



## REFLECTIONS ON A NECESSARY HOSPITALITY RE-ENCHANTMENT

### IGOR GUATELLI

Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie, Faculdade de Arquitetura e Urbanismo – Rua Itambé, 185a – Higienópolis, São Paulo – SP, 01239-001  
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3937-8073>  
[igor.guatelli@mackenzie.br](mailto:igor.guatelli@mackenzie.br)

Received: 16/02/2024

Approved: 27/07/2024

### CHRIS YOUNÈS

École Spéciale d'Architecture – 254, Bd. Raspail – 75014 – Paris  
[chris.younes@clermont-fd.archi.fr](mailto:chris.younes@clermont-fd.archi.fr)

## ABSTRACT

Invocações nacionalistas, desencantamentos democráticos, criação generalizada de áreas de exclusões desumanas, populações mantidas de fora mesmo dentro de seus territórios, conflitos inter-raciais, interculturais, religiosos, ao mesmo tempo vistos como avatares de civilidade. O mundo atual exige que nos debrucemos uma vez mais sobre a hospitalidade, uma hospitalidade ainda por vir, desconhecida, inominável, que certamente exigirá um exercício de reposicionamentos e deslocamentos do conceito de sujeito, cidadania, humanidade, política, justiça, fronteiras, dentro e fora. Mas, para esse exercício de um devir-hospitalidade, será necessário olharmos para trás para [re]pensarmos o presente e o futuro. Para tanto, filósofos que se dedicaram a teorizar sobre cidadania, o direito de existência do outro, a ideia de justiça a partir da chegada do outro e com o outro, pensadores como Kant, Lévinas, Ricoeur, Arendt, Derrida, Rancière foram convocados para nos ajudar nessa tarefa de pensar um [im]possível reencantamento de uma hospitalidade que governos não cessam de colocar em xeque por questionarem seus limites e virtude.

**Palavras chave:** Hospitalidade. Cidadania. Soleira. Arendt. Derrida.

## RESUMEN

Nationalist invocations, democratic disenchantment, widespread creation of dehumanizing exclusion areas, populations kept on the margins even within their territories, inter-racial, intercultural and religious conflicts seen as avatars of civility. Our contemporary world demands that we look once again to hospitality—a hospitality yet to come, unknown, unnamable, which will certainly require an exercise in repositioning and displacing the concepts of subject, citizenship, humanity, politics, justice, borders, inside and outside. But this exercise of becoming-hospitality will require us to look back to [re]think the present and the future. Thus, thinkers such as Kant, Lévinas, Ricoeur, Arendt, Derrida, Rancière and others who dedicated themselves to theorizing about citizenship, the other's right to exist, the idea of justice from the arrival of the other and with the other were called upon to help us think about an [im]possible re-enchantment of a hospitality that governments never cease to call into question by questioning its limits and virtue.

**Keywords:** Hospitality. Citizenship. Threshold. Arendt. Derrida.



## INTRODUCTION

What is the meaning of hospitality in these dark and uncertain times? In November 2022, an episode – a portrait of the world we live in – made the headlines; the media reported on the impossibility of the humanitarian ship Ocean Viking to dock in an Italian port before obtaining permission to disembark in the port of Toulon. Two hundred and thirty-four “expendable” men, women, and children, who had applied for asylum, were thus treated as undesirables. This episode adds to the terrible list of migrant boats pushed back into the sea, and the terrible number of deaths in the Mediterranean. Award-winning French journalist Éric Fottorino wondered whether states have become cannibal states. That is, how can we explain the fact that a crime of hospitality could have been decreed in the French Republic, founded on the indivisible principles of liberty, equality, and fraternity?

Just as the stories of the Odyssey recount a long series of hospitalities given to Ulysses during his journey, some of which even gave rise to breaches of hospitality (among the Lotophagi or the Cyclops, for example) or the many ambivalences (in Circe and Calypso). In Philosophy, Levinas (1988, p. 114, our translation) reflected on how to make an ethical act of hospitality mean an absolutely welcoming of the face of the other, namely in its irreducible and infinite otherness – an extreme difficulty that seems to be specific to the human being: *To shelter the other in one’s own land or home, to tolerate the presence of the landless and homeless on the “ancestral soil,” o jealously, so meanly loved – is that the criterion of humanness? Unquestionably so.*<sup>1</sup>

However, if hospitality was thought to be unconditional in essence, it is in fact conditional. In such a way that hospitality is captured, as Derrida (2021) masterfully dealt with in his seminars, in the paradoxical

tension, in a kind of “co-implication,” between these two poles. The concept of hospitality was mapped out by Derrida in terms of borders, edges, the “familiar stranger” [a concept borrowed from Freud], the neighborhood, the foreigner, the enemy, the law, politics, democracy, private and public. The aim, for the philosopher, would be to find intermediate “schemes” so that the law and desire of absolute and just hospitality might be determined effectively in revolutions and reforms, in real transformations of law and politics, in short, in order that absolute hospitality might become as inhabitable as possible.

