

Politics of Hospitality, Peace and Tourism: Review and Analysis

Ramesh Raj Kunwar

Nepal Mountain Academy, Ministry of Culture, Tourism and Civil Aviation
Kathmandu, Nepal
kunwar.dr@gmail.com

Aaditi Khanal

Department of Conflict, Peace and Development Studies
Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, Nepal
khanalaaditi@gmail.com

Abstract

The hospitality has been discussed only in the model of social, private and commercial domain. It has been argued that there are two school of thoughts: one sees the host-guest relationship entirely based on the commercial transaction between them and another sees hospitality as a social phenomenon. This paper highlights the correlation between hospitality, peace and tourism with context to the behaviors of nation-states as political actors towards migrants, asylum seekers and refugees in terms of ethics, human rights and citizenship with special focus on the difference in approach of hospitality between the rich and poor countries. However, it is also evident that peace can only be achieved through the acceptance of the outsiders without prejudices, although this has been rejected by the thinkers who believe that it is impossible for any nation to fully welcome the guests which will require them to compromise their national sovereignty. Attention has been given to the concept of hospitality with special reference to Kant's thought of universal hospitality, Levinas's concept of the ethics and politics of hospitality, and Derrida's notion of absolute or unconditional and conditional hospitality. The issues thus discussed are the various forms of discrimination in terms of the hospitable behaviors by the hosts (nations) towards the guests (migrants) by analyzing the host-guest relationship and further reflecting it upon the current global political scenario.

Keywords: Hospitality, aporia, cosmopolitanism, ethics, politics.

Introduction

The concept of hospitality has been defined and explained by many scholars of different disciplines. While studying about the verbatim meaning and origin of the word hospitality, Beveniste in Friese (2004, p. 68) has presented that the Latin notion of guests, *hostis* and *hospis* refer to two different semantic field of one being the “master of the house” and the other referring to a “compensatory relationship” based upon both equality and reciprocity. In addition to these meanings, *hostis/hospes* also came to signify the “enemy” originally used to designate neither stranger nor the enemy with the drawing borders, when the guest becomes the (public) enemy and the stranger. So, the meanings of the words “guest” and “stranger” are connected with the political and legal institutions of the community or the state and a specific “politics of hospitality”. In its double meaning the notion refers to both the guest, i.e. the stranger and to the enemy and thus already works on the equation of “being foreign and “hostile” (Friese, 2002, pp. 68-69; see in detail Kunwar, 2017). These literal meaning of hospitality further provide us with the indication of studying more about the relationship between the host and the guest and their relationships.

Hospitality has been considered as the major player of service economy as it contributes significantly to the world economy and this sector is the largest employer in the world next only to the armed forces (Ottenbacher, Harrington & Parsa, 2009, p. 269). Hospitality has been one of the most pervasive metaphors within tourism studies, referring in one sense to the commercial project of the tourist industry such as hotels, catering and tour operation and in another sense, to the social interactions between local people and tourists, that is hosts and guests (Germann-Molz & Gibson, 2007, p. 6). Kunwar (2017, p. 56) has further explained that most of the people everywhere in hospitality sectors refer to hospitality as the friendly and welcoming behavior towards the guests. In fact, the host-guest relationship serves as a power and control measure. Being a host means an element of power over the guest and vice versa. As Selwyn (2000; in Kunwar, 2017, p. 56) has suggested that there is an exchange of honor and the guest signals is the acceptance of the moral authority of the host. This scholar is of the opinion that basic function of hospitality is to establish new relationships or to promote already existing ones and it is achieved while making exchanges-both material and symbolic- between the guests and the hosts. Kunwar (2017; in Joshi & Kunwar, 2017, pp. 69-70) recently has also coined two very important types of hospitality namely persuasive hospitality and imposed hospitality. The persuasive hospitality refers to people (hosts) who are intrinsically oriented to welcome the strangers as a tradition. The term imposed hospitality refers to the host compelling to provide unintentional hospitality to the gorillas with the fear of torture or death.

As the topic of this study suggest, it is also important to highlight, how hospitality results in peace. In case, in the absence of peace, hospitality, sometimes converts into hostility and ‘hostipitality’ (Lynch, Germann-Molz, McIntosh, Lugosi & Lashley, 2011; in Kunwar, 2017, pp. 55-115). The term ‘hostipitality’ reminds us that hospitality always entails its opposite: hostility. Acts of hospitality framed as welcoming to some often exclude others. Studies focusing on the way hospitality is enacted often entail act of violence and exclusion. Such critical accounts of the treatment of unwanted guests enable us to understand how a discourse of hospitality is often marshalled in support of what are, in reality, failures of hospitality, ‘hostipitality’ (Lynch, et al., 2011, n.p.; in Kunwar, 2017, pp. 55-115).

So far as peace is concerned, D’Amore (1994; Goeldner et al., 2000, p. 310; in Kunwar, 2017, p. 377) indicates that our current definition of peace is simply “the absence of war” and calls for a new “positive concept of peace accepting the perspective of an organic and interconnected world.” He further defines that the term peace, in addition to the absence of war, also includes the absence of acts of terrorism and random violence.

According to *Webster Dictionary*, peace is defined as:

- A state of tranquility or quiet: as (a) freedom from disturbance (b) a state of security of order within a community provided for by the law and customs.
- Freedom from disquieting or oppressive thoughts or emotions.
- Harmony in personal relations.
- A pact or agreement to end hostilities between those who have been at war or in a state of enmity (Theobald, 1997, pp. 28-29; in Kunwar, 2017, p. 377).

While discussing about peace, it is also important to make distinction between negative peace and positive peace. The noted 20th-century French intellectual Raymond Aron (1966, FN.2; in Barash & Webel, 2002, p. 6) was thinking of negative peace when he defined peace as “a condition of more or less lasting suspension of rivalry between political units”. An alternative view to this realist or (*realpolitik*) perspective is one that emphasizes the importance of positive peace. The concept of positive peace has been particularly forwarded by the Norwegian peace researcher Johan Galtung. Positive peace is more than the mere absence of war or even the absence of interstate violence. It refers to a social condition in which exploitation is minimized or eliminated, and in which there is neither overt violence nor the subtler phenomenon of underlying structural violence (Barash & Webel, 2002, p. 6).

Albeit it might be irrelevant describing various types of peace to the present study but it is noteworthy to mention about the Relational Order Theory (ROT) founded by Donohue & Roberto (1993), Donohue (2001) and Donohue & Hoobler (2002)

suggests that there are three conditions or types of peace; (a) conditional peace, (b) unconditional peace and (c) isolationist peace (Donohue, 2006, pp. 226-229). Under conditional peace, in the condition of low interdependence and high affiliation, parties exchange messages that seek to retain their role autonomy, yet demonstrate approval and positive effect for one another. They assert few rights because they are not sufficiently interdependent to demand much. Yet, they remain friendly and polite, generally as an attempt to adhere to socially acceptable norms of interaction (Donohue, 2006, p. 228). Under unconditional peace, when parties communicate using expressions of high affiliation and interdependence, they are proposing a highly cooperative relationship. This combination challenges parties to honor their role obligations under individual rights. The focus on obligations invests parties in the needs of the relationship over the needs of the individuals (Donohue, 2006, p. 227). Further, the concept of isolationist peace suggests that when parties communicate with low levels of both affiliation and interdependence, they send isolationist messages. Parties seek to reduce their ties, push away from one another; and isolate themselves from the relationship. This is an Isolationist Peace in the sense that parties are not fighting but they are not moving forward productively with their substantive agenda. So, unconditional peace emphasizes constructive processes, while isolationist peace emphasizes withdrawal (Donohue, 2006, p. 227).

In this kind of study with no possibility of field work, review of the literature plays a very significant role. Marshall and Rossman (2006; in Creswell, 2009, p. 105) refer to the brief literature review in an introduction as a way to set the study within the context of other, related studies. Brotherton (2010, p. 65) has referred to the literature review as a 'critical review' of the existing literature.... For a review to be regarded as critical, there must be evidence of engagement with the literature. This demands more than regurgitation because it involves an element of processing in an attempt to develop a greater understanding of its relevance, validity and significance (Brotherton, 2010, p. 67). According to Mays et al. (2005; in Mair, Ritchie & Walters, 2014, p. 4), narrative reviews may include thematic analysis. However, in order to move from a simple narrative approach to more in-depth approach, a technique known as narrative synthesis is advised. Narrative synthesis allows for the synthesis of evidence drawn from a number of studies.... This review does not set out to assess all literatures written on politics, human rights, ethics and peace, but rather to document the state of the researchers' knowledge in the specific field of hospitality based on ethics and politics in relation to peace. Therefore, a narrative approach has been taken.

