

# Beyond the Welcoming Rhetoric: Hospitality as a Principle of Care for the Displaced

Benjamin Boudou

*Department of Ethics, Law and Politics*

*Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity*

**Abstract:** The concept of hospitality has seen a strong revival in the literature on migration and among pro-migrant activists. However, its meaning, its scope, and the nature of the obligations it imposes remain contested. Open-border advocates see hospitality as a moral principle of openness that should trump nationalist arguments for closure, while nationalists tap into the home analogy and compare the state to a household welcoming migrants as guests, whose stay should accordingly be temporary and marked by gratitude. Some consider hospitality a virtue that should translate into a personal responsibility to open one's doors to others, while some politicise the concept to apply it to borders and state duties towards migrants. This paper unpacks the various literal and metaphorical meanings of the age-old concept of hospitality, and the shortcomings of its rhetorical uses. It then argues for a conception of hospitality as a principle of care towards displaced people. Hospitality alleviates ordinary obstacles that prevent a functional life in a new environment and allows for practices. It is triggered by the vulnerability created by displacement, i.e., the material, emotional and political harms resulting from the loss of a home.

## Introduction

This paper addresses the tension inherent in the revival of the concept of hospitality in migration studies.<sup>1</sup> Hospitality, as a principle or meta-

Correspondence: boudou@mmg.mpg.de



phor, is present in pro-migrant discourses and practices. Open-border advocates see in hospitality a moral principle of openness or a humane gesture beyond what the law requires. In their view, it should trump any nationalist pressure for border closure.<sup>2</sup> Hospitality is also practiced by people who wish to give a decent home to asylum seekers and refugees and to help them to circumvent the obstacles raised by the ever-changing migration policies and bureaucratic rules.<sup>3</sup> More surprisingly, the concept of hospitality is also often used by anti-migrant advocates. Nationalists depict migrants as guests who should feel grateful to be admitted and who should leave before they “abuse hospitality.”<sup>4</sup> In fact, despite its long tradition as a religious duty or as a virtue based on consideration, compassion and altruism towards strangers, hospitality is not necessarily a desirable principle or a virtuous practice. Justifying who may or may not enjoy “our” hospitality or to what extent reciprocity is expected from the guests can render the concept more equivocal than it seems. Hospitality’s home analogy conflates domestic boundaries and national borders. It also suggests a nativist picture of citizens as benevolent hosts welcoming deserving foreign guests to their property.<sup>5</sup> To mention a few examples, Boris Johnson issued a call in 2019 to “be tougher on those who abuse our hospitality,” pledging to regain control of immigration after Brexit.<sup>6</sup> Marine Le Pen in France claimed, “we are hospitable, but we decide with whom we want to be” in an interview I analyse further below. Nikki Haley, then the United States ambassador to the United Nations, did not mention hospitality *per se* but stated in 2018 that “we will remain a *generous* country, but we are also a sovereign country, with laws that decide how best to control our borders and protect our people.”<sup>7</sup>

The nationalist conception of hospitality that replaces legal duties of states with arbitrary benevolence arguably clashes with deep-seated notions of human rights and international protection. Accordingly, either this idea of hospitality should be dropped as an outdated approach to migrant protection, or it is necessary to specify what it means to make sense of its academic and activist uses. I suggest following the latter route, defining a conception of hospitality that could sidestep its paternalistic, colonial and nativist undertones. I argue that the moral conception of hospitality as applied to issues of migration and border control is indeed ambiguous. But I contend that a redefinition of hospitality could prevent us from simply abandoning the concept and make of it a valuable supplement to a human rights approach. Using the recent publication of an inventory of “gestures” and “acts of hospitality” by a group of activists and academics working in Calais, the PEROU (Exploration Pole of

Urban Resources),<sup>8</sup> I will argue that hospitality aims to alleviate ordinary obstacles that prevent a functional life in a new environment allows for home-making practices. It is triggered by the vulnerability created by a displacement, i.e., the material, emotional and political harms resulting from the loss of home.

This reconstruction of hospitality participates in the renewal of normative theories of migration, switching the focus from the moral rights of migrants against states to the more empirically grounded practices of solidarity-building between citizens and migrants and the consideration of virtues and moral sentiments as complementing political justice.<sup>9</sup> A strictly legal-political approach to displacement might indeed remain inadequate to make sense of the conceptual resources on which people draw. From arguing in favour of open borders to opening one's home (broadly understood) to displaced people, the expressive and action-guiding qualities of hospitality can prove to be helpful not only to making sense of one's own moral attitudes but also to reacting and mobilizing in situations where the harms of displacement should be alleviated.