However, how can we measure the new historicity of hospitality in the face of the multiplication of refusals, abandonments, walls, enclaves, and widespread encampments? What compass to use in the midst of uncertainty and disorientation? Through which stories, imaginations, and alliances would it be possible to resist the filthy, the “immonde” [the un-worldly] as a response to the great current challenge of the inalienable pact of hospitality in the epic of humanity? What new common ground is there to welcome displaced persons, refugees, the exiled, the excluded? Can utopia constitute a resource as Ricoeur states?

*“It may be that certain epochs cry out for utopia, we wonder if this is not the case in our times: while emphasizing that the development of new and alternative perspectives defines the basic function of utopia, given the power of fiction to rewrite reality and thus participate in an active critique of socio-political reality.” (RICOEUR, 1997, p. 394, our translation)<sup>2</sup>.*

Faced with a world in crisis, haunted by specters of totalitarian logics that lead us to new and old immanent forms of conduction, submission, subalternation, and exclusion of individuals and populations, in what ways

---

<sup>1</sup> From the original : “Abriter l’autre homme chez soi, tolérer la présence des sans-terre et des sans-domicile sur un “sol ancestral” si jalousement, si méchamment aimé, est-ce le critère de l’humain ? Sans conteste.”

<sup>2</sup> From the original: “Il se peut que certaines époques appellent l’utopie, je me demande si ce n’est pas le cas de notre présent », tout en soulignant que « le développement de perspectives nouvelles, alternatives définit la fonction de base de l’utopie » étant donné le « pouvoir de la fiction de redécrire la réalité » et ainsi participer à une critique active de la réalité sociopolitique.”

can we think of other socio-political realities, other cosmopolitics? What right to hospitality and inhabit the land do wanderers have, whether they come from inside or outside the territories where they live or arrive? Aesthetic-sociopolitical considerations are outlined as the field of this becoming-hospitality. Alongside and in dialogue with authors such as Ricoeur himself, and Kant, Levinas, Arendt, Derrida, and Rancière, and through building intersections and shadings of concepts and of aesthetic political theories they work with, this article examines the theme of hospitality to reflect on the necessary re-enchantment of this practice.

In terms of methodology, this essay is crossed by issues of philosophical knowledge, built on the critical and cross-reading of primary sources, with the resulting reworking of concepts and theories present in the selected works. Theory plays a role as a means of building a thematic constellation around hospitality and its interpretation in reality. The use of the works mentioned are justified by the fact that the authors cited have adopted, at some point, the themes of hospitality, justice, cosmopolitanism, sharing, and emancipation as controversial and structuring themes for their theories. The intrinsically conflicting nature of the concept of hospitality, especially in humanity's current socio-political situation, points to the conceptual requirements necessary for its problematization.

### **Citizenship, concern for the world and human condition from Hannah Arendt's perspective<sup>3</sup>**

Aristotle, Rousseau, and Marx developed analyses that led to programs, projects or utopias. Kant (2015) launched the vision of a global citizen engaged in hospitality towards the stranger and the unpredictable in an aesthetic community. Hannah Arendt, on the other hand, offers appropriate analyses to prepare forms of resistance in the face of the worst, or even, possibilities

for rebuilding a "political life" without foreseeing what it could be. She is an explorer of the "human condition," in which she identifies its political dimension. However, condition is not a determination for her and the person capable of engaging in politics needs it in order to fully become what they can be. For Arendt, the spatiality of politics that originates in the space between people is not a metaphor, politics is not consubstantial with humans or humanity. This means that we cannot do politics, but that politics is the result of a certain activity that has to do with space: the opening of a public space, of an appearance that leads to the emergence of a world. (GOETZ; YOUNÈS, 2009)

But what persists is the "desert" of dark times. And it is not necessarily a question of disaster and desolation, of the catastrophe of totalitarianism. No, it is about the interruption of politics as a possibility for action and discourse, as an open space between people, as a common world. Or, more precisely, the closure of the possibility of interruption in which politics resides. Arendt's extraordinary hypothesis, according to which beauty and aesthetic judgment open up a common space that is, if not political, at least pre-political. With beauty, the world appears, "*the world that is inhabited by humans*" (ARENDR, 1991, p. 200).<sup>4</sup> Reading Kant, Arendt discovers that beauty is a condition of inhabitation. Now beauty is perceived by the plurality of people; being a political thing, it belongs to the world, defined by residence, habitability, offering mortals an immortal homeland through the relaying of works. But this immortality does not exclude an essential fragility.

