



## Research article

## An affective and posthumanist cosmopolitan hospitality

Jaume Guia <sup>a,b,\*</sup>, Tazim Jamal <sup>c</sup><sup>a</sup> Dept. of Business Administration, Faculty of Tourism, University of Girona, Girona, Catalonia, Spain<sup>b</sup> School of Tourism and Hospitality, College of Business and Economics, University of Johannesburg, South Africa<sup>c</sup> Dept. of Recreation, Park and Tourism, Texas A&M University, College Station, TX, USA

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received 8 December 2020

Received in revised form 7 March 2023

Accepted 22 March 2023

Available online xxxx

Associate editor: Kellee Caton

## Keywords:

Hospitality

Cosmopolitanism

Affect

Posthumanism

Gilles Deleuze

## ABSTRACT

This conceptual article argues for revisiting and revising notions of cosmopolitanism and hospitality in light of the increasingly interconnected local to global domain of contemporary tourism. We briefly trace the contributions of three key philosophers in modernity who have contributed to the theorization of these concepts: Immanuel Kant, Emmanuel Levinas, and Jacques Derrida. We then note some shortcomings of these approaches for contemporary problems of cosmopolitan hospitality and argue that Gilles Deleuze's conceptual apparatus enables a novel theorization to overcome the limitations of current approaches. This is done through an affective and posthumanist perspective, which introduces a new ethical understanding of cosmopolitan hospitality, dissolves problematic conceptual dualisms, and puts the focus on relational encounters, beyond spatiality.

© 2023 The Author(s). Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

## Introduction

Tourism's relation to international mobility and its global scope, and to relational encounters, makes it a fertile ground for theorizing on both *cosmopolitanism* and *hospitality*. In tourism studies, the concept of *cosmopolitanism* has been widely explored in recent decades. It has been framed as the capacity of individuals to cross cultural and national borders through physical space to which a layer of cultural awareness or consumerist entitlement was added. While early strands of tourism research explored cosmopolitanism as a sort of cultural literacy and social exchange whereby the ethnocentrism, stereotyping and cultural arrogance of many forms of tourism could be eschewed (Johnson, 2014; Swain, 2009), a more recent critical stream of research has condemned the highly consumerist cosmopolitanism of currently dominant commodified Western culture in tourism under neoliberal globalization (e.g., Butcher, 2018; Molz, 2011a; Salazar, 2010; Shepherd & Salazar, 2017), and calls for a moral turn (Caton, 2012; Cooke, Grimwood, & Caton, 2016) where ethics and justice can play a more prominent role (Boluk & Carnicelli, 2019).

On the concept of *hospitality* much of the research has focused on commercial hospitality and on the managerial and organizational practices of the hospitality industry (e.g., Clarke & Chen, 2009; cf. Lashley, 2016). Tourism's hospitality has been described as the capacity of individuals to welcome strangers in relational encounters, to create welcoming spaces for these others, and to make them feel cared for; where layers of monetary exchange are added to social exchange, and where hospitality is seen more predominantly as commercial than social and cultural. However, perceiving the hospitality's host–guest relationship uniquely through the commercial lens narrows it to the relationship between a provider and a consumer of the hospitality, where the focus is on technical knowledge. Against this dominant approach, a critical stream of research on hospitality has materialized

\* Corresponding author at: Dept. of Business Administration, Faculty of Tourism, University of Girona, Girona, Catalonia, Spain.

E-mail addresses: [jaume.guia@udg.edu](mailto:jaume.guia@udg.edu) (J. Guia), [tjamal@tamu.edu](mailto:tjamal@tamu.edu) (T. Jamal).

over the years, focusing, among other things, on the interaction between hospitality and society in the context of global travelers (Bell, 2009; Molz & Gibson, 2007b); on acts of welcoming in relational encounters (Grit, 2014; Höckert, 2018; Lynch, 2017); on spatialities of care and connection towards the stranger that would take tourism towards more just futures socially and ecologically (Grimwood, 2015); and on the affective and embodied experience of visitors in touristic places (Gibson, 2010; Veijola, 2014). Hence, while mainstream research focuses on the consumerist and market version of hospitality, there is an alternative stream where hospitality's host–guest relationships are perceived as relational encounters in a socio-cultural setting, and which calls for critical analysis, social responsibility, and a moral turn (Höckert, 2018).

Yet, despite the vital role that hospitality plays in tourism, and the role tourism plays in cosmopolitanism, the philosophical underpinnings of most research on cosmopolitanism and hospitality remain often unacknowledged. Furthermore, how hospitality and cosmopolitanism relate to each other is yet surprisingly unexplored and poorly conceptualized. The aim of this paper is to elucidate the intertwining of cosmopolitanism and hospitality, to critically analyze current theorizations of cosmopolitanism and hospitality, and provide a new theoretical and philosophical foundation that overcomes the limitations of current frameworks within the critical strand of research on these concepts. Following Deleuze, our article proposes an affective and posthumanist approach that emphasizes affect, and calls forth a situated ethics of cosmopolitan hospitality that affirms the more-than-human and blurs entrenched conceptual dualisms. A promising new avenue towards a cosmopolitan hospitality for a more globally just tourism emerges here.

In what follows, the way to this conceptualization arrives, first, through a brief journey of the work of Immanuel Kant, Emmanuel Levinas, and Jacques Derrida, three philosophers who are recognized in tourism studies for their key philosophical contributions to cosmopolitanism and hospitality. This is then followed by a brief description of the main calls made by tourism researchers for novel theorizations in the fields of hospitality and cosmopolitanism. In the subsequent section, a Deleuzian affective and posthumanist approach is presented, making evident its capacity to overcome the limitations found in Kant, Levinas, and Derrida's approaches. The final section offers some concluding points and calls for the adoption of an *affective* and *posthumanist* conception of *cosmopolitan hospitality* in tourism *pedagogy* and *praxis*.

### Philosophical underpinnings of cosmopolitanism and hospitality

In this section we introduce the way in which Kant, Levinas, and Derrida theorize on the concepts of cosmopolitanism and hospitality.

**Immanuel Kant** is one of the most influential moral and political philosophers, and within his moral philosophy he firmly situates an approach to institutional cosmopolitanism and a global approach to hospitality. He grappled with his concern about a cosmopolitan right and the need for a more universal hospitality in various philosophical writings, ranging from his early essay *Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim* (Kant, 1784/2007) to his popular essay *Toward Perpetual Peace* (Kant, 1795/2006), where Kant advances his political cosmopolitanism to enable perpetual peace in the world by States working together. At this point he is especially concerned about injustice, in the form of human rights violations, being perpetrated by colonialism and imperialism, and he is searching for more just institutional structures within and between States to enable perpetual peace. Kant (1795/2006) introduces a novel category of public right to address this, a cosmopolitan right to *hospitality*, i.e., the right to present oneself and initiate contact with a foreign individual or State without being treated with hostility or violence. It is “a natural right” that Kant situates “in the original common possession of the surface of the Earth and the fact that originally no one has more of a right to be at a given place on Earth than anyone else” (p. 358). However, this right is limited by the fact that, ultimately “[i]t is the right of the visited party to deny visitors entry into its territory, as long as this can be done without causing their death” (p. 358).

Meckstroth (2018) notes, too, that it is a right ultimately restricted to only those who are capable of rationality and autonomy. In other words, it is a human-centered right, steeped in a humanistic approach. Furthermore, Gani (2017) points out that the rationale of this Kantian right to cosmopolitanism is drawn from a Eurocentric anthropological and geographical reading of the person and the world, which makes it an imperfect and unenforceable moral guide for a practical cosmopolitanism. Yet the international management of human migration still largely follows this Kantian doctrine, which supports on one hand the cosmopolitical rights of people to move and expect hospitality, something akin to a safe access to the other's ‘home’, while at the same time privileging the rights of sovereign States to defend their territorial security against human mobility, that is, to deny hospitality if they wish (Franke, 2019).