Hospitality has been studied by Lashley and Morrison (2000), Lashley, Lynch and Morrison (2007), Germann-Molz and Gibson (2007), O'Gorman (2010), Brotherton (1999), Lugosi (2009, 2008), Lugosi et. al. (2009) amongst others. None of these

scholars except Gibson (2007) have critically analyzed on the politics of hospitality which came into existence since the time of Immanuel Kant, Emmanuel Levinas and Jacques Derrida. Since the time of Brotherton (1999) to Lugosi (2014), the hospitality studies were confined only in the context of social, private, commercial and industrial domain. Many scholars have recognized that the academia in management offers a utilitarian conception of hospitality which has been widely criticized for its failure to address the social, political, cultural and emotional dimensions of such transactions (Lashley et. al, 2007; Lugosi, 2008, 2009; in Kunwar, 2017, p. 58).

In course of identifying the new areas of hospitality, Lynch, Germann-Molz, McIntosh, Lugosi and Lashley (2011) have suggested that the ethics and politics of hospitality need further attention, exploration and scholarly development. As they elaborate in the context of ethics and politics of hospitality, the writings of Kant, Levinas and Derrida have used hospitality to reflect critically on broader questions about citizenship, human rights and the ethical treatment of strangers. The philosophical and ethical implications of hospitality, and in particular Derrida's challenging concept of 'absolute hospitality', may shed light on social relations and encounters. This has also been highlighted by Kunwar (2017, pp. 55-115).

So far as the host-guest relationship is concerned, majority of the scholars have focused on this relationship. But they are divided into two camps. One sees the host-guest relationship entirely based on commercial transaction between them (e.g. Wood, 1994; Aramberri, 2001; Slattery, 2002; in Causevic & Lynch 2009, p. 122). Another sees hospitality as a social phenomenon (e.g. Smith, 1989; Smith & Brent, 2001; Lashley & Morrison, 2000; Lashley et al., 2000; in Causevic & Lynch, 2009, p. 122). Citing the examples of diaspora and their visit to their native country, Causevic & Lynch (2009, pp. 123-124) in their study of the host-guest relationships in a post-conflict setting have argued that the value of hospitality goes beyond the general commercial notion and highlighted a need of researching the relationship as a social phenomenon in its naturalistic setting. They have further argued that in a critical theory perspective (as a theory of communication, i.e. communicative competence and communicative rationality on the one hand, distorted communication on the other) derived by Habermas in 1978, society can be understood through the hospitality lens, through the host-guest relationship observed as a social phenomenon which has been inferior, marginalized and less heard.

Methodologically, this paper has been prepared by reviewing the secondary sources where the purpose of reviewing studies in an introduction is to justify the importance of the study and to create distinctions between past studies and the proposed one (Creswell, 2009, p. 105). This study has been confined mostly to the notions of Kant, Levinas and Derrida. Through their approaches, the researchers have been able to analyze not only the past philosophy of hospitality in relation with

ethics, politics and human rights but also their influences on the present political hospitality scenario.

It will therefore, now be noteworthy to mention about ethics and politics including human rights in relation with hospitality as suggested by the above mentioned scholars. As this study is concerned with the politics of hospitality, peace and tourism, the researchers have made an attempt to understand peace, ethics and politics including human rights in today's context of globalism of the world. In this regards, very few scholars have studied the politics of hospitality which has already been realized as also imperative for the study of tourism, hospitality and peace. Therefore, the present researchers aim at highlighting the major theoretical debates forwarded by various scholars in terms of hospitality and peace and its impact on the global politics and tourism towards the asylum seekers, refugees, migrants and immigrants. Asylum seeker has been defined as a person who enters or remains in a country either legally, as a visitor or tourist or student, or illegally, with no or with fraudulent documentation, and then claims refugee status under the terms of the 1951 United Nations convention relating to the Status of refugees (Department of the Parliament Library, 2000). A refugee has been defined as any individual who: "owing to well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his (her) nationality and is unable or owing to such fear is unwilling to avail himself (or herself) of the protection of that country..." (Convention relating to status of refugees 1951) (Department of the Parliament Library, 2000). According the International Organization of Migration (IOM, 2018), a migrant is defined as any person who is moving or has moved across an international border within a State away from his/her habitual place of residence, regardless of (1) the person's legal status; (2) whether the movement is voluntary or involuntary; (3) what the causes for the movement are; or (4) what the length of the stay is. Similarly, an immigrant is a person who moves to another country, having met work or business or family reunion criteria, and having being issued with a visa or residence permit which entitles them to reside in that country (Department of Parliament Library, 2000). In this study, the terms migrant and immigrant are used interchangeably as it they both refer to the same sense of leaving one's own country to the other. Though it is a preliminary study, it is believed that this study will help the academics, hospitality and tourism scholars, entrepreneurs, contemporary scholars of conflict, peace, international relations and political science, media personnel, researchers, research think tanks, and students in general to understand hospitality, tourism and peace through the political lens.

Gibson (2007, pp. 159-176) and Laachir (2007, pp. 177-192) has given a new path for analyzing both negative and positive aspects of politics of hospitality which will be very useful for understanding tourism and hospitality at large. Also, the literature

review in the light of peace and hospitality is significant as because the recent years have witnessed growing enthusiasm about the concept of hospitality in an attempt to understand the status of immigrants, exiles, foreigners, refugees, and other displaced populations who are in transit and/or without a home and their hosts or the “new” socio-cultural and political “homes they are situated in. The portrayal of these groups as guests’ entails discussing the meaning of a series of other concepts and issues such as the host, what does welcome and receive mean, subjectivity, ipesity, and interruption of the self, conditional and unconditional hospitality, hostility, home ownership, and expropriation (or dispossession) giving ample scope to also have a discussion on the politics of hospitality.

This has been reflected in his study by Friese in 2004. The generalization of the other into the stranger have recently been questioned by concepts such as “hybridity”, “diasporas”, “transnationalism”, “dislocation” and “travelling cultures” that emphasize blurred borders, intersections and “contact zones”, uncertain identities and the increasing mobility of people and cultural traits. In the context of transnational communities, blurred borders and uncertain identities, it is obvious that such perspectives open up to questions about what concept such as “integration”, “belonging”, ultimately: “a politics of hospitality” can possibly mean, a politics that would not be immediately intertwined with a politics of identity which- with sorrow- either mourns the irretrievable loss of “difference” and “otherness” or as the new nationalisms, fanatic communitarianism and/or ethnicity movements, fervidly proclaims and attempts to save one’s own and distinct authenticity by mystifying “absolute otherness” and “difference” (Friese, 2004, pp. 74-74). So, this description about the politics of hospitality specifies dilemma of the states as political entities while offering hospitality to others. Most important of all, these debates have also highlighted the problematic and convoluted nature of the relation between the ethics and politics of hospitality (Yegenoglu, 2011, p. 450). This study further aims to penetrate this theme of discussion provided by the scholars while examining different circumstances at different stretches. To take this discussion forward, it is now apt to go through the ideas and opinions of Kant, Derrida and Levinas about hospitality.

Kant’s concept of hospitality

Immanuel Kant (1724-1804), the German philosopher is known to be one of the giants among the pantheon of Western philosophers as well as the one with most powerful and broad influence on contemporary philosophy. Born in 1724, he attended the Collegium Fridericianum since 1732. He wrote his first book named *Thoughts on the True Estimation of the Living Forces* in 1749. His most significant and groundbreaking writing titled *Perpetual Peace: A philosophical Essay* by Immanuel Kant was published in 1795 where Kant has developed the global right to hospitality (Wintersteiner & Wohlner, 2013), which reads: “The Law of World Citizenship

Shall Be Limited to Conditions of Universal Hospitality”, where hospitality means the right of a stranger not to be treated with hostility when he arrives on someone else’s territory. He can indeed be turned away, if this can be done without causing his death, but he must not be treated with hostility, so long as he behaves in a peaceable manner in the place he happens to be in. The stranger cannot claim the right of a guest to be entertained, for this would require a special friendly agreement but he may only claim a right of resort. But this natural right of hospitality does not extend beyond those conditions which make it possible for the strangers to attempt to enter into relations with the native inhabitants. In this way, continents distant from each other can enter into peaceful mutual relations which may eventually be regulated by public laws, thus bringing the human race nearer and nearer to a cosmopolitan constitution (Kant, 2003, pp. 34-35). In what follows, Kant distinguishes between what the foreigner has a right to from what he doesn’t have a right to. So, he is distinguishing between being peacefully allowed to set foot on the territory and to ask to be accepted into that society from being accepted into that society. So, that means it is all right to refuse him this acceptance into the society if the refusal doesn’t have fatal consequences for him but as long as he conducts himself peacefully and doesn’t push forward, he is not to be treated with hostility. Such host nation’s hospitable response to this temporary visit is something to be transmitted as a legislatable universal right through laws such as laws of citizenship, laws of commerce and laws of exchange. Hence, Kant’s understanding removes hospitality from the status of an obligation (Yengenoglu, 2011, p. 452).

