of genuine hospitality is only at stake when offering it appears as crisis, when the gesture of welcome is made in the shadow of a threatened dispossession".[8] In this case, in the endeavour to make impossibility possible, can moral beliefs be the answer? Thus, in the investigation of the limits of morality, can the guest overstep these limits? Can the host offer without restrictions, without any sort of boundaries as for the threshold to disappear? We have to take into account the fact that the moral norms are a social product and are not institutionalised and have no official form, thus they do not emerge from the state's power, and if these moral norms are ignored, there is no authority to punish or condemn any negative activity that is destructive for the well being of the society. In its essence, what we call morality is a sum of ideas about the distinction between good and bad that resides in everybody's consciousness. The laws refer to people's actions and forbid or punish anything that brings harm to the public wellness. The moral code reflects more in people's intentions and motifs. Is represents the subjective facet of any sort of behaviour, with a strong focus upon the perfection and ideal human structure. The legal system is focused on a good management of the whole society. Between the host and the guest a relationship will always be created, the reflection of an entire set of moral and/or social, legal law(s) will always exist; the question is whether we can act according to a set of unconditional - let's call them "gestures" instead of laws. In this case, morality should play a key role in the creation of the unconditional hospitality.

Therefore, when taking into consideration the gesture of Derrida of not believing in a pure, unconditional type of hospitality we immediately open a door that leads us to the fact that if we want to establish the traits of what hospitality can really mean we need to have the counter part of what hostility means, what the roots are of a hostile gesture and the immanent birth of an action which affects, in one way or another, the host, the guest and the witness.

---

[7] Madeleine, Fagan & Co. (Ed.), *Derrida: Negociating the Legacy*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2007, p.69.
[8] *Idem.*

> **We do not know what hospitality is [Nous ne savons pas**
>
> **cequec'estquel'hospitalité] .**
>
> **Not yet. Not yet, but will we ever know? Is it a question of**
>
> **knowledge and of time?[9]**

This question of (not) knowing is so powerful that it simply throws us in the middle of a conversation, of a global matter with multiple philosophic, moral, social and political facets, which started long before us and will continue long after us. What other more concrete, up to date example can we think of than the situation of the Syrian refugees? This particular condition has turned into an international crisis with which all the member states of the European Union are trying to deal with and to find the most favourable solution as to act as a welcoming host, taking into consideration the international laws of Human Rights and opening the doors towards the ones who try to escape a difficult and endless civil war. According to the data transmitted by the BBC News "more than 200,000 Syrians have lost their lives in four years of armed conflict, which began with anti-government protests before escalating into a full-scale civil war. More than 11 million others have been forced from their homes as forces loyal to President Bashar al-Assad and those opposed to his rule battle each other - as well as jihadist militants from Islamic State.[10]" Since the start of the conflict, a number of four million people have fled Syria hoping to arrive on territories that are free war zones. Consequently, this departure from one territory to another, generated into one of the largest refugee exoduses in the recent history. Their first attempt was to go to the neighbouring countries (Lebanon, Jordan and Turkey). In 2013 the exodus accelerated dramatically and the situation in Syria only deteriorated. In 2015 more than half of million migrants have appeared at Europe's borders according to the EU's border agency Frontex. What began as a humanitarian gesture of the European countries to welcome Syrian migrants, to open their borders and diminish any threshold, regardless of the differences that are between the Europeans and the Syrians, has converted into a state of general crisis as the interior ministers of the European Union failed in reaching a consensus on the plan to relocate a number of 120 000 refugees. The open borders and the first gesture of hospitality manifested itself in

---

[9] Jacques Derrida, "Hostipitality", trans.by Barry Stocker, Forbes Morlock, *Angelaki- Journal of the Thoretical Humanities*, 5: 3 (December 2000), 6.