Although Kant's conceptions of cosmopolitanism and hospitality have been highly influential in framing the United Nations doctrine on human rights, they are no longer constitutive of the promise of world peace and global justice today. Over time, the heydays of colonialism and the inception and spread of market neoliberalism have largely ‘liberalized’ this notion of cosmopolitanism into an exclusive practice of liberal modern subjects who call themselves cosmopolitans and assume they have the right to do exactly as they please in their travels. This autonomous, rational, liberal, and dominative subject has taken a central place during the 20th century on the world stage of neoliberal globalization and mass (over!)tourism, where the visited ‘other’, the different human being, is objectified, dominated, totalized, and reduced to conform to the concept by which she is known (e.g., minority Afro-Colombian Palenquera women exoticized, stereotyped, and reduced to colorful fruit sellers under the tourist gaze; Camargo, 2019). This touristic cosmopolitanism is utterly consumerist, where hospitality has been largely commodified, turned into simply something we buy, a consumer good and the prerogative of tourists. By contrast, the sovereign States of these same liberal modern subjects, when acting as hosts of other less prosperous travelers, like refugees and asylum seekers,

revert to the most restrictive interpretation form of Kantian hospitality: hospitality as a matter of national policy. Meanwhile tourists keep freely flooding countries where unwelcome political, economic, and climate refugees are produced.

Summing up, Kant's main concern is about the right to cosmopolitan mobility through international space, for which hospitality as safe or welcoming entry to foreigners is required. A hospitable cosmopolitanism helps to discourage war and facilitates peace by restricting the use of violence by States to deny entry to visitors and by instituting the right of cosmopolitanism as a universal human right. Rather than a relational hospitality, however, Kant's is eminently spatial and modernist, grounded on an ontology of pre-constituted rational and autonomous beings where rational cognition and morality override affect and emotions. A rational idea of humanity as a universal ideal and an end in itself is thus reified. This helps to identify those closer to the ideal from those far away from it, thus hierarchizing the moral value of its members, and producing a categorized ontology based on binary thinking. As a result, the more-than-human is precluded in Kant's cosmopolitan hospitality.

**Emmanuel Levinas** addresses hospitality in his writings on ethics. He does it in an opposite direction than Kant, by calling for a return to the sources of humanness, to what happens when people meet face to face. Hospitality is for Levinas the ethical responsibility one has for the well-being of the other: "the otherness of the Other is given in responsibility" (Barad, 2007, p. 391), beyond the color of their skin, nationality, gender, or any other categorical identification.

In Levinas, the face of the other suggests, first, "the irreducible uniqueness of the other person, ultimately resistant to comprehension, representation, categorization and containment in a conceptual framework" (Jordaan, 2009, p. 95). Hospitality towards the Other, no matter how incomprehensible or different the Other might be, is a fully committed responsibility that can never be discharged, what Levinas identifies as infinite responsibility.

Therefore, in Levinasian ethics, a relational hospitality can be seen as implicitly operating in a cosmopolitan context where people are open to difference, and do not consider their hometown and their home values superior to anyone else's. That would be indeed a non-ethnocentric and cosmopolitanized other to whom a radical hospitality is being extended. However, this is not the case for two reasons. Firstly, Levinas' "infinite responsibility for the other refers only to the interpersonal relation between one self and one other" (p. 97). The same responsibility to the 'third' (e.g., others in the group, community) cannot be simultaneously maintained and ultimately must be taken care of by a 'national' justice system, thus reintroducing in his scheme traces of the Kantian approach. Secondly, Levinas' overidentification of Europe as the cultural choice center of spiritual relevance for his ethics, retains an ethnocentric vision that dilutes the seemingly liberating and anti-colonial power of his arguments. Levinasian hospitality as infinite responsibility to one other only (an ethical obligation), and this Eurocentric restriction of responsibility may pull "against a more just global order cosmopolitans so desperately seek" (Jordaan, 2009, p. 99). This is especially problematic as hospitality in Levinasian ethics, while cosmopolitan in the sense of being inclusive of any "other" human being anywhere, cannot speak to group or societal level responsibilities.

Another important objection is about whether the meeting with the other in Levinas' work is a true engagement with otherness, or merely a meeting with a form of familiar difference. Badiou (2001) argues that even if Levinas clearly engages in a critique of liberal humanism, the face of the other always resembles us too much for the hypothesis of an originary exposure to alterity (otherness or difference) to be necessarily true. To overcome this limitation Barad's reading of Levinas establishes that otherness is created when relational exclusions and inclusions are made: "[e]thics is therefore not about right response to a radically exterior/ized other, but about responsibility and accountability for the lively relationalities of becoming of which we are a part" (Barad, 2007, p. 393). Following from this, Barad (2007) asserts that "if responsibility is not a commitment that a subject chooses but rather an incarnate relation that precedes the intentionality of consciousness, [...] we cannot ignore [...] the more-than-human as well as the human" (p. 394). Although more recent academic discussions acknowledge the value Levinas' work has for thinking about ethics and relationality beyond human beings (e.g., Calarco, 2019), which sets the stage for a posthumanist approach to ethics, this is an avenue Levinas stopped short of taking. The strong singularity of the other in Levinas' face-to-face ethics "remains bound by humanism, and is restricted to singular, non-political encounters" (Bunch, 2014, p. 2).

All things considered, Levinas' main concern is about the ethics of relations with strangers, for which a dissolution of spatial thresholds is requisite—towards a universal or cosmopolitan hospitality for ethical being. Rather than a spatial hospitality Levinas' is eminently relational, a universal ethics/hospitality, a welcoming of and caring for the stranger. Levinas' prescriptions are grounded on ethics as ontology, from which ethical individuality emerges, and where ethical affect comes before cognition. However, Levinas' ethics is only effectively applicable to dyadic encounters and is fundamentally a humanist ethics, even though it could inspire future extensions towards the more-than-human.

As for individuality, Levinas provides an ontological reformulation of the Kantian subject and a radical re-structuring of Kantian modes of thinking, beyond totalization (categorization), *logos* (reason), and the egocentrism of the modern subject (see Levinas, 1969, 1985). According to Bunch (2010, p. 132) "Levinas interrupts the totalizing tendency of Kantian logic by shifting the emphasis from identity to alterity and subverts Kant's assertion that ethical relations are based on the fact that we share a common moral law". Levinas emphasized the pre-eminence of ethical affect over cognition, a radical openness and responsibility towards otherness (Höckert, 2018), whose radical alterity arises not out of universal moral considerations grounded in the Kantian approach to cosmopolitanism, but in a pre-subjective relationality that hints at an *affective* conception of being, which if taken further could translate into an *affective hospitality*, as Ryder (2015) puts it. In this way, Levinas' pre-subjective and non-representational relationality paves the way forward to explore novel *affective* perspectives for cosmopolitan hospitality.

**Jacques Derrida** is the philosopher who has been most referred to by tourism scholars within the critical research streams on cosmopolitanism and hospitality. He takes a deconstructionist approach to Kantian cosmopolitanism and hospitality (Derrida, 2000), while significantly relying on Levinas' hospitality ethics for that purpose. On one hand, following Kant, Derrida makes it clear that "hospitality is possible only insofar as we acknowledge the necessity of the one offering hospitality as having a

home, being at-home" (Franke, 2019, p. 8). On the other hand, taking from Levinas, the unconditionality of hospitality requires individuals to "accept the duties of host to whoever should present themselves as guest" (Franke, 2019, p. 7). Derrida starts with these two disparate approaches and, from their dialectic, extracts a new synthesis, a synthetic framework for thinking about the ethics of social relations in a mobile world (Molz & Gibson, 2007a).

Derrida's is an attempt to make Kantian cosmopolitanism more hospitable and more ethical, but as Barnett (2005) observes, the hospitality that Derrida synthesizes is *still restricted* to an ethical condition at the moment of a guest crossing a threshold or border, like in Kant, that of the sovereign space of a pre-determined host. It is therefore restricted to a condition of temporal interpersonal and ethical encounter at the 'gate' rather than to a matter of spatial justice, as a complete critique, or deconstruction that the Kantian approach would require. Once the guest enters the host's home, the disruption of 'host' and 'guest' as stable, sovereign identities and the deconstruction of the sovereign mastery of the host are dissolved (Derrida, 2000). Both host and guest may seek different ways to assert their sovereignty, but neither of them can effectively do so without finishing the originary hospitable relation. How is hospitality exercised to manage one's home? What subjects or identities are enabled when 'host' and 'guest' are displaced? All this, Derrida's approach does not cover.