The concept of perpetual peace is then considered to be the starting point of the contemporary liberal thought and a normative basis for international law and international relations theory as well which stands out as the contentious and rivalrous idea against the law of nations as proposed by the theorists such as Hugo Grotius, Pufendorf and Vattel among others. Kant has also not backed out from accusing them of being the ‘miserable comforters’ of the law of nations in his 1795 essay ‘Toward Perpetual Peace’. Kant has indicted these scholars of using a concept of right(jus) in relation to war that not only lacked all legal force in restraining the belligerence of nations, but also actually encouraged this belligerence. It did not end war as such by eradicating the warlike disposition of mankind or nations, thereby bringing perpetual peace in the form of a world republican federation governed by global justice or ‘cosmopolitan right’. (Hunter, 2010, pp. 165-188). So, according to Waldröner (2000, p. 164), Kant thought that the distress produced by the constant wars in which states try to subjugate or engulf each other must finally lead them, even against their will, to enter into a *cosmopolitan* constitution.

Kant has claimed that the idea of a cosmopolitan right is not fantastic and overstrained; it is a necessary complement to the unwritten code of political and international right, transforming it into a universal right of humanity. Only under

this condition can we flatter ourselves that we are continually advancing towards a perpetual peace (Kant, 2003, pp.35-36).

In the modern times however from cosmopolitanism and perpetual peace of Kant, with regards to ethics and human rights in order to maintain peace, Robinson (2002, n.p.) has referred to two important international declarations, one by the world's governments and the other by the world's religious leaders. These documents were in many ways ahead of their time in addressing what world leaders at the UN Millennium Summit identified as the central challenge we face today: ensuring that globalization becomes a positive force for all the world's people. The two referred to texts are Declaration and Program of Action from the World Conference on Human Rights, adopted in Vienna in June 1993, and the Declaration of the Religions for a Global Ethic adopted in Chicago in 2001 which reflects that the values, morality, ethics, law and human rights are all linked in a complex normative cluster. The events of 11 September and their aftermath underlined the urgency of that thinking. So, there is a need of making globalization a positive force for all the world's people, to make it inclusive and equitable. Again, building an ethical and sustainable form of globalization is not exclusively a human rights matter, but it must include the recognition of shared responsibility for the universal protection of human rights. Over 50 years ago, the drafters of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights stressed the link between respect for human rights and freedom, justice and peace in the world, and called for a just international and social order (Robinson, 2002, n.p.). Therefore, the modern concept of human rights and globalization had been strongly influenced by and based upon the concept of universal hospitality and cosmopolitan rights of all the human beings that has been provided by Kant in the 13th century.

From this, it is also clear that, Robinson (2002) has glorified the legitimacy of the Kant's philosophy that still in many facets holds a lot of relevance in the contemporary world of the 21st century as the concept of hospitality in Kantian articulation, has been revived to address human rights and cosmopolitical formulations of a universal law of hospitality. Therefore, the concept of hospitality possesses practical and theoretical questions that span disciplinary boundaries (Germann-Molz & Gibson, 2007, p.2). Gibson (2007, p.4) have also maintained that the intersection between mobility and hospitality as written by Kant is just as relevant today, in framing the ethical, political and ethical parameters of social interactions, moral duties and state obligations in a world of strange encounters.

Fascinatingly commenting on the concept of hospitality by Kant, Zlomislic (2004) has mentioned that the notion that human race can gradually be brought closer to a constitution establishing world citizenship is admirable, yet Kant ends his essay with the words, 'one cannot flatter oneself into believing one can approach this peace except under the conditions outlined here', stepping on which Zlomislic has

argued that it further calls to conflict because it does not treat hospitality in a radical manner. As such his notion of hospitality is limited as it is based on the modern virtue of tolerance even after recognizing the postmodern value of dispersion and dissemination, he immediately reduces its effects through the phrase, 'they cannot infinitely disperse'.

Also, with reference to the conflicts happening around the world and a particular mention about the event of 9/11, Onkal has described the new situation as the philosophical and political positions that has only widened the gap between the civilizations that cross cuts the concept of universal rights and cosmopolitanism of Kant. Onkal has further proposed that to replace identity by humanity, there are some possibilities in 2 steps: Firstly, the conflict has been defined between two main cultures, i.e. West and East. Secondly he has tried to analyze the concept of universal hospitality considering Kant's essay on Perpetual Peace. Through this evaluation he has thus tried to identify the maxims of universally acceptable and equal politics which must be in accordance with the rights of this world's all citizens for the sake of humanity (Onkal, 2013, p. 27). As the term "civilization: has been replaced by "globalization: and standardization, globalization has become a means of increasing dominance of some languages, nations and business-classes. He has also posited a prominent question that we globe technologies, inventions; but do we globe rights? (Onkal, 2013, p.28). Further Appiah; in Onkal (2013, p.28) has mentioned that while we globe interconnectedness, we are not able to globe mutual-recognition of identities, as a primary condition of eternal peace. As pragmatism and individualism are becoming the dominant social principal day by day, it may be an unexpected and unwelcome consequence of Kant's Enlightenment. Further, the cross cultural debate over what rights are to be considered as human rights is prevalent, Onkal has mentioned that traditions should not be allowed to become absolutisms (radicals). So, an ethical and juridical agreement of cultures is the ground of peace (Onkal, 2013, p.28).

According to Onkal (2013, p.30), Kant is standing on a static point as his ideas on "cosmopolitan rights" are kept in transcendental for of duty. Until today the world has been approaching towards new forms of human rights, the concept of which has been strongly changed after the 9/11 attack by the fundamentalist. Much more common however, are racial, national and ethnic prejudices that result in oppression of minority populations. Thus, human rights as a Western concept ignores the differences, cosmopolitanism and local cultures of "the Other" and is based on a Eurocentric world-view. So, we need the umbrella of tolerance which Onkal has described in his paper, cannot be constructed with the transcendental ideas but practical and understandable principles since cosmopolitan recognition is the main pre-condition of cosmopolitan rights and hospitality (Onkal, 2013, pp. 30-31). So, from Onkal's point of view, until we respect and accept the existence and cultures of the others, the achievement of

the cosmopolitan rights and establishment of long term and sustaining peace is far-flung. Now, again if we connect the dots to the refugees and the asylum seekers, then their existence and values should not be denied by the nation or the land to which they migrate to seek shelter. Only if they are welcomed with the value that they have been cultivated with can the path towards peace be directed. Therefore, the concept of cosmopolitanism as per Kant has the prospects of being redefined in the present setting as per this writer.

Levinas's concept of hospitality

Considered as a political theologian, Emmanuel Levinas (1906-1995) attempts to draw a strict separation between his philosophical and religious writings. From Levinas's point of view, the problem inherent to a politics of hospitality become visible. Therefore, Levinas's concept of hospitality has been analyzed with an eye to its ethico-political implications (Gauthier, 2007, p.159). Levinas has clearly depicted the concept of hospitality by placing it at the stances of ethics and politics as mentioned in Gauthier (2007, pp. 158-180), hospitality operates in the two distinct realms: the ethical and the political. In the ethical realm, the self is morally obligated to welcome the stranger into the private space of the home; in the political realm, the self is politically compelled to welcome the alien into the public space of the homeland.

However, Levinas's powerful critique of politics renders the practice of political hospitality decidedly difficult since politics is violent and totalizing. From this vantage point, what is required is an ethical transformation of the public realm in order to render it more conducive to hospitable action. More specifically, the practice of hospitality necessitates an embrace of a fraternalistic, monotheistic and messianic political vision. While such a political vision has much to recommend it, this ultimately weakens the commitment to pluralism, tolerance and respect for cultural otherness that underlies Levinas's hospitality ethos (Gauthier, 2007, pp.159-160).

