

# Extending Hospitality: Giving Space, Taking Time

MUSTAFA DIKEÇ, NIGEL CLARK,  
CLIVE BARNETT

**Abstract:**

The recent revival of the theme of hospitality in the humanities and social sciences reflects a shared concern with issues of belonging, identity and placement that arises out of the experience of globalized social life. In this context, migration—or spatial dislocation and relocation—is often equated with demands for hospitality. There is a need to engage more carefully with the ‘proximities’ that prompt acts of hospitality and inhospitality; to attend more closely to their spatial and temporal dimensions. Is the stranger or the Other primarily one who is recognisably ‘out of place’? Or is there more to being estranged than moving from one territory to another? This brings us to the question of human finitude, and to the possibility of encounters with others that do not simply only occur *in* time or space, but are themselves generative of new times and spaces.

**Keywords:** hospitality, Derrida, Levinas, otherness, gift, time, space, globalization, human finitude

As the two men pass, their eyes meet briefly, neutrally. The whites of the sweeper’s eyes are fringed with egg-yellow shading to red along the lids. For a vertiginous moment Henry feels himself bound to the other man, as though on a seesaw with him, pinned to an axis that could tip them into each other’s life.<sup>1</sup>

Against the backdrop of Britain’s largest ever anti-war protest, the protagonist of Ian McEwan’s *Saturday* brushes against the life of a stranger in the streets of central London. Aside from the symptoms of exhaustion or perhaps ill health, the novel offers us little more of the sweeper, the possibility of a mutually life-transforming encounter flickering then fading as each man proceeds on his way. We know all about Henry, white, urbane, middle class, an eminent surgeon, a contented husband and father. But it is left to the reader—assuming

## 2 Paragraph

some familiarity with the divisions of labour of the multicultural metropolis—to fill in the outlines of the street cleaner, to imagine where he may have come from, where he might be heading, why he toils while others play or go about their politics.

The Iraq war protests of 15 February 2003 in the background of this story are a reminder that many of us care about the lives of others in distant places, at least enough to take to the streets. And with mention of the war comes the memory of those trigger events, recalling that strangers in our midst are capable of impacting upon our own lives, suddenly, catastrophically. But just as momentous, McEwan seems to be saying, are the ordinary lives of others working, living, struggling amongst us. Lives that tangle with our own even as they maintain their distance: eye to eye but worlds apart. This is the contemporary world on which the term globalized sits too easily, one in which dense and far-reaching connections weave their way around blunt disjunctures and brute differentials. Globalization, we might say, is the predicament in which some of us enjoy the benefits of easy connection and extensive mobility, while others are locked in place or coerced into motion by dire economic and political pressures. It is the condition in which globe-trotting business people, aesthetes, academics, holiday-makers and medical tourists take advantage of an international ‘hospitality’ industry, while economic migrants, guest-workers, asylum seekers and refugees find themselves up against regulation and infrastructures that can be described at best as inhospitable. It is the state of a world turning on an axis that could, if we were not careful, tip us over these divides into each other’s lives.

It is in this context of globalized living that questions of how we meet and mix with ‘strangers’ have, unsurprisingly, fixed themselves firmly on the intellectual agenda. Perhaps more surprising has been the way that this engagement is being filtered through the lens of hospitality: an ancient and rather musty philosophical and theological thematic that comes to us tinged with piety and otherworldly associations. The notion of hospitality has been revitalized as a way of responding to the ‘earthbound’ signals of distress or desire that we pick up from those around us. Reshaped as an ethico-political framework for analysing the worldly realities of living amongst diverse others, it manifests itself at the heart of current debates about immigration, multiculturalism, and post-national citizenship.

Above all, it is through the later work of Jacques Derrida that hospitality has emerged as a theoretical and normative frame of contemporary analysis in the humanities and social sciences.

His later writings focus on a set of attentive, generous, and responsive ways of relating to others. Hospitality, here, stands alongside forgiveness, confession, bearing witness, gift relations, mourning, justice, friendship. In conversation with the writings of Emmanuel Levinas, Derrida explores the idea of a receptiveness to the arrival of an other which breaks through any prior assignment of roles, duties, conventions. It is a mode of address which he presents as being in a complex interplay with a more careful, contained or 'conditional' engagement — one that is acted out in the expectation that provisions offered will be met with some form of reciprocation.

