HOSPITABLE ENTANGLEMENTS:

IMMIGRATION, APOPHASIS AND ATTITUDE TOWARD "THE OTHER"

A thesis submitted to the Theological School of

Drew University in partial fulfillment of

the requirements for the degree,

Master of Arts

Somyong Kim

Drew University

Madison, New Jersey

May 2015

ABSTRACT

Hospitable Entanglements:

Immigration, Apophasis and the Attitude toward 'the Other'

M.A. Thesis by

Somyong Kim

Drew Theological School   May 2015

We are living in the age of immigration. The reason that immigrants move to other place

beyond the border is understandable. They want to find better life. Counter to their

expectation, they are confronted by severe problems. Especially, in the wake of

international terrorism, immigrants are dealt with as dangerous elements. And because of

an exclusionary attitude toward immigrants, these serious problems cannot be solved, but

rather are aggravated. This thesis considers Jurgen Habermas' notion of tolerance and

Jacques Derrida's notion of hospitality as example of examples of ethical attitudes toward

"the others." Derrida insists on unconditional hospitality, asserting that tolerance is still

host-centric. However, since Derrida's hospitality deconstructs the boundary between

guests and hosts, it seems near impossible to realize. Derrida also mentions the

impossibility of unconditional hospitality. But it is not a fixed impossibility, but rather an

impossible possibility. This thesis then considers the metaphor of quantum entanglement

as shedding light on the impossible possibility of unconditional hospitality. Quantum

physics mentions that quantum manifests both as a wave and as a particle. Process

philosophy, influenced by quantum mechanics, insists on the duality – not the dualism -

of matter. This thesis then draws upon a current approach to apophatic theology to accentuate not only the unknowing God, but also the coincidence of opposites. Eventually, the impossible possibility of deconstruction of the boundary between guest and host is found in unconditional hospitality. This thesis examines an ethically attractive attitude toward "the other" including immigrants, foreign workers and strangers, via Derrida's notion of hospitality and its impossible possibility based on entanglements drawn from the vocabularies of quantum physics, process philosophy, and apophatic theology.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 1

Introduction

"'You shall love your neighbor as yourself.' There is no other commandment

greater than these." (Mark 12:31, NRSV)

Due to globalization, cultural exchanges are more common with the increase of

the exchanges of human and material resources during the period of Neo-liberal

capitalism. Because of these phenomena, border lines, as sources of traditional meaning,

are being undermined. Especially, the spread of neo-liberalism makes the economic

exchange active, and this situation lets many workers of the southern hemisphere move to

the northern hemisphere. However, this movement involves conflicting interests. Since

workers of the southern hemisphere are living in sad social realities, including extreme

poverty and political instability, they want to find a better life and stable working

conditions. On the other hand, even though countries of the northern hemisphere

superficially maintain that they accept workers of undeveloped countries as humanitarian

considerations, what seems evident, is that they just to solve their social problems via

low-income workers. In other words, the so-called advanced countries not only replenish

lacking labor manpower via immigrants, but they also exploit their labor, using their

unstable status. Thus, immigrants have a high exposure to discrimination and exclusion

as well as a problem of adapting to their new surroundings. In this sense, immigrants'

lives can be described as a kind of "bare life" in Giorgio Agamben's sense, since they are

outside the protection of the law in a law-governed country.[1]

Also, the expansion of liquidity of human and material resources by globalization is exacerbating unjust relationships among different cultures, thus thwarting the expectations that this movement would boost mutual understanding. Sometimes, the expansion of liquidity is regarded as the potential cause of a national crisis, such as, war, terrorism, and severe crime by foreigners. Especially, the United States anti-terrorist Patriot Act of 2001 instituted after the 9/11 attacks, deals with all kinds of foreigners as potential criminals. They are regarded as second-class citizens, even in cases when they have citizenship. In this way, the status as strangers has been unstable, causing them to exist as marginalized and political scapegoats.

In addressing the present planetary situation, Christian theology finds itself rethinking the ancient tradition and current meanings of hospitality to the stranger. And so, we may find theoretical support from the philosophy of Jacques Derrida (1930-2004 C.E.), who opens a new horizon of thought about strangers or "the others." In *Of Hospitality*, Derrida underscores that his theory of hospitality is clearly different from conditional hospitality such as tolerance. In the existing theories of the attitude toward "the other," when a host accepts a stranger, the host generally offers conditions to the stranger. He refutes the meaning of this limited hospitality. He suggests absolute hospitality beyond conditional hospitality.

---

[1] Agamben's "bare life" as being excluded from the protection of the law indicates strangers who are ruled out of civil rights of modern nations based on the law, especially illegal immigrants who are living outside the law. See Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*, translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995), 9.

There is the source of hospitality to the stranger in the Bible. Thoughts of absolute hospitality are found throughout the Old Testament including Deuteronomy, and the teachings of Jesus known as the Sermon on the Mount and the parable of the Last Judgment in Matthew Chapter 25 of the New Testament.[2] The story of Zacchaeus is representative. Jesus' notion of hospitality toward Zacchaeus and Zacchaeus' understanding of hospitality toward Jesus are entangled in the story. In other words, the boundary between guest and host has been broken down in a relationship between Jesus and Zacchaeus.

In this thesis, I argue that absolute hospitality has theological, scientific, and philosophical grounds. That is, these exists ontological equality based on interrelationship. Apophatic theology proposes the coincidence of opposites, quantum physics explains entanglement of beings, and the philosophy of Whitehead suggests ontological grounds of entanglement. Theories based on entanglement insist that the world is more chaosmic than cosmic.[3] There is order in chaos, and all divided things are entangled. Even God and the "most trivial puff of existence in far-off empty space"[4] are on the same ontological horizon as actual entities. This is a solemn fact of the world in which we are living. Thus, this concept of entanglement deconstructs the boundary between opposite things, such as, guest

---

[2] "'Truly I tell you, just as you did it to one of the least of these who are members of my family, you did it to me." (Matthew 25:40, NRSV)

[3] Catherine Keller, *Face of the Deep: A Theology of Becoming*, (New York: Routledge, 2003), 171. Keller says, "That depth of beginning cross-cuts in theory the "chaotic variability" of a proliferating matrix of tehomic icons … They (creatures) are not chaos, but the organized explications of its dimensions. "Art is not chaos but a composition of chaos," say Deleuze and Guattari, so that it constitutes "a chaosmos, a composed chaos – neither foreseen nor preconceived." Also see Gilles, Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *What is Philosophy?* translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham *Burchell,* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994), 205.

[4] Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, edited by David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne, (New York: the Free Press, 1978), 18.

and host, black and white, even creatures and creator. In chapter 3, I will research this fact in more detail.

Chapter 1 deals with the problem of the real condition of foreign workers and immigrants in South Korea and the United States. Chapter 2 treats the acceptable attitude about strangers, including foreign workers and immigrants with the help of the concepts of Habermas' notion of tolerance and Derrida's understanding of hospitality. In Chapter 3, we examine various grounds of hospitality are examined employing Niels Bohr's principle of complementarity, Whitehead's process thought, and Nicholas of Cusa's coincidence of opposites. I would like to an ethically attractive attitude or manner toward "the other," such as, strangers, foreign workers, and immigrants by way of the concept of unconditional hospitality.

1. Foreign Workers and Immigrants: the Case of South Korea and the United States
You shall not deprive a resident alien or an orphan of justice; you shall not take a widow's garment in pledge. (Deuteronomy 24:17 NRSV)

Modern society is often called "the age of migration," since the number and proportion of foreign workers working in many places of the world is without parallel in history.[5] The United Nations assumes that 200 million people, approximately 3 percent of the world's population, live in foreign countries longer than a year via "the age of

---

[5] Stephan Castles, Hein de Hass, and Mark J. Miller, *The Age of Migration: International Population Movements in the Modern World,* (New York: Guilford Press, 2014), 5.

migration" meaning that migration between nations is now common. These international

migrants live in foreign countries with various purposes, such as, immigration, working,

refuge, weddings, and studying abroad, and have an influence on the political, and

economic factors of a country. More than 50 percent of international migrants move to

other countries for work. Because of this growth of the number of international

immigrant workers, the protection of the human rights for foreigners and migrants is an

issue including international human rights. Individual countries also deal with this issue

as a primary political task.[6] Since there are already 550,000 foreign workers in South

Korean society on the basis of statistics of January 2011 (700,000 foreign workers in the

case including undocumented population), this issue has become a hot political issue.[7]

1) The Case of South Korea

In South Korean society, the number of border crossers of various forms are

visually increasing because of the multicultural policies being established after 2006.

They are divided into two parts: the first relates to a potential migrants, and the other

relates to the current migrants. Potential migrants means persons who have the possibility

of returning home. Foreign workers, international students, and temporary visitors are

---

[6] Lee Seong-Un, and Choi Yoo, *A Study Legislative Assistance for immigrants according to emerging multicultural families*, (Seoul: Korean Legislation Research Institute, 2006), 10.
[7] Europe's major national leaders, including British Prime Minister Cameron, German Chancellor Merkel, and, French President Sarkozy declared that Multiculturalism was failed. See "*Angela Merkel: German multiculturalism has 'utterly failed*,'" last modified on October 7, 2010, http://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/oct/17/angela-merkel-german-multiculturalism-failed. Accessed on April 13, 2015.

representative. On the other hand, current migrants refers to those who are part of a diaspora and who have the purpose of permanent residency with existing settlers. Married immigrants, North Korean defectors, and naturalized Korean citizens are also representative.

According to statistics of the Justice Department of South Korea in 2013, 1,576,034 were foreigners in South Korea.[8] The largest percentage of the "foreign" population consists of foreign workers, of whom 549,202 are documented workers representing approximately 34.8 percent of the total number of migrants in South Korea, while 184,106 are undocumented immigrants.[9] Since the number of foreign workers is more than twice the number of married migrants, it shows that the model of a migrant is that of a foreign worker. South Korean society has an ambivalent attitude toward immigrants. That is, South Korean society takes not only a positive attitude toward married immigrants under the social integration policy as a kind of multicultural policy, but also a negative attitude toward foreign workers, due to discrimination that is common toward non-Korean people. Interestingly due to the tragic history of Korea in the twentieth century, Korean people tend to be exclusive in terms of people of other races and ethnicities

2) The Case of the United States

---

[8] "Population Statistics," http://rcps.egov.go.kr:8081/jsp/stat/ppl_stat_jf.jsp. Accessed on April 13.2015. The total population of South Korea was 51,141,463 in 2013.
[9] "Status of foreigners," last modified on April 13, 2015, http://www.index.go.kr/potal/main/EachDtlPageDetail.do?idx_cd=2756. Accessed on April 13, 2015.

The United States can be referred to as a multicultural society. At first, the Anglo-Saxon Europeans moved to North America for their settlement. They came to North America via the Mayflower in search of freedom of religion. Since then, according to this tradition, several million Europeans immigrated to North America. For instance, the Irish were suffering from a severe famine and British control, the Jewish people were escaping persecution in Europe, and the Italians for evading a fear of unification if the war moved to North America. Next, instead of the great wave of migration of Europeans, Asians including Koreans, Chinese, and Vietnamese, moved to North American seeking the American Dream. Most black people were brought to United States as slaves.

Americans, whose ancestors were Anglo-Saxons established the United States and adopted a relatively open immigration policy toward the influx of immigrants. Especially, the social atmosphere of discrimination relief toward non-Europeans was formed from the mid-1965s with the human rights movements, such as, the Selma to Montgomery march.[10] Due to using English and sharing American values, such as, freedom, justice, and human dignity, non-European could assimilate with the mainstream of society, and a stable multicultural society was formed. However, soon after new immigrants, including Africans and Asians, including numerous Hispanics collectively moved to North America

---

[10] "Selma to Montgomery marches," last modified on March 1, 2015, http://www.britannica.com/popular-topics/browse. Accessed on April 20, 2015.
Selma Montgomery Marches means three marches involving Bloody Sunday that represented the political peak of human rights movement in United States. The first march occurred on March 7, the second march on March 9, and the last march on March, 21. Bloody Sunday happened during the first march on March 7 with the question. The right to vote of Amelia Boynton Robinson and her husband, the movement was launched. Martin Ruther King Jr. participated in the second march. After that, the movement affected the human rights movement in the United States.

keeping their language and culture. They tensed the mainstream society of the United States. Thus, the United States coped with this problem by increasing migration restrictions or a crackdown against undocumented immigrants.

The term, Hispanic refers to immigrants who are from Central and South America. They share the common language of Spanish. Their countries of origin are more than eighteen countries, including, El Salvador, Guatemala, and Mexico. Among them, Mexicans take possession of 64 percent of the total Hispanics living in the United States.[11] After the Mexican War (1846-48 C.E.), Mexicans moved to the United States in earnest. By the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo as the result of the war, parts of the Mexican territory, including, New Mexico, Utah, Nevada, Arizona, California, and Texas, were transferred to the United States. Consequentially, many Mexicans of those areas were them settled in Southwest region of the United States.

In the nineteenth century, the United States concentrated on the development of southwest region, including the railway construction, the mining industry, and the farming industry. At that time. Mexicans moved to the United States because of the needed labor forces. Mexican Revolution (1910-20 C.E.) and the First World War accelerated Mexican's immigration into the United States. As a result of the Mexican Revolution, More than 890,000 legal Mexican immigrants came to the United States for refuge between 1910 and 1920.[12] During the First World War, because of the labor

---

[11] "Hispanic Americans By the Numbers," last modified on October, 2013, http://www.infoplease.com/spot/hhmcensus1.html. Accessed on April 13, 2015.

[12] "Mexican Revolution and Immigration," last modified on June 5, 1999, http://www.pbs.org/kpbs/theborder/history/timeline/14.html. Accessed on April 13, 2015.

shortage, Mexican workers, such as, machinists, technicians, painters, and plumbers, moved to the United States.