I will first consider the various definitions and conceptualisations of hospitality to illustrate the normative divides regarding its relevance to questions relating to migration. While a Kantian revival of cosmopolitanism ("limited to conditions of universal hospitality"<sup>10</sup>) has been important, hospitality has also been considered as anachronistic or inadequate to the legal configuration of international mobility (section 1). I will next consider more closely the rhetorical and conceptual risks of mobilizing hospitality in a migration context. Current conceptions of hospitality blur the distinction between public laws and private virtues and activate a series of metaphors relative to home, hosts, guests, gifts, and gratitude that do not easily fit with the usual debates about the ethics and politics of migration (section 2). Nonetheless, the expressive and action-guiding qualities of hospitality can help make sense of the many acts of hospitality witnessed in the context of migration. Building on these acts, I reconsider the link between home and hospitality in an effort to avoid the essentialist and exclusionary trap embedded in the nationalist rhetoric. I argue that home is a network of material and immaterial things we need to anchor our identity and act autonomously; hospitality is the gift of time and space from one's home network to others who are in need and allows for an enabler of home-making practices. More generally, hospitality appears as a principle of care towards the displaced (section 3).

## Hospitality as a Contested Concept

Hospitality is a fuzzy concept. It spans from the most commonplace invitation to dinner to ethics itself (“ethics is hospitality,” argues Jacques Derrida).<sup>11</sup> It names the tourism industry<sup>12</sup> and the condition of a cosmopolitan right to visit as Kant defines it in his 1795 essay on perpetual peace.<sup>13</sup> It describes ritualized social interactions in small-scale societies<sup>14</sup> and immigration policies or humanitarian initiatives.<sup>15</sup> Hospitality has been mobilized in different disciplines, but it remains broadly defined or used in a metaphorical (and overly positive) way.

Hospitality can generally mean three things: the acts of generously welcoming foreigners (giving them space, food, time, help in general); an ethical principle of openness and benevolence; and, more commonly in public debates, a rallying cry against hostility towards migrants. It is a practice (the action of welcoming, hosting and caring for strangers at “home”) and a reason (strangers should be welcomed in the name of hospitality). It thus has a descriptive and a normative side, along with individual-private connotations (welcoming home) as well as political-public ones (migrant-friendly institutions).

Historically, hospitality as a legal-political concept has been used to balance a principle of autonomy—and later sovereignty—for political communities with a universal principle of sociability between people.<sup>16</sup> Vitoria conceptualized hospitality as a right to preach and possibly colonize based on the theological narrative of the Earth as originally given in common to humankind.<sup>17</sup> For Grotius, it was a right to access transit points, circulate and trade.<sup>18</sup> More famously, Kant suggested that hospitality as a right to visit and not to be treated as an enemy should be the condition of cosmopolitan law. A distinctive colonial genealogy of hospitality should be pointed out here. Kant scornfully argued against the authors of the natural law tradition (“Hugo Grotius, Pufendorf, Vattel and the rest”), calling them “sorry comforters”<sup>19</sup>: while discussing the rights of foreigners, universal law, and peace, they in fact were defending an imperial project and the aggressive politics of their nations or the private companies they worked for (Grotius being a case in point). Europeans argued that the soon-to-be colonized should let the colonizers enter and settle in their territory in the name of a universal duty of hospitality.<sup>20</sup> In more recent history, a rhetoric of hospitality has been reasserting the primacy of the national home and the authority of the hosts to justify the appropriation of lands by settlers, the perpetuation of postcolonial relationships, and the exclusion of migrants as newcomers.<sup>21</sup>

Seyla Benhabib has recently revived the international legal-political meaning of hospitality, while looking for its post-metaphysical justification (emancipated from the natural law tradition). Hospitality becomes synonymous with a transnational communicational ethic.<sup>22</sup> The fact of migration and the human rights of migrants render obsolete the vision of a world made up of perfectly independent and autonomous states. Benhabib thus defined hospitality either as a quasi-legal obligation to accept newcomers (i.e., to give asylum or transform a foreigner into a citizen) or a general human right to belong. She writes:

The right of hospitality is situated at the boundaries of the polity; it delimits civic space by regulating relations among members and strangers. Hence the right of hospitality occupies that space between human rights and civil rights, between the right of humanity in our person and the rights that accrue to us insofar as we are members of specific republics.<sup>23</sup>

Hospitality connects the moral, legal and political dimensions of human rights. Moral universalism, translated into an unconditional right to justification, allows foreigners and communities to negotiate and make the borders of the *demos* more just.

For some, however, hospitality appears to be anachronistic when we consider how modern states consider foreigners. Briefly put, why would we need a vague concept in a world where a system of visas, passports and residence permits have all expanded?<sup>24</sup> What does it add to the rights foreign residents enjoy, the principle of non-refoulement and refugee law? The idea of hospitality would not contribute much to the legal configuration of international mobility.