What we can observe hinging on the concept of hospitality is a pattern of translation that characterizes the current relationship between Continental philosophy and empirical research agendas in the humanities and social sciences. The imperative to show that philosophical discourse matters, the need to respond to the 'demand for politics' that has so often been made upon deconstruction and related traditions plays itself out in the search for some figure through which philosophical discussions of 'the Other' can be rendered concrete and contemporaneous. Taking globalization as a reference point, the Other comes to be personified as the foreigner, the migrant, the refugee: real people whose lives have been rendered precarious by specific social processes or documented events. At the same time, the strong ethical and political turn in Derrida's later work has contributed to the idea in the social sciences and humanities that ethics is primarily concerned with the relationship between responsibility and otherness, and to the related idea that this primordial ethical relationship trumps relations of law and legality. In this reading, 'unconditional' hospitality takes on the aura of a moral imperative; the name for the exposure to the demands of the Other that comes to serve as an ideal against which the worldly politics of territorial inclusions and exclusions can be evaluated and judged.

For many critical social thinkers, then, Derrida's distinction between unconditional and conditional hospitality seems to resonate with their own intense suspicion of boundaries. The demands he seems to make of a 'pure' hospitality are seen to converse closely with a political project that would have those of us 'here', in zones of relative privilege, take greater responsibility for others 'elsewhere' whose life chances are being adversely affected by our own action or inaction. Such imperatives appear to map comfortably onto an ongoing concern with identity: an inheritance from poststructuralist theory that targets firm demarcations of both selves and social formations. By this

#### 4 Paragraph

logic, any practice which seeks to secure identities or shore up boundaries is charged with an intolerance toward the difference that is always already amongst us, thus inevitably contributing to the manufacture of estrangement. A version of hospitality which oversteps all barriers and regulations, by contrast, is seen to side with fluid, impure identities, allying itself with the desired ‘deterritorialization’ of responsibility.

In this way, the shared concern of the humanities and social sciences with questions of hospitality that arise out of globalized social life has a resounding geographical tenor. Whether explicitly or implicitly, encounters between self and other tend to be conceived of in spatial tropes of openness and closure, inclusion and exclusion, border patrolling and boundary crossing, while the ‘stranger’ who might be welcomed or turned away is most often characterized as one who has been spatially mobilized or displaced. This conversation between the humanities and the social sciences is one that appeals to us, as do the predicaments of the ordinary people it responds to. But for all its obvious attractions, we want to suggest that the translation of hospitality into a principle of critical analysis is neither unproblematic nor necessary, and that the figures which it addresses are by no means straightforward recipients of this attention.

We propose that there is a need to engage with the ‘proximities’ that provoke acts of hospitality and inhospitality more carefully—to attend more closely to their spatial and temporal dimensions and to the relational qualities of identity, community and placement. Where exactly are we—spatially and temporally—when we encounter strangers? Is the stranger simply or primarily one who is recognizably ‘out of place’ or is there more to being estranged than being dislocated or relocated? The papers in this collection address in various ways the temporalization and spatialization of hospitality, as well as engaging with a range of historical and geographical contexts out of which the issue of liaising with strangers has emerged. They are drawn from a workshop convened in March 2006 in Hertfordshire, in South East England by the Open University Geography Department that brought together philosophers, anthropologists, scholars from cultural and literary studies, sociologists and geographers. The intention was both to make the most of the moment of convergence between philosophical and critical social scientific concerns, and to wonder what more we might make of it if we were to further interrogate our terms and assumptions: to extend hospitality, but also to be attentive to its limits, or rather the limits to which it already attends.

*Delineating Hospitality*

When the issue of how to be a good host or a good guest arises, the question of limits is never far from the scene. ‘After three days, fish and guests stink’ wrote sixteenth-century English dramatist John Lyly. For the Bedouin Arabs a stranger is to be hosted for three days and a third before even asking his name (Shryock, this issue). Or as Julius Nyerere, former President of Tanzania, put it: ‘Those of us who talk about the African way of life (. . .) might do well to remember the Swahili saying: (. . .) “Treat your guest as a guest for two days; on the third day give him a hoe!”’<sup>2</sup> For all that the issue of hospitality is so bound up with the question of otherness or difference it is remarkable just how much similarity there is in these sentiments. Calling to us across centuries and continents, they resound with the kind of tensions most of us would recognize from our own long weekends of fold-out beds and shared meals.