It is in the suspension of politics, in its withdrawal or abolition, that the expansion of contemporary deserts originates, in a process called "acosmism," alienation from the world, not that world of the celestial spheres, but that of human plurality. Politics only exists because men exist in plural and can talk to each other. In fact,

---

<sup>3</sup>The reflection on Arendt comes from a text by Benoît Goetz and Chris Younès entitled "Hannah Arendt: Monde – Désert – Oasis", published in GOETZ, Benoît; YOUNÈS, Chris. Hannah Arendt : Monde – Désert – Oasis. In: PAQUOT, Thierry; YOUNÈS, Chris. Le territoire des philosophes – XXe siècle. Paris: La Découverte, 2009. p. 29-46.)

<sup>4</sup>In her course on Politics, Arendt writes: "when we start from art, from the oases, to venture into the desert, or more precisely to turn back the desert, we can always refer to Kant, whose true political philosophy is found in the Critique of the Faculty of Judgement and springs from the phenomenon of beauty." (ARENDR, 1991, p. 200, tradução nossa). From the original: "lorsque nous partons de l'art, des oasis, pour nous aventurer dans le désert, ou plus exactement pour refouler le désert, nous pouvons toujours nous référer à Kant dont la véritable philosophie politique se trouve dans la Critique de la faculté de juger et a jailli du phénomène du Beau."

as soon as the role of language is at stake, the problem becomes political by definition, since it is language that turns people into political animals. This is what allows the plurality of people to understand each other and share the issue. A world then emerges between them. In *The Condition of Modern Man*, Arendt compares this world to a table because, like a table, it is an artifact (which the Earth is not). The table, like the world, while it relates, it separates men. It is the opening of an interest; or even a disinterest, a play on words that Levinas creates, but which also suits Arendtian thought.

In fact, in regard to this political interest, humans are concerned with issues other than their own private interests. Political space is therefore both meeting and separation. Arendt is faithful to Kant's unsociable sociability of humans – which we won't be able to go into enough in this article. In fact, there has never been so much confusion between social groups and political entities, socialization, and politicization. Putting modern nihilism on trial, the philosopher is strongly committed to a concern for the world, *amor mundi*. Consent and desire, the desire to “live together,” precede any political institution – and this is what remains largely forgotten.

It is no surprise that the essential condition of a shared world has been forgotten. This experience can only be understood in dotted lines: the experience of the Greek city; the experience of the French Revolution; Budapest in 1956; the resistance to fascism and neo-fascism; May 68 and the like; the French ZADs; urban occupations and the struggle for housing in the world's metropolises; peripheral urban artist collectives in large Brazilian cities; or insurgent communes in Mexico. These are the places and times when politics comes to the fore. In fact, like oases, with which they should not be confused, political events are discontinuous. Quoting the beginning of Herodotus' *Investigation*, Arendt reminds us that the work exists to preserve what was great in the words and actions

of men, even if they were “barbarians”. Paul Ricœur, who prefaces *The Condition of Modern Man* has undoubtedly drawn from this (as well as from Aristotle) his insights into the fundamental character of the narrative. Indeed, it is about maintaining the permanence of a common world.

In the very experience of being uprooted, we are preserved from desolation by *amor mundi*, which no desolation, no abandonment, even if “the desert grows”, can make disappear permanently. Today's “displaced” demand less compassion and love (which is not a political sentiment for Arendt) than belonging to a common world. There is no doubt that they are demanding territory. A territory more habitable than the “*campsites*” of Pas-de-Calais in the north of France, the sidewalks and underpasses of Brazilian metropolises, the *Bois de Vincennes*, the place of the homeless in the Parisian winter, or the Gaza Strip in all seasons. And if the reference is above all to a matter of comfort and habitability, we are trying to explain that this dimension cannot be separable from access to a world of appearances.

### Reinventing other ways of inhabiting the earth

Two layers now overlap for the reception of “displaced persons”: emergency shelter and the setting up of possible facilities. What ethos of hospitality should be chosen to meet the paradigm of care, the demand for attention, the art of bonds and collective actions, giving a taste for the risk of living together? The co-production of other kinds of existence, involving people, civil society, and the metamorphosis of international law is inseparable from a new radical awareness, capable of opening up a common horizon. For Rancière (2022, p. 83) “*Radicalism is above all a way of changing the distribution of places and identities, spaces, and times,*”<sup>5</sup> but where would this openness and radical awakening come from?

---

<sup>5</sup> From the original: “La radicalité c'est d'abord une manière de changer la distribution des places et des identités, des espaces et des temps.”

Radical awakening is a form of emancipation and the ability to keep it open is a democracy to come, a future that would begin with a different kind of hospitality, a different ethic of hospitality. According to Rancière (2022, p. 103), “*Emancipation is the act of departure from the way in which one is assigned to a place in the social order, the act through which one disrupts the configuration in which one has a certain position and can see, say and do something, and therefore an act in which one distances one from oneself.*”<sup>6</sup> And since hospitality is only developed in the presence of the other, with the other, perhaps we can think of the practice of conceiving unlikely junctures – join and suture – of the distant. An outsider invited to be a part of what does not seem to belong to them, a foreigner turned into an insider by an act of hospitality, without ignoring the difficulties of these interactions; unions that remain disjointed in their own processes of integration, a precondition for recognizing the differences that need to be maintained while overcoming them.