Moreover, the political ethics of hospitality developed by Derrida is not only temporal but also fundamentally spatial as it is confined to relations over a pre-established space. Altogether, Derrida's conception of hospitality "accentuates the contention that 'we' are at-home and 'you' are not, or it sustains the point that 'you' are at-home but in 'our' home" (Bulley, 2015, p. 15). This was noted by Dikeç (2002), for whom Derridean "[h]ospitality is about opening without abolishing the boundaries of the host's home" (p. 299), and by Yegenoglu (2003), for whom hospitality, as a respectful and tolerant multiculturalism, "implies the conditional welcoming of the guest within the prescribed limits of the law and implies a reassertion of mastery over the home and national space" (p. 16). Derrida and those who follow his path neglect to follow the deconstruction of hospitality itself more broadly, "and, if one were to do so, the ethical and political invigorations recommended by Derrida must be found far less revolutionary than one might hope" (Franke, 2019, p. 6). Derrida's approach remains insufficient to inform a cosmopolitan hospitality that encompasses de-spatialized or on-the-move local and global others.

Therefore, if we were to deconstruct the spatiality of cosmopolitanism and hospitality, which Derrida does not, the supposedly emplaced host and the supposedly displaced guest would encounter each other as equals who are on the move (Franke, 2019):

Any people who claim to be at-home within a territory and, as a result, burdened with the law of hospitality and, as Derrida argues, faced with the ethical and political dilemmas of hospitality can never point to a home that exists in any objective sense, either atemporally or temporally. The descriptions of such territories and what inheres to them properly, as society, are generated from the circulation of stories and cultural interpretations: they are established in the building and maintaining of structures, and they require ongoing efforts to assert boundaries and the presence of a people with authority over the land and the boundaries that give it outline. To be at-home is always to make home, to occupy home, to justify one's relation to the space of home, and to actively claim one's right to continue to make home (p. 11).

In a nutshell, Derrida's main concern is, like Kant, about the right to cosmopolitan mobility through international space. However, he sees the Kantian 'legal' form of hospitality as being too restrictive, with too much left to the discretionary interests and protections of the host State, and he sees in Levinas an ethical force that could draw Kantian hospitality away from its fundamental legality and rationality. To overcome this limitation, Derrida prescribes ethics as a 'political immunization' of the host with the hope of a more just hospitality: a political ethics, ethics politicized, or negotiated, a revitalised hospitality that has been inspirational for many critical scholars in tourism. The Kantian approach is made this way more ethical and the Levinasian more 'practical', but like in Kant, rather than a relational hospitality, Derrida's remains eminently spatial and temporal. It is only at the moment of crossing the threshold when relationality gain salience, but once the threshold is crossed, the hospitality's home-away spatial dualism keeps returning strongly. Deconstruction reaches only halfway.

In Derrida, affect and cognition play against each other differentially, where neither dominates or determines the other: Derrida's is a divided self. His differential ontology is fit for deconstruction, Derrida's philosophical trademark, that seeks to expose, and then subvert the binary oppositions that uphold the dominant Kantian way of thinking. This he does by taking the pre-constituted host and guest binary at the moment of crossing a threshold and showing how the binary gets destabilized once the guest is inside. However, this home-away binary is not dissolved but keeps resurfacing, as renovated 'identity politics' about a home. The spatial dualism is not deconstructed nor dissolved. Therefore, we must attempt to approach hospitality in ways that reach past Kant and Derrida, and that stop sustaining the dualisms of place versus movement, home and away, dwelling and travelling. Moreover, even though it has been acknowledged that Derrida's work has been critical of humanism, and that his later work on the human-animal distinction and power relations between humans and animals are a fertile ground for the construction of a posthumanist philosophy (Allender, 2013), Derrida's approach to hospitality is fundamentally a humanist political ethics, with no references to the more-than-human.

### **Critique of the theoretical foundations of hospitality and cosmopolitanism in tourism studies**

Four main sources of critique of the theoretical foundations of hospitality and cosmopolitanism in tourism have been found in the literature. The first important explicit critique on both hospitality and cosmopolitanism is made in the book *Mobilizing Hospitality: The Ethics of Social Relations in a Mobile World* (Molz & Gibson, 2007b), in which the authors provide a lucid account

of the dominant Kantian, Levinasian, and Derridean philosophical bases of most critical tourism studies' research. In the book, the editors point out some of the limitations of these theoretical approaches, concluding, along with Derrida, that Levinasian absolute hospitality is not possible, because "in welcoming the foreigner unconditionally, the host must relinquish the mastery of his or her home which is the condition of being able to offer hospitality in the first place" (p. 5). They also emphasize the underlying problematic of well-established dualisms like travelling vs dwelling, and host vs guest. Host and guest are not innocent terms, noted McNaughton (2006), and according to Molz and Gibson (2007a) one must question: "Who gets to be a host, and under what conditions? Who gets to move between these categories?" (p. 8). Their critique reveals the need for new theorizations around the *ethics of cosmopolitan hospitality*, and about problematic *conceptual binaries* in hospitality and cosmopolitanism research.

A second critique, this time regarding hospitality, is found in the inaugural issue of the journal *Hospitality & Society* (Lynch et al., 2011), in which the Kantian, Levinasian, and Derridean theoretical underpinnings of most current critical research in hospitality are acknowledged, and an open call for novel theorizations is made. In his more recent work Lynch (2017) focuses on the micro-interactions of hospitality, what he calls hospitality life politics. He expresses his concern for the high level of self-interest found in his empirical research on hospitality encounters and calls for further theorization on ethical relations, as well as for the critique of the pervasiveness of self-centered positions in the negotiation of hospitality. He also notes the promise that new *ethical views of hospitality* may have, while also hinting at, through his emphasis on micro-interactions, the promise of new *affective perspectives to hospitality*.

A third major critique of the theoretical foundations of hospitality is found in the book *Disruptive Tourism and its Untidy Guests: Alternative Ontologies for Future Hospitalities* (Veijola et al., 2014). This is the first serious attempt to explore novel theorizations of hospitality in tourism studies. Here, the authors explore, experiment with, and set the scene for alternative and novel ontological frameworks for a more precise and exhaustive understanding of hospitality in tourism. Particularly, the book begins to probe into the works of post-structuralist thinkers like Grosz, Irigaray, Nancy, Serres, Spivak, Levinas, Derrida, Guattari, and Deleuze, among others. To varying degrees, all these thinkers represent relational, affective, and posthumanist approaches in the social sciences, which are used in the book (Veijola et al., 2014) to disturb conventional tourism and hospitality concerns, and explore novel and different practices and kinds of ethical responsibility to ourselves, one another, and our environments. The authors acknowledge emergent and potential alternative social and spatial forms of hospitality and conviviality, which may replace the current totalizing forms and sites of tourism (e.g., hotel rooms, all-inclusive resorts, museums, some guided tours). This way, the book succeeds to go beyond "scholarly and industry-based approaches to controlling how guests and hosts 'should' experience, develop and maintain" those totalizing forms and sites (Ormond, 2015, p. 263).

Molz (2014) draws from Grosz and others to explore 'the clearing as a requisite for camping' as a metaphor of the 'complex violences of creativity, exclusion and entitlement' (p. 22) that the transferring of our habits onto other spaces and peoples produce, if we do not instead adapt with them. Veijola et al. (2014) refers to Irigaray, Nancy, and others, and shares lessons from non-human others about ethics as hospitality and being-with. Höckert (2014) draws from Levinas to advocates an alternative hospitality which relies on unlearning of our privilege and develop openness for co-learning. Finally, drawing from Deleuze, Grit (2014) studies spaces of hospitality in which host and guest construct their own unanticipated routes of exploration instead of being constrained by a pre-defined and totalizing touristic space. Altogether, in these explorations we observe an open and compelling invitation to further theorize with novel ethical and ontological frameworks that stop perpetuating the privileges of some over others in tourism and hospitality. It is about new ethical frameworks to situate more just hospitalities and hinder the totalizing drive of most current practices; about the promise of affective approaches to these purposes; about the artificiality of conceptual binaries or dualisms, e.g., host vs guest. And it is about the large neglect of posthumanist concerns in the research and understanding of cosmopolitan hospitality.