In 1942, since the labor was lacking because of the Second World War, the United States introduced the Bracero Program with Mexico. While running this program, approximately 5,000,000 people, including undocumented immigrants, moved to the United States. Since the 1970s, as the number of European immigrants decreased, Asian and Latin American immigrants increased. At that time, numerous immigrants were brought from Mexico regarded as an important country by the United States due to the Cold War and new oil development.[13] Especially, in the 1980s, since Mexico suffered from a sluggish economy and high unemployment, the number of Mexican's immigrating into the United States increased.[14]

Since Mexico is a neighbor of the United States, Mexican's immigrants into the United States are often undocumented immigration, as well as, documented immigrants. As of 2002, approximately 9.8 million Mexicans are living in the United States. Among them, 5.3 million people are undocumented immigrants. The number occupies the half of total undocumented immigrants in the United States.[15] Hispanics including undocumented immigrants, are suffering difficulties, such as, poverty (the poverty rate is 26 percent), discrimination, and alienation. For example, Hispanics are confronted by cheap labor (earning 65 percent of the average wage of their white counterparts) in

---

[13] Alma M. Gracia, *The Mexican Americans*, (Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2002), 43-44.
[14] Ibid., 48.
[15] "Mexican Immigration to the U.S.: The Latest Estimates," last modified on March 1, 2004, http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/mexican-immigration-us-latest-estimates. Accessed on April 13, 2015.

restaurants and hotels, the exclusion of the social security system, Xenophobia, racial

segregation, and exploitation.[16] In fact, 32% of Hispanics answer that their families or

friends have experienced discrimination because of race and religion.[17]

3) Identity as the Marginalized

Foreign workers often come from countries with severe labor environments, such

as, low pay, overdue wages, and poor labor condition. In their daily life, they have

experienced various problems, including discrimination of language and culture, racial

prejudice, excessive violence of the police, and difficulties due to religious life. In the

case of undocumented foreign workers, fear of crackdown and expulsion is also added.

Generally, foreign workers are not regarded as future citizens or long-term

residents. On the other hand, foreign workers display a tendency to stay in their

residential countries permanently. In spite of the risk of deportation and detention, they

try to live in their newly adopted residential countries longer. Thus, they form a new

community, including the association for the protection of foreign workers' rights, in

connection with legal or illegal employment, and even make a home through marriage

with nationals.[18] Nevertheless, they remain widely regarded as strangers and identified as

the marginalized.

---

[16] James Quesada, Laurie K. Hart and Philippe Bourgois, "Structural Vulnerability and Health: Latino
Migrant Laborers in the United States," *Medical Anthropology* 30, no.4 (2011): 339.
[17] Lee Seong-Hun, *Two Perspectives toward Hispanic immigration*, (Seoul: Spanish Literature, 2010), 526.
[18] Will Kymlicka, *Contemporary Political Philosophy*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 350.

Thus, the most basic requirement of foreign workers is to live in a foreign country with stability where they are staying or to obtain citizenship. Thus, policies based on control, such as, deportation or spontaneous decisions to return to their country of origin, are not realistic solutions. Those policies, rather, can give birth to larger problems, including violence, division, and conflict. To overcome these problems, many countries already try to enforce amnesty programs for undocumented immigrants and gradually grant them and their children citizenship. These policies have to come into effect actively, since they are not only actually useful, but also are connected to the social system based on human rights, and ethical practices.[19]

Unrestricted emigration beyond the border, and breaking down or alleviating barriers between citizens and strangers are in accord with the intention point of politics, ethics, and philosophy based on human rights. Also this intention point is connected with Derrida's notion of unconditional hospitality that insists on tearing down the boundaries between guest and host.

---

[19] Ibid., 352.

Chapter 2.

Attitudes about Strangers: Habermas' Notion of Tolerance and Derrida's Understanding

of Hospitality

Today, it is reality that problems of immigrants, foreign workers, and

undocumented persons regarded as strangers are serious. As we have seen above,

thousands of immigrants are confronted by cheap labor in restaurants and hotels, the

exclusion of the social security system, Xenophobia, racial segregation, and exploitation.

So, how is modern society to deal with these problems? I would like to treat the question

of attitude toward strangers rather than definite policies or plans in this chapter. There are

many theories of attitude toward "the other." I would like to deal with two representative

theories having positive thoughts toward "the other"; one is Habermas' understanding of

tolerance and the other is Derrida's notion of hospitality.

1. Habermas' Concept of Tolerance

"Let your gentleness (tolerance) be known to everyone. The Lord is near."

(Philippians 4:5 NRSV)

What kind of virtue do you need in a relationship with "the other"? In other

words, what kind of attitude is needed for those who move to a strange place? Tolerance

and hospitality are representative. Jürgen Habermas (1929- C.E.) is a representative

person who elaborately theorizes the characteristic of tolerance. He emphasizes it his understanding of being in a relationship with "the other." Why does he underscore the concept of tolerance? Let us examine the reason by explaining his theory.

In the way that Habermas lays stress on "rationality" emphasized by the Enlightenment, calling him a legitimate child of the Enlightenment, is no hyperbole. So, what is the Enlightenment? Let us examine the concept of the Enlightenment, since to trace the concept helps to understand tolerance and hospitality. It can be considered that Immanuel Kant (1724-1804 C.E.) suggested the most appropriate definition about the concept of the Enlightenment. He defines the Enlightenment as "freedom to make public use of one's reason in all matters."[20] What does "to make public use of one's reason in all matters" mean? It means to keep blind or unconditional agreement at arm's length in one's matters. In other words, it means objective thought and a kind of attitude or will that tries to keep objectivity beyond private understanding. Rationality advocated by the Enlightenment means to think beyond boundaries as particular groups or societies. In this context, "to make public use of one's reason" is mentioned, and, on this point, it can be assumed that Habermas follows the route of the Enlightenment.

For Habermas, rationality, especially "communicative rationality," is the only key to solve ills and problems appearing in modern society, as well as, the only possibility of transparent and undefiled communication. The place where this possibility can be actively guaranteed is space of emancipation. Since the current situation is not able to

---

[20] Immanuel Kant, "An Answer To The Question:' What Is Enlightenment?," In *Kant: Political Writings*, edited by H. S. Reiss, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970). 55.

meet this standard, the present ought to be criticized. Thus, it means that his theory analyzing and assessing the current situation should be "critical theory" demanding improvement for the better human situation.

Emancipation mentioned by Habermas is directly connected with tolerance. He define tolerance as follows, "Emancipation is a very special kind of self-experience, because in it processes of self-understanding link up with an increase in autonomy."[21] In other words, emancipation is a form of recognition and physical experience to accompany when people in social relationships recognize that they experience the relationship as active autonomy by themselves. When symmetry and equality are placed between participants in social relationship, freedom and emancipation are shown.[22] Habermas mentions that in the most basic relationship, such things as communicative action by language happen. In other words, human beings learn the fact that they are autonomous and emancipated beings via communication with others. The basis of forming identity as a free agent is social relationship with others, and the essence of the relationship is communicative action. The essence of the communication is mutual understanding among participants.[23]

In this understanding, tolerance is needed, since the basic premise for mutual understanding among participants is tolerance. It does not mean one has to stick to one's opinion. If others' opinions are not esteemed in communication, it is impossible that

---

[21] Jürgen Habermas, "What Theories Can Accomplish," in *The Past As Future*, edited and translated by Max Pensky, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), 103.
[22] Jürgen Habermas, *Knowledge and Human Interests*, translated by Jeremy J. Shapiro, (Boston, Beacon Press, 1987), 208.
[23] Jürgen Habermas, *Theory of Communicative Action*, translated by Thomas McCarthy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984), 390.

14

mutual understanding is located. In Habermas, this situation should be removed, because this is the kind of communication that contradict emancipation. Therefore, for emancipated and ideal communicative action, tolerance is necessary. He asserts that self-criticism and self-transformation are indispensable in order not to contradict oneself in relationship with others, especially strangers.[24] It is a project of relativization to prevent self-idealization or self-mystification, including delusion of grandeur. He argues that self-objectification and self-criticism are not only for the others, the strangers, and the misunderstood, but also for oneself. [25]

Habermas employs the situation in Europe as a real example of his assertion. It means that Europeans should reject "Eurocentrism" by themselves in order to live together. However, it is only possible to overcome Eurocentrism out of the better spirit of Europe. The better spirit means Western rationalism. He believes that Western rationalism has to work as the momentum of intellectual and daily life via endless self-criticism and self-transformation.[26] And only in Western rationalism, based on rationality, is tolerance possible. He insists as follows:

Europe must use one of its strengths, namely its potential for self-criticism, its power of self-transformation, in order to relativize itself far more radically vis-á-vis the others, the strangers, the misunderstood.

[24] Jürgen Habermas, "Europe's Second Chance," in *The Past As Future,* edited and translated by Max Pensky, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994), 96.
[25] Ibid.
[26] Ibid.

That's the opposite of Eurocentrism. But we can overcome Eurocentrism

only out of the better spirit of Europe. Only if we are able to do this will

the wounds inflicted on the world by Eurocentrism, and the material

world culture that grew from it, become if not healed, then at least

treatable.

In order to understand the fact more clearly, let us examine the theory of

"communicative action." Habermas especially emphaizes "intersubjectivtiy"[27] in the

theory of communicative action. He regards the individual as a member of the

community, not as an isolated agent. He argues this fact in his "Universal pragmatics."[28]

He believes that the independent use of language by individual is impossible in everyday

communicative action, since the communication action is possible only in shared

understandings based on interdependence and interpenetration. And "orientation toward

consensus" is in that area without exception.[29]

According to Habermas' theory, everyday communicative action is "the residue of

rationality."[30] Because interdependence, interpenetration, and orientation toward

consensus are entangled with rationality. These are activated by rationality. If these things

are ideally conducted, it guarantees emancipation. Communicative action (rationality) is

---

[27] Jürgen Habermas, *Communication and the Evolution of Society*, translated by Thomas McCarthy, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1979), 3

[28] Ibid., 5

[29] Jürgen Habermas, *Postmetaphysical Thinking: Philosophical Essays*, translated by William Mark Hohengarten, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1994), 68.

[30] Giovanna Borradori, ed., *Philosophy In A Time Of Terror: Dialogues With Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida,* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003). 60.

"renewed with each act of unconstrained understanding, with each moment of living together in solidarity, of successful individuation, and of saving emancipation."[31] Rationality of communication renewed with each moment works as resisting power in history.[32]

Habermas pays attention to 'lifeworld' as the treasure house where communicative action ideally occurs. In the way that communicative action occurs, lifeworld is connected with the political public sphere. He defines the sphere as all the conditions of communication that public opinion and discussion formed by people make possible.[33] However, there is something repressing and detorting lifeworld. He calls it "system." The "state apparatus" and economy are the representative examples of "system." Thus, the goal of his critical theory is "to erect a democratic dam against the colonizing encroachment of system imperatives on areas of the lifeworld."[34] The understanding of "system," as observed by him, is the strategic sphere of disintegrative and non-participatory action. Therefore, he has concern about lifeworld being colonialized by a "system," and insists that this stream has to be stopped. The efforts to stop this stream, namely, movement,[35] begin with free public discourse, not the expression of individual dissatisfaction. Thus, he asserts that must be shed new light on

---

[31] Jürgen Habermas, "A Reply to My Critics," in *Habermas: Critical Debates,* edited by John B. Thompson and David Held, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982), 221.
[32] Ibid., 227.
[33] Jürgen Habermas, "Further Reflections on the Public Sphere," in *Habermas and the Public Sphere*, translated by Craig Calhoun, (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992), 446.
[34] Ibid., 444.
[35] Habermas calls these movements "new social movements." Ecology, pacifism, and civil rights movement are representative examples. See Jürgen Habermas, "New Social Movement," *Telos*, 49, (1981). 33-37.

this movement, since this has not been singular in history. He points out that this

movement is indifferent to obtaining government power, unlike previous movements.[36]

In other words, he argues that since this movement is universal and beyond the

boundaries of a country, this has to be given a new meaning.

Thus, in Habermas, universalism is particular goal to be supported. Because it is

not only to raise the possibility of public agreement, but also to open the probability of

justification to let others understand individual faith or opinion. His support of

universalism can be connected with establishing Kant's "Federation of people"[37] via the

abolition of the concept of the "nation-state" and the appearance of the concept of the

"multicultural society."[38] Ultimately, he advocates a "cosmopolitan order."[39] It is

completed by the 'transnational agreement' beyond sovereignty of individual nations.[40]

Thus, he emphasizes that European nations have to become the Federal States of Europe

in this big plan. In his thought, since "A national identity necessarily collides with the

universalist rules of mutual coexistence for human beings,"[41] the nation-state should be

the target to be overcome.

Thus, 'universalism' does not only express rationality not to be buried under

interests of individual nations, but also embodied in the form of tolerance. In other words,

---

[36] Ibid.

[37] Immanuel Kant, "Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch," in *Kant: Political Wirtings,* edited by H. S. Reiss (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 102.

[38] Jürgen Habermas, "Yet Again: German Identity- A Unified Nation of Angry DM-Burghers," in *New German Critique* 52, (1991), 96.

[39] Jürgen Habermas, "Fundamentalism and Terror: A Dialogue with Jürgen Habermas," edited by Giovanna Borradori, in *Philosophy In A Time Of Terror: Dialogues With Jürgen Habermas And Jacques Derrida* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003). 27.

[40] Ibid., 40.

[41] Jürgen Habermas, "Yet Again: German Identity- A Unified Nation of Angry DM-Burghers," 96.

for establishing a "cosmopolitan order," tolerance has to be realized and practically

operated. As a result, in Habermas' thought, tolerance is a very important virtue.[42] He

argues the relationship between universalism and tolerance as follows:

> To tolerate other people's beliefs without accepting their truth, and to
>
> tolerate other ways of life without appreciating their intrinsic value as we
>
> do with regard to our own, requires a common standard ... What is
>
> important, however, is the peculiar character of reflexivity ... The
>
> explanation of this intricate issue brings us back to the question of
>
> universalism.[43]

In summary, tolerance mentioned by Habermas is the modern result of

the enlightenment. In modern society, rationality boasts its own delicate figure via

the "clothes" of restoration and the "makeup" of universalism. Tolerance is the

extravagant crown of modernity. It is the fruit obtained by self-examination and

self-criticism of modernity.[44] It is the important virtue that modern people living

under those conditions find and master. It is the natural attitude that modern

people who remove or are removed from the strong barriers that can be

encountered in community or society obtain after regarding themselves as very

---

[42] Jürgen Habermas, "Fundamentalism and Terror: A Dialogue with Jürgen Habermas," 40-41.
[43] Ibid., 41.
[44] Jürgen Habermas, *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity,* translated by F. G. Lawrence, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1987), 7.

empty and weak beings via communion with others – on that point, modern

people are kinds of "others."