Onora O'Neill's take on hospitality is characteristic of this: "Despite the continuing resonance of the parable [of the Good Samaritan], the world in which hospitality and succour shown to lone strangers in our midst provide a model for all relations with strangers is now far away."<sup>25</sup> For O'Neill, hospitality is essentially a face-to-face relationship with a stranger who has arrived on "our" lands. Hospitality is no longer relevant because globalization makes it possible to fulfil such duties at a long distance. Responsibility now goes beyond our borders, while the moral scope of hospitality is limited. Its beneficiaries can only be close foreigners. It thus belongs to a communitarian ethic, according to which "the only context for moral relations, even for justice, is local, and duties to strangers arise only when they are nearby."<sup>26</sup>

From a sociological perspective, hospitality is a kind of social recommendation to give or lend, encompassing a gift of time (welcome,

services), protection (space), goods (gifts), or meals (food, drink). It may imply opening one's home and/or enabling home-making practices.<sup>27</sup> Its justification generally relates to a natural duty of generosity and kindness. O'Neill is right, then, to consider this superfluous or supererogatory obligation as not fitting well with modern political categories. It relates to friendly and private relationships, where love and altruism outweigh personal interests. This reading functions in the same way for hospitality as a religious virtue. As Luc Boltanski wrote regarding Christian love:

Modern political science has been established as an autonomous field on the basis of an anthropology that leaves no room for the possibility of achieving peace except through the constraint of law or force, and that virtually ignores the notions arising from the New Testament corpus [. . .]. The same can be said about economics, which, if we are to believe Schumpeter, has nothing to say about texts in which people are told they “should sell what they have and give it to the poor, or that they would lend without expecting anything (perhaps not even repayment) from it.” (Boltanski 2012, 129–130)

Secularization separates religion from other values and spheres of activity, relegating acts of charity and their soteriological benefits to the private sphere.

Moreover, the practical conditions of hospitality place it at odds with some grounding principles of liberal democracies. The peculiar relationship between a host and a guest implies many tacit rules that institute a situation of domination: the guests, while honoured, should not question the rules of the hosts who retain their power to chase the guests away whenever they see fit. Hosts are, by definition, the masters of the house, whatever the precise meaning of “house,” and solely decide who might benefit from their hospitality. They expect gratitude, as their hospitable action depends on their generosity. While there are socially sanctioned duties attached to hospitality practices, especially in traditional societies, the power asymmetry between hosts and guests inhibits dissent from the guests, status equality, and emancipation from the ascribed status of guests.<sup>28</sup>

### **The Rhetoric of Hospitality and its Discontents**

The academic literature on hospitality is divided, as is the mobilisation of the concept in the public sphere. For some, hospitality encapsulates a general duty towards migrants that can easily be fulfilled in the here and now<sup>29</sup>; for others, this concept is too moralistic or inequalitarian com-

pared, for instance, to solidarity.<sup>30</sup> I wish to go further and consider more closely the rhetorical and conceptual risks of mobilizing hospitality in a political context. Doing so blurs the distinction between public laws and private virtues and activates a series of metaphors relative to home, hosts, guests, gifts, and gratitude, that do not easily fit with the usual debates about the ethics and politics of migration.

One could argue that hospitality is merely a symbolic image or a metaphor. It provides an intuitive sense of duty, triggers familiar emotions and helps to pool together various criticisms of migration policies in the name of an ahistorical, evocative and prestigious concept.<sup>31</sup> The sense of homely intimacy that hospitality elicits participates in the construction of a general critique of the shortcomings of the state and its administration in the area of welcome and integration. Sociologists Boltanski and Thévenot called it the “domestic” critique of the “civic world.”<sup>32</sup> The critique stems from an emphasis placed on concrete and personal relationships and argues against impersonal and blind public decisions. It values the thoughtfulness of private compassion over public bureaucratic impartiality, as well as concrete acts of assistance over abstract legal protection and the inertia of institutional responses. But with the metaphor of hospitality comes a series of images that may be detrimental to the original aim of articulating a pro-migrant narrative. I have mentioned the colonial narrative’s use of the metaphor; it also involves an essentialist image of the political community. Immigration as hospitality legitimises the idea of a homogenous welcoming “home” and a well-defined “us” distinct from “them,” which “we” have the privilege to define. For example, during the 2017 French presidential election, an interview with Marine Le Pen (candidate of the far-right Front National) given on *SBS* in 2012 resurfaced in which she said to the interviewer: “I am a very tolerant and hospitable person, like you. Would you accept 12 illegal immigrants moving into your flat? You would not! On top of that, they start to remove the wallpaper! Some of them would steal your wallet and brutalize your wife. You would not accept that! Consequently, we are hospitable, but we decide with whom we want to be.”<sup>33</sup> Conflating the domestic home with the nation-state without further conceptual precautions necessarily leads to the reification and homogenisation of the political community.<sup>34</sup> Muslim migrants in Europe are regularly facing this kind of racialized and exclusionary hospitality,<sup>35</sup> and more radical versions of this rhetoric had previously largely been used as an anti-Semitic narrative. Jewish people were systematically described as undesirable guests who had overstayed their welcome and ought to leave, or worse.<sup>36</sup>