The fourth and last critique we found it in the camp of cosmopolitanism. It refers to the limitations of dominant approaches, which are not able to effectively overcome the ongoing difficulties of people to develop abilities to understand each other and create more equitable lives across differences. It also refers to the difficulty of current approaches to embrace the ontological multipolarity of globalization and concomitant need to overcome the still dominant Eurocentric conceptions of cosmopolitanism; and to their still heavy reliance on normative (totalizing) approaches to ethics. Attempts to transcend these may be found in Swain's (2009) work when she goes beyond the traditional approaches to cosmopolitanism research in tourism, by exploring how cosmopolitanisms are experienced, embodied, situated, performed and imagined by tourists, and where she argues for the value that feminist analysis could bring to develop peoples' abilities to understand each other and create more equitable lives.

Pieterse's (2006) accounts of emancipatory cosmopolitanism, and Calhoun's (2008) elaboration of connective cosmopolitanism, are also significant references here. In Pieterse's words about her emancipatory cosmopolitanism: "[t]he options are to go with Plato to NATO, carried by frequent travelers; to go normative and abstract and risk the standardization of dissent; or alternatively, to reckon with the real cosmopolitanism of history and accept pockmarks" (Pieterse, 2006, pp. 1255–1256), referring respectively to liberal, Kantian, and affective perspectives. As noted by Nandy (1989), universalistic normative claims can be an expression of unreflective ethnocentrism, ethnocentrism in disguise, or a plain disciplinary regime, as in the dominance of human rights discourse which produces the 'standardization of dissent'. Moreover, a 'historical' cosmopolitanism relies on a cult of necessity, origins, and linear causation, rather than stressing the irreducible contingency of becoming: pockmarks as unhistorical elements and non-representational affects. And as Calhoun (2008) states in his own advocacy for a connective cosmopolitanism, there is nothing wrong with employing a logic of universal equivalence, such as that of Kantian ethics, "[b]ut this is one-sided and needs to be complemented by a cosmopolitanism oriented to the connections that link people to each other in several scales of solidarity" (p. 111). A call for a major focus on relational and affective approaches is thus observed in this camp, as well

as for novel ethical frameworks to overturn the privileges of the powerful tourism cosmopolitans and deter the totalizing drive of currently dominant conceptions and practices in tourism.

These four critiques specifically call for new theorizations that support affective and posthumanist approaches to hospitality, those precisely neglected in varying degrees by Kant, Levinas, and Derrida (see Table 1). If we are to advance a critical and more just conception of cosmopolitan hospitality, we need to find an approach which is relationally affective and ethically situated and embodied, rather than generalized, objectified, rationalized, and totalizing—and which extends to the more-than-human while dissolving conceptual binaries. This we contend can be found if we follow Gilles Deleuze's theoretical work, as discussed below.

**Gilles Deleuze: an affective and posthumanist approach to cosmopolitan hospitality**

In Deleuze's philosophical texts there is no explicit mention made of the word hospitality nor is cosmopolitanism given much attention by this contemporary philosopher. No wonder references to Deleuze in the literatures on hospitality and cosmopolitanism in tourism studies are negligible. However, in his philosophy (Deleuze, 1983, 1988, 1990a, 1990b, 1994, 2000, 2003; Deleuze & Guattari, 1987) we can find theoretical solutions for the limitations found above in current approaches to cosmopolitanism and hospitality in tourism research. In what follows we introduce our Deleuzian conceptualization of cosmopolitan hospitality and elaborate on how Deleuze overcomes the limitations of the Kantian, Levinasian, and Derridean frameworks with his reliance on affect and a situated ethics, and his enactment of posthumanism and related dissolution of other categorical binaries, e.g., home-away, and host-guest—the two key conceptual areas where we argued above that current frameworks are limited.

Deleuze enables a synthesis of the Kantian and Levinasian approaches to hospitality that is opposite to that carried out by Derrida. The Derridean political ethics of hospitality will be transformed by the use of Deleuzian thinking into an ethical politics. Moreover, the fact that Deleuze's hospitality, like Levinas', is primarily relational, averts the temporal and spatial limitations that Derrida's hospitality has, when a threshold has to be crossed.

*A Deleuzian conceptualization of cosmopolitan hospitality*

To account for Deleuze's position on hospitality we must rely on his unorthodox conception of friendship (Deleuze, 1983) which, according to Goh (2007), refers to “another form of relation, a new understanding of relation” (p. 220), whereby present notions like friends or friendship come to be revealed as anachronistic misnomers. Goh coins the neologism post-friendship to refer to this Deleuzian new form of relation that replaces or reconceptualizes ‘friendship.’ According to Deleuze (2003), individuals have their subjective point of view of the world, but the simple fact that others, in their anonymity, may have an unknown different point of view, can destabilize, and put into question the world as seen by the former. Due to this uncertainty, in encounters

**Table 1**  
Theoretical limitations of the Kantian, Levinasian and Derridean approaches to hospitality, affect and posthumanism.

THEORETICAL LIMITATIONS	KANT	LEVINAS	DERRIDA	Some tourism researchers calling for further and novel theorization
<b>AFFECTIVE APPROACH</b>  SIGNIFICANCE OF AFFECT	Unaccounted for	Limited to ethical pre-individual and relational affect	Limited to the moment of crossing the border, and to ethical relational affect	Lynch (2017), Pyyhtinen (2014) Grit (2014) Swain (2009) Pieterse (2006) Calhoun (2008)
RELATED ETHICS	Unaccounted for (Politics)	Universal ethics of care Restricted to dyadic encounters – Problem of the Third	Universal ethics of care Restricted to dyadic encounters, and to the moment of crossing the border	Molz & Gibson (2007); Lynch et al. (2011) Molz (2014) Hockert (2014)
<b>POSHUMANIST APPROACH</b>  POST-ANTHROPOCENTRISM	Unaccounted for	Only sets the stage but does not follow	Only sets the stage but does not follow	Veijola (2014)
POST-DUALIST THINKING	Unaccounted for	Accounted for albeit not developed	Accounted for to dissolve and deconstruct relational binaries (host and guest) – Stops short and the home-away binary remains	Molz & Gibson (2007) Grit (2014) Dikeç (2002) Yegenoglu (2003)

with anonymous others, the others may be seen as potentially contentious, untrustful. Deleuze calls one example of this type of individuals 'mediocre individuals', those who cannot bear that others have an unknown inner life. Mediocre individuals look for the security of a friend, but friendship is only sought for egoistic purposes. Here, friendship is a relation through which individuals make use of each other to embellish their view of the world and reinforce their mediocrity as individuals. According to Goh (2006, p. 231), "it is here that friendship becomes instrumental, where it is useful only to fulfill a lack in oneself". If we translate these Deleuzian arguments to the context of hospitality, we can understand the many forms of host-guest relations that are ultimately either untrustful or instrumental and formed to make use of each other.

For Deleuze (2003), the mediocre individual has not learned yet to embrace and affirm the unknown and unknowable inner world of others including friends, guests, and hosts. The mediocre one is always seeking to bring the other into "reciprocities, communications, communions" (p. 93). She cannot not know the friend, or the encountered other; she has a terrible will to knowledge; she cannot let him or her just be or become; she has not learned to accept, or regard with respect, the mute existence of the friend, guest, host, or any other next to her. She does not know how to relate 'hospitably', that is, to regard others without desiring to penetrate their inner world and possess it. Ultimately, in 'friendship' there must always be traces of 'mistrust' within the very intimacy of relations, an assertion of the fundamental truth of living in a world in which relational certainty is impossible (Deleuze, 2000; Derrida, 1997).

Let us remind ourselves here of the prominence that rational modernist individuals have against other individuals which are made subaltern, and the additional fact that with the spread of liberalism these rational individuals have grown to possess and claim their rights to free mobility. Disregarding the original focus on duties of Kantian cosmopolitan hospitality, these individuals resonate well with the Deleuzian definition of the mediocre self, whose subjectivity contributes and perpetuates unjust and inhospitable worlds. Against this, Deleuze (2003) introduces the idea of *team subjectivity*, for those who have learned to relate hospitably with different others. In contrast to the mediocre self, this team subjectivity is that of a relational and nomadic self, a somehow fragmented self that is dissolved with each encounter, such that becoming takes ontological status.