2. Derrida's Concept of Hospitality

He must be hospitable

(Titus 2:8 NRSV)

Even though the concept of tolerance is attractive enough in a relationship

with "the other," there are some limitations, such as, conditional, defensive, and

alignment with strong person. Let us examine points of limitation within the

concept of tolerance via Derrida's perspective.

Like Habermas who regards tolerance as the very important virtue, Derrida deals

with it as a desirable virtue. As peace originated in recognition of difference, virtues

including tolerance are required. Thus, in Derrida, peace would be understood as tolerant

cohabitation.[45] Nevertheless, tolerance is not a sufficient concept in Derrida. Thus, he

suggests the concept of 'hospitality.' Why does he think that tolerance is not enough? It is

simple. In his perspective, tolerance is not only a kind of religious concept, but also

involves the relationship of power. He argues, "Though I clearly prefer shows of

tolerance to shows of intolerance, I nonetheless still have certain reservations about the

word 'tolerance' and the discourse it organizes. It is a discourse with religious roots; it is

---

[45] Jacques Derrida , "Autoimmunity: Real and Symbolic Suicide: A Dialogue with Jacques Derrida," edited by Giovanna Borradori, in *Philosophy in A Time Of Terror: Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida,* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 127.

most often used on the side of those with power, always as a kind of condescending

concession."[46]

      In Derrida, tolerance is a kind of mercy suggested by reason of the strongest.

Thus, it is the limitation of hospitality, not the condition.[47] In other words, tolerance is an

attitude as limited hospitality in spite of masquerading as good face toward others. He

expresses it as "the good face of sovereignty."[48] He puts it as follows:

> (Sovereignty) says to the other from its elevated position, I am letting
>
> you be, you are not insufferable, I am leaving you a place in my home,
>
> but do not forget that this is my home.[49]

      As we can see from the phrase, 'the threshold of tolerance,'[50] tolerance involves

not exceeding the prescribed boundaries. On this point, tolerance is unsatisfactory to

Derrida. Tolerance is a "conditional, circumspect, and careful hospitality."[51] In other

words, it is always "a scrutinized hospitality, always under surveillance, parsimonious

and protective of its sovereignty."[52] On the other hands, his hospitality is hospitality, *per

se,* without any conditions or modifiers. It is "pure or unconditional hospitality"[53] and

---

[46] Ibid.
[47] Ibid.
[48] Ibid.
[49] Ibid.
[50] Jacques Derrida, *Of Hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond*, translated by Rachel Bowlby, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), 49.
[51] Ibid., 128.
[52] Ibid.
[53] Ibid., 129.

"hospitality *itself.*"[54]

In Derrida, tolerance is "hospitality of invitation," "conditional hospitality," and "practiced hospitality."[55] On the other hand, hospitality is "hospitality of visitation," "unconditional hospitality," and "impossible."[56] In other words, if there is visitor – centered hospitality in the real world, it is very dangerous to the host. It is "nothing short of life-threatening."[57] On the other hand, tolerance is boring hospitality not to involve a death threat.

Derrida suggests openness toward "the other" via the theme of hospitality. However, he did not deal with this theme from the beginning of his thought. Derrida previously focused on deconstructing and overturning the order of rank of traditional philosophy, such as, Phonocentrism, Eurocentrism, and Logocentrism. On the other hand, Derrida, in his later years, concentrated on the possibility of intrusion of the outside or of the inside opening toward the outside, such as, hospitality, responsibility, and the coming democracy and justice rather than the deconstruction of the inside.

How can the exterior be understood? First of all, we have to consider that the exterior cannot exist, *per se*. In other words, the exterior, as the absolute other, can be only thought of as a difference from the interior. However, if the difference is presented, *per se*, the absolute other that enables the difference is not presented, *per se*, because the

---

[54] Ibid., 25.
[55] Jacques Derrida, "Autoimmunity: Real and Symbolic Suicide: A Dialogue with Jacques Derrida," edited by Giovanna Borradori, In *Philosophy In A Time Of Terror: Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida,* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 128.
[56] Ibid., 129.
[57] Ibid.

absolute other has already been the internalized exterior.[58] Since being presented, the

difference is not caught in the discussion of identity, but connected with the discussion or

the subject. Derrida calls this connection 'trace.'[59] He develops the thought of the non-

presence by connecting the concept of trace in the chapter, *Différence*, of *Margins of*

Philosophy. It means that since he criticizes presence, *per se*, the difference cannot be

presented by itself. Rather, the difference, *per se*, should have a difference from itself.

This difference only appears as the form of the trace. Furthermore, this trace is not

presented, *per se*, and this as the trace of the trace (*la trace de la trace*) is appeared in the

erasure of the trace (*la trace de l'effacement de la trace*) like a kind of *différence*.[60] Thus,

the trace is not the fixed something, but rather it is thought of as the process adding traces

continuously.

     Différence and the concept of the trace of the difference are good examples that

all absolute others or outside are not presented, *per se*, but appear in the non-presented

trace by concealing themselves. On the other hand, when the absolute outside is

presented by identity or the inside, the nature as the outside is captured in the

representational system of identity or incorporated into the order of identity. Thus, it is

the basic thought of Derrida that one thinks about surface of absolute outside that is not

---

[58] Jacques Derrida, *Positions*, translated and annotated by Alan Bass, (Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1981), 6. "To "deconstruct" philosophy, thus, would be to think – in the most faithful, interior way – the structured genealogy of philosophy's concepts but, at the same time, to determine – from a certain exterior that is unqualifiable or unnameable by philosophy – what this history has been able to dissimulate or forbid, making itself into a history by means of this somewhere motived repression."
[59] Derrida gives shape to the concept of *différence* by referring to Emmanuel Levinas and Martin Heidegger. See Jacques Derrida, *Margins of Philosophy*, translated by Alan Bass, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982), 12.
[60] Ibid., 66.

captured by representation of identity. These thoughts of Derrida can be found in the concept of hospitality.

In his book, *Of Hospitality*, Derrida claims that his concept of unconditional hospitality is clearly different from the existing concept as conditional hospitality.[61] Conditional hospitality means that when a host accepts a stranger, the host selects them or suggests conditions to them. Kant, like Habermas' tolerance, insists on conditional hospitality. He disagrees with the privilege based on region. However, he agrees with the restriction of the free right of residence without regard for borders. He just accepts the right of visiting other countries or areas under the condition that the sovereignty of individual countries must be protected. He introduces this concept of hospitality under conditions.

In Kant's modern perspective, sovereign countries are not natural or necessary. It is just a historical result of the fact that the countries have taken their territory on the earth. Nevertheless, because of the fact that the sovereignty of the countries should not be ignored, hospitality is restrictedly allowed at the level of trading or visiting. Thus, Kant's understanding of hospitality is not in accord with unlimited migration that has the possibility to infringe on the sovereignty of other countries. But his concept of hospitality agrees with visiting other areas within a certain period of time. Eventually, his notion of hospitality is defined as 'the right not to be dealt with hostility in other areas.'[62] In other

---

[61] Jacques Derrida, *Of Hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond*, translated by Rachel Bowlby, 81-83.
[62] Moon Seong-Weon, *Baeje eu Baeje wa hwandae* [The Exclusion of the Exclusion and Hospitality], (Seoul: Dong Nyeock, 2000), 117.

words, this right means not to be oppressed, and assures the right of passage under the given limitation than residence. Thus, this hospitality naturally excludes the presumption of the right of permanent migration. In order to protect the sovereignty of welcoming countries, the right of hospitality is always selected by those who welcome "the other," and is treated under the level of tolerance.[63]

On the other hand, Derrida rejects this limited hospitality. He approaches the meaning of hospitality in light of a radical acceptance of the other. As mentioned earlier, in Kant's notion of hospitality, those who extend hospitality to "the other," offer the certain method and standard of hospitality, and then select strangers according to the method and standard. Thus, in the strictest sense, the right of hospitality means the right of choice of those who will receive hospitality. Not everyone will be offered hospitality, but just qualified persons, including those who do not damage the sovereignty of welcoming countries. That is, in order to discern the qualification, status, nationality and ethnicity of strangers should be managed and controlled.[64]

On the other hand, Derrida suggests unconditional hospitality beyond conditional hospitality. His theory of hospitality could be called deconstructionism of difference. In other words, difference as mentioned by Derrida does not mean the principle of contradiction of formal logic, such as, $A \neq \sim A$. Since true difference is a kind of process of unlimited differentiating, the difference cannot be fixed. He illustrates continuous

---

[63] O. Custer, "Making Sense of Derrida's Aporetic Hospitality", in *Derrida: Critical Assessments of Leading Philosophers Ⅲ*, edited by Len Lawlor and Zeynep Direk, (New York: Routledge, 2002), 201.
[64] Jacques Derrida, "Deconsturction Terrorism," edited by Giovanna Borradori, In *Philosophy In A Time Of Terror: Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida,* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003), 161-162.

movement of difference with difference at the beginning, and then explains it with

unconditional hospitality in the social-political perspective. Thus, his theory of hospitality

is basically different from the notion of hospitality based on the law.[65] Generally,

hospitality is restricted by its laws and system, which minimize the difference of "the

other" in the general and universal regulations, and selects the object of hospitality in the

universal categories. It means that the subject never gives up her/his sovereignty. On the

other hand, unconditional hospitality is the abandonment of the sovereignty about "the

other." Thus, the subject suspends the phenomenological judgment of identity and origin

of the other, "[The other is] the foreigner, the immigrant (with or without papers), the

exile, the refugee, those without a country [sans patrie], or a State [sans-Etat], the

displaced person or population."[66] Thus, hospitality is not a political notion, but an

ethical concept beyond the political arena. Since unconditional hospitality deconstructs

the sovereignty of the subject, the subject cannot even stay in her/his home as a host.

In order to explain the relationship between host and guest in more detail, we

need to deal with the notion of *hôte*, in the French language. *Hôte* simultaneously means

"host and guest" in its linguistic roots. In other words, in the meaning of *hôte*, host and

guest are not independent of each other. In the general concept of hospitality, a host

always exists as a host and guest should always exist as a guest. However, in the area of

unconditional hospitality, a host cannot be host any longer. Derrida explains this concept

---

[65] Jacques Derrida and Elizabeth Roudinesco, *For What Tomorrow . . . A Dialogue*, translated by Jeff Fort, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004), 60. Derrida argues, "There is no place for this type of hospitality in law and politics."
[66] Jacques Derrida, *Adieu to Emmanuel Levinas*, translated by Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999), 64.

with Levinas' subjectivity as "hostage" (*otage*).[67] As Levinas mentioned, the subject is

called, criticized, oppressed, and accused by the other. The subject exposed by the other

is already hostage of the other. In this sense, Derrida discusses Levinas' ethical subject,

"[The subject always] finds himself elected to or taken up by a residence [élu à domicile]

before himself electing or taking one up [*élire domicile*]."[68] The most important thing in

this thought is that subjectivity of the subject has no choice but to be damaged in order to

that the other is discussed.[69]

> I want to be master at home (*Ipse, potis, potens*, head of house, we have
>
> seen all that), to be able to receive whomever I like there. Anyone who
>
> encroaches on my "at home," on my ipseity, on my power of hospitality,
>
> on my sovereignty as host, I start to regard as an undesirable foreigner, and
>
> virtually as an enemy. This other becomes a hostile subject, and I risk
>
> becoming their hostage.[70]

Ironically, only when power, sovereignty, and ipseity of a host are

abandoned, hospitality is possible. And, via the process of abandonment, the

egocentric subject changes into subjectivity of hospitality. Thus, true hospitality is

possible, only when the boundary between host and guest is collapsed. It means that

---

[67] Simon Critchley, *Ethics, Politics, Subjectivity*, (New York: Verso, 1999), 66.
[68] Ibid., 56
[69] Jacques Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, 77.
[70] Ibid., 53-55.

a host has to accept a guest before any judgment. Eventually, the initiative of hospitality belongs to a stranger, not to a host. A host never demands anything from "the other." By demagnifying the sovereignty, the subject cannot rule over or control "the other" via the objectification of "the other." "The other" is absolutely "the other" and a stranger all the time. In order that otherness of "the other" become meaningful, unconditional hospitality should be possible. In other words, it should be possible that the difference that is not controlled by the subject can trespass from the exterior of the subject to the interior. Otherness does not only exist with the exterior of the control power or sovereignty of identity, but also goes into the interior of identity.[71] Therefore, in unconditional hospitality, the subject is required to accept "the other" before interpreting the other or demanding anything of "the other," since all interpretation about "the other" means the elimination of its difference and its incorporation into one's identity.

However, the loss of sovereignty does not only mean to stay in the reciprocal relationship with the subject, but also involves possibility to change into the hostile relationship with the subject.[72] Unconditional hospitality toward "the other" connotes this extreme danger. Derrida not only recognizes the risk, *per se*, but also emphasizes that this risk is necessary to accept the other.[73] His notion of hospitality

---

[71] Jacques Derrida, *Psyche: Inventions of the Other*, Vol I, edited by Peggy Kamuf and Elizabeth Rottenberg, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007), 39.

[72] Derrida quotes Benveiste's analysis of the notion of *hostis*: Hostis is used as not only the meaning of host, but also the meaning of enemy. See Jacques Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, 43.

[73] Hospitality and hostile are coordinate concepts with each other. However, in Derrida's thought, these two concepts are dealt with together. In other words, for hospitality, the possibility of hostility should always be allowed. This way of thought can be connected with indeterminism often appeared in his deconstructionism. See Jacques Derrida, *Of Hospitality*, 44.

breaks down the boundary between guest and host and can be found in Namsoon Kang's cosmopolitan theology.[74] She explains especially Jesus' gaze as cosmopolitan gaze breaks down the boundary between guest and host.