Can we think of these radical metamorphoses, reinventions, and re-enchantments – terms that are very present in the field of aesthetics – of the idea of inhabiting, welcoming, and hospitality based on daily aesthetic-political practices as a way of confronting, on the one hand, the growing dystopian desert that is advancing on social relations, and on the other, the security zones that make them – the social relations – sprout like utopian territorial deserts that advance over cities and inhabit us? As Rancière proposes, to think of new ways of symbolizing certain elements and practices of our daily lives, capable of promoting our commonality and the sharing with the arrival of the other. The crossing of the desert, from this dispensable other to their arrival and reception can only happen through a shared experience. From what forms of sharing that are not given or parameterized by hegemonic and alienating logics could we set out in order to think of other ways of living with the other? How do we cross the boundaries imposed upon us by the inhospitable, the un-worldly?

## A different aesthetics of hospitality

As we approach Rancière’s thought, we deduce that in a certain way, the universe of aesthetic perception presupposes impasses about the sensitive divergences to which each visual object may be subject. If approached through an intertextuality that does not start from the misleading notion of a *priori* admissible kinships or similarities, the chance of anachronistic, heterogeneous – and non-diachronic – assemblages can foster the emergence of intervallic, intermediary, and conflictual movements that are conducive to a method of reading, interpreting, and signifying that escapes the rigid antinomies of the mere being and non-being of the thing. Through intertextuality, or through heteroclitc arrangements of people, things, and situations, we can imagine a being-with [others] that departs from diversity and heteronomy in order to build an unusual common territory, of the sharing, even if it is conflictual.

For Rancière (2022), disagreement is the precondition for sharing, precisely because it does not dispense with the negative that each party lacks. Hospitality begins with a disjunction. Parties that start to work in a relationship built on a lack of meaning adjusted by their positive existences, with no remainders; the interval generated becomes the remainder of each one of them, it is the opening that obscures the stable positions of each of them. Without the negative of absence, of what is always lacking or should be lacking in something, in an image, in a so-called “culture” or identity, which is almost always very positivized by history, nothing is perceived or admitted beyond what is already perceived and given as natural limits and traits.

Binary oppositions should not just lead to functional syntheses, to disturbances accumulated by approximation, because, through pairing, they can initiate a process of becoming as an opening to an unforeseen other, a transformation up to a moment when the difficulties of [re]conciliation become a point of suste-

---

<sup>6</sup> From the original: “L’émancipation, c’est le fait de sortir de la condition à laquelle on était assigné, des manières d’être, de penser et d’agir qui étaient attachées à cette condition.”



nance of a future object, of thought, of being that were not *a priori* foreseen. It is in the act of hospitality and arrival and presence of the other that the possibility of enriching oneself opens up.

A counter-history can emerge from these unprecedented, disjointed approaches, the beginnings of injunctions and disjunctions that were not given. In short, difficult alliances that open fissures in a supposedly cohesive history, chained in its apparent linearity without remainders, understood as a categorical historical imperative. Interstices are minority fields capable, through their openness, of causing opacity in what apparently appears with irreducible clarity to the other. Welcoming what arrives, what comes from outside, is the chance for fissures to occur in apparently cohesive totalizing realities.

Such hospitality can be the beginning of [unacceptable] cultural marriages; a marriage that is not complete and adjusted between the parties that originate it (at least two), which does not destroy the positives that shape them, but can destabilize and cause disorder in their own meanings by placing itself as union and separation simultaneously. One and the other can perhaps no longer be seen without the fissure that now separates them, uniting them by space-time lapse. Ontological and semantic slippages are triggered by this fissure, this gap, this absence between one and the other, one with and against the other.

*Fin-de-siècle* French thought helps us in this mission of thinking about alterity from the point of view of problematic joins, junctures and ruptures, or perhaps from the point of view of disjunction, the *out-of-joint*, as initially problematized by much of Derrida's work and, more recently, in the social field, by Paul B. Preciado, one of his disciples and former student, and by Rancière himself. One might say that each of them, in their own way, problematizes the notion of unity, affinities, and complementarities in the process of cons-

truction of thought from semiotic fissures, resulting in a temporary shake-up of signs and their stable meanings. Fissures in a thought that is given as coherent, cohesive, and formatted are the constitutive negativity of interstices, through which it becomes possible to move on to what remains to be thought about.