More specifically, what Levinas's analysis suggests is that our status as moral beings stand or fall with our treatment of the strangers who presents themselves on our doorstep. Levinas provides a welcome dose of ethical sensitivity, indeed a challenge, to a post- modern genre. As notable as this achievement is, however, the question of politics remains open; Levinas makes no mention of politics in his discussion of the home. The notable lack of political themes in this respect is a reflection of the fact that the self's relationship to the Other originally occurs in an ethical, rather than political realm. Even so, this fact does not preclude the possibility of a politics of hospitality. As it turns out, the self does not confront the Other in isolation, but also faces a third party that renders it to be a political animal (Gauthier, 2007, p. 165). From this it can be further understood that, even if a host, especially the state prioritizes ethics while welcoming the guest of some sort, but the dilemma lies in the fact that there is a

greater world lying beyond the other/guest who then are to be treated equally. As such, it then pounces back to the capacity of the limits to which any state or the host can be flexible towards the guest. Hence, starts the politics of hospitality. So, while defining the status of the political realm of hospitality and the status of state, Levinas has introduced the concept of the Third that refers to not only an Other to the self but also the Other to the Other. As such, the appearance of the Third significantly complicates the self-Other relationship as faced with two parties who simultaneously vie for its attention and concern, the self is compelled to weigh competing ethical obligations. Besides being a distinctive mental activity, such an act is necessary because it forces the self to consider the welfare of those who fall outside the parameters of the self-Other relationship. In compelling the self to enlarge its sphere of moral concern, the third party ensures that its attempt to satisfy its asymmetrical obligations to the other person will not be pursued at the excessive expense of the mass of humanity. In this sense, the Third serves as a corrective to the danger of ethical myopia. On Levinas's account, these changes are engendered by the self's new-found consciousness of an aspect of the human condition that the face of the Third brings home to it: fraternity. Hence, the link that binds the human community together is the shared ethical responsibility of everyone for everyone else. As it stands, there are two principal aspects of human fraternity: irreducible singularity and monotheism. Each member of the Levinasian fraternal order is unique by virtue of the fact that each is singularly responsible for the well-being of fellow members. Monotheism, of course, is the belief that there is but one God. For Levinas, the human fraternity is monotheistic in the sense that its members are inextricably linked by the fact of divine paternity. Thus, God's reign over the human fraternity is manifested in the self's connection to the Other. As the ultimate source of community, divine paternity also makes possible the practice of politics. Therefore, politics is prefigured in the face of the Third because its presence demands the creation of politico-juridical institutions to govern the human brotherhood. Since the Third inspires the creation of 'State, institutions, laws', one can say that its presence projects the self into the realm of politics. It is not difficult to anticipate the core features of a Levinasian politics. Obviously, the state and its accompanying institutions should respect irreducible human dignity and rest on an ethical foundation. Politically, the self is called to welcome the Third into its public space by creating a political community where individual human dignity is respected and ethical conduct encouraged. However, extending such a welcome turns out to be a highly problematic endeavor because the sphere where political action occurs is radically dissimilar from the anarchical realm where the hospitable gesture is privately performed (Gauthier, 2007, pp.165-167).

Regarding the politics of hospitality from the Levinas's perspective, welcoming the foreigner into the homeland represents the principal means by which attempts

to possess the land are repudiated. Considered in relation to the grandiose political projects that have characterized the twentieth century, the toleration of outsiders appears to be a simple, even unremarkable, affair. Considered in relation to the nationalistic, xenophobic and chauvinistic political enthusiasms that continue to mark the contemporary political climate, however, it represents an act of Nietzschean overcoming of the ever-present temptation to prize one's particular people over the rest of humanity. In Levinas's ethico-political calculus, then, a nation will distinguish itself as either noble or base — as either a state of Caesar or as a member of the Messianic order, as it were — by virtue of how it treats foreigners. As Levinas writes, 'To shelter the other in one's own land or home, to tolerate the presence of the landless and homeless on the "ancestral soil", so jealously, so meanly loved — is that the criterion of humanness? Unquestionably so.' This 'criterion of humanness' is utterly central to a politics of hospitality. As such, it represents perhaps the pivotal formula that political actors are expected to apply when practicing a politics of hospitality. Insofar as politics is inherently warlike and self-alienating, even the most ethical political actions are morally tainted. For Levinas, a politics of hospitality is fraternalistic, monotheistic and messianic in nature. But in this theologically-driven transition from anarchical ethics to politics, the problematic nature of Levinas's politics of hospitality becomes more and more apparent. In sum, the ethical imperative to extend hospitality to the stranger is compromised by the political obligation to create fraternalistic, monotheistic and messianic political institutions. Levinas's contribution to postmodern thought lies in conceptualizing a politics that is ethical in emphasis, and it is the stress on ethics that propels his politics of hospitality (Gauthier, 2007, pp. 175-180). From this comparison and the stress of ethics in the politics of hospitality by Levinas, it would then be very interesting to reflect this thought upon the globally concerned issues of present.

Derrida's concept of hospitality

Jacques Derrida (1930-2004) considered the most important French philosopher of the late twentieth century grew up as a Jew in Algeria in the 1940s, during the anti-Semitic French colonial regime. Excluded in his youth from his school after the quotas for Jews were reduced, he was confronted with violent racism. He eventually managed to study philosophy in Paris. In 1967 Derrida's international reputation was secured by the publication of three books, and he went on to publish 40 different works. Various philosophers have tried to attach different labels to him—a pragmatist, a post-Kantian transcendentalist and a linguistic philosopher. Derrida was credited as the inventor of "deconstruction", the practice of dismantling texts by revealing their assumptions and contradiction (O'Gorman, 2006, p. 50). As Derrida proclaims, "Hospitality is the deconstruction of the at-home; deconstruction is hospitality to the other, to the other than oneself" (Mikics, 2009, p. 232). Hospitality does not significantly surpass social boundaries. Derrida's (2000a, 2000b) work on

the sociological meaning of hospitality identifies a conceptual distinction between 'absolute' and 'conditional' forms of hospitality. He suggests that hospitality is normally conditional as the mere existence of a 'host-guest' relationship in some way implies impermanence, instruction, *modus operandi* and obligation (Stephenson, 2013).

"Absolute hospitality" according to Derrida requires the commitment to unconditional accommodation of the "absolute, unknown, anonymous" other, it requires to accept the Other "at home" to donate, to "give him a place", without enquiring as to "identity, name, passport, capabilities or origins." This unconditionally, unquestioned acceptance, should together with the conventionally accepted law of hospitality, requires neither reciprocity nor identification in name. Absolute hospitality which suspends reciprocity, does not require identification and is beyond the order of law, its application and a judgement- becomes a figure of an always futurized and thus unrealized hospitality. The relationship between absolute hospitality and he laws and rules which should serve its unconditionality thus becomes, the object of political negotiation and political deliberation (Friese, 2004, p. 72). So, absolute hospitality requires "generosity" of the state even as the ethical notion of absolute hospitality goes beyond the frontier or border of the state (Gibson, 2014, p. 375). Absolute hospitality thus shares the same structure of the gift, justice, friendship as being "the very figure of the impossible" (Derrida, 1994, p. 7).

According to Derrida upon the law of hospitality, it violently imposes a contradiction on the very concept of hospitality in fixing a limit to it, in determining it: hospitality is certainly, necessarily, a right, a duty, an obligation, the greeting of foreign other as a friend but on the condition that the host, the Writ, the one who receives, lodges or gives asylum remains the patron, the master of the household, on the condition that he maintains his own authority in his own home, that he looks after himself and sees to and considers all that concerns him and thereby affirms the law of hospitality as the law of the household, *oikonomia*, the law of his households, the law of a place (house, hotel, hospital, hospice, family, city, nation, language, etc.), the law of identity which delimits the very place of proffered hospitality and maintains authority over it, maintains the truth of authority, remains the place of this maintaining, which is to say of truth, thus limiting the gift proffered and making this limitation, namely the being-oneself in one's own home, the condition of the gift and hospitality (Derrida, 2000, p. 4). This condition as considered as the aporia of both the constitution and the implosion of the concept of hospitality, the effects of which has been explored by Derrida. This implosion also named as self-deconstruction renders hospitality to be a self-contradictory concept and experience which can only self-destruct (put otherwise, produce itself as impossible, only possible on the condition of its impossibility) or protect itself from itself, auto-immunize itself in some way, which is to say deconstruct itself-precisely- in being put into practice (Derrida, 2000,

p.5). As hospitality is owed to the other as stranger. But if one determines the other as stranger, one is already introducing the circles of conditionality that are family, nation, state, and citizenship. Hence, Derrida has claimed that we need to attempt to distinguish between the other and the stranger and venture into what is both the implication and the consequence of the double blind, the impossibility as the condition of possibility, namely, the troubling analogy in their common origin between *hostis* as host and *hostis* as enemy, between hospitality and hostility (Derrida, 2000. pp. 7-15).

In addition to its association to the law, hospitality has been reciprocal, engaged in an economy of exchange and even violence. In other words, an exchange takes place between the host and the guest. In offering hospitality, in welcoming the other, the host imposes certain conditions upon the guest (Wetmoreland, 2008, p.2). Further, according to Derrida, any law or concept would impose on hospitality and would cause it to no longer be absolute, or unconditional. So, Derrida defines hospitality as ethics and ethics as hospitality and hospitality as the principle or the whole of ethics. Hospitality is also defined as culture as there is no culture without hospitality (Wetmoreland, 2008). Absolute hospitality requires one to give all one has to another without asking any questions, imposing any restrictions or requiring any compensation. It involves neither the governance of duty nor the payment of debt. And if there is an imposition, nothing is left to be called absolute. Hospitality as such is never fully open; there is always some violence. Therefore, according to Derrida, absolute hospitality is both inconceivable and incomprehensible. Further, according to Kant hospitality is limited to the rights of the visitor to not be treated with hostility when he arrives on someone else's territory, but not the right of the resident, which must be established by and between political sovereignties. Favouring the conditionalities of hospitality, Wetmoreland (2008) implies that the law of absolute hospitality does not involve an invitation, nor does it involve an interrogation of the guest upon entering. In order to be hospitable, the host must rid himself of security, authority and property and promise benevolence. The guest becomes the host. Thus, absolute, unconditional hospitality is never possible in conjugation with indivisible sovereignty. So, the host welcomes into his home the very thing that can overturn his sovereignty and take him hostage (Wetmoreland, 2008, pp.3-7).