[10] http://www.bbc.com/news/world-middle-east-26116868 (site accessed on September, 10th, 2015).

political and economical debates, agreements between the countries of EU, supposedly without containing imperative, legal terms as "obligation, obligatory, mandatory, imposed" even though such agreements must be respected. In the international press, headlines such as "Migrants and asylum seekers have staged protests at Hungary's border with Serbia after the Hungarian government launched a new anti-immigration crackdown" (*The Guardian*) or "Europe struggles to cope with migrants' march of misery" (*CNN*), "Croatia overwhelmed by flood of migrants, EU calls summit" (*Reuters*), "Austria has officially notified the European Commission that it will temporarily reintroduce controls its borders with Hungary, Italy, Slovakia and Slovenia at midnight" (*The Telegraph*), "German chancellor Angela Merkel said Germany's decision to reintroduce border controls was necessary for an orderly regime" and "Hungary's government has confirmed plans to extend its border fence with Serbia to its much longer border with Romania" (*The Guardian*) reiterated the idea that Europe was and still is not prepared for the (un)expected wave of immigrants coming in search of a dream (which ever this may be). Thus, the result of the endeavour to manage this "crisis" has degenerated into the enforcement of borders' controls, of constructing fences between the countries, of military forces engaged into operations that have the purpose to stop these waves of migration. The economic situations of the countries that are to become host countries for the asylum – seekers had a great impact on the capacity, capability and readiness to strengthen their protection systems regarding the maintenance of equilibrium. The intention of an initial act of unconditional hospitality was tainted by xenophobia and intolerance which led to incidents of discrimination, violence, hostility and aggression. The political debates at both micro and macro levels are still continuing and a certain number of asylum – seekers are destined for each European country. Romania will supply a sum of 300 000 Euros in the next three years for the World Food Programme to provide assistance and support for the Syrian refugees. The quotas established initially by the Romanian authorities was for 1 785 asylum – seekers, but after the discussions held with the European authorities Romania agreed to accept 4 837 Syrian immigrants. Apart from the political manifestations in the attempt to find a solution for this crisis, it is attractive to analyse at least two points of view of, on one hand, the historian, essayist, philosopher, journalist and diplomat Neagu Djuvara and, on the other hand, the philosopher, journalist and literary and art critic Andrei Pleşu. In an interview for Realitatea Tv, Neagu Djuvara expressed his opinion on the Syrian migration crisis underlining that the continent is facing a faze which might be similar to

the beginning of the Middle Ages when Europe was slowly conquered by barbarians or with the end of the Roman Empire when Europe was besieged by other populations. The historian stressed on the idea that Europe will not integrate the asylum – seekers but the asylum – seekers will integrate Europe. On a humorous note he continued the idea that the immigrants are not exactly interested in remaining on Romanian soil as our country is not rich enough in comparison with Germany, France or the UK.

A similar point of view was revealed by Andrei Pleşu in an editorial for the *Adevarul* newspaper on September 14th 2015. Andrei Pleşu reiterated the idea that Europe is not the solution for this crisis. Europe may be or act as a balanced, detached, selfless partner in the effort to diminish the crisis. He advised against the acceptance to bedizen ourselves into the universal remedy for this situation, into the cosmic asylum, the supreme competence and the Planetary Red Cross. He also admitted that we cannot be indifferent, absent or selfish - "When a friend asks for your help the solution is not the adoption. The solution is to help him to find his own place, his own purpose, his own destiny. And until he succeeds, you can host him, feed him, and comfort him without any media exposure and holly posture"[11]. Therefore, taking into account the European situation and the Syrian crisis the problem of hospitality becomes more than a simple concept. It is necessary to understand and act upon and according to it and to discover its multiple facets, its conditions of existence, the possibility of establishing the premises of an unconditional type of hospitality.

From the Derridean perspective hospitality points out towards welcoming and inviting the "stranger". This invitation presupposes the delimitation of two levels of analysis: one level which has a personal feature as the stranger is welcomed into the master's house and a second level that include a public macro perspective referring to the relationship between individual countries.