Already fraught, the dilemma of honouring guests and respecting hosts whilst also maintaining a safe distance is further complicated when journeys take us into culturally or geographically unfamiliar terrain. This challenge intensified with the increases in mobility of early modernity — a world increasingly parcelled into sovereign states, in response to which Immanuel Kant penned the famous *Toward Perpetual Peace*.<sup>3</sup> Overarching (or, rather overlooking) various regional traditions of engaging with strangers, Kant proposed the institution of a single globally recognized set of laws of hospitality which would guarantee the security of those moving across nation-state borders. In doing so he sought to overcome some of the limits imposed by the division of the earth’s surface by national boundaries, but in a way which bolstered the importance of sovereign states by acknowledging them as the pre-eminent unit through which practices of hosting and visiting were to be organized.

For all that it is utopian in scope and aspiration, Kant’s vision has come to be viewed as paradigmatic of ‘conditional’ hospitality. The tolerance with which strangers are to be treated, it has been noted, is reserved for those who front up with their papers in order; visiting rights apply for a restricted time, in a space administered by a state, as part of a reciprocal agreement with other states.<sup>4</sup> If the intervening centuries have proved receptive to many of the details of Kant’s ideal, they have also provided plentiful reasons to doubt his general faith in the state as the requisite vehicle for enacting the virtues of hospitality. Over the course of what Levinas described as ‘century of unutterable

6 Paragraph

suffering'<sup>5</sup> sovereign states came to be singled out by critical voices as the progenitors of the very intolerance Kant would have had them prevent: the project of unifying and strengthening the state being charged with the production of whole categories of officially unrecognized or unwanted people. As Hannah Arendt was to observe of the post-war European landscape: those without papers, without citizenship, without a home had emerged as 'the most symptomatic group in contemporary politics'.

Confronted by similar horizons of inhospitality as Arendt, Emmanuel Levinas chose to return wholeheartedly, hyperbolically to an aspect of engaging with strangers that seemed to have been sidelined by the earlier imaginings of Kant. Though hospitality is not a term he often uses, it is, as Derrida attests, the pervasive theme of his work (*AEL*, 21). His is 'a hospitality that does not belong to the order of the political, or at least not simply to a political space' (*AEL*, 49). What Derrida meant by this is that Levinas takes as his point of departure not the procedures that are set up to regulate and direct the movement of bodies through the social world, but what he saw as the originary impulse that precipitates any association with others. Before we have checked to see if each others' papers are in order, before there is any calculation of what might be gained or lost by entering into a relationship, there must first be an opening, a desire for contact and togetherness. What Levinas reclaims and makes central, then, is the very receptiveness of one person to an Other, that capacity an embodied self has to take its inspiration from what it perceives as the needs of an other self, an other body. His hospitality, we might say, proceeds from that *vertiginous moment* when one feels *bound to the other*—the moment that makes possible the ever risky tipping together of unfamiliar lives.

At the heart of Levinas's work is this idea that our openness to the 'advent' of the Other carries with it the potential to nudge us out of our familiar patterns and pathways, thus offering the very possibility of a future undetermined by present conditions. Taken up, revised, extended by Derrida, this sense of the Other as a figure of futurity is what constitutes the 'unconditionality' of a welcome, an act of friendship or giving or forgiving or any generous gesture which goes forth without immediate consideration of how it will come back to the one who performs it. Not to seek a return on one's investment in an other, in this way, breaks out of the closed circuit of what can be known, worked out, weighed up in advance. It is how the realm of the 'perhaps' comes about. 'What history, what time, and what space

are determined by such a “without return”?’ Derrida asks (*GT*, 100).<sup>6</sup> But he poses this question knowing full well that our world is even more fully circumscribed by state boundaries and regulations than was Kant’s spherical earth, more replete than ever with Arendt’s stateless or undocumented migrants. This is our question, too, the issue of what to make of the worldly demands of ‘guests’ who may have damned good reasons for staying more than a few days, who might already have taken up the hoe and taken over the gardening, or who may simply not want our attention at all.