This way, the focus of cosmopolitan hospitality is finally shifted away from the rights of the privileged over the subaltern, as in Kant and his liberal interpretations. It also is not a continuous "negotiation" or "compromise" as in Derrida, where hosts are always involved in an incessant negotiation between the law of unconditional hospitality, which ordains a welcome to the newcomer beyond any conditions, and that of the laws of hospitality which, through the determination of rights and duties, defy the law of unconditional hospitality. Deleuze's focus is instead put on an ongoing mutual transformation that necessarily dissolves the oppositional binary of host and guest and blurs the borders between their positions in encounters, without excluding the more-than-human, as we will see further below. For Deleuze (2003), friendship (and thus hospitality) remains possible, but only when a team subjectivity, as Deleuze put it, has replaced the mediocre individual.

Deleuze can put this relational dimension of hospitality in conversation with cosmopolitanism's spatially. This way, the concepts of home and away in spatial accounts of hospitality, as framed in Kant, and also in Derrida's approach, take a very different shape in Deleuze. For Deleuze and Guattari (1987) the concept of home, or 'community', is nothing but a contingent and temporary stabilization of an always already underlying 'nomadicity'. The Deleuzoguattarian concept of community, and thus of home, does not relate to that of the Greek *logos* or *polis*, a striated (regulated) and fixed space. Rather, it resembles the Greek *nomos*, a smooth (open) space. Interpreting Deleuze and Guattari, Sellars (2007) describes these types of spaces as follows:

"A distribution according to *logos* is a distribution in which that which is distributed is divided up; the distribution of parcels of land to different sedentary farmers, for instance. Such a distribution requires a *logos* in the form of a judgement or a principle; it is a proportional determination. A distribution according to *nomos*, in contrast, is a distribution in which this relationship is reversed. Rather than individuals dividing up a territory and distributing it to themselves, instead individuals distribute themselves across an open and undivided territory; nomadic shepherds scattered across an undivided plain" (p. 33).

Therefore, the Deleuzian conception of cosmopolitanism is utterly *nomadic*, and could perhaps be best described as a *cosmonomadism*, instead. In this regard, Deleuze's cosmopolitans are "the experimental people, who have left behind the striated spaces of State-communities" (Goh, 2006, p. 223). They "affirm and exercise the freedom to come together or break away into other trajectories" (Goh, 2006, p. 223). It is about a global community which shares an ethical demand to the political; a community that transcends the us and them, us as good, them as bad, and therefore, a community without exclusion. Following Goh (2006, p. 225), the architecture of the *nomos*, the smooth space characteristic of the nomadic distribution, is an architecture of "moving bridges" that are "always constructing towards a future community" (as against the "bunker architecture" of the *polis*). It is an undefined architecture, an "architecture-in-progress". It is in this way that Deleuze succeeds in also dissolving the oppositional binaries of traveler and dweller, home and away, which Derrida could not convincingly deconstruct in his account of hospitality. More properly, Deleuze's cosmopolitan hospitality becomes a cosmonomadic co-hospitality, a nomadic and mutual hospitality (Irigaray, 2013).

### **Affect and ethics: towards a (situated) ethical politics of cosmopolitan hospitality**

Deleuze's conception of affect, like Levinas', is pre-subjective and non-representational, but goes far beyond the latter's, thus offering new theoretical ground for an extended *affective* perspective of cosmopolitan hospitality.

In Deleuze (1988, 1990a, 1994), affect is extended from being a mere pre-subjective ethical force (as in Levinas) to heterogeneous bundles of *affective forces* and capacities through which something new is actually produced, and where affects and productions “act and react in complex relationships and assemblages” (Guia & Jamal, 2020, p. 3). Deleuzian affect is generative, rhizomatic, and virtual, and must be found not in individuals but in assemblages, i.e., affective spaces and atmospheres in and from which situated instances of hospitality actualize (Reckwitz, 2012). Action is regarded through embodied and embedded capacities and environmental affordances, rather than in terms of interactional individual determinations. Affects, for Deleuze, are not emotions, nor personal feelings, but intensive forces impelling individual ways of existence in specific places. In fact, Deleuze (1988, 1990a, 1994) defines *affect* as an individual capacity to act and to be acted upon, i.e., what it can do and what it can undergo. Affect is thus the ability of bodies to form and transform assemblages with other bodies and be formed and transformed in and by them. Deleuzian affect is primarily political and has a stronger resemblance to power, where the power to affect and be affected “varies considerably due to the different capabilities that bodies have during their lifetime, and also due to the relationships a given body enters into: some will increase the given body’s capacities, and some diminish it” (Kristensen, 2016, p. 17).

Hence, an affective characterization of Deleuzian cosmopolitan hospitality makes it a practice that only comes about within particular and self-transforming assemblages (Grit, 2014; Ryder, 2015). This will let tourists, as well as tourism operators and regulators, communities, and educators alike, ascertain the specific assemblages within which hospitality materializes or is impeded—in other words, the particular assemblages and forces through which individual instances of hospitality are established, disseminated, continued, or disturbed (Sinha, 2018). It is the entanglement of affective forces, in their co-determination, “which hints at the inventiveness of hospitality that comes to mean and feel differently to different people and settings” (Zembylas, 2020, p. 42). As put by Ruitenberg (2015, p. 70), hospitality “can only be invented anew each time in a particular context, with a particular host and a particular guest”. It is in this way that affect becomes the basis of a radically situated ethics for cosmopolitan hospitality.

The resulting ethical responsibility becomes a (situated) *response-ability* (Haraway, 2008), a capacity for becoming-other before the other. Deleuzian ethics is not moralistic in the sense of consisting of binding and stable rules that judge actions and intentions in the light of universal values, as in Kant. Nor it is a universal humanist pre-subjective and infinite responsibility for the other, as in Levinas. Ethical worth is judged without universal values, by means of situated criteria about whether the capacities to affect and be affected in assemblages that respect and seek heterogeneity increase or decrease. It is an affirmative ethics, one of ‘willing’ whatever occurs inasmuch as it occurs, even when what occurs is ‘unwelcome’. It is not fatalism, though, but rather an ethics of overturning the negative, without resignation or resentment; an *amor fati*, where we have to feel worthy of what happens to us and if this is ‘negative’, rework it in the direction of positive relations (Braidotti, 2013, 2019; Deleuze, 1983). In other words, the ‘worthiness’ of an event – that which ethically should compels us to engage with it, must not be its intrinsic or explicit value according to given standards of moral or political evaluation, but rather the extent to which it contributes to conditions of becoming. It resonates with a cosmopolitan hospitality which, instead of being based on the feeling of an essentialist, pre-determined and universal sense of humanity, is based on the idea that “the other feels at home in the world [only as far as the one] does justice to the other as a [‘different’] equal in the world” (Hallemeier, 2013, p. 154).

It is precisely this relationship between hospitality and affectivity that renders hospitality a complex interaction of ethics and politics (Bulley, 2015). In Table 2, we can observe how in Kant, the political is both the substance of hospitality and its condition

**Table 2**  
The substance and quality of hospitality (ethics/politics) in the different philosophical approaches to cosmopolitan hospitality.

		SUBSTANCE OF HOSPITALITY	
		POLITICAL	ETHICAL
CONDITION OR QUALITY OF HOSPITALITY	POLITICAL	<p><b>KANT</b></p> <p>COSMOPOLITAN HOSPITALITY AS POLITICAL</p>	<p><b>DERRIDA</b></p> <p>COSMOPOLITAN HOSPITALITY AS POLITICAL ETHICAL</p>
	ETHICAL	<p><b>DELEUZE</b></p> <p>COSMOPOLITAN HOSPITALITY AS ETHICAL POLITICAL</p>	<p><b>LEVINAS</b></p> <p>COSMOPOLITAN HOSPITALITY AS ETHICAL</p>



or quality, a political politics, or simply and uniquely a politics. In Levinas it is the ethical that is both the substance and its condition or quality, an ethical ethics. In the Derridean approach, the underlying Levinasian ethical substance of hospitality is made qualitatively political, i.e., a political ethics of hospitality. Deleuze, on the contrary, makes the Kantian political substance of hospitality qualitatively ethical, thus establishing an *ethical politics of hospitality*.