3. Cosmopolitan Theology: Unconditional Hospitality in Theology

"Rejoice before the Lord your God – the strangers, the orphans, and the widows who are among you – at the place that the Lord our God will choose as a dwelling for his name."

(Deuteronomy 16:11, NRSV)

Namsoon Kang unfolds her cosmopolitan theology - and also the book of that name - via the concept of Derrida's notion of hospitality and cosmopolitanism. From the late twentieth century, cosmopolitanism has been discussed in many different fields. This thought has not been newly created in modern times. In fact, this thought not only is derived from the Stoic school, but also comes into the spotlight after Kant, once again. The origin of cosmopolitanism is based on the ancient Greek philosophy, especially the fact that when Diogenes of Sinope questioned, "Where are you from?" he answered, "I am a citizen of the cosmos," not a citizen of Sinope usually. It is well-known that the answer of Diogenes, 'a citizen of the cosmos,' is the origin of cosmopolitan. Via this thinking, two answers can be possible about the question, "Where are you from?:" One is the answer on a   geographical level, based on the place where a person was born, and

---

[74] Namsoon Kang, *Cosmopolitan Theology: Reconstituting Planetary Hospitality, Neighbor-Love, and Solidarity in an Uneven World*, (St. Louis: Chalice Press, 2013), 10-11.

the other is the answer on the cosmic level. The latter answer has extended the understanding of the place where human beings belong.[75]

There are several factors demonstrating how cosmopolitanism is issued in modern times again. The representative reasons are nationalism, multiculturalism, and immigrants' problems following the era of globalization. These issues have features that must be dealt with beyond geographical boundaries. After globalization, the boundaries between countries have become blurred. It means that various problems, including human rights and world justice, cannot be treated as limited geographical conditions. Thus, cosmopolitanism is currently being reviewed in various areas, such as, philosophy, law, and politics. Emphasizing global justice or citizenship via politics, economics, and law moves beyond geographical boundaries, allowing cosmopolitanism to begin to grasp the attention by focusing on various aspects.[76] Diverse problems experienced by modern society are not be limited by geographical boundaries of particular countries any longer. For example, global issues, such as, immigrants, refugees, and global warming or terrorism, such as that demonstrated by the Islamic State, demand a new perspective beyond the existing perspective of a nation-state. In that sense, it is probably a spontaneous process from which interest in cosmopolitanism emerges. Cosmopolitan theology deals with theological issues occurring in the age of Cosmopolitan.

The term, "Cosmopolitan Gaze," shows the main theme of cosmopolitan

---

[75] Namsoon Kang, *Cosmopolitan Theology: Reconstituting Planetary Hospitality, Neighbor-Love, and Solidarity in an Uneven World*, 20-21.
[76] Ibid., 13

theology.[77] It means that not only "I," but also "you" belong to the cosmos, and all humans have equality, rights, and dignity as colleagues. The gaze can be connected with Jesus' view in the Bible. In Jesus' words and behaviors, factors of cosmopolitanism can be found. In cosmopolitanism, the gaze toward "the other" transcends her/his nationality, gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation or ability. And the gaze is analogous to Jesus' view based on sympathy. His gaze of sympathy toward "the other" is basically different from the gaze of judgment. In fact, judgment toward human beings is in the area of God, but not of humans. Salvation is only chosen by God. As Pope Francis mentioned, an attitude as "who am I to judge?" is a basic position that human beings should have.

Let us take the example of the story of Zacchaeus. In the story, Jesus represents two models of behavior. The first point is that Jesus gazed at Zacchaeus. Many people do not realize his existence in that event. However, why does Jesus focus on him? In order to understand this situation, we need to know that everyone has different modes of seeing the other, even though some may be in the same place, with everyone seeing different things or persons in a different perspective. Thus, believing in Jesus means learning about Jesus' gaze of sympathy, not his gaze of judgment or hatred. The second point is that Jesus tells him, "Zacchaeus, hurry and come down; for I must stay at your house today." We have to focus on using the word, "must." The concept of hospitality absolutizes the boundary between host and guest. However, Jesus eliminates immediately the fixed boundary by communicating with Zacchaeus.[78] In this story, Jesus' gaze then can be

---

[77] Ibid., 17.
[78] Ibid., 168-169.

regarded as Kang's cosmopolitan gaze.

Jesus' statement, "I must stay at your house," deconstructs the boundary between the host and the guest. In other words, hospitality, as the traditional concept, always exists on the boundary between the host who provides hospitality and the guest who receives it. However, Jesus goes beyond the traditional boundary. It is difficult to separate the concept of host from guest. Zacchaeus also accepts Jesus' anti-traditional behavior without argument. Via these two actions, Jesus invites Zacchaeus – and himself - into Zacchaeus' house without any religious judgment. In this story, we can recall the double meaning of *hôte*, the French language deconstructing the boundary between guest and host, and find the example of unconditional hospitality.

This unconditional hospitality can be connected with Jesus' concept of loving neighbors.[79] In fact, Jesus' concept of loving neighbors is a revolutionary thought. The concept of loving neighbors is found in the book of Leviticus before Jesus. However, when the religious leaders of the New Testament era, such as, the Sadducees, the Pharisees and the scribes, interpret the words of the Old Testament, they regarded that neighbors only meant Jews, and strangers do not belong to the group of neighbors. For example, in "You shall not covet your neighbor's wife," one of the Ten Commandments, the neighbor just means Jews, not strangers. But, Jesus deconstructs the traditional concept of "neighbor," as having a limited meaning.[80] Jesus even includes the notion of "enemy" in the concept of neighbor. The Old Testament asserts, "An eye for an eye, a

[79] Ibid., 17.
[80] "Cosmopolitan loving neighbor," last modified on August 14, 2014, http://veritas.kr/contents/article/sub_re.html?no=16824. Accessed on April 13, 2015.

tooth for a tooth."[81] It can be interpreted as limited love or conditional hospitality.

However, Jesus requires love for enemies that are more dangerous beings than strangers.

In the way that Jesus deconstructs the boundary with neighbors, strangers, and even

enemies, Jesus' loving neighbors can be called revolutionary thought. There is a point

that we have to think furthermore. Jesus' teachings, including loving enemies, even

makes us go beyond our fixed understanding and the boundary of neighbors and enemies.

In this sense, Jesus' love is related to unconditional hospitality and cosmopolitan love.[82]

---

[81] "Fracture for fracture, eye for eye, tooth for tooth; whatever injury he has given." (Leviticus 24:20. NRSV) "You have heard that it was said, 'An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.' … But I say to you, Love your enemies and pray for those who persecute you" (Matthew 5:38-44. NRSV).
[82] Ibid., 121-123

Chapter 3.

Grounds of Hospitality: Niels Bohr's Principle of Complementarity, Whitehead's Process

Thought, and Nicholas of Cusa's Coincidence of Opposites

Via the concept of unconditional hospitality, Derrida insists on deconstructing the boundary between guest and host. On that point, we can cast suspicion on possibility of unconditional hospitality. Derrida has written of the utopian nature of unconditional hospitality as mentioning "the impossible that there is."[83] I would like to suggest that current theories of physics give evidence for the impossible possibility of unconditional hospitality to deconstruct the boundary between guest and host as opposite beings. Theories of entanglement, including Niels Bohr's principle of complementarity, Whitehead's process theology, and Nicholas of Cusa's apophatic theology are representatives of such possibility. These theories show that not only our world is sophisticatedly more entangled than our thoughts, but also the that boundaries between apparent opposites, such as, guest and host, immigrants and stayers, and even creatures and creator, are ambiguous.

In quantum physics, Niels Bohr accepted wave-particle duality via the principle of complementarity. At first, Bohr argued that light was just made up of waves. Therefore, when Albert Einstein insisted on the photoelectric effect though the light quantum hypothesis, Bohr only agreed with the wave nature of the light. But, as the Bohr-Kramers-Slater (BKS) theory failed, Bohr accepted the wave-particle duality and insisted

---

[83] Jacques Derrida, "Autoimmunity: Real and Symbolic Suicide: A Dialogue with Jacques Derrida," 120.

on the principle of complementarity. This quantum theory had a significant influence on Whitehead's process philosophy. Similarly, the principle of complementarity can be connected with Cusa's coincidence of opposites.

Nicolas of Cusa has been credited with building a bridge between the middle Ages and modern times. Also, as a great statesman of the Western Church, he tried to come in contact with not only the Eastern Church, but also with Islam. His representative assertion is the coincidence of opposites. He attempted to find a coincidence between infinity and finitude, God and the world, and the Creator and creatures. This theory also can be closely connected with Whitehead's process philosophy, explaining the relationship between God and the world. I would like to consider the possibility of unconditional hospitality by explaining the fact that opposites, such as, immigrants and stayers, guests and hosts, even creatures and creator, instead are coincident and entangled.

1. Niels Bohr's Principle of Complementarity

1) Beginning of Quantum Mechanics

In the history of science, the late nineteenth century was the era when classical mechanics was almost completed. A flow of modern science beginning with the Copernican heliocentrism was almost completed in the era of Isaac Newton (1642-1727 C.E.) and established as a paradigm in the nineteenth century. This development of

science gave humans hope that research for the laws of nature could be more perfectly explained. Also the advancement provided a basis for optimistic thinking about the progress of human society that was an ultimate goal of the Enlightenment thinkers.

These expectations for classical mechanics reached its peak by Pierre-Simon Laplace (1749-1827 C.E.), a great mathematician of France. Laplace argued that if the initial conditions of the universe are given, all things that can happen in the future will be determined by a law of nature and we will be perfectly able to predict things by a physical or mathematical theory.[84] However, in the twentieth century, two major events that could not be explained by the point of view of classical mechanics occurred; one was Einstein's special theory of relativity, and the other was the failure of a description of blackbody radiation.[85] As it happens, both cases affecting the collapse of classical mechanics were related to light.

Since Newton, light was recognized as a particle. However, at the end of the nineteenth century, evidence supporting that light was a wave was found. Diffraction and the interference of light were the representative evidences.[86] Through the two-slit experiment, Thomas Young (1773-1829 C.E.) showed the fact that light passing through two narrow slits forms patterns of bright and dark stripes, and when a crest meets a trough in opposite directions, dark stripes appear by a decrease of intensity. Young explained that this phenomenon was the evidence that light was a wave.[87]

---

[84] Philip Clayton, *Religion and Science: The Basics*, (Abingdon: Routledge, 2012), 71.
[85] Karen Barad, Meeting *The Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*, (Durham: Duke University Press, 2007), 108.
[86] Ibid., 28.
[87] Ibid., 97-100

Substantial evidence of the wave theory came from the research of James Clerk

Maxwell (1831-1879 C.E.) on electricity and magnetism in 1860. Depending on the

experiment of Hans Christian Ø rsted (1777-1851 C.E.) and Michael Faraday (1791-1867

C.E.), Maxwell generated one theory about electromagnetism via combining electricity

and magnetism.[88] In this process, Maxwell set up the wave equation, and the solution of

the equation was a wave function. Maxwell interpreted that the physical meaning of the

wave function was that there was an electromagnetic wave in space. He consequently

predicted that there was an electromagnetic wave in space, and Heinrich Hertz (1857-

1894 C.E.) proved the existence of an electromagnetic wave via his research.

However, a problem was the existence of the luminiferous aether. If it was certain

that light was a wave, there should be a medium from the viewpoint of classic mechanics.

Therefore, scholars assumed that there was a virtual medium and it was called the

luminiferous Aether, or a colorless and odorless material. However, in 1887, in

Michelson-Morley's experiment, it was demonstrated that there was not a luminiferous

aether. That fact contributed to Einstein's special theory of relativity that was later

found.[89] The special theory of relativity shattered the basic premise of classical

mechanics that time and space were independent, absolute, and equal. Such findings were

fatal to classical mechanics.[90]

Another element breaking down classical mechanics was the problem about the

---

[88] Ibid., 98.
[89] John Polkinghorne, *Quantum Physics and Theology: An Unexpected Kinship*, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007), 56-57.
[90] Karen Barad, *Meeting The Universe Halfway,* 100.

description of the blackbody radiation. Classical mechanics could not explain the discontinuity shown in blackbody radiation. In 1900, in the course of solving the problem of the blackbody radiation, the concept of quantum was introduced by Max Planck (1858-1947 C.E.) in the process of solving the element of discontinuous energy, and that was a flare for the new quantum theory.[91]

2) Particle-Wave Duality: the Light Quantum Hypothesis and the Compton Effect

Planck claimed energy quantization, but he did not know whether it was a random tool for the explanation of blackbody radiation or a tool having necessity. He thought that classical mechanics could accept it. However, since the photoelectric effect showed that classical mechanics could not explain Planck's energy of quantization any longer, a new physical theory was needed. Einstein's photon hypothesis to explain the photoelectric effect was a theory proving that light was a particle.[92] As a result, light not only had a property of a particle, but also a property of a wave. Thus, through his research, he concluded, that particle-wave duality of light could not be explained by classical mechanics.[93]

The Compton Effect known as Compton scattering was a significant experiment to intensify the photon hypothesis that light was a particle. In 1923, Arthur Holly Compton (1892-1962 C.E.) strengthened a property of a particle of light via the study

---

[91] Ibid., 108.
[92] Ibid.
[93] John Polkinghorne, *Quantum Physics and Theology: An Unexpected Kinship*, 36-37.

about the scattering of X-rays by a material. To know a property of a particle of something, he suggested that it is very useful to cause something to collide with some other thing; the other thing was an electron. In the experiment, light showed the property of a particle.

Eventually, after two hundred years, since Newton's corpuscular theory of light, light was again regarded as a particle. However, a property of light did not perfectly return to Newton's corpuscular theory of light. Also Young's wave interpretation, and the electromagnetism theory formed by Paraday and Maxwell were not perfectly collapsed. On the one hand, a property of a wave of light had to be accepted, while, on the other hand, a property of a particle of light had to be accepted. Finally, the area of physics accommodated the particle-wave duality of light theory that previously had seemed a contradiction. Niels Bohr (1885-1962 C.E.) accepted the model of particle-wave duality via the principle of complementarity.