Mentioning Kant's "Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch", Derrida continues his argumentation highlighting that if the "foreigner" is to be received by the "host" in his space, the latter has the right of at least ask the name of the "foreigner", in order to guarantee his identity as one would act as witness in a court of law.

This is someone to whom you put a question and address

a demand, the first demand, the minimal demand being:

---

[11] Andrei Plesu, http://adevarul.ro/news/eveniment/opinii-emotii-principii 1_55f59eaaf5eaafab2c9087ed/index.html, site accessed on September 14-th, 2015, author's translation.

"What is your name?" or then "In telling me what your name is, in responding to this request, you are responding on your own behalf, you are responsible before the law and before your hosts, you are a subject in law.[12]

Once the "host" has a reasonable amount of information about his "guest" a relationship can be established between the two.

In *"*The Law of World Citizenship Shall Be Limited to Conditions of Universal Hospitality", Kant accentuates that "hospitality means the right of a stranger not to be treated as an enemy when he arrives in the land of another". As long as the "guest" occupies peacefully the given space, one may not treat him with hostility. This right is available only for a limited amount of time, a "temporary sojourn" that may accompany an inhabitant another right to associate, which "all men have"[13].

The concept of "hospitality" presupposes a delimitation of thresholds or frontiers, between spaces, places, countries, familiar and non – familiar, foreign and non – foreign, private and public, private and public law, the public or political space and the individual or familial home. Derrida brings the attention on the limitations or delimitations of the State, as the public authority, the public power to control, monitor, "ban exchanges that those doing the exchanging deem private, but that the State can intercept since these private exchanges cross public space and become available there, then every element of hospitality gets disrupted"[14]. Along with the development of the technology, the communication technologies (e-mail, fax, telephone) these techno-scientific possibilities threaten the interiority of the home ("we are no longer at home!")[15], but we will focus our attention upon such matters in the chapter destined for the analysis of the use of technological instruments or technological barriers.

When focusing on hospitality and the nation states, Derrida argued that there is no country that has laws on unconditional immigration. Each individual may have the personal

---

[12] Jacques*,* Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, *Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond*, trans.Rachel Bowlby, Stanford California: Stanford University Press, 2000, 27.
[13] Immanuel, Kant, "The Law of World Citizenship Shall Be Limited to Conditions of Universal Hospitality" in *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch, 1795.* http://www.constitution.org/kant/perpeace.htm
[14] Jacques*,* Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, *Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond*, trans.Rachel Bowlby, Stanford California: Stanford University Press, 2000, 50.
[15] Jacques, Derrida, *Of Hospitality, 52.*

opinion as being and acting in the most hospitable way (just as we all witnessed Europe's first gesture to welcome the asylum – seekers from Syria, but once the situation developed into an unstoppable number of migrants, the European countries began to fear that they would not be able to handle them). Consequently, they will close their open doors to all the strangers who might approach them, and will not do anything without establishing a condition, a limit or a threshold, or even build a wall between them just as to further even more any possible sense of proximity. Derrida emphasizes on the fact that conditional hospitality takes place in the shadow of the impossibility of an ideal version of a hospitable gesture, reflecting on the conceptual possibility of unconditional hospitality just to "understand and to inform what is going on today in our world":

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.[16]

In "Responsabilité et hospitalité" Derrida mentions Michael Rocard, the former French minister of immigration, who, in 1993, stated that France could not offer a home to everybody in the world who suffered[17]. Derrida maintains that the French minister's immigration quotas were set through mediation with a degree of impossibility, highlighting the vulnerability of a brutal manner to showcase authority.

In order to maintain the position of "power" or "control", the law rearranges itself, there are new legal texts along with new police ambitions attempting to adapt to the changes related to communication or information, thus, creating new spaces of "hospitality[18]"

---

[16] Jacques, Derrida, *Hospitality, Justice and Responsibility: A Dialogue with Jacques Derrida*. In Richard Kearney and Mark Dooley (Eds.), Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy., London: Routledge, 1998, 70.