## Hospitality of the non-dispensable

What if the field of aesthetics became an experimental laboratory for practicing a different hospitality? Aesthetics as a political act, the aesthetics of politics aimed at the complex construction of a different hospitality, one that stems from a defined political aesthetic, as Rancière discusses (2011, p. 134, our translation) in his work *Aisthesis*:

*The articulation of three relationships: a being-together, a being-alongside, and a being-against. This complex configuration makes it impossible to define its boundaries. Politics is a sphere of experience to the very extent that it is impossible to circumscribe its space and draw its boundaries.*<sup>7</sup>

Another kind of hospitality comes from the tensions between the different and conflicting intensities of a relational proximity that suggests breaking with imposed social hierarchies. A hospitality built on unprecedented closeness, an act in which individuals enter resonance from a sensitive experience, based on sharing; a form of sharing that attenuates, fades, or erases the boundaries – cultural, social, religious, behavioral – of origin by introducing an aesthetics of the trace. In line with Derrida's thinking, we consider that an aesthetics of the trace could be understood as overcoming the ontological differences between beings, exceeding them as simple deferred presences. An être-ensemble, être-à-côté, être-contre [a being-together, a being-alongside, a being-against] capable of promoting the erasure of specific identities and the dissemination and

---

<sup>7</sup> From the original: "l'articulation de trois relations: un être-ensemble, un être-à-côté et un être-contre. Cette configuration complexe rend impossible de lui donner des frontières définies. La politique est une sphère d'expérience dans la mesure même où il est impossible de circonscrire son espace et de tracer ses frontières."

contamination constitutive of an *autrui* [other], of any other. The re-enchantment of hospitality would have to go through an overcoming of the original identity traits of those involved in acts of reception and welcoming. The trace of another is also a sign of the erasure of the stigmatizing original traits of those who arrive. The trace as an inscription of the differences within the supposedly original identity. It is through the interval, through spacing, that another politics of the threshold will be possible, a step towards a revision of what and who seems to be indispensable in the face of the law. Through this other threshold, identities are constituted that can only emerge from, and with, the presence of the other, in the presence of the other.

### Nappropriate Threshold

According to Jean Luc Nancy, “Destinerrance is one of the major terms in Derrida’s idiolect”<sup>8</sup> (PERETTI et al., 2018, p. 192). *Destinerrance* is a concept of Derrida that unites destiny and wandering. Destiny is linked to the idea of *envoi* [to send], but a sending of a being that is not sent to a specific destiny, but as a sending as such, where the sending in-itself overcomes the idea of origin and destiny. The sending, thought of as the loss of origin and destiny, becomes the result of unexpected, unpredictable unions and bonds. With no origin as an identity to be preserved, protected or stigmatized, and no destiny to be ensured, perhaps the idea of wandering is the chance to build renewed and unpredictable bonds; in sending, the being becomes a being-in-movement, free for unforeseen articulations.

Accompanying Nancy’s arguments about the destinating movement (*destinerrance*) of *différance* in Derridean thought, “*nothing subsists, nothing is identified, nothing presents itself and nothing comes together without defer-*

*ring, anonymizing, absenting and disseminating itself.*”<sup>9</sup> (PERETTI et al., 2018, p. 194). In sum, nothing or no one is joined to something or someone without ceasing to be in order to become another. An aesthetics of the expropriation of one-self in order to be-other by being-with, to use Heidegger’s concept. No longer the preservation of inviolable identities, but a being contaminated by the beyond oneself, a being beyond itself, in short, a being contaminated by the other, a supplementary being. Without a new start, without a determined destiny, the common horizon perhaps involves a reconsideration of the extent of what can become a being-with, a being with others, a being-in-common.

The being-in-common presupposes crossings, contaminations, inscriptions of traces within what seems to be someone’s or something’s own. Multilingualism, the always more than one language or one’s own language, evoked by Derrida in some of his works, would be the condition for the exercise of a hospitality yet to come, a hospitality based on an aesthetics of miscegenation, of grafting of one onto the other, of one language onto the other. However, these crossings and receptions can only take place while preserving what seems to be specific and therefore insurmountable and unbridgeable in each language. Thresholds, spacings, intervals between things need to exist for crossings and intersections to occur.

*Through each language something is aimed at that is the same and yet that none of the languages can achieve separately. They can only claim to achieve it, and promise to do so, by co-deploying their intentional aims, the whole of their complementary intentional aims. This co-deployment towards the whole is a re-deployment because what it aims to achieve is ‘pure language’ (dir reine Sprache), or pure tongue. (DERRIDA, 1987, p. 232, our translation).*<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> From the original: “Destinerrance c’est un des termes majeures de l’idiolectique.”

<sup>9</sup> From the original: “Rien ne subsiste, rien ne s’identifie, rien ne se présente et rien ne se rassemble sans se différer, s’anonymer, s’absenter et se disséminer.”

<sup>10</sup> From the original: “À travers chaque langue quelque chose est visé qui est même et que pourtant aucune des langues ne peut atteindre séparément. Elles ne peuvent prétendre l’atteindre, et se le promettre, qu’en co-employant au co-déployant leurs visées intentionnelles, ‘le tout de leurs visées intentionnelles complémentaires’. Ce co-déploiement vers le tout est un repliement car ce qu’il vise à atteindre, c’est ‘le langage pur’(dir reine Sprache), ou la pure langue.”