### *Figuring Otherness*

The question of the stranger is closely tied up with how ‘otherness’ is perceived and theorized. In much recent critical thought, the concept of otherness depends on running together two distinct understandings of the concept of the Other in contemporary philosophy and theory. In the first, the Other is understood to be the abjected effect of a ‘power’ which works through exclusion, hierarchy, and projection. In the second, the Other is a figure for human finitude. The former sense of otherness is a basic concept in critical theory. It arises out of a critique of ‘essentialist’ understandings of identity that present identity as natural, stable, or freestanding. In contrast, anti-essentialist understandings consider identities to be malleable and constructed—through codes, practices, and performances. According to this line of critique, identity is constructed in relation to other identities, in a simultaneous process of identification with and differentiation from selected ‘others’. If identity is relational, then identity-formation works primarily by excluding some element that takes on the role of the Other, setting up an image of non-identity that confirms the identity of the self or the collective community. But in turn, this excluded element always threatens to undermine the appearance of self-contained identity that it supports.

This understanding presents identity-formation as a process of controlling boundaries and maintaining the territorial integrity of communities or selves. Identity-formation therefore entails a calculus of the rights and wrongs of different modes of relating. The assumption is that harm arises primarily through inadequate recognition of the reciprocal and co-constitutive characteristics of subjectivity. This failure is often presented in terms of spatial exclusion or separation. It is argued that the identity/difference, self/other relation is organized

8 *Paragraph*

in fundamentally spatialized ways — around tropes of here and there, inclusion and exclusion, presence and absence, in-place and out-of-place.

And it is in this regard that the theme of hospitality is easily integrated into the normative frame of critical cultural theory. The affirmative sense of the Other as a figure of finitude developed in the work of Levinas, Derrida, Irigaray, Kofman and others is easily presented as a kind of ideal against which to judge the messy actualities of reality. It is certainly possible to read Levinas's account of the 'indissoluble but heterogeneous' relationship between unconditional hospitality and conditional hospitality in this way. Levinas's account of the priority of ethics over justice at first glance invites an interpretation of hospitality in terms of political abjection, by its designation of space as the sphere of operations of the state. In Levinas's work there is no clear association between the encounter with the other and pre-existing forms of territorial sovereignty or exclusiveness. Indeed he is emphatic that the 'proximity' to the other is not about a simple spatial contiguity. The unconditionality of the reception of the other, that is, is not a simple spatial opening or inclusiveness. But Levinas does go on to suggest that the entry of a third party demands a different kind of justice: more calculating and deliberative — hence conditional. And this, he suggests, is played out in a spatial arena, by which he means the realm of sovereign and territorial divisions.<sup>7</sup> In this way, there are clear indicators of associating conditionality with institutions of spatial demarcation and belonging. What we might make of this inheritance is open to question. But we do need to be careful about simply associating a moral spacing of deterritorialized responsibility with the unconditional welcome of the stranger, or figuring the embrace of otherness with spatial inclusion and the disavowal of otherness with exclusion.

This becomes clearer if we look more closely at Derrida's reading of hospitality. Here, the elaboration of the relationship between conditionality and unconditionality does not devolve into a simplistic ideal of unconditional hospitality against which the worldly operations of states, sovereignty, and law can always be found wanting. Derrida's reading of Levinas confirms the sense in which hospitality cannot properly be conditioned: pure hospitality consists of a welcome extended without condition to an unanticipated guest. Levinas would seem to imply that attributing an identity to the guest contravenes the imperative of unconditional welcome. But Derrida suggests that this imperative calls forth another, equally compelling one.<sup>8</sup> Hospitality

requires that a guest be greeted, addressed, named as a singular individual. It requires that the guest be welcomed as a Somebody, not as a serialized nobody. This is not a distinction between an ethical imperative of unconditional welcome and a political imperative to impose conditions that is born out of the empirical necessity to institutionalize rules and regulations. The imperative to extend unconditional welcome without question and the imperative to impose conditionality on any such welcome by attributing identity are of equal weight within the ethical drama of hospitality.<sup>9</sup>