Wouldn't it be preferable, then, to abandon the wording? Its meaning might be too easily twisted and even mocked. During a session on asylum law reform in the French Parliament in 2003, a member of the communist party said: "Reading this bill, one can wonder where is the French spirit of generosity and hospitality." "Get out the tissues!" ironically replied a member of the conservative party.<sup>37</sup> We could cease talking about hospitality while still retaining the normative aim of a pro-migrant discourse. The strategy is the one we know from the literature on the ethics of migration. Whether we question the legality of the practices of border authorities, the lack of consent of those over whom they exercise this power at the borders, or the justifiability of the treatment of migrants in terms of equality, freedom, or solidarity, there is always room for specific criticism without the need for metaphors or overgeneralizations.<sup>38</sup> This type of immanent critique, careful about the discrepancy between practices and principles does not depend on a concept as ambiguous as hospitality. However, as I mentioned earlier, mobilising the notion of hospitality usually has a more radical purpose. In the French context, for example, where the term 'hospitality' has never been used to describe an industry, and where scholars build on the legacy of Jacques Derrida's influential work,<sup>39</sup> the idea of hospitality remains a radical concept. As the philosopher Balibar recently put it, hospitality is about "a recasting of international law" with a "law of hospitality, whose principle is that wanderers [. . .] can oblige the State."<sup>40</sup> The legal scholar Delmas-Marty calls for making hospitality a "legal principle regulating human mobility."<sup>41</sup> Here, hospitality is inseparable from a global normative, political and legal change.

The opposite rhetorical strategy limits the scope of hospitality to its common-sense meaning. As the growing scholarship on private housing for refugees and asylum seekers shows, hospitality may retain its relevance to describing the practices of literally opening one's door. But it cannot justify a political duty to do so. Migration policies are the responsibility of the state. As Walter Sinnott-Armstrong argues, "the fact that your government morally ought to do something does not prove that you ought to do it, even if your government fails."<sup>42</sup> Acting privately and relieving the state of its responsibility could, moreover, prevent fellow citizens from realising precisely how the state failing its duties, thus directing political outrage away from its appropriate target.

There might still be some truth in this idea that hospitality suggests a more interpersonal approach to migration ethics. Speaking of hospitality rather than justice is meaningful. While the latter is best realized

by states, international institutions or humanitarian organizations, the former commits us to more immediate and personal actions. Hospitality does generally relate to virtue ethics with a strong exemplarist component, as the many religious parables about it illustrate.<sup>43</sup> It depends on the subjective experience of the needs of others and sides with charity and beneficence: the relationship to a particular other gives meaning to the benefit provided. The compassionate impulse is the product of an encounter in the face of the ostensible distress of a ‘neighbour.’ Limiting hospitality towards migrants to this religious approach might, however, leave it outside of the scope of political justice.

How could we better define hospitality, then, if we are unsatisfied with its strictly private understanding, its religious justification, its exclusionary vision of the political community, and the proposal to abandon the concept entirely? To reply, I provide in the following section a critical analysis of the link between hospitality and home to develop a more comprehensive conception of hospitality in the context of displacement.

### **Framing a New Conception of Hospitality for the Displaced**

The recent publication of an inventory of “gestures” and “acts of hospitality” by a group of activists and academics working in Calais, the PEROU (Exploration Pole of Urban Resources), signals a new way of understanding hospitality.<sup>44</sup> It is no longer limited to a clearly defined moment of welcome to a home and for a limited period. Hospitality is deterritorialised and reterritorialised<sup>45</sup> from the traditional house to, among other things, the car that carries people across borders; the hand that cares, serves, lends, and gives; to the socket that charges a telephone; to the free Wi-Fi access; to the administrative forms filled out together; or to the table around which French lessons are given. These practices, multiplied and deterritorialised, serve a more practical meaning of hospitality. They have descriptive value, making it possible to bring together acts of hospitality that share the same aim and are directed towards individuals who share the same experience (while not necessarily sharing the same status): that of displacement. This more practical form of hospitality unveils the reasons individuals act in altruistic ways: in the name of hospitality, simple gestures of sharing resources traditionally attached to home respond to a need, alleviate ordinary obstacles that prevent a functional life in a new environment, and allow for home-making practices.

Acts of hospitality take place in a home community where there are still forms of inequality between hosts and guests, but along the line of knowledge rather than status. Those who are welcoming have epis-

temic and social privileges over those who are welcomed. They transmit intimate knowledge of administrative impediments, specific institutions and tacit social rules. Hosts are intermediaries who play the roles of interpreter and informer, while remaining willing to learn from the newcomers.<sup>46</sup> Welcoming someone home, then, does not imply forced integration into an imaginary national whole. The ‘home’ in question is not necessarily national and native. Indeed, gestures of hospitality also refer to the reception of refugees by other refugees;<sup>47</sup> the very possibility of hospitality practiced by the guests themselves, for example by offering food, creates a sense of home.<sup>48</sup> Practicing hospitality can subvert the social and political passivity usually associated with the status of ‘guests.’ Hospitality does not function in one direction only, creating an inherently unequal relationship: it becomes egalitarian and potentially emancipatory through these disseminated and reciprocal acts.