Drawing on the work of Levinas, Derrida offered an encompassing philosophy of hospitality, clearly differentiating between the 'law of hospitality' and the 'laws of hospitality': the law of unlimited hospitality, and on the other hand, the laws, those rights and duties that are always conditioned and conditional (Derrida, 2000, p.77). Further, Naas (2003, p.157) has pointed out that for when it comes to political, to hospitality in or of the state, conditions are always stipulated. It has been stated that violence is also allowed by absolute hospitality. A new arrival or guest who stands at the door, at the border and is welcomed inside without condition. This

very welcoming opens into violence which turns the home inside out. It appears as though the law of unconditional hospitality and the laws of hospitality conflict with one another. However, the two are irreducible to one another nonetheless. The law of hospitality opens up the possibility for contamination that it calls for no governing body such as a sovereign state or master of a home to establish laws and authority over another subject. The state or master retains the capacity to be overthrown. The laws of hospitality strongly rely upon laws and duty, or adherence to the law. These laws attempt to ensure the preservation of a state or master. Derrida in "Of Hospitality" as translated by Bowlby(2002, p.77) as questions the relationship between the two meanings: "It is as though the laws of hospitality, in marking limits, power, rights and duties, consisted in challenging and transgressing the law of hospitality, the one that would command that the 'new arrival' be offered an unconditional welcome." So, it seems as if the laws of conditional hospitality and the law of unconditional hospitality conflict with one another. Do the laws transgress the law of hospitality? Does the law of hospitality demand a transgression of the laws? They are not symmetrical, equally opposing one another. Rather, a hierarchy exists in which the law is above the laws, outside the laws (Westmoreland, 2007, p.8). However, the two complement each other in that the law of hospitality requires the laws of hospitality so as to not be abstract according to Peggy Kamuf (2006, p.207).

Reflecting upon the aporia (confusion or doubt) of hospitality as put by Derrida in terms of the law and the laws of hospitality, he argues that we have to reconcile the demand for equality with the demand for singularity following which Zlomislic (2004) critically raised the question as to how can the states at the same time, take in account the equality of everyone and respect the heterogeneous singularity of everyone? As the aporia of hospitality, says that the Other, the orphan, the widow and the alien has to be welcomed. Hospitality, therefore is a risk which has to be negotiated at every instant and as such it tends to be an opening without the horizon of expectation where peace can be found beyond the confines of conflict Zlomislic (2004, n.p.). Therefore, Westmoreland (2008, p.9) concludes that the laws of hospitality receive inspiration from the law. These laws and the law of hospitality simultaneously include and exclude one another. Furthermore, hospitality remains "inconceivable and incomprehensible" and "becomes possible but as impossible," yet it "remains impracticable". And yet the two are forever inseparable.

Discussion

By considering the concept of universal hospitality for the maintenance of perpetual peace as provided by Immanuel Kant and the crosscutting concern of the question raised by Derrida on the laws of common, conditional hospitality in contrast with the law, or perhaps the ethics of unconditional hospitality, the researcher senses it to be imperative to consider the contemporary global and comprehensive political

activities through the lens of hospitality and peace with special attention towards the concerns of refugees, migrants and asylum seekers. Therefore, this study bears colossal implications and significance in the sense that it endeavors to deliver a theoretic and conjectural understanding of the recent political uproars which has also been indicated by Onkal (2013, pp. 26-32) in his study as the “Neo-Global Conflicts”.

In this regards, Gibson (2002, p. 693), in her paper has strongly argued that the representation of the figure of stranger in contemporary culture conceals the complex power relations involved in the categorization of others. She has also mentioned about the difference in treatment and hospitality towards the tourists and the asylum seekers in which the borders work different ways as there are substantive differences between the ways of being displaced from home (Gibson, 2006, p. 697). Further, Gibson (2014, p. 367) through the ethical writings of Jacques Derrida on hospitality, generosity and parasitism has argued that it is the nation-state that parasites asylum seekers both through their defining difference and their contribution to the services economies connoting towards the “new racism” towards the asylum seekers which is located within the economic sphere, as asylum control is linked to the welfare state and to fears of strangers’ parasiting the host nation. The new racism as such denotes the move from the black immigrant to the figure of the “asylum seeker” mirrors the movement from as racism predicated upon biological difference to the current “new” form of racism entitled “xeno-racism” (Sivanandan, 2001; in Gibson, 2014, p. 368). The hatred circulating around the black immigrants has now been generalized to contempt for strangers or foreigners in general. It is this conjunction of racism with nationalism that now results in a generalized xenophobia (Dummett, 2001, p. 128). This xeno-racism is now directed towards asylum seekers, with the new enemy now regarded as “poverty”. Asylum seekers are thus demonized for “scrounging at capital’s gate and threatening capital’s culture” (Fekete, 2001, p. 23).

Following the nature of asylum seekers, asylum has sacred or quasi sacred resonance denoting a sanctuary od inviolable place of refuge and protection for criminals and debtors, from which they ought not to be forcibly removed. It can also mean a benevolent institution affording shelter and support to some class of afflicted, the unfortunate and destitute (Gibson, 2014, p. 373). The space of asylum is staked out by a power that is heterogeneous to the law of the state, of civic government. Or rather, it is “higher” kind of law that establishes its sovereignty on the basis of a moral/religious or “ethical” relation to the law’s abject classes. This heterogeneous, ethical relation renders the space inviolable to politics and law. So, in Derrida’s distinction between the political and ethical hospitality between law and justice, between the laws and the law of hospitality, the space of asylum can be found absolutely placed in the ethical rhetoric of hospitality (Gibson, 2014. pp. 373-374). Immigrants and asylum seekers are often regarded as being forms of parasite, intruding into the body

of the host nation. The coalition of asylum seekers with illegal immigration allows asylum seekers to be associated with so called “unproductive hospitality” (Derrida, 2002, p. 100), for the asylum seekers are regarded as not giving anything back to the host community. So, it is productive to compare the figures of two strangers: the asylum seekers and the tourist (Gibson, 2014, p. 379).

Citing the case of Britain’s hospitality, Gibson (2007, p.159) has analyzed the mobilization of ‘hospitality’ in contemporary debates on immigration and asylum as a way of justifying increasingly fortified border controls into the nation. The abuse of the asylum system by the bogus or abusive asylum seekers and economic migrants; trying to fleece the welfare system of the nation has been posited a threat. The policy of deterrence of Britain that discourages potentially abusive asylum seekers from choosing to seek asylum through more restrictive and less generous welcomes to defend the nation against the risk of hospitality (Gibson, 2007, p. 162). So, the welcome of the other is thus restricted and controlled. The welcome offered to those genuine and deserving refugees is paradoxically enabled through the exclusion of those abusive others. As such, this intolerance and hostility between social groups is connected to narcissism. By definition, narcissistic individuals depend on an audience to validate their self-worth (Lash, 1978; Elmes & Barry, 1999, p. 164). However, narcissism fundamentally intrapsychic reflecting a structure of self that is either well developed or deficient (Elmes & Barry, 1999, p.164). According to Freud (1991, p. 72), narcissism has been identified as the ‘narcissism of minor differences’: ‘it is precisely the minor differences in people who are otherwise alike that form the basis of feelings of strangeness and hostility between them.’ Nationalism then is a ‘kind of narcissism,’ (Ignatieff, 1999, p.79) in its self-love for the national ideal and its aggression towards those others outside the national community. Ignatieff (1999, p.86) argues that nationalism is necessarily intolerant as it is predicated upon constructing an ‘us’ and a ‘them.’ The ‘narcissism of minor differences’ is thus an ‘intolerance of minor differences.’ This narcissism of the nation links to the conditional hospitality given by Derrida.

Hence, the context of unconditional hospitality and universal right for cosmopolitanism is compromised by the nationalistic behavior of the states with sovereignty being at the stake of negotiation, that renders fertile ground for conditional hospitality and sometimes also unreceptive acts by the nation-states that further leads towards the Kundani’s concept of ‘logic of suspicion’ as an extension to the ‘logic of deterrence,’ which has been adopted in Gibson (2007, p.168). The logic of suspicion views all refugees and asylum seekers as potentially abusive leading to a culture of disbelief which gives rise to the perception that refugees and asylum seekers do not travel because of genuine fear of persecution, but are instead merely economic migrants attracted to the “Honey Pot” as in the case of Britain (Gibson, 2007, p. 168). This sort of protection of the nation’s welfare and the demonization of the figure of the

asylum seeker can be located in the new economic racism, where 'poverty is the new Black' (Sivanandan, 2001, p.2). This 'xenoracism' is directed towards 'impoverished strangers' (Sivanandan, 2001, p.2) and is symptomatic of global capitalism. This is the new 'global apartheid' which separates the rich and poor into distinct territories (Balibar, 2004, p. 113).