3) Niels Bohr's Principle of Complementarity

There were several events to appear with Bohr's complementarity. One of the important chances was Erwin Schrödinger's (1887-1961 C.E.) visit to Copenhagen. In the spring of 1926, Schrödinger developed wave mechanics based on the work of Louis de Broglie (1892-1987 C.E.), and in mid-1926, he completed the most important part of a mathematical experiment on the quantum theory. Schrödinger rejected the notion of the existence of discontinuous energy or quantum jumping via wave mechanics, unlike the

theories of Bohr and Werner Heisenberg (1901-1976 C.E.). He tried to solve the quantum

theory by simple classical wave theory. Due to this problem, Bohr invited Schrödinger to

Copenhagen in the fall of 1926. Schrödinger debated the pending problems of the

quantum theory with Bohr and Heisenberg. Even though Schrödinger left Copenhagen

still rejecting quantum jumping, he brought new perspectives to Copenhagen.

According to Heisenberg, as a result of the intensive research during the few

months following Schrödinger's visit to Copenhagen, the so-called Copenhagen

interpretation on the quantum theory appeared: Bohr introduced a novel and simple

picture resulting from wave mechanics to an interpretation for the theory. Heisenberg

formulated a perfect interpretation to explain all possible physical experiments with a

transformation matrix. In this way, Bohr found the principle of complementarity in 1927,

and Heisenberg solved the problem of how an actual state from all given situation is

experimentally translated into a mathematical representation via assuming that an actual

state is represented as a vector in a Hilbert space; the principle of uncertainty was a

simple expression of this assumption.[94] Two pivots of the Copenhagen interpretation are

the principle of complementarity and the principle of uncertainty. In 1927, after Bohr

announced the principle of complementarity at the Solvay meeting, it was generally

accepted by scholars, and it became a basis of all practical applications.[95]

In fact, Einstein first insisted on the particle-wave duality of light. However, until

1924, Bohr did not accept particle-wave duality, unlike Einstein, because Bohr thought

---

[94] Werner Heisenberg, "The development of the interpretation of the Quantum Theory," in *Niels Bohr and the Development of Physics,* edited by W. Pauli, 12-29, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book, 1995), 13-16.
[95] Ibid., 16. See also Karen Barad, Meeting *The Universe Halfway,* 295.

that since a concept of frequency to calculate energy of a photon was defined by the wave nature of light, light was still a wave, and if the quantum theory was more sophisticated, the corpuscular theory of light would be rejected. However, when the corpuscular theory was solidified by Compton scattering etc., Bohr researched further to negate this corpuscular theory of light in earnest. The result was the Bohr-Kramers-Slater theory (or BKS theory) presented in 1924. However, BKS theory was criticized by showing that the conservation of energy applied to the individual atoms in an experiments of Geiger-Bothe and Compton-Simon. Bohr accepted the failure of BKS Theory and accepted the particle-wave duality of light via the principle of complementarity as follows:[96]

> From these results it seems to follow that, in the general problem of the quantum theory, one is faced not with a modification of the mechanical and electrodynamic theories describable in terms of the usual physical concepts, but with an essential failure of the pictures in space and time on which the description of natural phenomena has hitherto been based.[97]

Bohr mentioned the principle of complementarity in his 1927 Como lecture for the first time.[98] In the lecture, Bohr argued, "The two views of the nature of light are rather to be considered as different attempts at an interpretation of experimental evidence

---

[96] Niels Bohr, "Atomic Theory and Mechanics," in *Atomic Theory and the Description of Nature*, 25-51, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1934), 34.
[97] Ibid., 34-35. See also Karen Barad, *Meeting The Universe Halfway,* 124.
[98] Karen Barad, Meeting *The Universe Halfway,* 296

in which the limitation of the classical concepts is expressed in complementary ways."[99]

These two views seem contradictory. However, they are not contradictory, but

complementary. Thus, the complementarity of particle-wave duality was presented.

Bohr not only used this concept of complementarity in particle-wave duality, but

he often used this concept to refer to other dualities, such as, complementary notions,

complementary aspects, complementary features, complementary experiences,

complementary information, complementary pictures, complementary evidence,

complementary phenomenon, etc. According to Dugald Murdoch's study, complementary

notions, pictures and aspects primarily were used in Bohr's earlier works, and

information and evidence were mostly used in his later works.[100] This principle of

complementarity presented by Bohr was expanded to the outside of areas beyond physics.

4) The Principle of Complementarity and *Yin* and *Yang* Theory of Northeast Asian

Thought.

One of the expanded areas of northeast Asian thought is the *yin* (陰) and *yang*

(陽). In 1937, Bohr had a chance to travel to China and encountered the concept of *yin-*

yang that *yin* and *yang*, two elements seemingly contradictory, exist in harmony via a

dynamic interaction. From then on, he took a keen and active interest in the Great

---

[99] Niels Bohr, "The Quantum Postulate and the Recent Development of Atomic Theory" in *Atomic Theory and the Description of Nature*, 52-91, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934), 56.
[100] Dugald Murdoch, *Niels Bohr's Philosophy of Physics*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987), 60.

Ultimate (太極) and even drew it in the crest of the family. In honor of the Danish

physicist Niels Bohr, the Danish Government engraved the Great Ultimate pattern on the

500 *kroner* bill (the monetary unit of Denmark) with his portrait.[101]

Bohr also wrote "*Contraria Sunt Complementa* (opposites are complementary)."

This has something in common with *yin* and *yang* theory including the *Classic of*

Changes of northeast Asian thought. The *Classic of Changes* has been only widely

known as a book of fortune telling, but this is a book explaining the principle of the

universe via the Great Ultimate.[102] The *Classic of Changes* was formed for long periods.

It is assumed that the *Classic of Change*s of the present time was written by King Wen

(文王, Wen Wang) of the Zhou dynasty (周 Zhou, an ancient Chinese dynasty) revered

as sage king, and added an interpretation of Confucius.[103] The *Classic of Changes* argues

that all things in the universe are born in the Great Ultimate and become *yin-yang*; *yin-*

yang gives birth to *yin* and *yang*; *yin* and *yang* exist in complementary relation; *yin*

changes into *yang*; *yang* changes into *yin*.[104] In summary, the principle of

---

[101] "The story of the Classic of Changes," last modified January 8, 2013,
http://news.donga.com/Column/3/04/20130108/52118774/1. Accessed on May 14. 2014.
[102] Vivian-Lee Nyitray, "Confucianism, Bioethics in," In *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*, Ed. Stephen G. Post,
3rd ed. Vol. 1. (New York: Macmillan Reference USA, 2004), 508-513. *Gale Virtual Reference Library*.
Web. 20 May 2014.
Mark Csikszentmihalyi. "Confucianism: The Classical Canon." In *Encyclopedia of Religion*, ed., Lindsay
Jones, 2nd ed. Vol. 3, (Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2005), 1905-1910. Gale Virtual Reference
Library. Web. 24 May 2014.
http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CCX3424500634&v=2.1&u=madi95127&it=r&p=GVRL&s
w=w&asid=2313b95664f2b2a3802e16f7f76cffbd. Accessed on May 14. 2014.
[103] Wi-Pyeon-Sam-Jeol (韋編三絶) is one of the most famous old northeast Asian sayings. It means that
since Confucius read the *Classic of Changes* so much, a leather strap stringing the bamboo poles were
woven the text through three times. Therefore, it is used as an expression of "extensive reading."
[104] The Appended Remarks (繫辭傳, *xicizhuan*) of the *Classic of Changes* argue, "Giving birth again and
again is called Change, Change has the Great Ultimate; the Great Ultimate generates two Modes; two
Modes generate four Figures; four Figures generate eight Trigrams (易有太極, 是生兩儀, 兩儀生四象,

complementarity of quantum mechanics and the yin-yang theory of northeast Asian thought argues that differences are not essentially causes of a conflict, but rather a dynamic principle penetrating the world to maintain harmony.[105]

Quantum theory had a significant influence on Whitehead's process philosophy. I would like to research the epoch theory of actual entities via quantum theory and the relationship between God and the world in the same metaphysical horizon in the next section.

2. Actual Entity and the Duality of a Material in Whitehead's Thought

Actual entities are "the final real things of which the world is made up. There is no going behind actual entities to find anything more real."[106] In other words, actual entities are ultimate reality as a metaphysical concept achieved via the process of the imaginative generalization or philosophic generalization from daily experience.[107] Therefore, it can be difficult to compare the actual entities as a metaphysical notion with light or a material substance as a physical notion. Nevertheless, actual entities clearly are

---

四象生八卦)." It means that the Great Ultimate is a base of eight Trigrams, four Figures, and two Modes. And it means that Change consists of *yin-yang* duality. In other words, all things in the universe consist of *yin* and *yang* seeming contradictory. Also, Zhou Dunyi (周敦頤, 1071-1073 C.E.) explains the Great Ultimate in Explanation of the Diagram of the Great Ultimate (太極圖說, *Taiji tushou*), "the Non-Ultimate is the Great Ultimate. The Great Ultimate generates *yang* by its moving; its moving is calm in its extreme; Tranquility generates *yin*; Tranquility again changes into moving in its extreme (無極而太極, 太極動而生陽, 動極而靜, 靜而生陰, 靜極復動)." See Also Hyo-Dong Lee, *Spirit, Qi, and the Multitude*, (New York: Fordham University Press, 2014), 44-46, 66-67.
[105] Italics are for emphasis.
[106] Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 18.
[107] Ibid., 5.

abstract ideas derived from the realities of life. Actual entities cannot be explained

without the experience of reality. It can be that process philosophy, affected by quantum

theory, has a trace of particle-wave duality. How has particle-wave duality permeated

process philosophy? How can the relationship between God and the world be explained

via that notion? And how can the notion suggest possibility to deconstruct the boundary

between guest and host as opposite concepts?

1) Epoch Theory for the Explanation about a Particle Nature of Actual Entities

Alfred North Whitehead (1861-1947 C.E.) argues, "The discontinuities introduced

by the quantum theory require revision of physical concepts in order to meet them,"[108]

and "The point illustrated by this example is that the cosmological outlook, which is here

adopted, is perfectly consistent with the demands for discontinuity which have been

urged from the side of physics."[109] As mentioned earlier, quantum theory was introduced

to explain a problem of blackbody radiation. That was the problem of discontinuity.

Eventually, the problem of discontinuity had a significant influence on Whitehead's

philosophy. According to Whitehead, "Every enduring object is to be conceived as at rest

in its own proper space, and in motion throughout any space defined in a way which is

not that inherent in its peculiar undifferentiated endurance." Whitehead explains "its own

---

[108] Alfred North Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1925), 137.
[109] Ibid., 138.

proper space" as a concept of "Epoch." [110]

Actual entities as *res vera* have a property of epoch as a minimum unit in process philosophy. It is a minimum condition for the presence of experience.[111] Whitehead notes, "Your acquaintance with reality grows literally by buds or drops of perception. Intellectually and on reflection you can divide these into components, but as immediately given, they come totally or not at all."[112] A main point of this sentence is that a minimum endurance for the establishment of experience is necessary. The establishment of experience is impossible in a moment below a minimum endurance. In other words, it means that when experience of the most basic unit is divided, the experience disappears.

Therefore, actual occasions always appear as a whole of becoming, namely, epoch. In this sense, Whitehead sometimes mentions actual occasions as epochal occasions.[113] An epochal occasion is non-extensive in the sense that it cannot be spilt in the process of concrescence. It literally is "atomic."[114] It is an "atomized quantum of extension"[115] or "*Quantum in solido*." [116]

Let's take a closer look at a meaning of epoch. Epoch literally means "arrest,"[117] but also it has an extended meaning, such as "period." Whitehead pays attention to the

---

[110] Ibid., 127.
[111] Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 35: "There is a becoming of continuity, but no continuity of becoming." This mysterious sentence of Whitehead means that our experience does not consist of continuous durability without an articulation, but an indivisible lump or node. Whitehead even mentions "a creation of continuity."
[112] Ibid., 68.
[113] Alfred North Whitehead, *Religion in the Making*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1926), 78.
[114] Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 61.
[115] Ibid., 73.
[116] Ibid., 283.
[117] Alfred North Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*, 127.

extended meaning, and understands this meaning as involving physical meaning such as a period of vibration, which needs the whole of the period for revealing itself, and it cannot exist at any point of the total period. Therefore, the concept of epoch connotes the meaning that when the period as a whole is split, actual occasions cannot exist. In other words, actual occasions are not individual moments made by a division of the most basic unit for becoming. Becoming, per se, of actual occasions is inseparable, and non-extensive. When Whitehead mentions, "The ultimate metaphysical truth is atomism,"[118] he has basically that argument in mind. Eventually, actual entities are transcendent of each other, to the individuality of an atomic unit.

This epoch of concrescence is a basis of freedom in the process of concrescence. This freedom is an element explaining how a pure interior process of the subject becomes the teleological process with an escape from a simple repetition of the past. The truth sense of "creative" in a creative process takes root in this freedom. Since, each phase of concrescence in the occasion is not in time, it is not a causal process. Therefore, there is a space for the "final cause" in the occasion. Since this final cause can act in the occasion, a process of concrescence of the occasion can be understood as a creative and autonomous process leading to self-completion. Eventually, the epoch of concrescence is a categorical space where a subjective aim, as the final cause, leads to an autonomous creation that can be active.

Freedom or independence of actual entities can be connected with a particle nature. One of the most important features of a particle nature is its individuality or

---

[118] Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 35.

independence. However, actual entities do not only have a particle nature. Actual entities are not only free, but also determined,[119] which means being not only in relationship with others, but also influenced by others. It can be related with a wave nature. One of the most important features of the wave nature is interference (as reaction by external influences). Therefore, via an interference, we can examine a wave nature of actual entities. Eventually, the duality of actual entities as *res vera* can be connected with the double meaning of *hôte* which in the French language, implies deconstructing the boundary between guest and host.

2) The Principle of Relativity for the Explanation about a Wave nature of Actual Entities

Actual entities are not only a process of self-determination, but also a product of given conditions. Actual entities do not only autonomically organize themselves in an activity of self-determination, despite the difference of degrees, but also they create themselves only within given datum as possibility. In other words, actual entities can be present only by accepting given conditions. Therefore, it they cannot enjoy absolute freedom. Actual entities are determined as well as free; they are dependent as well as independent; they are collective as well as individual.