Thus, acts of hospitality are not necessarily practiced in a house, but they sustain a hospitable home. To sidestep the simplified vision of home that leads to an exclusionary definition of hospitality, I define home as dynamic territory. A territory is the “list of entities on which one depends,” i.e., the collection of entities whose maintenance and access to which are essential to our life.<sup>49</sup> It is a network of material and immaterial things we need to anchor our identity and act autonomously. Hospitality is the gift of time and space from one’s home network to others, allowing for home-making practices. It is triggered by a sense of vulnerability in a context of displacement, which is not necessarily an international phenomenon. Displacement involves specific harms, related to the loss of home. These harms are material (the destruction of, or eviction from, one’s home); emotional (the deterioration of the sense of ease, familiarity, and attachment to one’s place); and political (the impediment to safety, privacy, and autonomy).<sup>50</sup> Hence, hospitality appears as a principle of care for the displaced, aimed at mitigating these harms. It is not, as such, a legal duty. Being hospitable, like being generous or courageous, cannot be enforced. Its practice might, however, be protected by law, as shown in the recent decision of the French Constitutional Court regarding the meaning and scope of “*fraternité*” in the cases of the criminalisation of border-crossing helpers.<sup>51</sup> *Fraternité*, usually the least politicized value in comparison with *liberté* and *égalité*, has suddenly been reactivated and deparochialized as a cosmopolitan value justifying particular acts of solidarity that I would classify as hospitality practices.

Hospitality is, then, a particular form of solidarity,<sup>52</sup> specifically granting access to a home for migrants and displaced people and allow-

ing for home-making practices. And in cases where the law is insufficiently attuned to the harms done by displacement, and to the moral impulse of citizens to do something about it, hospitality might become a concrete and political practice of civil disobedience.<sup>53</sup> I have shown elsewhere how social movements and sanctuary advocates have been mobilising hospitality in precisely such a manner and how the famous French farmer Cédric Herrou has invoked “mountain hospitality” to justify his accommodation of migrants illegally crossing the border between France and Italy.<sup>54</sup>

### Conclusion

Using hospitality as a political concept to address questions relating to migration and displacement is difficult, but that should not prevent social actors or political theorists from working with it. After having identified crucial disagreements about the relevance and usefulness of hospitality in the context of migration, I have discussed the shortcomings of understanding hospitality as a grand normative principle, as literal call to open one’s doors to strangers, or as a metaphor that could essentialize or homogenise the political community and the relationships between hosts (citizens) and guests (foreigners). Finally, I have reconstructed the main features of a more comprehensive conception of hospitality as a principle of care for the displaced. Hospitality alleviates ordinary obstacles that prevent a functional life in a new environment and allows for home-making practices. It is triggered by the vulnerability created by a displacement, i.e., the material, emotional, and political harms resulting from the loss of home.

### Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity. I am grateful to Ayelet Shachar, director of the department of Ethics, Law and Politics, for her trust. I wish to thank Alex Sager and the two anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments.

## Endnotes

1. See in particular Mette Louise Berg and Elena Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, “Encountering Hospitality and Hostility,” *Migration and Society* 1, no. 1 (2018): 1–6; Luca Mavelli and Erin K. Wilson, eds., *The Refugee Crisis and Religion: Secularism, Security and Hospitality in Question* (London; New York: Rowman & Littlefield International, 2017); James A. Chamberlain, “Responsibility for Migrants: From Hospitality to Solidarity,” *Political Theory* 48, no. 1 (2020): 57–83; Matthew Gibney, “The Duties of Refugees,” in *The Political Philosophy of Refuge*, ed. David Miller and Christine Straehle (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 132–153; Gideon Baker, *Hospitality and World Politics* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013); Daniela DeBono, “Plastic Hospitality: The Empty Signifier at the EU’s Mediterranean Border,” *Migration Studies* 7, no. 3 (2019): 340–361; Dan Bulley, *Migration, Ethics and Power: Spaces of Hospitality in International Politics* (Los Angeles: SAGE, 2017); Garrett W. Brown, “The Laws of Hospitality, Asylum Seekers and Cosmopolitan Right: A Kantian Response to Jacques Derrida,” *European Journal of Political Theory* 9, no. 3 (2010): 308–327.
2. See for instance Angeliki Dimitriadi and Haris Malamidis, eds., “Hospitality in civil society: Practices during the European ‘Refugee crisis,’” Briefing paper, Novamigra (2020); Louise Knops and Eline Severs, “Self-Appointed Representatives on Facebook: The case of Belgian citizen’s platform for refugee support,” *International Journal of Communication* 13 (2019): 5617; Melissa Schnyder and Noha Shawki, *Advocating for Refugees in the European Union* (Lanham: Lexington Books, 2020), 152–153; Chandran Kukathas, “Are refugees special?,” in *Migration in political theory: The ethics of movement and membership*, eds. Sarah Fine and Lea Ypi (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 249–268.
3. Camillo Boano and Giovanna Astolfo, “Notes around Hospitality as Inhabitation: Engaging with the Politics of Care and Refugees’ Dwelling Practices in the Italian Urban Context,” *Migration and Society* 3, no. 1 (June 1, 2020): 222–232; Marjorie Gerbier-Aublanc, “Un migrant chez soi,” *Esprit*, no. 7–8 (2018): 122; Ulf Liebe et al., “From Welcome Culture to Welcome Limits? Uncovering Preference Changes over Time for Sheltering Refugees in Germany,” *PLOS ONE* 13, no. 8 (2018): 1–13; Anna Tuckett, “Strategies of Navigation: Migrant’s everyday encounters with Italian immigration bureaucracy,” *The Cambridge Journal of Anthropology* 33, no. 1 (2015): 113–128.
4. Sarah Gibson, “‘Abusing Our Hospitality’: Inhospitableness and the Politics of Deterrence,” in *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World*, eds. Jennie Germann Molz and Sarah Gibson (London: Routledge, 2007), 159–76; Gibney, “The Duties of Refugees,” 145–47.
5. Estella Carpi and H. Pınar Şenoğuz, “Refugee Hospitality in Lebanon and Turkey. On Making ‘The Other,’” *International Migration* 57, no. 2 (2019):