[17] Jacques, Derrida, *Responsabilité et hospitalité*. In M. Seffahi (Ed.), *Manifeste pour l'hospitalité*, Paris: Paroles l'Aube,1999, 32.

[18] Jacques*,* Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, *Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond*, trans.Rachel Bowlby, Stanford California: Stanford University Press, 2000, 57.

For the law, the "guest" is a "foreigner", and he must remain a "foreigner". The concept of "hospitality" remains, in this case, like a law, conditional and conditioned "in its dependence on the unconditionality that is the basis of the law[19]". Thus, people are kept in, inside the law, dependable on the law, having the right to act as "hosts" on limited grounds.

There is always a threshold that must be passed, a territory that has a "host", and a "foreigner" that needs to enjoy the right of "hospitality" or at least, only to transit the territory.

In an age of mass migration, globalization, connectivity at all levels this concept shifts its parameters becoming a subjective, legal, protective or human term.

In conclusion as our journey, our objective of crossing the barriers with the intention of understanding and erasing what was limiting are close to an end, we find ourselves reaching the final, ideal level, perceived as "the poetic gesture". If, in the beginning we had to find a balance, a common ground that would allow us to rest and absorb the complex features of what hospitality means, now, after crossing over the barriers of the (non)existence of an invitation, the acknowledgement of law(s) and morals, the language and what it carries, the (un)conditional features of hospitality, the existence and acceptance of the other as a friend, a duplicate, a self-reflection, we step over a new frontier, the new threshold that is meant to create a perfect balance for us, as travellers, as hosts and guests. It makes no difference if we think at the gesture of hospitality having in mind a country's border or a private place, if we let our doors open to guests or immigrants, from the moment we impose limitations without accepting the other(s), we fail to create hospitality as an attempt to eliminate the threshold(s) with generosity. We may fail even with the best intentions to open ourselves towards the other, but the gesture still remains there as a proof of the existence of a pure intention of hospitality and it places us on a different level, closer to a kind of poetic gesture. A need to transform us, to push our own boundaries is essential, if not crucial.

What the final, global level understanding the depths of the concept of hospitality reveals is the need for acceptance for the guest's ideas, culture, language, manner of manifestation, and the host's own set of cultural representative structure. This can offer us the comprehension of the missing link in the creation of hospitality as a pure gesture, of recognising without limiting, of understanding one's limits and limitations and acting according to it without disturbing the other.

---

[19] Jacques, Derrida, *Of Hospitality, 73.*

It is a gift which implies no obligations, as the host may offer without imposing and the guest who accepts and does not renounce but understands and offers in his return without feeling obliged to do so, just for the sake of a poetic gesture…

Acknowledgment

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Derrida, Jacques, *Adieu to Emmanuel Lévinas,* Stanford*:* Stanford University Press, 1999.

2. Derrida, Jacques, *Hospitality, Justice and Responsibility: A Dialogue with Jacques Derrida,* Richard Kearney and Mark Dooley (Eds.), in Questioning Ethics: Contemporary Debates in Philosophy, London: Routledge, 1998.

3. Derrida, Jacques*, Of Hospitality*, *Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond*, trans. by Rachel Bowlby, Stanford California: Stanford University Press, 2000.

4. Foucault, Michel, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972 – 1977*, trans. by Gordon Colin, Marshall Leo, New York: Pantheon Books, 1980.

5. Kant, Immanuel, "The Law of World Citizenship Shall Be Limited to Conditions of Universal Hospitality" in Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch, 1795. http://www.constitution.org/kant/perpeace.htm.

6. Levinas, Emmanuel, *Otherwise than Being or Beyond Essence*, trans. by Alphonso Lingis, Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1991.

7. Levinas, Emmanuel, *Totality and Infinity*. *An Essay on Exteriority*, trans. by Alphonso Lingis, The Hague/Boston/London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 1979.

8. McQuillan, Martin (Ed.), *The Politics of Deconstruction. Jacques Derrida and the Other of Philosophy*, London: Pluto Press, 2007.