Freedom realizes the absoluteness of actual entities, but determinacy realizes the relativity of actual entities.[120] And the latter property is the main concept of process

---

[119] Ibid., 27: "The concrescence of each individual actual entity is internally determined and is externally free."

[120] Alfred North Whitehead, *Adventures of Ideas,* (New York: Macmillan Company, 1933), 54.

philosophy that regards the relationship between beings as a basic axis. A birth of actual

entities is a product of the past in the way that begins from the datum of the past.

However, actual entities are not only influenced by the datum of the past. Actual entities

also are becoming current as they become the datum of other actual entities.[121]

Therefore, relativity is a notion involving a relationship of following actual entities. To

become the datum of following other actual entities means to become their

objectification. Actual entities are connected by following other actual entities via this

objectification. This comes true at the same time with the self-completion of actual

entities; via self-completion, they work as identity restricting following other's actual

entities

      This process can be explained by the principle of relativity. "It belongs to the

nature of a 'being' that it is a potential for every 'becoming.'"[122] In other words, it is a

nature of all beings that all beings are potentiality for all becoming.[123] Depending on this

metaphysical necessity, when their behavior of self-regulation terminates, actual entities

as the superjective remain permanently a regulator of following all others.[124] This

process involves countless results via repetition and reappearance in all actualities

objectified by those events. All completed beings stamp their identity on new beings via

the emergence of all actual entities as objective data. This is a function of efficient cause

that actual entities experience as superjective, and, in that sense, we can regard actual

---

Alfred North Whitehead, *Science and the Modern World*, 137.
[122]   Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 22.
[123]   Ibid., 45.
[124]   Ibid., 29.

entities as self-creative and other-creative beings at the same time. In conclusion, Actual

entities is not only independent (a nature of a particle) in relation to others, but also they

receive interference (a nature of a wave) from others.[125]

3) The Relationship between God and the World

God is a main exemplification of the metaphysical principle in process

philosophy.[126] Therefore, God is on the same metaphysical horizon with other actual

entities, and has polarity,[127] namely, the primordial nature and the consequent nature.[128]

The primordial nature is essentially pure potential; it consists of unconditional prehension

of eternal objects. It is the primordial fact in the world not limited by any actuality.

Therefore, this aspect of God's nature is free, perfect, primordial, and eternal. On the

other hand, the consequent nature is actuality; it consists of a process of an integration

between God's prehension from the actual world and God's primordial nature. Therefore,

the consequent nature is determined, incompleted, permanent, and perfectly actual.[129]

God interacts with the world via God's polarity. God lures the world via the

primordial nature which makes pure potential into actual potential via conjunctive

prehension about them. These actual potentials, as an initial aim, are given into a process

of concrescence of actual entities, and novelty that have never before been born via the

---

[125] Italics are for emphasis.
[126] Ibid., 343
[127] Ibid., 36, 345.
[128] Ibid., 343-51.
[129] Ibid., 345.

50

initial aim. These actualities have never been experienced by God. Therefore, the consequent nature of God is enriched and renewed as much as temporal occasions are newly completed and then casually objected to God. Eventually, the temporal world suggests the physical novelty to God as well as God suggests conceptual novelty to the temporal world. In this sense, "Either of them, God and the World, is the instrument of novelty for the other."[130]

To sum up, the dynamic relationship of contradictory properties, namely, particle and wave, freedom and determinacy of actual entities, and the primordial nature and the consequent nature of God, is a metaphysical principle forming our cosmos, which is a process in which the 'disjunctive many' go forward toward the 'conjunctive one.' Therefore, the actual world as the 'disjunctive many' is a solemn fact.[131] Harmony formed in a contradictory relation, and a relationship between God and the world, as opposite beings, can be connected with Nicolas of Cusa's coincidence of opposites much like deconstructing the boundary between guest and host as opposite beings in unconditional hospitality.

3. Nicolas of Cusa's the Coincidence of Opposites

1) The Reason of the Unknowable God: *Dialogue on the Hidden God*

Give ear to my prayer, O God, and hide not yourself from my plea for mercy.

---

[130] Ibid., 349.
[131] Italics are for emphasis.

(Psalms 55:1, NRSV)

Nicholas of Cusa was born in Germany and was one of the most outstanding theologians, philosophers, and mystics of the fifteenth century. He played a bridge role between Roman Catholicism, and also with medieval and modern thought in philosophy. He also tried to reform Roman Catholicism and reconcile the differences between the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Church throughout his life as a church administrator and reformer.[132] He thought was especially based on Pseudo-Dynosius, Meister Eckhart, and Neo-Platonism;[133] He also influenced later thinkers including Ernst Cassirer, Karl Jasper, and Hans-Georg Gadamer.[134] His major writing is *De Docta Ignorantia (On knowing ignorance)*. His other writings include *De Deo Abscondito (Dialogue on the Hidden God)*, *De Visione Dei (On the Vision of God)*, et cetera.

How can we know God? Is it possible to comprehend God? The answer of apophtic theology about this question is that we cannot know God. The reason why we are not able to know God is found in *Dialogue on the Hidden God*, which consists of a dialogue between pagans and Christians.[135] Nicholus of Cusa explains the hidden God or God's self-concealment via the form of the dialogue. Needless to say, the topic of the hidden God or God's self-concealment does not only belong to Nicolas of Cusa. From ancient Christian

---

[132] H. Lawrence Bond, translator, "Nicholas of Cusa: Selected Spiritual Writings," (New York: Paulist Press, 1997), 4.

[133] William Franke, ed. *On What Cannot Be Said: Apophatic Discourse in Philosophy, Religion, Literature, and the Arts,* Vol. 1, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press: 2007), 338-339.

[134] Ibid.

[135] Nicholas of Cusa, *Dialogue on the Hidden God,* 1444/5, in *Nicholas of Cusa: Selected Spiritual Writings*, trans. H. Lawrence Bond (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1997), 1, 209. "A dialogue between two men, one of whom is a pagan, the other a Christian."

mystics to Thomas Aquinas, to religious reformers like Martin Luther and Karl Barth, this topic has appeared in various thinkers with frequency. Thomas Aquinas explored God's incomprehensibility via the doctrine of God's infinity.[136] Martin Luther mentioned the hidden God, "One who was not simply identifying the limits of human reason, analogy, or the natural knowledge of God."[137] However, his concern was based on fideism rather than apophatic theology. Karl Barth insisted that God as the absolute other is not able to be imagined by finite Human beings; he underscored God's absolute transcendence and the human incapability of knowing God except in the medium of revelation.[138] But his concern directly was based on mysticism of the neoplatonic or speculative sort rather than apophatic theology.

Nicholas of Cusa severely criticizes the arrogant attitude that one can know truth via Christianity in the dialogue, "Truth is not known otherwise and in some other manner than the manner truth itself is. Hence, one is out of one's mind who thinks one knows anything in truth but who is ignorant of truth."[139] He argues from the Christian's lips that his knowledge of God is not God, her/his awareness of God is not similar with God, *per se*, because God is beyond all of these things[140] He also contends that the attitude that one can

---

[136] James L. Fredericks, *Buddhists and Christians*, (New York: Orbis Books, 2004), 87.

[137] Steven D. Paulson, "Luther on the Hidden God," *The Journal of Word & World* 19, no. 4 (September 1, 1999): 364. http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.drew.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=763b5747-70d3-4b83-9b21-1c9c74d0c9a4%40sessionmgr4005&vid=20&hid=4112. Accessed April 13, 2015.

[138] Godsey, J., M. B. Schepers, and J. Burnett, "Barth, Karl." In *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed. Vol. 2 (Detroit: Gale, 2003), 120-121.
http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.drew.edu/ps/retrieve.do?sgHitCountType=&sort=&docLevel=&prodId=GVRL&tabID=T003&subjectParam=&searchId=R5&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&searchType=BasicSearchForm&currentPosition=1&searchResultsType=SingleTab&subjectAction=&bucketSubId=&inPS=true&userGroupName=madi95127&nav=prev&sgCurrentPosition=&docId=GALE%7CCX3407701142
Accessed April 13, 2015.

[139] Cusa, *Dialogue on the Hidden God*, 3, 210.

[140] Ibid., 9, 211.

know God resembles the blind trying to know the universe by seeing since God as the absolute being or absolute truth is infinitely beyond all humans' thoughts and ideas. As he observes, "Because of the excellence of God's infinity all that can be said disjunctively and unitively, whether by means of agreement or contradiction, does not correspond to God, for God is the one beginning prior to every idea that can be formed of God."[141]

However, he argues that God is not nothing, since the nothing has the name as "nothing." God also is not something that is not nothing, since something is not all things but God is all things and then something. He says, "God is not nothing, for this nothing has the name "nothing" … God is beyond nothing and beyond something, for nothing obeys God in order that something may come into being … God cannot be called "this" rather than "that," since all things are from God."[142] He continuously insists that God cannot be named and explained by language, thereby rejecting all definitions of God. He says, "God is neither nothing nor not nothing, nor is God both nothing and not nothing, but God is the source and origin of all beginnings of being and not-being."[143] This logic is found in Buddhism's "four alternatives" *(catuskoti, 四句否定).*[144]

"I know that everything I know is not God and that everything I conceive is not like God, but rather God surpasses all these."

[141] Ibid., 10, 212.

[142] Ibid., 9, 211.

[143] Ibid., 11, 212.

[144] Frederick J. Streng, "Sunyam and Sunyata," in *Encyclopedia of Religion*, edited by Lindsay Jones, 2nd ed. Vol. 13 (Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2005), 8855F-8860. http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.drew.edu/ps/retrieve.do?sgHitCountType=None&sort=RELEVANCE&inPS=true&prodId=GVRL&userGroupName=madi95127&tabID=T003&searchId=R1&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&contentSegment=&searchType=BasicSearchForm&currentPosition=1&contentSet=GALE%7CCX3424503000&&docId=GALE|CX3424503000&docType=GALE. Accessed April 13, 2015. Four alternatives (*catuṣkoti*) is the dialectical method of inquiry that lightens the opinion of being or non-being via the repeated negation in order to know the reality of things. "That is, when denying that an entity has "being," a person implicitly asserts that the entity has "nonbeing." Thus in the Mādhyamika dialectic a common argumentative procedure is the denial of "four alternatives" (*catuṣkoti*). For example, in

To sum up, God is not discovered in the linguistic regions of human beings. God is beyond and precedes all human thoughts or concepts. Nicholas of Cusa finally explains these ideas from a pagan's lip - in his dialogue with a Christian: "I clearly understand that neither God nor God's name is to be found in the realm of all creatures and that God flees from every concept rather than being asserted as something … That which is composite is not from itself but from that which precedes every composite … Therefore, may God, who is hidden from the eyes of all the wise of the world be blessed forever."[145] This is the reason of the hidden and unknowable God.

2) The Enlightenment of the Unknowable God: *De Docta Ignorantia*

If anyone imagines that he knows something, he does not yet know as he ought to

know. (1 Corinthians 8:2, NRSV)

Nicholas of Cusa explores the possibilities and the limits of the recognition of knowing God in his book*, De Docta Ignorantia.* He tries to unfold the absolute or infinite being via the reflection of human recognition.[146] He quotes Socrates' sentence to elucidate the limits and finitude of the ability of human recognition in the introduction of *De Docta Ignorantia (Knowing Ignorance)*, "he knew nothing except that he did not know."[147] It is an undeniable fact that human beings can know that she/he does not know anything via

---

discussing the nature of the perfectly enlightened one (*tathāgata*), Nāgārjuna states: "One can say neither 'empty' nor 'non-empty'; nor both, nor neither."

[145] Cusa, *Dialogue on the Hidden God*, 15, 213.

[146] H. Lawrence Bond, "Nicholas of Cusa: Selected Spiritual Writings," 34.

[147] Nicolas of Cusa, *De Docta Ignorantia* 1440, in *Nicholas of Cusa: Selected Spiritual Writings*, translated by H. Lawrence Bond (Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 1997), I.1.4, 88

ignorance. Ignorance is simply not the lack of knowledge that can overcome through the development of the recognition and the effort of seeking knowledge.[148] The obvious point in him is that the more humans are faithful to knowledge, the more they reach the knowing ignorance[149] According to Chris Boesel and Catherine Keller in their book, *Apophatic Bodies*, Nicholas of Cusa's knowing ignorance reminds us of the saying in the *Tao Te Ching* (道德經)*,*[150] "To know yet to think that one does not know (knowing ignorance) is best (strength); Not to know yet to think that one knows (ignoring knowledge) will lead to difficulty (sickness)."[151]

Nicholas of Cusa gives a circle and a polygon within a circle as an example in explaining the fact that we can only reach knowing ignorance. If human intelligence is compared to a line of a polygon, the more human intelligence develops, the more the number of the line of the polygon is increased. Then, the polygon becomes similar to the circle. However, even if the number of the lines of the polygon is increased infinitely, then the polygon is not able to become the circle perfectly. Likewise, even though human intelligence ceaselessly develops, it cannot reach and thus know God.[152]

Nicholas of Cusa's main writing, *De Docta Ignorantia,* is composed of three parts.

---

[148] Ibid., 62

[149] Cusa, *De Docta Ignorantia*, I.1.4, 89.
"If all this is true, since the desire in us for knowledge is not in vain, surely then it is our desire to know that we do not know. If we can attain this completely, we will attain learned ignorance. For nothing more perfect comes to a person, even the most zealous in learning, than to be found most learned in the ignorance that is uniquely one's own. One will be the more learned, the more one knows that one is ignorance."

[150] Chris Boesel, and Catherine Keller, eds., *Apophatic Bodies,* (New York: Fordham University, 2010), 10.

[151] Lao Tzu, *Tao Te Ching*, translated by D. C. Lau, (New York: Penguin Books, 1963), 78. "知不知上
不知知病"

[152] Cusa, *De Docta Ignorantia*, I.3.10, 90-91.