As Derrida points out, a different kind of hospitality can only come from multiple voices, or from the indiscernibility of what seems to be someone's, some people's, or culture's own. Promoting indiscernibility while preserving differences, how can we think hospitality from this apparent paradox? What are these borders, capable of guaranteeing individuality by stimulating miscegenation?

### Margins of hospitality

Let's go back to the case of the Ocean Viking ship, from the beginning of the text. Since the "discovery" of America over 500 years ago, our history, of both Americans and Europeans, has been marked by crossings [of seas, oceans] and margins, with boats, dinghies, ships that could be understood as modalities of a tower of Babel, multilingual and multicultural territories that, as vectors and humanitarian resistance, originate from projects of domination at the service of the erection of submissions, subalternities, and erasures under the label of a civilizing process. Despite the joint crossings, we have never been in the same boat, in a collective and mixed way. Under the aegis of the flourishing bourgeois era, unsociable sociabilities forged in the crossings guaranteed a project of modernity whose side-effects we watch in reruns every year, and not just confined to the Mediterranean Sea, but all over, by land between countries, between regions, between states, between cities, and within the same state – as we have seen recently.

People are castaway on the sidewalks and streets of our cities. Our modernity never ceases to create outsiders so that by admitting them, when admitted, it can make them strangers from within, an eternal outsider even though inside. What kind of hospitality are we talking about? Shreds of places of plural conviviality, simulacra of multicultural and linguistic hospitality are

found in shopping malls, large museums, cultural centers, cathedrals, tourist attractions, and even gyms, just depictions of the persistent logic of exclusive inclusions. At the other extreme, fortified and functional territories guarantee the reproduction and update of caste society, now characterized by outsiders and insiders, even though, apparently, everyone is in the same boat, in the same cosmic boat.<sup>11</sup> Regarding the spread of enclaves and zones in contemporary times, Derrida (2021, p. 276, our translation) points out:

*So, what did we deal with last time? Not only the zone and the enclave, but also the zone in the enclave, the enclave in the zone. The zone in the enclave, the enclave in the zone - this is what, belonging without belonging to the territory, to the stay, and therefore to the ethos, remains unheimlich, uncanny, strangely disquieting, strangely familiar, familiarly strange: the stranger in the family or just as much the familial or the familiar in the strange. Through the figures, topical and tropical figures, of the zone the zones, the belts [zon in Greek, zona in Latin, the "zone" is the same word] and the Outlaw Zone (where we can't even talk about the suburbs anymore) and in the divided and cleavable enclave (more or less than in the abyss), we tested the differences in accent or inflection that could affect the meaning of a formula like "at-home-with-the-other," "being-at-one-with-the-other."<sup>12</sup>*

But this perverse and omnipresent zoning of populations, capable of generating inclusive exclusions, exclusive inclusions, enclaves and ghettos [updates of slave ships?] within zones, "belts" that generate foreigners and strangers within the land itself, involuntarily and against their will, also creates other more modest modes of crossing, not overseas or oceans, but over urban and domestic thresholds.

<sup>11</sup>As Peter Sloterdijk says, "the good old cosmopolitanism is turning into a cosmopathic nomadism."

<sup>12</sup> Do original: "Qu'avons-nous donc traité la dernière fois ? Non seulement la zone et l'enclave, mais aussi la zone dans l'enclave, l'enclave dans la zone. La zone dans l'enclave, l'enclave dans la zone, voilà ce qui, appartenant sans appartenir au territoire, au séjour, donc à l'ethos, reste unheimlich, uncanny, étrangement inquiétant, étrangement familier, familièrement étrange : l'étranger dans la famille ou tout aussi bien le familial ou le familier dans l'étrange. À travers les figures, figures topiques et tropiques, de la zone les zones, les ceintures [zon en grec, zona en latin, le « zona » est le même mot] et La Zone hors la loi là où l'on ne peut même plus parler de banlieue) et de l'enclave clivée, clivable (plus ou moins qu'en abyme), nous avons mis à l'épreuve les différences d'accent ou d'inflexion qui pouvaient affecter le sens d'une formule telle que « chez-soi-chez-l'autre », « être-chez-soi-chez-l'autre. »"



We are talking, first, about the so-called “occupations” and spaces of artist collectives, both scattered throughout the metropolises of Brazil and some European countries [in France, particularly the so-called ZAD,<sup>13</sup> *zones à défendre*, places of struggle for territory]. Plural, as a matter of principle, unstable, built by the interweaving of units and by the cracks and crevices it creates, just like a raft – not the “spherical group raft” of Sloterdijk (1999, p.51) – these places could be understood as raft-territories or social rafts. Like the rescue ship Ocean Viking, territory of unconditional welcome, the occupations, shelters, and the spaces created and conquered by artist collectives and collectives of political resistance anchor, in the city and country, like fragile rafts and towers of babel, but this time endowed with a social and political project. Those are multilingual, multicultural, multiethnic territories, carrying out legal, social, and cultural crossings, which have as one of their strategies the conception of another home aesthetics of the threshold. A threshold which becomes a device for overcoming borders and zoning that ensure an unequal population distribution.