Derrida's reading of the laws of hospitality, therefore, undoes the lingering sense of logical and normative priority of pure ethical responsibility that pervades Levinas's work. Derrida's reading of Levinas revolves around the classically supplementary motif of the parasite. From a deconstructive perspective, hospitality is necessarily 'contaminated' by law, system, and calculation, and this contamination is emphatically not understood as an unfortunate loss of ideal purity. Therefore, ethics-as-hospitality is always already 'becoming political'. To put it another way, the border between the ethical and the political is not taken to be an indivisible limit (*OH*, 99). Any idealized purity of unconditional hospitality is undone by the need for this imperative to become effective. And this is not merely a practical or empirical necessity: it is itself an ethical imperative (*OH*, 79, 81). The 'corruption' of the unconditional law of hospitality is therefore not an accident. It is the opening up of an equally compelling imperative to develop effective, conditional laws of hospitality 'without which *The* unconditional law of hospitality would be in danger of remaining a pious and irresponsible desire, without form and without potency, and of even being perverted at any moment'.<sup>10</sup>

This reading affirms that the condition of possibility of responsible action lies in divisibility of borders and finitude of boundaries, but not their erasure.<sup>11</sup> Thresholds are the very scenes for the drama of responsiveness, hospitality, and responsibility. The deconstruction of hospitality, in this way, has ambivalent implications for how we judge received discourses of sovereignty and autonomy.<sup>12</sup> Hospitality is a virtue that depends upon retaining a semblance of both sovereignty and autonomy, not their negation. Derrida (*AEL*, 32–3) insists that the absence of law, politics, or the state would threaten to unleash what he sees as the double possibility of violence that inheres in the asymmetry of the Levinasian ethical relation. Firstly, the affirmation of absolute asymmetry harbours within it the exposure of the self to harm. It implies that the ethical subject should be indifferent to

its own happiness or well-being. Secondly, to actually honour this singular responsibility to a concrete Other would threaten injustice by ignoring the claims of other subjects. It is here—in the internal possibility of a violence and an injustice that remains undiminished within the apparently non-violent purity of the asymmetrical ethical relation—that Derrida critically addresses the Levinasian inheritance.

### *Gifts of Time and Space*

Reading Derrida in this way, unconditionality is not so much an ideal, set against conditionality, as it is a moment within the event of hospitality. Likewise, the setting up and maintaining of boundaries and thresholds is not opposed to the breaching of barriers and the prising open of new pathways. Rather, each implies or calls forth the other. But what is the nature of these limits and their breaching? While the call for concrete figures of the Other summons equally concrete figures of the limit—the state border, the closed door, the detention centre—we should recall Levinas's insistence that 'proximity' to the Other is not constituted by simple spatial contiguity. Likewise Derrida's assertion that hospitality does not simply belong to a political space does not deny that such discernible (and often literally) concretized boundary markers have significance. But it does suggest that something more is at stake. For Levinas, as we have seen, proximity entails contact and intimacy, but it is a mode of relating propelled by the experience of a profound difference between Self and Other. This disjuncture between Self and Other is a kind of non-relation that engenders a new relation—the very opening of the future—which Levinas refers to as 'asynchrony'. In this way, as the temporal image of asynchrony implies, Self and Other cannot ever be fully present to each other; there a gulf which no mere opening of a border post or a door or a pair of embracing arms can ever fully overcome.

So for Levinas and Derrida, the stranger, the Other, the one who inspires an offer of hospitality may well have come from afar, but what matters most is not their traversal of physical distance (which might well be monitored, tracked or anticipated). It is not their current position in space, at least not in such a way that we can localize or pin down. Nor is it necessarily any form of difference that fits into the recognisable and pre-existing categories that we can read off as indicative that someone comes from someplace else. Thus Derrida speaks of 'an other who is yet stranger than that, whose strangeness

does not limit itself to strangeness with reference to language, family or citizenship'.<sup>13</sup> By this he refers to an 'otherness' or 'strangeness' that is not an object at all, but is the temporal modality in which we encounter the unknown: it is the very event of our exposure and susceptibility to 'what is absolutely surprising' (*OH*, 76).