- 126–142; Katerina Rozakou, “The Biopolitics of Hospitality in Greece: Humanitarianism and the Management of Refugees,” *American Ethnologist* 39, no. 3 (2012): 562–577; Magali Bessone, “Le Vocabulaire de l’hospitalité est-il républicain?,” *Éthique Publique* 17, no. 1 (2015). <https://ethiquepublique.revues.org/1745>.
6. Jessica Elgot, “Boris Johnson vows push on immigration points system,” *The Guardian*, June 26, 2019. <https://www.theguardian.com/politics/2019/jun/27/boris-johnson-vows-push-on-immigration-points-system>.
  7. United States Mission to the United Nations, “Press Release: Ambassador Haley on the UN’s Criticism of U.S. immigration policies,” June 5, 2018. <https://usun.usmission.gov/press-release-ambassador-haley-on-the-uns-criticism-of-u-s-immigration-policies/>, also quoted in Luke Glanville, “Hypocritical Inhospitality: The Global Refugee Crisis in the Light of History,” *Ethics & International Affairs* 34, no. 1 (2020): 3.
  8. PEROU, *Des actes à Calais et tout autour* (Fécamp: Post Éditions, 2018).
  9. See for instance the special symposium edited by Kerri Woods and Clara Sandelind, “Solidarity with Refugees,” *Journal of Social Philosophy* 51, no. 4 (2020); Sarah Fine, “Refugees, safety, and a decent human life,” *Meeting of the Aristotelian Society* 119, no. 1 (2018): 25–52.
  10. Immanuel Kant, “Perpetual Peace: A philosophical Sketch,” in *Political Writings*, ed. Hans Siegbert Reiss, 2nd ed. (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 105–106.
  11. Jacques Derrida, *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, trans. Mark Dooley and Michael Hughes (London and New York: Routledge, 2001), 17.
  12. Conrad Lashley, ed., *The Routledge Handbook of Hospitality Studies* (London: Routledge, 2017).
  13. Kant, “Perpetual Peace.”
  14. Julian Pitt-Rivers, “The Law of Hospitality,” *HAU: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 2, no. 1 (2012): 501–517.
  15. Respectively, Donatella Di Cesare, *Resident Foreigners: A Philosophy of Migration* (Medford, MA: Polity, 2020); Didier Fassin, *Humanitarian Reason: A Moral History of the Present Times* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012).
  16. Gideon Baker, “Right of Entry or Right of Refusal? Hospitality in the Law of Nature and Nations,” *Review of International Studies* 37, no. 3 (2011): 1423–1445; Vincent Chetail, “Sovereignty and Migration in the Doctrine of the Law of Nations: An Intellectual History of Hospitality from Vitoria to Vattel,” *European Journal of International Law* 27, no. 4 (2016): 901–922; Georg Cavallar, *The Rights of Strangers: Theories of International Hospitality, the Global Community, and Political Justice since Vitoria* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2002); Benjamin Boudou, “Migration and the Duty of Hospitality: A Genealogical sketch,” *Transitions: Journal of Transient Migration* 4, no. 2 (2020): 257–274.