He develops the idea, the "coincidence of opposites" (*coincidentia oppositorum*), in his book through a Napoleonic Christian tradition, which derives from Proclus and Pseudo-Dionysius and comes down to us by way of John Scotus Erigena and the School of Chartres to Meister Eckhart, which rejected much of the standard presumptions of Scholasticism.[153]

The first book describes the concept of the "absolutely maximum" (*maximum absolutum*).[154] The absolutely maximum means an oneness that embraces all things, God as ultimate being.[155] This reminds us of the God's concept mentioned by Anselm, God as "the absolutely maximum."[156] Knowing ignorance is needed based on the fact that the human's request about knowledge is not meaningless. The more knowing ignorance is realized, the more truth is revealed; maximum and minimum are unified in the infinity. On this point, the coincidence of opposites takes place, which is Nicholas of Cusa's overall thought.

From the human's viewpoint, there are a number of opposites in the world, such as up and down, left and right, something and nothing, and eternity and moment. However, according to Nicholas of Cusa, "the opposites" is only a concept by the thought of humans

---

[153] J. Koch, "Nicholas of Cusa," in *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed. Vol. 10, (Detroit: Gale, 2003), 372-376. http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.drew.edu/ps/retrieve.do?sgHitCountType=None&sort=RELEVANCE&inPS=true&prodId=GVRL&userGroupName=madi95127&tabID=T003&searchId=R5&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&contentSegment=&searchType=BasicSearchForm&currentPosition=3&contentSet=GALE%7CCX3407708014&&docId=GALE|CX3407708014&docType=GALE. Accessed December 12, 2013.

[154] Chris Boesel, and Catherine Keller, eds., *Apophatic Bodies,* 38. "God as the absolutely maximum is "negatively infinite." By contrast the universe "embraces all the things that are not God."" The universe as the "contracted maximum" (*maximum contractum*) is explained in his second book of *De Docta Ignorantia*. And, the two concepts are coincident in Christ as the "absolute and contracted maximum" (*maximum contractum pariter et absolutum*). This is also the explanation of the "coincidence of opposites" (*coincidentia oppositorum*) that is the principle penetrating the entire book.

[155] H. Lawrence Bond, translator, "*Nicholas of Cusa: Selected Spiritual Writings*," 19

[156] Chris Boesel, and Catherine Keller, eds., *Apophatic Bodies,* 38.

who are finite and relative, but "with God we must, as far as possible, forestall contradictories and embrace them in a simple concept." [157] In God, distinction and indistinction are not each different concepts, but rather they are in accordance. Likewise, maximum and minimum are not each two concepts, but harmony, instead. Since the opposites are made by human thought, opposites are meaningless in God. Cusa describes this via mathematical examples of how opposites can be unified within the concept of infinity.

Let us take a look at Nicholas of Cusa's mathematical examples of the coincidence of opposites. The diameter of the circle is the straight line. Circumference is the curved line that is longer than the diameter of the circle. If the curved line is less bent as much as the increase of the circumference, then the circumference of the biggest circle will be the least bent, which means that curved line becomes straight as possible. In other words, if the diameter of the circle increases to the max, then the circumference is bent at the least resulting in the diameter with the circumference becoming unified.[158] Also, he explains the coincidence between maximum and minimum with the concept of quantity. The maximum quantity is the maximum large, but the minimum quantity is the maximum small. Therefore, if "large" and "small" are eliminated in the sentence, maximum and minimum are unified in the maximum, since maximum and minimum are the superlatives.[159]

Nicholas of Cusa refers to the infinite triangle as another example of this point. The triangle is made up of three straight lines. The more one line increases, the more the others

---

[157] Cusa, *De Docta Ignorantia*, I.19.57, 113.
[158] Ibid. I.13.35, 103. Refer to the picture of the book.
[159] Ibid., I.4.11, 91.

58

along the lines increase. Let us consider that the straight line is increased infinitely. Eventually, the triangle becomes a straight line. In other words, three straight lines of the triangle are unified in the infinity;[160] this also is an instance of how the opposites are unified in the concept of the infinity. This point is explained by mathematics and appears in his other writings.[161]

The second book discusses the "contracted maximum" (*maximum contractum*), which means the universe is derived from the absolutely maximum. In other words, the universe is originated of God, the whole creature. Even though the universe enfolds all things, this does not include God. Nicholas of Cusa refers to the universe as the limited maximum in comparison with the absolutely maximum.[162] He tries to remove the boundary between God and human, creator and creature, by regarding God as the absolutely maximum embracing all things as well as the center of the world.

Nicholas of Cusa tries to explain the relationship between God and the world through the concepts of a point and line. According to his explanation, if a point is found in all of a line, then the point "is nothing else than infinite unity, for infinite unity is the point that is the limit, perfection, and totality of line and quantity, which It enfolds."[163] This means within the enfolding relationship that the point enfolds the line. He uses another mathematical concept to make his point, namely the relationship between a finite line and infinite line. He says, "every finite line has its being from the infinite line, which is all that

---

[160] Ibid., I.14.39, 105. Refer to the picture of the book.
[161] H. Lawrence Bond, translator, "*Nicholas of Cusa: Selected Spiritual Writings*," 9.
[162] Ibid.
[163] Cusa, *De Docta Ignorantia*, II.3.105, 134.

which the finite line is. Hence, in the finite line, all that the infinite line is -- line triangle and so on -- is that which the finite line is. In the finite line therefore every figure infinite line itself, and no triangle, circle, or sphere is actually present on it, because that which is, actually one does not become from that which is actually many."[164] In other words, an infinite line can be a triangle, circle, and sphere, but a circle cannot be a triangle. Likewise, a triangle cannot be a circle and sphere. Keller, paraphrasing Cusa, mentions about these points specifically, "The universe as unfolded, is not-God, but as enfolded in God is God."[165]

The third book explores the "absolute and contracted maximum" (*maximum contractum pariter et absolutum*), which means Christ. He is not only united with the absolute, but also the maximum and the perfection of the universe. Also, he does not only have the divine wisdom, but also the center and circumference of all intelligence.[166] These are undeniable facts that, in Christ, opposite beings or concepts are integrated; divinity is unified with humanity, absolutely maximum is associated with contracted maximum, and God is connected with the universe. Eventually, the coincident of opposites penetrates the entire book.

Keller discusses the coincidence of opposites in her book, *the cloud of the impossible*.[167] She says, "Cusa's condensed early Renaissance contribution to European thought, signifies in its impossibility both the impassable wall and the passage through

---

[164] Ibid., II.5.119, 141.
[165] Chris Boesel, and Catherine Keller, eds., *Apophatic Bodies,* 36.
[166] H. Lawrence Bond, translator, "*Nicholas of Cusa: Selected Spiritual Writings*," 19.
[167] Catherine Keller, *Cloud of the Impossible*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 201), 99.

it."[168] She exemplifies the imagination for "apophatic bodies as a fresh"[169] this may seem impossible as the concept of opposites, but it can be in the coincidence of opposites. The concept is also found in the Buddhist tradition[170] One of Zen Buddhism's books of disambiguation (公案), *Blue Cliff Record* (碧巖錄), states, "Heaven and Earth have the same root with me, all things is the same body with me."[171] In other words, since all things are born in one root, all things are one body. This sentence is connected with the coincidence of opposites, which suggests that all things, even opposite things, are unified in infinite God.

The concept of the coincidence of opposites is reminiscent of Whitehead's discussion of the relationship between God and the world.[172] He puts the relationship between God and the world in the last section of his major book, *Process and Reality*, in a famous set of antitheses: "It is as true to say that God is permanent and the World fluent,

---

[168] Chris Boesel, and Catherine Keller, eds., *Apophatic Bodies,* 28.

[169] Ibid.

[170] Thich Nhat Hanh, *Being Peace*, (Berkeley: Parallax Press, 1987), Kindle Edition, 51-52 of 126. The concept of *coincidentia oppositorum* is found in Thich Nhat Hanh's book, *Being Peace*. He argues that there are heterogeneous things in things per se, and describes the concept via Buddhism's "Emptiness." ""A sheet of paper is made of non-paper elements." A cloud is a non- paper element. The forest is a non-paper element. Sunshine is a non-paper element. The paper is made of all the non-paper elements to the extent that if we return the non-paper elements to their sources, the cloud to the sky, the sunshine to the sun, the logger to his father, the paper is empty. Empty of what? Empty of a separate self. It has been made by all the non-self elements, non-paper elements, and if all these non-paper elements are taken out, it is truly empty, empty of an independent self. Empty, in this sense, means that the paper is full of everything, the entire cosmos. The presence of this tiny sheet of paper proves the presence of the whole cosmos.

[171] Paul F. Knitter, *Without Buddha I Could not be a Christian*, translated by Jeong Kyeong-il and Lee Chang-yeop, (Oxford: Oneworld, 2009), 4. "天地與我同根, 萬物與我同體."

[172] Cusa, *De Docta Ignorantia*, II.5.118, 140. Whitehead's reference is particularly associated with Nicholas of Cusa's following sentences, "Since the universe is contracted in each actually existing thing, it is obvious that God, who is in the universe, is in each thing and each actually existing thing is immediately in God, as is the universe. Therefore, to say that "each thing is in each thing" is not other than to say that ''through all things God is in all things" and that "through all things all are in God.""

as that the World is permanent and God is fluent … God is one and the World many, as that the World is one and God many… the World is immanent in God, as that God is immanent in the World … God transcends the World, as that the World transcends God … God creates the World, as that the World creates God." [173] In short, he regards the relationship between God and the world as from the opposite to an interdependent and harmonious relationship.

As we have seen above, Nicholas of Cusa lived on the boundary between the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Church, medieval and modern thought, and creatures and creator. And he always deconstructed the limitation. On this point, his thought can be related with unconditional hospitality. As the straight line and the curved line coincide in the infinite diameter, maximum and minimum coincide in the superlatives, and three lines coincide in infinite triangle, and opposite things in the world coincide in the infinite God. Thus, it means that in infinite, unconditional, and unlimited hospitality is impossible possibility, with God as hidden being, the boundary between guest and host can be deconstructed, and guest and host can be coincided.

---

[173] Alfred North Whitehead, *Process and Reality*, 348.

Chapter 4. CONCLUSION: ENTANGLEMENT AND THE POSSIBILITY OF

UNCONDITIONAL HOSPITALITY

I give you a new commandment, that you love one another. Just as I have loved

you, you also should love one another. By this everyone will know that you are my

disciples, if you have love for one another.

(John 13:34-35 NRSV)

We are living in the age of migration. Now, numerous people move to from one

place to another place. The reason that they move to other place beyond the border is

obvious. They want to find better life, better educational environment for their children,

stable working condition. However, unlike their expectation, they are confronted by

severe problems, such as, undocumented immigrants, xenophobia, racial segregation, and

exploitation. Especially, after the international terrorism including Islamic State, the 9/11

attacks, the bombing attack at the Boston marathon, immigrants are dealt with as

dangerous elements. Via the negative attitude toward immigrants, including,

discrimination, forced expulsion, and regarding them as potential criminals, these serious

problems cannot be solved, but rather are aggravated.

I have treated Habermas' notion of tolerance and Derrida's understanding of

hospitality as an ethically attractive attitude toward the "others," including immigrants,

strangers, and foreign workers. Both theories insists on open attitudes toward "the other."

There is a decisive difference between tolerance and hospitality; Habermas' notion of

tolerance is conditional, but Derrida's understanding of hospitality is unconditional.

Derrida insists on unconditional hospitality with appraising that tolerance is still host-centric. However, since Derrida's notion of hospitality deconstructs the boundary between guests and hosts, it seems near impossible and dangerous. Derrida also mentions impossibility of unconditional hospitality. But it is not fixed impossibility, rather impossible possibility.

I also have examined entanglement theories. And these theories support the impossible possibility of unconditional hospitality. The duality of matter in quantum mechanics including particle nature and wave nature, the duality of actual entities in process theology including a mental pole and a physical pole, freedom and determinacy, and concrescence and transition, and the coincidence of creator and creatures in apophatic theology are associated with the coincidence of guest and host, immigrants and dweller, and employers and employees in unconditional hospitality.

First, quantum mechanics was the scientific ground of impossible possibility of hospitality. Modern science is represented by quantum mechanics. This asserts that quantum has two natures, including a wave and particle. Also quantum mechanics proves that two matters in the distance is intertwined via quantum entanglement,[174] which exemplifies the double meaning of *hôte*, the French term for guest. As we have seen above, *hôte* simultaneously refers to "host and guest" in its linguistic roots. In other

---

[174] In quantum mechanics, quantum entanglement explains the non-classical interrelationship between two parts. This entanglement can be possible, even though two parts are in the long distance. For example, suppose one particle and another particle of quantum state spin in opposite direction each other. According to the principle of quantum mechanics, we cannot know the state of two particle before measurement. However, if we measure state of two particles, at the moment, the state of one particle is decided and the effects on the state of another particle. It seems that information of one particle delivers to another particle in an instant. See Karen Barad, *Meeting The Universe Halfway*, 270.

words, in the meaning of *hôte*, host and guest are not independent of each other, but rather are intertwined understanding. Thus, in the message of quantum mechanics, can we find the fact that we are simultaneously subject and object, guests and hosts, and migrants and dwellers?

Second, process thought was the philosophical ground of absolute hospitality. Process philosophy influenced by quantum mechanics insisting on the duality of matter, such as, a physical pole and a mental pole, a mental pole and a physical pole, freedom and determinacy, and concrescence and transition. This principle unexceptionally applies to all actual entities, even God. According to this principle, God also has two natures, such as, a primordial nature and a consequent nature. This shows that all things are concurrently active being and passive being. This also proves that we are simultaneously guest as passive being and host as active being, and migrants as passive being and dwellers as active being.

Finally, apophatic theology was the theological ground of impossible possibility of hospitality. Apophatic theology insists on not only unknowing God, but also the coincidence of opposites. Nicholas of Cusa demonstrated this insight via mathematics, geometry, and comparative terms. This principle demonstrates that opposing-looking various things coincide, harmonize, and unify.

These thoughts show the truth of the world we are living in. And, on this basis, it is the fact that unconditional hospitality is the attitude to realize the intertwined and ambiguous real world. In fact, unconditional hospitality is dangerous and impossible. Going beyond boundaries always seems hazardous. Whitehead asserts, "Abstract

speculation has been the salvation of the world speculation which made systems and then transcended them, speculations which ventured to the furthest limit of abstraction. To set limits to speculation is treason to the future."[175] Likewise, to keep silent in front of boundaries, to fix borders, and to set limits hospitality is treason to the future.