It is this sense of the unforeseeability of the Other—the idea of a 'visitation' rather than an 'invitation'—that constitutes hospitality as a temporization: not just an event that takes place *in* time, but one that actually generates or *gives* time. 'I do not define the other by the future, but the future by the other' writes Levinas.<sup>14</sup> 'Time' is what the arrival of the other opens up. It is what is given in the process of welcoming the other. Attending to the temporization of hospitality brings us back to the question of the appropriate time-span of a sojourn, and the circumstances under which these limits might be overlooked, exceeded, or forgotten. It brings us to the issue of hospitality as a moment or an instant, but also to the extended temporality of patience, postponing and deferring.<sup>15</sup> More than this, it returns us to the question of the limits of life itself, to the experience of human finitude. For as Derrida reminds us, amidst all the attention to the negotiation of territorial boundaries which Kant put centre stage and which intensifying globalization has kept on the agenda, what is also always with us are the borders, thresholds, and turning points of ordinary embodied existence. And these are no less significant than the more concrete figures of mobility and transition. With regard to the story or the property of 'one's own life', Derrida announces, 'the border (*finis*) of this property would be more essential, more originary, and more proper than those of any other territory in the world' (*Ap*, 3).

Hospitality turns on a vital receptivity to the needs of an Other, but so too are these needs bound up with the constitutive openness and vulnerability of the living body. Illness, destitution, death of loved ones, unexpected pregnancy, love or desire beyond the bounds of communal acceptability, these are all predicaments that 'befall us', exceeding our knowledge and preparedness, carrying with them the risk of a radical de-worlding.<sup>16</sup> They are all forms of estrangement from our own self identity and from the relationships that sustain us: events that disturb our being at home with ourselves, which at the same time remind those around us of the tenuousness of their own 'home' life.<sup>17</sup>

There are more than enough estrangements that can be visited upon an embodied self, then, without one ever needing to mobilize this body across the earth's surface. In returning us to questions of human finitude, such eventualities draw us more deeply into

the temporization of otherness. But does this necessarily entail a corresponding restriction in the possibilities we attribute to the spatialization of otherness? Need we follow Levinas in addressing the enigma of the other in terms of open and giving temporalities while consigning space to the dominion of the known, the calculable, the conditional? Or is there more to the spacing of hospitality than the division of surfaces and volumes, and the parcelling out of the world into variously inclusive or exclusive territories?

Derrida already gestures towards a conception of space not simply as a pre-existing terrain within or upon which operations take place, but as a manifestation of relations which is more in keeping with Levinas's view of time prised open through the encounter with otherness. If one who arrives in our world genuinely takes us by surprise, rather than checking in by lawful and orderly means, then they do more than simply cross an existing boundary. 'Such an *arrivant* affects the very experience of the threshold, whose possibility he brings to light' (*Ap*, 33). The limits of our bodies, our dwellings, our communities become concrete, in this way, through the advent of an other who pushes against or passes over them. Such limits are not merely impediments to freedom of movement or full inclusion. They are also part of the supporting framework that enables us to respond effectively; the means by which a degree of reorientation can be offered to the one whose 'world' has unravelled. In the words of Alphonso Lingis:

You ask of my hands the diagram of the operations your hands are trying to perform, and ask the assistance of my forces lest yours be wanting. But you ask first for terrestrial support. The fatigue, the vertigo, the homelessness in your body appeal for support from my earthbound body, which has the sense of this terrain to give.<sup>18</sup>

If we think of space not only in terms of positioning or movement, but as the relations that give us our bearings, our grounding, our self-identity, then there is indeed a terrain *which is given*. Or as we might say, every act of hospitality gives space, just as it gives time. Inseparably so, for without at least a modicum of structural integrity and direction, an open future promises only an endless drift, unmoored and tossed around by the elements. And without the wild swerve which is the gift of the other, there would only be a single, unwavering line which would scarcely be a future at all.

We should be wary of over-emphatically reclaiming a hospitality excited by human finitude. The geopolitically-uneven distribution of

human vulnerability is too glaring to ignore, too messed up with other dimensions of frailty and susceptibility to be untangled. There are endless ways in which the projections, restrictions, and exclusions that too often characterize territorialized politics can cut into the perishable medium of living bodies, just as there are ways in which the fidelity of a warm welcome can help firm the resolve to speak back to power.