17. Francisco de Vitoria, "On the American Indians," in *Political Writings*, ed. Anthony Pagden and Jeremy Lawrance (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 231–292.
18. Hugo Grotius, *The Rights of War and Peace*, ed. Richard Tuck (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 2005).
19. Kant, "Perpetual Peace," 103.
20. See in particular Georg Cavallar, "Vitoria, Grotius, Pufendorf, Wolff and Vattel: Accomplices of European Colonialism and Exploitation or True Cosmopolitans?," *Journal of the History of International Law* 10, no. 2 (2008): 181–209. See also Peter Niesen, "Colonialism and Hospitality" *Politics and Ethics Review* 3, no. 1 (2016): 90–108; Glanville, "Hypocritical Inhospitality."
21. Avril Bell, "Being 'at home' in the nation: Hospitality and sovereignty in talk about immigration," *Ethnicities* 10, no. 2 (2010): 236–256; Nandita Sharma, *Home rule: National sovereignty and the separation of natives and migrants* (Durham; London: Duke University Press, 2020): 188; Mireille Rosello, *Postcolonial Hospitality: The Immigrant as Guest* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001); David Moffette and Jennifer Ridgley, "Sanctuary City Organizing in Canada: From Hospitality to Solidarity," *Migration and Society* 1, no. 1 (2018): 147–155.
22. Seyla Benhabib, *The Rights of Others: Aliens, Residents, and Citizens* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004); Seyla Benhabib, *Another Cosmopolitanism: Hospitality, Sovereignty, and Democratic Iterations* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).
23. Benhabib, *The Rights of Others*, 27; Benhabib, *Another Cosmopolitanism*, 23 and 31.
24. John Torpey, *The Invention of the Passport: Surveillance, Citizenship and the State*, Second edition, Cambridge Studies in Law and Society (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2018).
25. Onora O'Neill, *Bounds of Justice* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 186.
26. *Ibid.*, 187.
27. Robin Vandevoordt, "The Politics of Food and Hospitality: How Syrian Refugees in Belgium Create a Home in Hostile Environments," *Journal of Refugee Studies* 30, no. 4 (2017): 605–621; Derrida, *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*, 16.
28. Pitt-Rivers, "The Law of Hospitality," 512; Benjamin Boudou, *Politique de l'Hospitalité: Une Généalogie Conceptuelle* (Paris: CNRS Editions, 2017).
29. Jessica Jacobs, "Simple Hospitality Could Be the Answer to the European Migrant 'Crisis,'" *The Conversation*, August 18, 2015. <https://theconversation.com/simple-hospitality-could-be-the-answer-to-the-european-migrant-crisis-45512>.
30. Avner de-Shalit, *Cities and Immigration: Political and Moral Dilemmas in the New Era of Migration* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 59–60;

- Harald Bauder and Lorelle Juffs, “Solidarity’ in the Migration and Refugee Literature: Analysis of a Concept,” *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 46, no. 1 (2020): 46–65; Rosine Kelz, “Political Theory and Migration Concepts of Non-Sovereignty and Solidarity,” *Movements. Journal Für Kritische Migrations—Und Grenzregimeforschung* 1, no. 2 (2015): 1–18; Alain Badiou, *Migrants and Militants*, trans. Joseph Litvak (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2020); Chamberlain, “Responsibility for Migrants.”
31. Michael Walzer, “On the Role of Symbolism in Political Thought,” *Political Science Quarterly* 82, no. 2 (1967): 191–204. On prestige, as Dewey wrote, “old conceptions and convictions continue to receive theoretical assent and strong emotional attachment because of their prestige. But they have little hold and application in the ordinary affairs of life.” See John Dewey, *Logic: The Theory of Inquiry* (New York: The Athlone Press, 1938), 64.
  32. Luc Boltanski and Laurent Thévenot, *On Justification: Economies of Worth*, ed. Catherine Porter (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006).
  33. Mark Davis, “Full Interview with Marine Le Pen,” SBS, May 8, 2012. <https://www.sbs.com.au/guide/video/11822659766/Full-Interview-with-Marine-Le-Pen>.
  34. Margaret Davies, “Home and state: Reflections on metaphor and practice,” *Griffith Law Review* 23, no. 2 (2014): 153–175; Bonnie Honig, “Difference, dilemmas, and the politics of home,” *Social Research* 61, no. 3 (1994): 563–597. See more generally the critique of methodological nationalism in the study of migration in Andreas Wimmer and Nina Glick Schiller, “Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences, and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical Epistemology,” *International Migration Review* 27, no. 3 (2003): 576–610; Alex Sager, “Methodological Nationalism, Migration and Political Theory,” *Political Studies* 64, no. 1 (2014): 42–59.
  35. See in particular Erin Wilson and Luca Mavelli, “The refugee crisis and religion: Beyond conceptual and physical boundaries,” in *The Refugee Crisis and Religion: Secularism, Security and Hospitality in Question*, eds. Luca Mavelli and Erin Wilson (London and New York: Rowman & Littlefield International), 1–22; Nicholas de Genova, “The borders of ‘Europe’ and the European question,” in *The borders of “Europe”: Autonomy of migration, tactics of bordering*, ed. Nicholas de Genova (Durham, UK: Duke University Press, 2017), 1–35.
  36. See for instance Adolph Hitler, *My Struggle*, trans. James Murphy, Hurst and Blackett, 1939, 255–256: “If [the Jew] occasionally abandoned regions where he had hitherto lived he did not do it voluntarily. He did it because from time to time he was driven out by people who were tired of having their hospitality abused by such guests.”
  37. Session of June 5, 2003. <https://www.assemblee-nationale.fr/12/cr/2002-2003/20030227.asp>.
  38. For an overview of these debates, see Alex Sager, ed., *The Ethics and Politics of Immigration: Core Issues and Emerging Trends* (London: Rowman &