### **Posthumanism: the more-than human and the dissolution of oppositional binaries for a more just cosmopolitan hospitality**

Deleuze (1990b) affirms that matter is already sense-making, thus laying a much more solid ground for a posthumanist approach to hospitality than the limited and insufficient grounds provided by Levinas and Derrida. Deleuze's philosophy is in this sense overtly posthumanist (Guia, 2021; Guia & Jamal, 2020). Philosophical posthumanism must be understood as both a post-anthropocentrism and a post-dualism (Ferrando, 2019): decentering the human in relation to the non-human is the main concern of post-anthropocentrism, while understanding human experience in pluralistic, rather than in generalized and universalized terms and strict, rigid, and absolute categories, particularly when they lead to hierarchical relations, is the concern of post-dualism.

Deleuze's is a philosophy where knowledge is always partial, embodied, and embedded, and in no case do humans have an exclusive right to it. A Deleuzian situated and affirmative ethics involves meeting others with political response-ability and without domination, whether they are human or non-human beings (Braidotti, 2013, 2019). A posthumanist hospitality becomes truly post-anthropocentric. It is an ethics where one "shares an affective relation with any other entity as part of a multiplicity, a collective that crosses the boundaries between human and animal" (Bunch, 2014, p. 16), an affective assemblage, space, atmosphere of humans and the more-than-human together and in motion, a becoming that "pulls beings together, one to the other, under conditions of sheer alterity without binding them under conditions of sameness" (p. 16).

The concept 'more-than-human' gains relevance here, as it was established as a counterpoint to the culture vs nature oppositional binary and refers to the worlds of the different beings co-dwelling on Earth, involving but surpassing human societies. Usually, the more-than-human emphasizes complex multi-species entanglements, frictions, and arrangements of co-vulnerability and reciprocity experienced in modern-day places of tension across species and beings. Moving from humanism to posthumanism along these lines enables us to contrapose hegemonic human exceptionalism.

With the dissolution of the culture-nature dualism in post-anthropocentric approaches, the domain of cosmopolitan hospitality is extended to more-than-human entities (from soil and trees to animals or water, making them actors and agents in their own right with legitimate claims to justice). It brings the more-than-human world into the purview of justice, which is needed if we are to make visible the ecological effects of humanism that would otherwise remain invisible. It provides theoretical shelter to recent claims for a more just hospitality, one that would not only include other disfavored humans, but also animals, and even the inanimate (Leep, 2018). It also affirms intrinsic and Indigenous values through a relational and situated ethics that forms the basis for a just tourism in the Anthropocene (Jamal, 2019; Viken et al., 2021) and caters for new perspectives on posthumanist cosmopolitanism in times of climate crisis. For instance, framing travel generated forms of carbon emissions as all-powerful 'guests' could be explored if hospitality was extended and made posthumanist. These and other related concerns with non-human actants have started to be theorized in tourism studies from the perspective of Actor Network Theory (ANT; van der Duim et al., 2012), but our Deleuzian approach emphasizes an affective dimension that ANT does not have. This was noted by Sage et al. (2020), who found that ANT's refrain of "following the actors themselves or rather that which makes them act" (Latour, 2005, p. 237) was of limited value when following how technologies are organized through and with affects. These authors started exploring the overlooked potentials in ANT to engage with affect, and particularly with a Deleuzian approach. Our paper is in line with these findings, which open new and promising avenues for further research.

Deleuze's (1994) conceptual apparatus also offers great value for a posthumanist theorization of the dissolution of key dualisms or oppositional binaries (Hollinshead, Suleman, Wang, Nair, & Vellah, 2021) that have been characteristic of cosmopolitan hospitality, e.g., traveler vs dweller, host vs guest, home vs away. For Deleuze, the prevailing categorical, oppositional, and binary way of thinking hides and misplace relations of difference. His approach dissolves binary thinking and categorical totalization, affirming the relations of difference and repetition that empower nomadic and non-representational thought instead.

A Deleuzian approach dissolves both the relational (guest/host) and spatial (home/away) binaries of hospitality, which were not fully nor effectively dissolved in other frameworks, as shown in Table 3. The relationality of hospitality must not assume an original sovereignty of the host, nor a fixed identity of the guest. In cosmopolitan settings, both individuals and nation states become situated in a 'smooth space' which is always negotiated with each interaction. It is through this spatial and relational nomadology (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987; Hollinshead & Vellah, 2020), that both the shifting nature of guest and host in relational encounters and the often-paradoxical meaning of home and away in cosmopolitanism can be properly and fully theorized.

This affective and posthumanist approach to cosmopolitan hospitality may open promising avenues for tourism research (Guia, 2021; Guia & Jamal, 2020; Hollinshead, Suleman, Wang, Nair, & Vellah, 2021). Beyond those topics already noted by these authors, research on overtourism could benefit from this approach, where the host community and the ensemble of visitors could be reframed and treated situationally, instead of as strict categorical unities and in fundamental oppositional binary relation. Deleuzian methodologies (Coleman & Ringrose, 2013) could start to be imported for this purpose. In hospitality studies, this approach could inspire new practices of commercial tourism, where otherness is not so tightly organized and commoditized, and where the value that encounters with unexpected others may have for visitors is acknowledged (Veijola et al., 2014). Instead of assuming commercialized interactions as not hospitable per se, we could examine the way social interactions in commercial settings can become instances of relational encounters of cosmopolitan hospitality. As noted by Molz and Gibson (2007a), commercial venues such as

**Table 3**  
Conceptual binaries of cosmopolitan hospitality: theoretical approaches.

<b>DISSOLUTION OF CONCEPTUAL BINARIES</b>	<b>KANT</b>	<b>LEVINAS</b>	<b>DERRIDA</b>	<b>DELEUZE</b>
<b>SPATIAL BINARIES</b> HOME / AWAY DWELLER / TRAVELLER	FIXED AND STABLE	DESTABLIZED AND DISSOLVED	SHIFTING BUT STABLE	DESTABLIZED AND DISSOLVED
<b>RELATIONAL BINARIES</b> HOST / GUEST	FIXED AND STABLE	SHIFTING BUT STABLE	DESTABLIZED AND DISSOLVED	DESTABLIZED AND DISSOLVED

restaurants, hotels, and others “do not elide hospitality, but rather become the settings for complex negotiations of multiple hospitalities, and embodied encounters between strangers, whose roles as guest or hosts are shifting constantly, as do their movements and rest” (p. 8).

**Conclusion**

Our theoretical endeavor has first acknowledged key thinkers in cosmopolitan hospitality. Kant's version of cosmopolitan hospitality is grounded on a universal moral and institutional politics, and his hospitality is clearly limited to a global politics of space. By contrast, Levinas leaves us with an ethical cosmopolitanism that is singular and does not translate to universal justice as it is limited to individual relational encounters. Derrida adds Levinas' ethics of unconditional hospitality to the Kantian framework, in order to develop a political ethics of hospitality. But Derrida's deconstruction of Kantian hospitality reaches only halfway, perpetuating the asymmetry between host and guest, and thus the conceptual binaries and inequalities that inhere as a precondition of the original concept of hospitality itself. A Deleuzian approach to cosmopolitan hospitality can overcome these limitations. Table 4 represents the conceptualizations of hospitality and concomitant theorizations under the Kantian, Levinasian, Derridean, and Deleuzian frameworks.

Deleuze offers an affective and posthumanist approach to cosmopolitan hospitality that opens touristic spaces for affective, situated, nomadic, and more-than-human relational practices of cosmopolitan hospitality, for example, those of couchsurfing described by Molz (2007, 2011b), or in relationality with animals in tourism, as for instance that described by Cui and Xu (2019). The Deleuzian ontology of affects produces a notion of ‘just’ action and emancipation that rejects all struggles to re-establish desired and predefined original positions. What matters is to cultivate the capacity to affect and be affected. This cosmopolitan hospitality seeks encounters where affections increase this capacity, and where the intensification of these affective capacities becomes the ethical ground for emancipation, political community, and global justice. It is in this way that new approaches to counter injustices in the local-to-global spaces of tourism and hospitality can be opened. A new situated and affirmative ethics of hospitality operates in the tension between Levinasian unconditional hospitality, Kantian conditional hospitality, and the demands of ordinary acts of hospitality as revealed in specific encounters in a particular place and time (Ruitenbergh, 2015). Moreover, the Deleuzian conceptualization of cosmopolitan hospitality extends the domain of hospitality beyond the human and dissolves oppositional binaries while issuing alerts about the totalizing force of categorical thinking. We must take Deleuzian posthumanism seriously if we want to advance more just forms of cosmopolitan hospitality and tourism in the Anthropocene. Posthumanism denies human exceptionalism, advocates non-anthropocentrism, de-centers the individual subject, abolishes the culture-nature dualism, and puts into prominent position the more-than human.