This description of hospitality as a phenomenon then evokes the persistent questions raised by Germann-Molz and Gibson (2007), "how should we welcome the stranger, the sojourner, the traveler, the other? Where might hospitable encounters occur and what kinds of spaces does hospitality produce? Who is able to perform the welcoming host, and who can be admitted as a guest? And in extending hospitality to the other, how should we define our individual, communal, or national self?" The answers to these questions according to Germann-Molz and Gibson (2007, p.1), are highly edified in the law of hospitality and the laws of hospitality as discussed by Derrida. Further, this embodies impossibility of hospitality calls to mind the images of exclusion, closure and violence: walled borders, gated communities, asylum detention centers and race riots. The development of internet, communication and technologies and the new intersections and proximities brought by them brings the provocative dilemma of hospitality- how do we welcome the stranger in the contemporary concerns of the mobile world (Germann-Molz & Gibson, 2007, p.2). Social networks today are increasingly produced through mobile networks of environmental, cultural, social and economic interdependencies that transcend territorially bounded societies or nation-states (Ury, 2000; Hannam, Shellar & Ury, 2006 in Germann-Molz & Gibson, 2007, p.1). People and places across the globe are now bound together through complex and fluid connections that emerge around the transnational flows of commodities and capital, images and information, ethnicity and culture, crime, disease, waste and pollution. And of course, people. New patterns of migration, diaspora, and transnational labor, along with exponential growth of business travel and global tourism, now account for unprecedented levels of international mobility. The plethora of different journeys in today's mobile world has thus led to a diversity in hospitalities.

Once again referring back to the very meaning of hospitality, according to Rosello, as cited by Germann-Molz & Gibson (in Kunwar, 2017, p.85), hospitality is not just a metaphor for reflecting on encounters with the strangers, but according to Urry (1990; in Kunwar, 2017, p. 85) it serves more broadly as a central concept for the emergent paradigm of 'mobility' that regulates, negotiates and celebrates the social relations between inside and outside, home and away, private and public, self and other. So, in most of definitions of hospitality, it is implicated that hospitality means the movements of tourists and visitors (those mobile others who come and go) as

well as the movements of migrants, asylum seekers and refugees (those mobile others who come and stay). So, the notion of hospitality as Hent de Vries (2001) argues has immense relevance [...] for the most urgent questions dominating contemporary political debates on immigration, globalization, multiculturalism, and citizenship (Germann-Molz & Gibson, 2007, p.3).

With an effort to correlate the concept of place and mobility with hospitality, Creswell (2007, pp.50-51) has mentioned that Jacques Derrida's questions of hospitality have tended to focus on hospitality towards moving people who enter a place and confront that place and people who inhabit it with new challenges. How can a place (the nation-state, the city, the neighborhoods) accommodate the new arrivals and how much hospitality can be extended? How on the other hand might these motilities be legislated and regulated? So, questions of place and mobility are central to the question of hospitality. Further, the question of overwhelming 'excess' is a key one for theorization of hospitality. The excessive is that which needs to be rejected, regulated, excluded, removed. Excess is not possible without order. As Bauman has argued, waste is a by-product of order-making. The more you are concerned with order, the more noticeable is the excess. In Bauman's formulation, the order-making processes of modernity produce people-as waste- the homeless, the refugees, the migrants. And these very people that Derrida suggests are in need of an impossible hospitality- a welcoming without limits. It is comparatively easy to extend hospitality to those who fit in and belong to a place. It is excess/waste that makes hospitality a challenge (Creswell, 2007, p. 3).

Thus this point of discussion is very interesting in line with this study as it is noteworthy to also realize why are some group of people are considered as the waste or the by-product as more and more order making is practiced in the politics of hospitality. This means that the world today is becoming more and more intolerant for accepting the cultures and beliefs of many different units that have been coexisting since hitherto. Then once these groups are excluded as the waste, they become the refugees, migrants and the asylum seekers who are need of being accepted by the foreign state or nation. As such, the role of hospitality in terms of ethically welcoming the refugees or politically treating them under various conditions arises as a dilemma to the host nation. It is the gap between hospitality as a universal and unconditional right of cosmopolitanism and hospitality as something which is granted that has proven problematic within Western liberal societies trying to come to terms with issues of immigration and asylum (Creswell, 2007, p.60). When hospitality is mobilized in the current debates of immigration and asylum, it is in fact a way of justifying increasingly fortified border controlled into the nation (Gibson, 2007, p.159).

Friese (2004) has also highlighted the current debates, in addition to the thematization of hospitality as an integral part of ethics of the good life, or a

renewed ethics of responsibility, are the tensions between, on one hand, the law of unconditional hospitality, an absolute ethic requirement, and the laws, i.e., the political and legal limitations, on the other. These debates take place in the context of pressing questions related to how contemporary democratic and pluralistic nation-states unable to dictate commonly shared moral and ethical percepts- should interpret and implement the law of hospitality. The question posed here is how – given the crisis of the modern systems of organized solidarity and in an atmosphere of growing nationalisms, resentment and animosity, general indifference and increasing xenophobia to hospitably welcome the exiled, the deported, refugees, migrants and these who long for a better, a good life. The question that the arrival of the other raises is thus that of responsibility and the response to a request posed by an Other and how to do justice to its unmistakable, irreducible, singularity and subjectivity (Friese, 2004, pp. 71-72).

Now, when it has been discussed about the treatments towards the migrants, Wintersteiner & Wohlmuther (2013, p. 41) with an effort to connect the complex relationship between tourism, peace and line these concepts with hospitality, feel that migration, ‘the negative of the tourism constellation cannot be ignored. While tourists travel for entertainment and recreation mostly from the West to the South with an orientalist view, migrants travel for survival and better living conditions or quality of life mainly from Global South to the Northern hemisphere. As it is, the tourists are warmly welcomed in a hospitable manner by the natives with the expression of personal friendliness or as a part of a strategy, the flow of hospitality rarely works in reverse through. When these migrants actually manage to arrive, for them, the idea of hospitality does not exist. With ever stricter migration (or should we say anti-migration?) laws, the rich countries try to stop or to hinder the migration flow. The point to ponder upon further is that nobody is aware of this contradiction. As such, the movements of tourists and the movement of migrants are world apart; they do not contact each other, nor do they ‘see’ each other (Mazumdar, 2011, p. 71).

Hence, in order to make a difference, hospitality must no longer be limited to a cultural custom, but instead must acquire a legal status. This was at least the vision of European enlightenment- specially from Kant (Wintersteiner & Wohlmuther, 2013, p. 41).

Hence, in the present era when a nation such as the USA puts a ban on the acceptance of outsiders as refugees or migrants and the very recent decision upon the applicants from 11 countries defined as ‘high-risk countries’ including 10 Muslim-majority nations plus North Korea to face tougher ‘risk based assessments’ to be accepted as reported in *AFP* and *Reuters* and mentioned in the *Dailymail* (2018) could be analyzed from the viewpoint of hospitality. Similarly, the specific case of Rohingya refugee’s current crisis from Myanmar in which the Rohingya people are

one of the most ill-treated and persecuted refugee groups in the world, having lived in a realm of statelessness for over six generations, and who are still doing so. Perhaps, in the absence of specific refugee policy in Bangladesh and politicization of the refugee situation, integration of Rohingya has always been a challenge which is marked by inadequate access to basic needs, exposure to violence, restricted movement, local hostility, and various forms of discrimination (Milton, Rahman, Hussain, Jindal, Choudhary, Akter, Ferdousi, Mouly, Hall & Eifrid, 2017). These and many other similar cases then can be attached with the logic of suspicion that forbids the nation to flexibly welcome the others into their own territory. The same kind of argument has been put forward by the scholars such as Wintersteiner & Wohlmuther (2013) which compels to rethink about the differences in the approach to hospitality by the rich and poor countries. Furthermore, this sort of xenoracism is not just a result of global capitalism but also the flourishing terrorism and fundamentalism in an up roaring modus. Thus, the 'culture of disbelief', whereby anybody crossing the border could potentially be an abusive asylum seeker, justifies 'the repetition of violence against the bodies of others in the name of protecting the nation' (Ahmed, 2004, p. 47). In constructing the figure of the abusive asylum seeker, a nation (Britain as the case) actually then seeks to redefine its own national character as such 'processes of exclusion and rejection uncover and reveal and become constitutive of national identity itself' (Cohen, 1994, p. 198). In such a limited model of hospitableness, the figure of abusive asylum seeker is constructed in order to support the nation's pride in its ideal (Gibson, 2007, p. 169).