- Littlefield, 2016); Sarah Fine and Lea Ypi, eds., *Migration in Political Theory: The Ethics of Movement and Membership* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016).
39. Derrida and Dufourmantelle, *Of Hospitality*; Derrida, *On Cosmopolitanism and Forgiveness*; Jacques Derrida, "Hostipitality," *Angelaki* 5, no. 3 (2000): 3–18.
  40. Etienne Balibar, "Pour Un Droit International de l'hospitalité," *Le Monde*, August 17, 2018.
  41. Mireille Delmas-Marty, "Pour Une Gouvernance Mondiale Du Droit Des Migrations," *Le Monde*, April 14, 2018.
  42. Walter Sinnott-Armstrong, "It's not *my* fault: Global warming and individual moral obligations," in *Perspectives on climate change: Science, economics, politics, ethics*, eds. Walter Sinnott-Armstrong and Richard Howarth (Amsterdam: Elsevier, 2005), 287. Thanks to the anonymous referee for pointing out the reference to me.
  43. Jean-Marie Carrière, "The Refugee Experience as Existential Exile: Hospitality as a Spiritual and Political Response," in *The Refugee Crisis and Religion: Secularism, Security and Hospitality in Question*, eds. Luca Mavelli and Erin K. Wilson (London; New York: Rowman & Littlefield, 2017), 145–56. More generally, on the religious traditions of hospitality and its practices today with refugees, see Benjamin Boudou, Hans Leman and Max Scholz, "Sacred welcomes: How Religious Reasons, Structures, and Interactions Shape Refugee Advocacy and Settlement," *Migration and Society* 4 (2021): forthcoming.
  44. PEROU, *Des actes à Calais et tout autour*; Benjamin Boudou, "Pour-quoi n'accueillez-vous pas des migrants chez vous?" Définir le devoir d'hospitalité," *La Revue du MAUSS* 53 (2019): 291–307.
  45. Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*, trans. Brian Massumi (London: Continuum, 1988), 54–55.
  46. See Gerbier-Aublanc ("Un migrant chez soi," 126) who sees in the exchange of one's life stories the act of reciprocity in hospitality *par excellence*.
  47. Elena Fiddian-Qasimiyeh, "Refugees Hosting Refugees," *Forced Migration Review* 53 (2016): 25–27.
  48. Vandevoordt, "The politics of food and hospitality;" Catherine Brun, "Hospitality: Becoming 'IDPs' and 'Hosts' in protracted displacement," *Journal of Refugee Studies* 23, no. 3 (2010): 337–355; Derrida and Dufourmontelle, *Of hospitality*.
  49. Bruno Latour, "La mondialisation fait-elle un monde habitable?" *Territoires* 2040 (2010): 13.
  50. On a political approach to home and the harms caused by its loss, see Cara Nine, "The wrong of displacement: The home as extended mind," *The Journal of Political Philosophy* 26, no. 2 (2018): 240–257; Iris Marion Young, "House and Home: Feminist Variations on a Theme," in *Motherhood and Space*, eds. Sarah Hardy and Caroline Wiedmer (New York: Palgrave

Macmillan, 2005), 115–147; Jan Willem Duyvendak, *The politics of home: Belonging and nostalgia in Western Europe and United States* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Philip Cole, “Global displacement in the 21st century: towards an ethical framework,” *Journal of Global Ethics* 16, no. 2 (2020): 203–219. I have defined elsewhere hospitality as the collective obligation to relieve distress caused by crossing borders (Boudou, “Migration and the Duty of Hospitality,” 269). I believe this definition makes sense historically, but misses some key elements I present here. I thank the anonymous referees for pushing me on this point.

51. Liz Fekete, “Migrants, Borders and the Criminalisation of Solidarity in the EU,” *Race & Class* 59, no. 4 (2018): 65–83; Cecilia Vergnano, “Why Take Such a Risk? Beyond Profit: Motivations of Border-crossing Facilitators between France and Italy,” *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale* 28, no. 3 (2020): 743–758; Benjamin Boudou, “The Solidarity Offense in France: Egalité, Fraternité, Solidarité!,” *Verfassungsblog: On Matters Constitutional*, 2018. <https://verfassungsblog.de/the-solidarity-offense-in-france-egalite-fraternite-solidarite/>.
52. Solidarity implies a more collaborative, long-lasting and future-looking relationship. Iris Young defines it as “a relationship among separate and dissimilar actors who decide to stand together, for one another. [. . .] Solidarity is firm but fragile. It looks to the future because it must constantly be renewed,” in *Responsibility for Justice* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 120. In contrast with Chamberlain (“From hospitality to solidarity”), I define hospitality practices as constituting a subpart of the relationship of solidarity rather than an alternate understanding of responsibility for migrants.
53. “A politically motivated breach of law designed either to contribute directly to a change of a law or of a public policy or to express one’s protest against, and dissociation from, a law or a public policy,” Joseph Raz, *The authority of law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1979), 263.
54. Benjamin Boudou, “Hospitality in sanctuary cities,” in *The Routledge Handbook on Philosophy of the City*, eds. Sharon Meagher, Samantha Noll, Joseph S. Biehl (New York: Routledge, 2019), 279–290; Boudou, “Migration and the duty of hospitality.”