A call is made here to incorporate affective and posthumanist conceptualizations of cosmopolitan hospitality in both tourism pedagogy and praxis, where instead of a system of representations, tourism will be seen as an assemblage of emerging and affective forces, and where more-than-human encounters will not possibly be excluded in advance.

**Declaration of competing interest**

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

**Table 4**  
 Conceptualization of hospitality in Kant, Levinas, Derrida and Deleuze, and the significance of affect and posthumanism in each approach.

<i>HOSPITALITY</i>	<b>KANT</b>	<b>LEVINAS</b>	<b>DERRIDA</b>	<b>DELEUZE</b>
<b>Main concern</b>	COSMOPOLITAN RIGHT (Spatial mobility)	RELATIONAL ETHICS (Relationality)	COSMOPOLITAN RIGHT (Spatial mobility)	RELATIONAL SITUATEDNESS (Relationality)
<b>Subsidiary concern</b>	HOSPITABLE RELATIONS (Safe spatial mobility)	COSMOPOLITANISM (Spatial universality)	ETHICAL RELATION (hospitable mobility)	COSMONOMADISM (Situated shifting spatiality)
<b>Conceptualization</b>	HOSPITABLE COSMOPOLITANISM (Right of entry)	COSMOPOLITAN HOSPITALITY (Open welcome & care for the stranger)	ETHICAL (HOSPITABLE) COSMOPOLITANISM (Welcoming entry)	COSMOPOLITAN HOSPITALITY (As comonomadic and mutual co-hospitality)
<b>Individuatliiy (assumed)</b>	AUTONOMOUS & RATIONAL SELF (Cognition over affect)	ETHICAL SELF ('Ethical' affect as Responsibility) ('Ethical' affect over cognition)	DIVIDED SELF (Cognition and affect Playing against each other)	FRAGMENTED (MULTIPLE) SHIFTING SELF (Affect as situated ethics) (Affect over cognition)
<b>Affect's significance</b>				
Ontological position	PRE-CONSTITUTED CATEGORICAL BEINGS	PRE-SUBJECTIVE ETHICAL AFFECTIVITY	DIFFERENTIAL AFFECTIVITY	PRE-SUBJECTIVE (DIFFERENTIAL) AFFECTIVE BECOMING
Ethics & Politics	HOSPITALITY AS POLITICS	HOSPITALITY AS ETHICS	HOSPITALITY AS POLITICAL ETHICS	HOSPITALITY AS ETHICAL POLITICS
<b>Posthumanism's significance</b>				
Anthropocentrism	STRONG	MILDER	MILDER	COMPLETELY DISSOLVED
Oppositional binaries	STRONG	DISSOLVED	INCOMPLETELY DISSOLVED	COMPLETELY DISSOLVED

**Acknowledgements**

We would like to thank the anonymous referees and the handling editor for their valuable comments, which contributed to enhance the quality of the paper.

**References**

Allender, P. (2013). Derrida and humanism: Some implications for post-humanist political and educational practice. *Power and Education*, 5(3), 318–329.

Badiou, A. (2001). *Ethics: An essay on the understanding of evil*. London and New York: Verso.

Barad, K. (2007). *Meeting the universe half-way*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Barnett, C. (2005). Life after Derrida. *Antipode*, 37, 239–241.

Bell, D. (2009). Tourism and hospitality. In T. Jamal, & M. Robinson (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of tourism studies* (pp. 19–34). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Boluk, K., & Carnicelli, S. (2019). Tourism for the emancipation of the oppressed: Towards a critical tourism education drawing on Freirean philosophy. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 76, 168–179.

Braidotti, R. (2013). *The posthuman*. Cambridge, UK and Malden, MA: Polity.

Braidotti, R. (2019). *Posthuman knowledge*. Cambridge, UK and Malden, MA: Polity.

Bulley, D. (2015). Ethics, power and space: International hospitality beyond Derrida. *Hospitality and Society*, 5(2), 185–201.

Bunch, M. (2010). *Outlawry and the experience of the (im)possible: Deconstructing biopolitics*. London, Ontario, Canada: University of Western Ontario (Doctoral Thesis).

Bunch, L. (2014). Posthuman ethics and the becoming animal of Emmanuel Levinas. *Culture, Theory and Critique*, 55(1), 34–50.

Butcher, J. (Ed.). (2018). *Tourism, cosmopolitanism and global citizenship*. Abington: Routledge.

Calarco, M. (2019). All our relations: Levinas, the posthuman, and the more-than-human. *Angelaki*, 24(3), 71–85.

Calhoun, C. (2008). Cosmopolitanism in the modern social imaginary. *Daedalus*, 137(3), 105–114.

Camargo, B. (2019). Case 3.1: Palenqueras in Colombia: A case of cultural injustice in tourism. Case example. In T. Jamal (Ed.), *Justice and ethics in tourism* (pp. 72–77). London: Routledge.

Caton, K. (2012). Taking the moral turn in tourism studies. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(4), 1906–1928.

Clarke, A., & Chen, W. (2009). *International hospitality management*. London: Routledge.

Coleman, R., & Ringrose, J. (2013). *Deleuze and research methodologies*. Edinburgh University Press.

Cooke, L., Grimwood, B., & Caton, K. (2016). A moral turn for mountain tourism. In H. Richins, & J. S. Hull (Eds.), *Mountain tourism: Experiences, communities, environments and sustainable futures* (pp. 246–254). Wallingford: Cabi.

Cui, Q., & Xu, H. (2019). Situating animal ethics in Thai elephant tourism. *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 60(4), 267–279.

Deleuze, G. (1983). *Nietzsche and philosophy*. Oxford University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1988). *Spinoza: Practical philosophy*. San Francisco: City Lights Publishers.

Deleuze, G. (1990a). *Expressionism in philosophy: Spinoza*. New York: Zone Books.

Deleuze, G. (1990b). *The logic of sense*. Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. (1994). *Difference and repetition*. Columbia University Press.

Deleuze, G. (2000). *Proust and signs*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Deleuze, G. (2003). Statements and profiles. *Angelaki*, 8(3), 85–93.

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus*. University of Minnesota Press.

Derrida, J. (1997). *The politics of friendship*. New York: Verso.

Derrida, J. (2000). *Of hospitality*. Stanford: Stanford University Press (Original published in 1998).

Dikeç, M. (2002). Pera peras poros: Longings for spaces of hospitality. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 19(1–2), 227–247.