As a result, the host nations then do not hesitate to paint a picture of the asylum seekers generally as abusers in order to justify the violent means to deny the admittance of the migrants, asylum seekers or the refugees. Therefore, this aporia of hospitality is in fact the condition of hospitality for Jacques Derrida. Derrida's recent writings have focused on hospitality, generosity and tolerance as the figures of the impossible. However, for Derrida, there is always a tension between the limits of the conditional hospitality and an infinite unconditional hospitality (Gibson, 2007, p. 169). The impossibility of a national hospitality for Derrida comes from the restrictions and securing of the borders by the nation-state as no nation finds it acceptable to abandon its border controls and immigration controls (Gibson, 2007, p. 170). Therefore, tolerance then is a 'conditional circumspect, careful hospitality' (Derrida, 2003, p. 128).

To sum up the discussion about the politicization of hospitality, according to the study of Laachir (2007), hospitality as an ancient tradition with ethical imperatives has become politicized in the Europe and New World in the last two decades with strict laws issued to 'protect' rich states from any form of visitation from poor countries since they are perceived as potential economic immigrants that may threaten the

financial, social and political stability of the host countries voicing their xenophobia and racism against those perceived as foreigners, are alarming examples to the return of the exclusionist popular nationalism and fascism to haunt postcolonial Europe (Laachir, 2007, p.177). Hospitality has become more difficult since the 9/11 attacks and the subsequent 'war on terror' led by the American Government. Events such as terrorist bombings in Madrid in March, 2004 and London, 2005 have been interpreted by some as a conflict between contending civilizations, Western and Islamic. This problem of xenophobia and racism (which is not limited to Europe) in the last decades after the horrors of colonialism and fascism raises a crucial question about the relationships between communities of different 'race', religion and culture. The main argument put forward by Laachir then is the attempt to fix the social, economic and cultural mobility of these diverse postcolonial diasporic communities is a manifestation of the perpetuation of colonial culture that still preserves the same power structures that existed in the colonies (Laachir, 2007, p.179).

As a critic to Kant's cosmopolitanism, Laachir (2007, p.179), has mentioned that Kant does not address the problem of how peace may be decided differently between those who have wealth and influence and those who have not. Thus, his cosmopolitanism is exclusive to certain powerful states that pass the law on the rest of humanity. Even though Kant's ideas of cosmopolitanism, universal hospitality and common right to the surface of the earth shared by all human beings have had a strong appeal in contemporary debates on democracy and citizenship, his 'racial theories' sit uncomfortably and embarrassingly with his claims to metropolitanism marked by exclusiveness. His democratic aspirations could not contain the black 'race', as his racialogical ideas about the inferiority of the 'Negro' and his warning against the dangers of racial mixing contradict his cosmopolitanism. This idea of Kant has been developed in a number of works especially, *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* (1798) and his 1775 essay 'On the Different Races of Man' (Laachir, 2007 p. 179).

Therefore, it is this exclusionary aspect of hospitality that must be questioned. In light of this, Derrida (2002, p.22) accuses Kant of restricting hospitality to state sovereignty, as he defines it as law. Unlike Kant, Levinas introduces the disjunction between the host and the guest, the host becoming the guest if the guest in his/her own home as the home of the other, that is, to be welcomed by the face of the other that one intends to welcome. Such a political connotation of hospitality, according to Levinas then introduces 'tyrannical violence'. Auxiliary, Derrida, 1999, p. 23) suggests that hospitality therefore, is opposed to the 'thematization' because it is welcoming of the other who cannot be calculated or known, that is, the other is infinite and 'withdraws from the theme'. So, Levinas suggests a theory of respecting the other instead of 'mastering' him/her; that is, a theory of desire that bases itself on infinite

separation instead of negation and assimilation. Hence, what is needed today in comparing Kant and Levinas, and with regard to the right of refuge in a world of millions of displaced people, Derrida (1999, p.101) argues, is to call out for another international law, another border politics, another humanitarian politics, indeed a humanitarian commitment that effectively operates beyond the interests of the Nation-state.

Conclusion

Hence, the distinction introduced in Derrida's work on unconditional or absolute hospitality as the ethics and conditional hospitality as the law or politics, is directing our attention to find an 'intermediate schema' between the two to keep the political laws and regulations open to new changes and circumstances and to keep alive the fact that hospitality is always inhabited by hostility. Derrida stresses the aporetic relationship between the unconditional hospitality or ethics, which starts with risks, and the conditional hospitality or politics that starts with the calculation or controlling of these risks. However, if this calculation means the closure of all boundaries, not only territorial but also cultural, social and linguistic, this would mean the death of the nation (Laachir, 2007, p.183) as because in a globalized world today, no nation can be remaining aloof from the rest of the world and has to be able to balance a way out between the ethics and politics of hospitality despite of the reality that both of them appear to be parallel concepts to each other. To finally conclude that the aporia of hospitality presented by Derrida, does not mean paralysis, but in fact, it means the primacy of the ethics over politics, and thus, keeping alive the danger of hostility in the making of the politics of hospitality by 'political intervention' that respects the 'uniqueness of the other every time a decision is taken' Laachir (2007, p.188).

This indicates the need of a new form of conscience among the nations that can possibly prevent the various vicarious acts of hostilities that has been taking place around the world. The researchers also would like to express that this sort of study can be helpful in answering persistent questions like the fear of protectionism by American government led by Trump as presented by Sawson (2018, n.p.), why the South Asia as a region and the nations as the sovereign entities are not able to extend their hospitality to the Rohingyas who have fled the war and terror from the various state and non-state actors? What does it now at the existing milieu take to empathize with the refugees, asylum seekers and migrants as a result of conflict, war and terror? Also, reflecting upon the interconnectedness among hospitality, peace, conflict and tourism with an intend to answer the prevalent question, "In the context of tourism in the area of ongoing socio-political unrest, how are hospitality, peace and conflict interrelated?", Buda (2012, pp.50-59), has posited that an area of ongoing conflict inevitably raises emotions which turns the people/state facing the conflict to have a different and mostly less affinity towards the concept of hospitality ultimately

connoting the place (state or people) as less hospitable and hence the declination of tourism industry. Therefore, Buda (2012, p.59) has suggested that the issue of hospitality and peace needs to be debated in the studies of tourism as well. So, now the greater question that lies before us is it justifiable for the nations as the political entities to conditionally offer hospitalities as per their convenience and has the Kant's concept of universal hospitality and cosmopolitan rights coming till the role of United Nations as an international system becoming obsolete? And lastly, if there is the need of a revision in the system to contextualize the concept of hospitality for the greater protection of human rights of every one?

Because from the above discussions, it is quite pertinent that theoretically, even if a nation is willing to welcome the others, the very notion of politics of hospitality influenced by the laws of hospitality as argued by Derrida restricts it from providing unconditional welcome promoted by Kant. Likewise, the dilemma of prioritizing ethics over politics as per Levinas also plays a significant role whereby it tends to become very difficult for the nation to find a balance between the ethics and politics of hospitality when treating the refugees, asylum seekers and migrants who even if are offered the hospitality will become imposed hospitality as used by Kunwar (2017) and as mentioned by Zlomislic (2004, n.p.) that hospitality is an opening without the horizon of expectation where peace can be found beyond the confines of conflict.

References

- Ahmed, S. (2004). *Strange Encounters*. London: Routledge Books.
- Balibar, E. (2004). *We, the People of Europe?* Oxford: Pricenton University Press Books.
- Barash, P.D. & Webel, C.P. (2002). *Peace and Conflict Studies*. Bonhill Street. London: Sage Publications.
- Brotherton, B. (2010). *Researching Hospitality and Tourism: A Student Guide*, London: Sage Publication.
- Buda, D. (2012). Hospitality, peace and conflict. 'Doing fieldwork' in Palestine. *The Journal of Tourism and Peace Research*, 2(2), 50-61.
- Causevic, S. & Lynch, P. (2009). Hospitality as a human phenomenon: Host-guest relationship in a post-conflict setting. *Tourism and Hospitality Planning of Development*. 6(2), 121-132.
- Cohen, R. (1994). *Frontiers of identity: The British and the Others*. London: Longman Publishing.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. London: Sage Publication