I have seen a Hispanic man who fell helpless on the street in cold weather. There was no sign that the man, surrounded by policemen, could get up. Since I hurried off and left that place, I did not find out what happened to the man. However, the man has haunted my memory. Of course, I do not know the reason that the man fell on the street. I also do not know whether or not the man is alive. However, I can fully imagine that he would been discriminated against because of his language, poverty, and his ethnic background. I can even imagine that since the man could not get something to eat or find some place to sleep in the cold weather, he may have lost his life.

Hospitality toward the other is not simply the problem on the theoretical dimension. Hospitality is related to the survival problem of my neighbors, nature, and the entire universe. Global issues, such as, the Ebola virus arising in Africa, the Islamic State, and the radiation releases by the greatest earthquake in Japan, have already become a part of my life. The Ebola virus has already been in the air that I breathe, the Islamic State has already threatened my neighbors, and radioactivity be spilled from nuclear power in Japan has already been found in the fish that I eat. If we do not regard ourselves as a community sharing a common destiny via hospitality, we cannot solve these serious problems based on entanglements at all.

---

[175] A. N. Whitehead, *The Function of Reason*, (Millis, MA: Agora, 2014), 31.

In our daily life, unconditional hospitality deconstructing the boundary toward "the other" seems like an impossible dream. The cosmopolitan gaze can be treated as a kind of utopia especially since it never exists in the real world. However, the notion of the impossible has always endured with possibility. Reality is in the darkness of unreality. But, eventually, reality breaks through the darkness of unreality. As the impossibility of the cross gave birth to the possibility of the Resurrection, we have to dream of the impossible future in the possible present.

Bibliography

Albertini, Tamara. "Mathematics and Astronomy." In *Introducing Nicholas of Cusa: A Guide to a Renaissance Man*. Ed. Christopher M. Bellitto, Thomas M. Izhicki and Gerald Christianson. 373-408. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2004.

Agamben, Giorgio. *Homo Sacer: Sovereign Power and Bare Life*. Translated by Daniel Heller-Roazen. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Barad, Karen. *Meeting the Universe Halfway: Quantum Physics and the Entanglement of Matter and Meaning*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2007.

Biechler, James E. "Interreligious Dialogue." In *Introducing Nicholas of Cusa: A Guide to a Renaissance Man*, Ed. Christopher M. Bellitto, Thomas M. Izhicki and Gerald Christianson. 270-298. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2004.

Boesel, Chris and Catherine Keller, Eds. *Apophatic Bodies.* New York: Fordham University, 2010.

Bohr, Niels. "Atomic Theory and Mechanics." In *Atomic Theory and the Description of Nature*, 25-51. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1934.

Bond, H. Lawrence, Trans. "Nicholas of Cusa: Selected Spiritual Writings." New York: Paulist Press, 1997.

Borradori, Giovanna. Ed. *Philosophy In A Time Of Terror: Dialogues With Jürgen Habermas And Jacques Derrida.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2003.

Calhoun, Craig. Trans. *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.

Castles, Stephan, Hein de Hass, and Mark J. Miller. *The Age of Migration: International population Movements in the Modern World.* New York: Guilford Press, 2014.

Critchley, Simon. *Ethics, Politics, Subjectivity*. New York: Verso, 1999.

Csikszentmihalyi, Mark. "Confucianism: An Overview." In *Encyclopedia of Religion*. Ed. Lindsay Jones. 2nd ed. Vol. 3. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2005. 1890-1905. Gale Virtual Reference Library. http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CCX3424500633&v=2.1&u=madi95127&it=r&p=GVRL&sw=w&asid=1d9c4a452c30e7a3dfdb1558c969ab16. Accessed on May 14. 2014.

_____. "Confucianism: The Classical Canon." In *Encyclopedia of Religion*. ed. Lindsay Jones. 2nd ed. Vol. 3. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2005. 1905-1910. Gale Virtual Reference Library. http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CCX3424500634&v=2.1&u=madi95127&it=r&p=GVRL&sw=w&asid=2313b95664f2b2a3802e16f7f76cffbd. Accessed on May 14. 2014.

Clayton, Philip. *Religion and Science: The Basics*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2012.

Custer. O. "Making Sense of Derrida's Aporetic Hospitality," in *Derrida: Critical Assessments of Leading Philosophers Ⅲ*. Edited by Len Lawlor and Zeynep Direk, New York: Routledge, 2002.

Deleuze, Gilles and Felix Guattari, *What is Philosophy?* Translated by Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Derrida, Jacques. *Adieu To Emmanuel Levinas*. Translated by Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael Naas. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1999.

_____, and Elizabeth Roudinesco. *For What Tomorrow . . . A Dialogue*. Translated by Jeff Fort. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004.

_____. *Margins of Philosophy*. Translated by Alan Bass. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1982.

_____. *Of Hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida To Respond*. Translated by Rachel Bowlby. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000.

_____. *Positions*. Translated and annotated by Alan Bass. Chicago: The University of Chicago, 1981.

_____. *Psyche: Inventions of the other*. Vol I. Edited by Peggy Kamuf and Elizabeth Rottenberg. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2007.

Donga. "The Story of *Classic of Changes*." Last modified January 8, 2013. http://news.donga.com/Column/3/04/20130108/52118774/1. Accessed on May 14, 2014.

Duclow, Donald F. "Life and Work." In *Introducing Nicholas of Cusa: A Guide to a Renaissance Man*. Ed. Christopher M. Bellitto, Thomas M. Izhicki and Gerald Christianson. 25-58. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2004.

Duclow, Donald F. "Nicholas of Cusa." In *Encyclopedia of Religion*. ed. Lindsay Jones, 2nd ed. Vol. 10. Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2005. 6610-6611. Gale Virtual Reference Library. http://go.galegroup.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CCX3424502248&v=2.1&u=madi95127&it=r&p=GVRL&sw=w&asid=3a5ecc632603b483d84bb4a0ca9670d3. Accessed on May 14. 2014.

Encyclopedia Britannica. ″Selma to Montgomery marches." Last modified on March 1. 2015. http://www.britannica.com/popular-topics/browse. Accessed on April 20, 2015.

Franke, William. Ed. *On What Cannot Be Said: Apophatic Discourse in Philosophy, Religion, Literature, and the Arts.* Vol. 1 Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press: 2007.

Fredericks, James L. *Buddhists and Christians.* New York: Orbis Books, 2004.

Godsey, J., M. B. Schepers, and J. Burnett. "Barth, Karl." In *New Catholic Encyclopedia*, 2nd ed. Vol. 2 Detroit: Gale, 2003, 120-121. http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.drew.edu/ps/retrieve.do?sgHitCountType=&sort=&docLevel=&prodId=GVRL&tabID=T003&subjectParam=&searchId=R5&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&searchType=BasicSearchForm&currentPosition=1&searchResultsType=SingleTab&subjectAction=&bucketSubId=&inPS=true&userGroupName=madi95127&nav=prev&sgCurrentPosition=&docId=GALE%7CCX3407701142 (accessed December 12, 2013).

Gracia, Alma M. *The Mexican Americans*. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 2002.

Habermas, Jürgen. *Communication and the Evolution of Society*. Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1979.

_____. *Knowledge and Human Interests*. Translated by Jeremy J. Shapiro,. Boston, Beacon Press, 1987.

_____. "New Social Movement." *Telos*, 49. 1981: 33-37.

_____. *The Past As Future. Translated by Max Pensky.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1994.

_____. *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity.* Translated by F. G. Lawrence. Boston: Beacon Press, 1987.

_____. *Theory of Communicative Action*. Translated by Thomas McCarthy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1984.

_____. "Yet Again: German Identity- A Unified Nation of Angry DM-Burghers." In *New German Critique* 52, (1991): 84-101.

Heisenberg, Werner. "The development of the interpretation of the Quantum Theory." In *Niels Bohr and the development of Physics.* Ed. W. Pauli. 12-29. New York: McGraw-Hill Book, 1995.

Infoplease. "*Hispanic Americans By the Numbers*." Last modified on October, 2013. http://www.infoplease.com/spot/hhmcensus1.html. Accessed on April 13, 2015.

Kang, Namsoon. *Cosmopolitan Theology: Reconstituting Planetary Hospitality, Neighbor-Love, and Solidarity in an Uneven World*. St Louis: Chalice Press, 2013.

Keller, Catherine. *Face of the Deep: A Theology of Becoming*. New York: Routledge, 2003.

_____. *Clould of the Impossible*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.

Knitter, Paul F. *Without Buddha I Could not be a Christian*. Translated by Jeong Kyeong-il and Lee Chang-yeop. Oxford: Oneworld, 2009.

Koch J. "Nicholas of Cusa." In *New Catholic Encyclopedia*. 2nd ed. Vol. 10 Detroit: Gale, 2003. 372-376. http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.drew.edu/ps/retrieve.do?sgHitCountType=None&sort=RELEVANCE&inPS=true&prodId=GVRL&userGroupName=madi95127&tabID=T003&searchId=R5&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&contentSegment=&searchType=BasicSearchForm&currentPosition=3&contentSet=GALE%7CCX3407708014&&docId=GALE|CX3407708014&docType=GALE. Accessed December 12, 2013.

Kymlicka, Will. *Contemporary Political Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.

Lao Tzu. *Tao Te Ching*. Translated by D. C. Lau. New York: Penguin Books, 1963.

Lee, Seong-Hun. Two Perspectives toward Hispanic Immigration. Seoul: Spanish Literature, 2010.

Lee, Seong-Un, and Choi Yoo. *A Study Legislative Assistance for immigrants according to*

emerging multicultural families. Seoul: Korean Legislation Research Institute, 2006.

Lee, Hyo-Dong. *Spirit, Qi, and the Multitude*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2014.

Ministry of Government Administration and Home Affairs of the Republic of Korea. "Population Statistics." http://rcps.egov.go.kr:8081/jsp/stat/ppl_stat_jf.jsp. Accessed on April 13.2015.

Migration Policy Institute. "Mexican Immigrants in the United States." Last modified on March 1, 2004. http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/mexican-immigrants-united-states. Accessed on April 13, 2015.

Mills, Catherine. "Giorgio Agamben." In *Internet encyclopedia of philosophy*. Last updated October 10, 2005. http://www.iep.utm.edu/agamben/.

Moon, Seong-Weon. *Baeje eu Baeje wa hwandae* [the exclusion of the exclusion and hospitality]. Seoul: Dong Nyeock, 2000.

Murdoch, Dugald. *Niels Bohr's Philosophy of Physics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Paulson, Steven D. "Luther on the Hidden God," *The Journal of Word & World* 19, no. 4 (September 1, 1999): 363-371. http://web.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.drew.edu/ehost/pdfviewer/pdfviewer?sid=763b5747-70d3-4b83-9b21-1c9c74d0c9a4%40sessionmgr4005&vid=20&hid=4112. Accessed April 13, 2015.

PBS. "Mexican Revolution and Immigration." Last modified on June 5, 1999. http://www.pbs.org/kpbs/theborder/history/timeline/14.html. Accessed on April 13, 2015.

Polkinghorne, John. *Quantum Physics and Theology: An Unexpected Kinship*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2007.

Quesada, James, Laurie K. Hart and Philippe Bourgois, "Structural Vulnerability and Health: Latino Migrant Laborers in the United States," *Medical Anthropology* 30. No.4. 2011: 339-62.

Reiss, H. S. Ed. *Kant: Political Writings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970.

Statistics Korea. "Status of foreigners." Last modified on April 13, 2015.

http://www.index.go.kr/potal/main/EachDtlPageDetail.do?idx_cd=2756.
Accessed on April 13, 2015.

Streng, Frederick J. "Sunyam and Sunyata." In *Encyclopedia of Religion*, edited by
Lindsay Jones, 2nd ed. Vol. 13, Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2005.
8855F-8860.
http://go.galegroup.com.ezproxy.drew.edu/ps/retrieve.do?sgHitCountType=N
one&sort=RELEVANCE&inPS=true&prodId=GVRL&userGroupName=ma
di95127&tabID=T003&searchId=R1&resultListType=RESULT_LIST&conte
ntSegment=&searchType=BasicSearchForm&currentPosition=1&contentSet
=GALE%7CCX3424503000&&docId=GALE|CX3424503000&docType=G
ALE. Accessed April 13, 2015.

The Guardian. "*Angela Merkel: German multiculturalism has 'utterly failed*.'" Last
modified on October 7, 2010.
http://www.theguardian.com/world/2010/oct/17/angela-merkel-german-
multiculturalism-failed. Accessed on April 13, 2015.

Thich Nhat Hanh. *Being Peace*. Berkeley: Parallax Press, 1987. Kindle edition.

Thompson, John B, and David Held. Ed. *Habermas: Critical Debates.* Cambridge: MIT
Press, 1982.

Veritas. "Cosmopolitan loving neighbor." Last modified August 14, 2014.
http://veritas.kr/contents/article/sub_re.html?no=16824. Accessed on April
13, 2015.

Watanabe, Morimich. "An Appreciation." In *Introducing Nicholas of Cusa: A Guide to a
Renaissance Man*, Ed. Christopher M. Bellitto, Thomas M. Izhicki and
Gerald Christianson, 3-24. Mahwah, N.J.: Paulist Press, 2004.

Whitehead, Alfred North. *Adventures of Ideas*. New York: Macmillan Company, 1933.

_____. *Science and the Modern World.* New York: The Free Press, 1967.

_____. *Process and Reality*. Edited by David Ray Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne.
New York: The Free Press, 1978.

_____. *Religion in the Making*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1926.

_____. *The Function of Reason*. Millis, MA: Agora, 2014.

United Nations. "Geographical Names in a Changing World." Last modified on June 28,

2011. http://unstats.un.org/unsd/geoinfo/UNGEGN/docs/26th-gegn-docs/media%20kit/Media%20kit%203_Geographical%20Names%20in%20a%20Changing%20World.pdf. Accessed on April 13, 2015.