The figures of human finitude—the vulnerable, the destitute, those whose flesh and organs fail them—and the figures of political abjection—the exiled, the undocumented, those seeking refuge—rub shoulders in the following articles. So too do the invited guests, the pleasure-seeking travellers, the traders in search of good return cross paths with others who journey furtively, under duress, or without clear destination. Space appears both as the terrain upon which walls, gateways or paths are inscribed, and as the tracery of relations from which diagrams, structures and thresholds materialize. Time makes itself felt both as the localizable historical context or measurable duration of events, and as the futurity which irrupts out of unforeseeable encounters or impossibly virtuous gestures. Not only do these stories wend their way through different geographical and historical locations, they also, in suggestive ways, navigate between different scalar levels. They move between the earth in its totality and the patterning of nation-states, communities and households, delving down to the inter-corporeality of bodies, organs, and even micro-organisms.

### *Acknowledgements*

We would like to thank the Geography Department of the Open University, Milton Keynes, UK, for funding ‘Giving Space, Taking Time: A Workshop on Hospitality and Generosity’ which took place at the Ashridge Conference Centre, Berkhamstead, Hertfordshire on 22–23 March 2006. We would also like to express our gratitude to the authors in this collection and to all the workshop participants, especially Doreen Massey and Joanna Zylińska, for their contribution to the discussion and development of these papers.

### NOTES

- 1 Ian McEwan, *Saturday* (London: Vintage, 2006), 74.
- 2 Julius K. Nyerere, ‘Ujamaa — The Basis of African Socialism’, in *I am Because We Are: Readings in Black Philosophy*, edited by Frederick L. Hord and Jonathan Scott Lee (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1995), 68.

14 *Paragraph*

- 3 Immanuel Kant, 'Toward Perpetual Peace' in *The Cambridge Edition of the Works of Immanuel Kant: Practical Philosophy*, translated and edited by Mary J. Gregor (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 311–51.
- 4 Jacques Derrida, *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*, translated by Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), hereafter *AEL*.
- 5 Emmanuel Levinas, *Entre Nous*, translated by Michael B. Smith and Barbara Harshav (London: Continuum, 2006).
- 6 Jacques Derrida, *Given Time: 1. Counterfeit Money*, translated by Peggy Kamuf (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), hereafter *GT*, 100.
- 7 Emmanuel Levinas, *Otherwise Than Being or Beyond Essence*, translated by Alphonso Lingis (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1998), 81–2.
- 8 Jacques Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, translated by Rachel Bowlby (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000) hereafter *OH*.
- 9 Michael Naas, *Taking on the Tradition: Derrida and the Legacies of Deconstruction* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2002).
- 10 Jacques Derrida, *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, translated by Mark Dooley and Michael Hughes (London: Routledge, 2001), 22–3.
- 11 Jacques Derrida, *Aporias*, translated by Thomas Dutoit (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1993), hereafter *Ap*.
- 12 On this topic, see Jacques Derrida, *Rogues: Two Essays on Reason*, translated by Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005).
- 13 Jacques Derrida, 'Hostipitalité' in *Pera Peras Poros: atelier interdisciplinaire avec et autour de Jacques Derrida*, edited by Ferda Keskin and Öney Sözer (Istanbul: YKY, 1999), 17–44, 27.
- 14 Emmanuel Levinas, *Time and the Other*, translated by Richard A. Cohen (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1987), 82.
- 15 Clive Barnett, 'Ways of Relating: Hospitality and the Acknowledgement of Otherness', *Progress in Human Geography* 29:1 (2005), 5–21.
- 16 Nigel Clark, 'Living through the Tsunami: Vulnerability and Generosity on a Volatile Earth', *Geoforum* 38:6 (2007), 1127–39.
- 17 Mustafa Dikeç, 'Pera Peras Poros: Longings for Spaces of Hospitality', *Theory, Culture & Society* 19:1–2 (2002), 227–47.
- 18 Alphonso Lingis, *Foreign Bodies* (New York: Routledge, 1994), 219.