- Cresswell, T. (2007). Hospitality and Migrant Memory in Maxwell Street, Chicago. In Molz, J.G. & Gibson, S. (Eds.). *Mobilizing Hospitality: The ethics of social relations in a mobile world*. (pp. 47-64). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Department of the Parliament Library. (2000). *The Problem with the 1951 Refugee Convention* (Research Paper No. 5 2000-01). Retrieved from <https://www.aph.gov.au/binaries/library/pubs/rp/2000-01/01rp05/pdf>
- Derrida, J. (1999). *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*, Brault, P. & Naas, M. (6Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press Books.
- Derrida, J. (1994). *Given Time: I. Counterfeit Money*, Kamuf, P. (Trans.), Chicago: University of Chicago press.
- Derrida, J. (2000). Hospitality. *Angelaki. Journal of Theoretical Humanities*. 5(3). 3-18.
- Derrida, J. (2002). Negotiations: Interventions and Interviews 1971-2001, Rottenberg, E. (Eds. & Trans.), California: Stanford University Press.
- Derrida, J. (2003). *Philosophy in a Time of Terror*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.
- Donohue, W.A. (2006). Managing Interpersonal Conflict. In Oetzel, J.G. & Toomey, S.T. (Eds.) *The Sage Handbook of Conflict Communication: Integrating Theory, Research and Practice*. (pp.211-233). London: Sage Publications,
- Dummett, M. (2001), *On Immigration and Refugees*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Elmes, M. & Barry, D. (1999). Deliverance, denial, and the death zone: A study of narcissism and regression in the May 1996 Everest climbing disaster. *The Journal of Applied Behavioural Science*, 35(2),163-187.
- Fekete, L. (2001). The Emergence of Xeno-Racism, *The Three Faces of British Racism*.43(2), 23-40.
- Freud, S. (1991), *On Sexuality*. In Strachey, J. (Trans.). Harmondsworth: Penguin. 7.
- Friese, H. (2010). In Keye, J (Trans.), Spaces of hospitality, *Angelaki*, 9(2), 67-79.
- Gauthier, D. (2007). Levinas and the Politics of Hospitality. *History of political thought*. 28(1), 158-180.
- Gibson, S. (2007). Abusing our hospitality: Inhospitableness and the politics of deterrence In Molz, J. G. & Gibson, S. (Eds.), *Mobilizing Hospitality: the ethics of social relations in mobile world* (pp. 159-176). Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Gibson, S. (2014). Accomodating strangers: British hospitality and the asylum hotel debates. *Journal for cultural research*. 7(4), 367-386.

- Gibson, S. (2006). Border politics and hospitable spaces in Stephen Fearer's Dirty Pretty Things. *Third Text*. 20(6), 693-701.
- Hannam, K., Sheller, M. & Ury, J. (2006), 'Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings', *Motilities*, 1(1), 1-22.
- Hunter, I. (2010). Kant's regional cosmopolitanism. *Journal of the History of International Law*. 12(2), pp. 165-188.
- Ignatieff, M. (1999). 'Nationalism and Toleration' in S. Mendus (Ed.). *The Politics of Toleration*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- International Organization for Migration (2018). *Who is a migrant?* Retrieved from <https://www.iom.int/who-is-a-migrant>
- Joshi, B. & Kunwar, R.R. (2017). Sustainability in Hospitality Industry: A study of Nagarkot, Nepal. In *Proceedings of 8th International Conference on Tourism and Sustainable Development 2017*. 67-81.
- Kamuf, P. (2006). From Now on. *Epoche*. 12(2), 203-20.
- Kant, I. (2003). From "Perpetual peace". In Hodgkinson, V. & Folly, M. (Eds.). *The civil society reader*. (pp. 28-39). St. Lebanon: University Press of New England.
- Kunwar, R. R. (2017). What is Hospitality? *The Gaze Journal of Tourism and Hospitality*. 8(1), 55-115.
- Laachir, K. (2007). Hospitality and the limitations of national. In Molz, J.G. & Gibson, S. (Eds.), *Mobilizing Hospitality: the ethics of social relations in mobile world* (pp. 47-64). Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Lashley, C. (2000). Towards a theoretical understanding. In Lashley, C., & Morrison, A. (Eds.). *In Search of Hospitality Theoretical Perspectives and Debates* (pp.1-17), Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Lashley, C., Lynch, P., & Morrison, A. (Eds.). (2007). *Hospitality A Social Lens*. Amsterdam: Elsevier
- Lashley, C., Lynch, P., & Morrison, A. (Eds.). (2007). Ways of knowing hospitality. *Hospitality: A Social Lens*, 173-191. Amsterdam: Elsevier
- Lashley, C. & Morrison, A. (Eds.). (2000). *In Search of Hospitality: Theoretical Perspectives and Debates*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann
- Lugosi, P. L. (2008). Hospitality spaces, hospitable moments: consumers encounter and affective experiences in commercial settings. *Journal of Food Service*, 19, 139- 149.
- Lugosi, P. L. (2009). The production of hospitable space: commercial propositions and consumer co-creation in a bar operation. *Space and Culture*, 12(4): 396-411.
- Lynch, P., Germann, M. J., McIntosh, A., Lugosi, P., & Lashley, C. (2011). Theorizing hospitality. *Hospitality and Society*, 1(1), 3-24.

- Mair, J. Ritchie, B.W. & Walters, G. (2014). Towards a research agenda for post-disaster and post crisis recovery strategies for tourist destinations: a narrative review. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-26.
- Marshall C. & Rossman, G.B. (2006). *Designing Qualitative Research*. London: Sage Publication.
- Mazumdar, P. (2011). *Das Niemandsland der Kulturen. Über Migration, Tourismus und die Logik kultureller Nichtverständigung*. Berlin: Mattes & Seitz.
- Mikics, D. (2009). *Who Was Jacques Derrida?: An Intellectual Biography*. New Haven, London: Yale University Press.
- Milton, A.H., Rahman, M., Hussain, S., Jindal, C., Choudhury, S., Akter, S., Ferdousi, S., Mouly, T. A., Hall, J. & Eifrid, J. T, (2017). Trapped in Statelessness: Rohingya Refugees in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 14(8), 942.
- Molz, J. G., & Gibson, S. (2007). Introduction: Mobilizing and mooring hospitality In Molz, J. G. Molz & S. Gibson (Eds.), *Mobilizing Hospitality: the ethics of social relations in mobile world* (pp. 1-26). Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Molz, J.G. & Gibson, S. (Eds.). (2007). *Mobilizing Hospitality: The ethics of social relations in mobile world*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Naas, M. (2003). *Taking in the tradition: Jacques Derrida and the legacies of deconstruction*. California: Stanford University Press.
- N.a. (2000). *Of Hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle invites Jacques Derrida to respond*. Bowlby, R (Trans.). California: Stanford University Press.
- N.a. (2018). *Trump's ban on refugees from 'high risk' countries including Muslim-majority nations and North Korea is over says Homeland Security chief*. Retrieved from <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-5326999/US-lifts-ban-refugees-11-countries.html>
- O'Gorman, Kevin. (2006). Jacques Derrida's philosophy of hospitality. *Hospitality Review*. 8, 50-57.
- Onkal, G. (2013). Kant's concept of "Universal Hospitality: and neo-global conflicts against perpetual peace. *The Internatonal Journal of Social Sciences*. 12(1), 26-32.
- Ottenbacher, M., Harrington, R., & Parsa, H. G. (2009). Defining the hospitality discipline: A discussion of pedagogical and research implications. *Journal of Hospitality's Toursim Research*, 35(3), 363-383.
- Robinson, M. (2002). *Ethics, Human Rights and Globalization: Second Global Ethic Lecture*. Tubingen, Baden-Wuttemberg: The Global Ethic Foundation.

- Sawson, A. (2018). Will 2018 be the year of protectionism?: Trump alone will decide. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from <https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/03/us/politics/2018-trump-protectionism-tariffs.html>
- Sivanandan, A. (2001). 'Poverty is the New Black', *Race and Class*, 43(2), 1-5.
- Selwyn, T. (2000). Hospitality. In Smith, M. & Richards, G. (Eds.) *The Routledge Handbook of Cultural Tourism*. London: Routledge.
- Stephenson, M.L. (2013). Deciphering 'Islamic hospitality': Developments, challenges and opportunities. *Tourism Management*: 40, 155-164.
- Ury, J. (2000). *Sociology beyond Societies*. London: Routledge Books.
- Waldron, J. (2010). What is Cosmopolitan? In Brown, G. & Held, D. (Eds.). *The Cosmopolitanism Reader* (pp. 163-175). London: Polity Press.
- Westmoreland, M.W. (2008). Interruptions: Derrida and Hospitality. *KRITIKE*. 2(1), 1-10.
- Wintersteiner, W. & Wohlmuther, C. (2013). Peace sensitive tourism: How tourism can contribute to peace. In Wintersteiner, W. & Wohlmuther, C. (Eds.). (pp.31-61). *International Handbook on Tourism and Peace*. Kalgenfurt: Centre for Peace Research and Peace Education.
- Wintersteiner, W. & Wohlmuther, C. (Eds.). (2013). (pp.31-61). *International Handbook on Tourism and Peace*. Kalgenfurt: Centre for Peace Research and Peace Education.
- Yegenoglu, M. (2011). Hospitality, Rights and Migrancy. In Delanty, G. & Turner, S.P. (Eds.), *Routledge International Handbook of Contemporary Social and Political Theory* (pp. 450-459). Oxon: Routledge.
- Zlomislic, M. (2004). Conflict, tolerance and hospitality. *The Philosopher*, LXXXII: 2.