Thresholds thought of as an invitation to any other, an almost unrestricted invitation, not as offering, but as territory of closeness and bonds without prior addressing, because every invitation, when addressed, is already a form of exclusion. As Derrida proposed, *inviter* [to invite] without *éviter* [to avoid], the right to visit, to stay without invite, *visitation sans invitation* [visitation without invitation]. Thresholds as device for building other political and legislative dispositions. There is, therefore, a relationship between unconditionality and conditionality, which is not of opposition, but of conjunction.

Many of these places become zones of convergence, sharing, and the mixing of domains, with junctions which are flexible and malleable enough not to beco-

me a reversed trench, a being-with the medium [the water, the city], with others, sometimes adrift, always as territories of action, with some resistance. Like rafts, trunks joined together with gaps necessary to resist and adapt to the environment, these are places built by the interweaving of individualized units functioning as a cooperative whole. The territories of occupations and collectives are formed by the singularization of each person who arrives and positions themselves with others, upheld by junctions capable of preserving collective individualities. Alterity without alienation from oneself, a different dwelling is conceived as a place for the collectivity of individuals, a cohesive but not unified plurivocity.

The social rafts are “unclaved” enclaves, small insulae for inviting, welcoming, and receiving anyone who arrives at the threshold, as a device for building generosity and destroying immunizing community logics. An aesthetics operating through the logic of included exteriorities. Alongside the unconditionality of hospitality imagined by Derrida, a practice that invites and lets in, before asking, before wanting to know where you come from, who you are, what is your name, religion, creed. Indiscernibility first. Entering, staying, returning, territorial porosity; the threshold is the crevice between the trunks of a raft.

Territories that offer up themselves as the home of the other, spacing between the memory of domestic and urban, the common to come. Brothel territories, places against codifications, etymologically, they are territories on the edge, at the edge, on the margins, between the conditional and unconditional, spectrum at the same time of home and city, a place of memory for those who have no place, urban castaways. According to Derrida (2021, p. 280, our translation):

---

<sup>13</sup> ZAD, acronym for Zones à Défense, territorial self-defence collectives. The acronym is the manipulation of another acronym of the same name, ZAD - Zone d'Aménagement Différée, zones created with the purpose of printing vast land operations in rural and peri-urban areas. Zones à Défense, on the other hand, are characterized by collective occupations of territories in France through encampments to protect land against destructive and exploitative actions by the state and the market, always with a view to collective access to land. Originating from farmers' collectives in the 1970s who refused to give up their land, but also the memory, or spectre, of May 68, they are barricades of resistance. The most famous and successful ZAD was that of Notre-Dame-Des-Landes, near Nantes, which for two decades, between the late 1990s and the mid-2010s, fought against the construction of a large airport in the region. In 2016, after a referendum in the region approved the construction of the airport, which seemed an irreversible process, there was a huge mobilization of the French population. Tens of thousands of people flocked to the region, set up camps and built sheds. Despite the mobilized police force, the constant risk of expulsion and court battles, in January 2018 the verdict in favour of not building the airport came down.

*There is no hospitality without memory. A memory that did not recall the dead person and mortality would be no memory. What kind of hospitality would not be ready to offer itself to the dead one, to the revenant? Would hospitality that was not ready to offer itself to the ghost still be hospitality? Without the chance of this spectrality, there would be no hospitality. This spectrality to the guest as ghost or Geist or Gast.*<sup>14</sup>

Raft-territories become harbours for those who are adrift in the city, castaways in the public space. Domestic hospitality is transformed into public, cosmopolitical hospitality. The cosmopolitical begins with another aesthetics of the threshold and another practice of visitation, an invitation for the other to enter without preconditions, a free admission. Without the erasure of wounds, the practice of enchantment from the face

of the other, an ethics based on Eros. Threshold as table and political bridge, lever for a different way of inhabiting the world. Through the threshold, an anti-conformist and non-resigned hope takes hold.

Through these in-between places, here understood as intermediate and decoded zones, neither inside nor outside, an action begins with the other, in the arrival and presence of any other, the hope of small and possible ethical-urban revolutions. Following Levinas, quoted by Derrida (2021, p. 83-84) in his seminar, the stranger is the third party who arrives and interrupts the face-to-face. The third-party breaks binarism [oppositions are capable of guiding social practices too much], institutes neither one nor the other, disjointed collectivities, difficult and undisciplined weavings from a plural political life, shared in an unstable, non-taxonomic way, a radical version of Arendt's active life.

---

<sup>14</sup> From the original: "Il n'y a pas d'hospitalité sans mémoire, et une mémoire qui ne se rappelle pas, qui ne se rappelle pas par-delà toute contemporanéité en général, qui donc ne rappelle pas le mortel et le mort, n'est pas une mémoire. Une hospitalité qui ne serait pas prête à s'offrir au revenant, serait-ce encore une hospitalité? Y a-t-il de l'hospitalité sans spectralité, y a-t-il de l'hôte, du host ou du guest ou du Gast sans ghost ou sans Geist?"

## FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

A re-enchantment of hospitality probably implies a reconsideration of borders, of margins. Transitional territory between being outside, adrift, and being inside, with others, a non-prescriptive being-with-others. Being-with-others, non-prescriptively, presupposes interactions constructed by plurovocity, by dissonant sharing, by [dissonant] possibilities of acting with others which the desired common life requires. A hospitality based on an authentic exercise of citizenship and only possible by establishing a dwelling place as a universal territory for voluntary, contingent, and unprecedented collective experiences.

The threshold is the means of exercising non-strict, unrestricted, non-addressed hospitality. In a true act of hospitality, there can be no invitation addressed to anyone. Any advance destination creates a population from within, belonging to it, and a population outside. On the contrary, the logic of the threshold is the chance of an “adestination”, a neologism created by Derrida to define a place where someone arrives, or should arrive [*arriver à destination*], but also a place without an *a priori* destination [*adestination*], a nobody’s place, not privileged, therefore, anyone’s place.

Threshold territory is the territory in which inside and outside intertwine. Neither one nor the other, an inside-outside and outside-inside that cause a disturbance to what would be appropriate for a property. The threshold can be the resistance to enclaves, fortified and exclusive spaces, in short, to the inside as property immune to the outside. Threshold territories, like raft territories, welcome the outside in order to build an in-

side-outside, an unsecure inside. An insecure place, as Derrida (2022) suggests, because it is not sure of anything, of what would be its property, of what should be its own as a foundation, a presupposition.

The re-enchantment of hospitality would lead to an overcoming of the more conventional and traditional notions of “identity,” “belonging,” “ownership,” of what is proper to something, a place or someone. Instead of preservation, maintenance, a territory that is open to change by the affections of the unexpected other. “Clandestinization” of the property by the arrival of the unexpected. On the margins of the property, practicing improbable social and spatial weaves. A hospitality built and tested by territories of social insecurity, in a sense.

In line with Derrida’s thinking (2022), we propose that hospitality should be free, not driven by private or state interests linked to work, commerce or a specific program, but by grace, leisure, playfulness, and improvisation. And for this reason, it is art, disinterested action. Hospitality offered to any other must be hospitality without consideration or calculation. Hospitality as an exercise in spacing that postpones identities and properties, contaminating them, crossing them by the unforeseen presence of any other and, therefore, deprogramming them. Given the obvious inadequacy of this premise today, but perhaps because of this, its necessary re-enchantment is the necessary experience of the impossible. An experience of the possibility of the impossible that we lack, condition of possible impossibility.

## REFERENCES

ARENDT, Hannah. Juger: Sur la philosophie politique de Kant, suivi de deux essais interprétatifs par Ronald Beiner et Myriam Revault d'Allonnes'. Paris: Seuil, 1991 French version by Myriam Revault d'Allonnes of the English original.

DERRIDA, Jacques. *Hospitalité*: volume 1 Séminaire (1995-1996). Paris: Seuil Bibliothèque Derrida, 2021.

DERRIDA, Jacques. *Hospitalité*: volume II Séminaire (1996-1997). Paris: Seuil Bibliothèque Derrida, 2022.

DERRIDA, Jacques. *Des tours de Babel in Psyché: Inventions de l'autre*. Paris: Galilée, 1987.

GOETZ, Benoît; YOUNÈS, Chris. Hannah Arendt : Monde – Désert – Oasis. In: PAQUOT, Thierry; YOUNÈS, Chris. *Le territoire des philosophes – XXe siècle*. Paris: La Découverte, 2009. p. 29-46.

KANT, Immanuel. *Critique de la faculté de juger [Kritik der Urteilskraft, 1790]*. Edição e tradução Alain Renaut. Paris GF Flammarion, 2015.

LEVINAS, Emmanuel. *À l'heure des nations*. Paris: Éd. de Minuit, 1988.

PERETTI, Cristina *et al.* *Derrida Lecteur de Heidegger*. Coimbra: Palimage, 2018.

RICOEUR, Paul. *L'idéologie et l'utopie*. Paris: Seuil, 1997.

RANCIÈRE, Jacques. *Penser l'émancipation*. Paris: éditions de l'aube, 2022.

RANCIÈRE, Jacques. *Aisthesis: Scènes du régime esthétique de l'art*. Paris: Galilée, 2011.

SLOTERDIJK, Peter. *No mesmo barco: ensaio sobre a hiperpolítica*. Translation by Claudia Cavalcanti. São Paulo: Liberdade, 1999.

The article is linked to the research “Habiter en devenir: autres demeures”, coordinated by Prof. Dr. Igor Guatelli and funded by MSH Paris Nord in the biennium 2021/22, project number: 21 4 C 1