- Ferrando, F. (2019). *Philosophical posthumanism*. Bloomsbury Academic.
- Franke, M. F. (2019). The patronising Kantianisms of hospitality ethics in international relations: Towards a politics of imposition. *Journal of International Political Theory*, 17(3), 276–294.
- Gani, J. K. (2017). The erasure of race: Cosmopolitanism and the illusion of Kantian hospitality. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 45(3), 425–446.
- Gibson, C. (2010). Geographies of tourism: (Un)ethical encounters. *Progress in Human Geography*, 34(4), 521–527.
- Goh, I. (2006). The question of community in Deleuze and Guattari (I): Anti-community. *Sympoloke*, 14(1–2), 216–231.
- Goh, I. (2007). The question of community in Deleuze and Guattari (II): After friendship. *Sympoloke*, 15(1–2), 218–243.
- Grimwood, B. S. (2015). Advancing tourism's moral morphology: Relational metaphors for just and sustainable Arctic tourism. *Tourist Studies*, 15(1), 3–26.
- Grit, A. (2014). Messing around with serendipities. In S. Veijola, J. G. Molz, O. Pyyhtinen, E. Höckert, & A. Grit (Eds.), *Disruptive tourism and its untidy guests: Alternative ontologies in future tourism hospitalities* (pp. 122–141). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Guia, J. (2021). Conceptualizing justice tourism and the promise of posthumanism. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 29(2–3), 502–519.
- Guia, J., & Jamal, T. (2020). A (Deleuzian) posthumanist paradigm for tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 84, Article 102982.
- Hallemeier, K. (2013). *J.M. Coetzee and the limits of cosmopolitanism*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Haraway, D. J. (2008). *When species meet*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Höckert, E. (2014). Unlearning through hospitality. In S. Veijola, J. G. Molz, O. Pyyhtinen, E. Höckert, & A. Grit (Eds.), *Disruptive tourism and its untidy guests: Alternative ontologies in future tourism hospitalities* (pp. 96–121). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Höckert, E. (2018). *Negotiating hospitality: Ethics of tourism development in the Nicaraguan highlands*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Hollinshead, K., Suleman, R., Wang, S., Nair, B., & Vellah, A. (2021). The call for 'dynamic genesis' (after Deleuze) in tourism studies. In E. Çakmak, H. Tucker, & K. Hollinshead (Eds.), *Tourism paradoxes: Contradictions, controversies and challenges* (pp. 145–158). Bristol: Channel View Publications.
- Hollinshead, K., & Vellah, A. (2020). Dreaming forward: Postindictment and the generative thresholds of tourism. *Journal of Geographical Research*, 3(4), 8–21.
- Irigaray, L. (2013). Towards a mutual hospitality. In T. Claviez (Ed.), *Ethics, politics, and aesthetics on the threshold of the possible* (pp. 42–56). Berlin: DeGruyter.
- Jamal, T. (2019). *Justice and ethics in tourism*. London: Routledge.
- Johnson, P. C. (2014). Cultural literacy, cosmopolitanism, and tourism research. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 44, 255–269.
- Jordaan, E. (2009). Cosmopolitanism, freedom, and indifference: A Levinasian view. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 34(1), 83–106.
- Kant, I. (2006). Toward perpetual peace. In I. Kant (Ed.), *Toward perpetual peace and other writings on politics, peace, and history* (pp. 87–99). Yale: Yale University Press (Original book published in 1795).
- Kant, I. (2007). Idea for a universal history with a cosmopolitan aim. In I. Kant (Ed.), *Anthropology, history and education* (pp. 107–120). Cambridge University Press (Original book published in 1784).
- Kristensen, K. (2016). What can an affect do? Notes on the Spinozist–Deleuzian account. *LJR Journal*, 7, 11–32.
- Lashley, C. (Ed.). (2016). *The Routledge handbook of hospitality studies*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the social: An introduction to Actor-Network Theory*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Leep, M. (2018). Stray dogs, post-humanism and cosmopolitan belongingness: Interspecies hospitality in times of war. *Millennium: Journal of International Studies*, 47(1), 45–66.
- Levinas, E. (1969). *Totality and infinity: An essay on exteriority*. Duquesne University Press (Original published in 1961).
- Levinas, E. (1985). *Ethics and infinity: Conversations with Philippe Nemo*. Duquesne University Press.
- Lynch, P. (2017). Mundane welcome: Hospitality as life politics. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 64, 174–184.
- Lynch, P., Molz, J., McIntosh, A., Lugosi, P., & Lashley, C. (2011). Theorizing hospitality. *Hospitality & Society*, 1(1), 3–24.
- McNaughton, D. (2006). The 'Host' as uninvited 'Guest': Hospitality, violence and tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 33(3), 645–665.
- Meckstroth, C. (2018). Hospitality, or Kant's critique of cosmopolitanism and human rights. *Political Theory*, 46(4), 537–559.
- Molz, J. G. (2007). Cosmopolitans on the couch: Mobile hospitality and the internet. In J. G. Molz, & S. Gibson (Eds.), *Mobilizing hospitality: The ethics of social relations in a mobile world* (pp. 65–82). London: Ashgate.
- Molz, J. G. (2011a). Cosmopolitanism and consumption. In M. Rovisco, & M. Nowicka (Eds.), *The Ashgate research companion to cosmopolitanism* (pp. 32–53). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Molz, J. G. (2011b). Couchsurfing and network hospitality: 'It's not just about the furniture'. *Hospitality & Society*, 1(3), 215–225.
- Molz, J. G. (2014). Camping in clearing. In S. Veijola, J. G. Molz, O. Pyyhtinen, E. Höckert, & A. Grit (Eds.), *Disruptive tourism and its untidy guests: Alternative ontologies in future tourism hospitalities* (pp. 19–41). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Molz, J. G., & Gibson, C. (2007b). *Mobilizing hospitality: The ethics of social relations in a mobile world*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Molz, J. G., & Gibson, S. (2007a). Introduction: Mobilizing and mooring hospitality. In J. G. Molz, & S. Gibson (Eds.), *Mobilizing hospitality: The ethics of social relations in a mobile world* (pp. 1–27). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Nandy, A. (1989). Shamans, savages and the wilderness: On the audibility of dissent and the future of civilizations. *Alternatives*, 14(3), 263–277.
- Ormond, M. (2015). Book Review: Disruptive tourism and its untidy guests: Alternative ontologies of future hospitalities, Soile Veijola, Jennie Germann Molz, Olli Pyyhtinen, Emily Höckert and Alexander Grit (2014). *Hospitality & Society*, 5(2–3), 272–274.
- Pieterse, J. N. (2006). Emancipatory cosmopolitanism: Towards an agenda. *Development and Change*, 37(6), 1247–1257.
- Reckwitz, A. (2012). Affective spaces: A praxeological outlook. *Rethinking History*, 16(2), 241–258.
- Ruitenbergh, C. (2015). *Unlocking the world: Education in an ethic of hospitality*. Boulder: Paradigm Publishers.
- Ryder, R. G. (2015). The curious case of affective hospitality: Curiosity, affect, and Pierre Klossowski's laws of hospitality. In D. Sharma, & F. Tygstrup (Eds.), *Structures of feeling* (pp. 159–168). Berlin: DeGruyter.
- Sage, D., Vitry, C., & Dainty, A. (2020). Exploring the organizational proliferation of new technologies: An affective actor-network theory. *Organization Studies*, 41(3), 345–363.
- Salazar, N. B. (2010). Tourism and cosmopolitanism: A view from below. *International Journal of Tourism Anthropology*, 1(1), 55–69.
- Sellars, J. (2007). Deleuze and cosmopolitanism. *Radical Philosophy*, 142, 30–37.
- Shepherd, R., & Salazar, N. B. (Eds.). (2017). *Cosmopolitanism and tourism: Rethinking theory and practice*. Washington: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Sinha, S. (2018). The racialized body of the educator and the ethic of hospitality: The potential for social justice education re-visited. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 37, 215–229.
- Swain, M. B. (2009). The cosmopolitan hope of tourism: Critical action and worldmaking vistas. *Tourism Geographies*, 11(4), 505–525.
- van der Duim, R., Ren, C., & Johannesson, G. T. (2012). *Actor-network theory and tourism: Ordering, materiality and multiplicity*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Veijola, S. (2014). Towards silent communities. In S. Veijola, J. G. Molz, O. Pyyhtinen, E. Höckert, & A. Grit (Eds.), *Disruptive tourism and its untidy guests: Alternative ontologies in future tourism hospitalities* (pp. 68–95). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Veijola, S., Germann Molz, J., Pyyhtinen, O., Höckert, E., & Grit, A. (2014). *Disruptive tourism and its untidy guests: Alternative ontologies in future tourism hospitalities*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Viken, A., Höckert, E., & Grimwood, B. (2021). Cultural sensitivity: Engaging difference in tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 89, Article 103223.
- Yegenoglu, M. (2003). Liberal multiculturalism and the ethics of hospitality in the age of globalization. *Postmodern Culture*, 13(2).
- Zembylas, M. (2020). From the ethic of hospitality to affective hospitality: Ethical, political and pedagogical implications of theorizing. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 39, 37–50.

**Jaume Guia** is Professor at the University of Girona and Visiting Scholar at the University of Johannesburg, with interests in collaboration networks, governance, cross-border tourism, justice and posthumanist approaches to tourism research.

**Tazim Jamal** is Professor at Texas A&M University, working on sustainability and tourism, with interest in collaborative planning, community-based tourism, as well as cultural heritage management and conservation, and justice in tourism.