UACES 47th Annual Conference

Krakow, 4-6 September 2017

www.uaces.org

Integration and Enculturation in the Past and in the Future: A Philosophy of Migration

Marcin Rebes

Introduction

Integration and enculturation are important problems faced by contemporary Europeans. The influx of refugees has brought the problem of European integration into question. Many countries worry about terrorism, but also about the loss of national cultural heritage (or in the case of multinational states, of a common heritage), and are now reflecting on the meaning of European integration and the efficiency of the political project of enculturation. Therefore, in this paper I would like to raise the question of what is European **integration and migration are all about presently**. The article will consist of two parts.

In the first part, the problem of **integration and its influence on the process of disintegration the European identity would be presented.** Threats coming from the outside, such as an increase of terrorism, but also caused by the phenomena of xenophobia and extreme nationalism (isolationism), could jeopardize the security of Europe. The only way of preventing these problems is integration, which at its base should be a reflection of man and his understanding of his community.

Problem of integration refers to question of the identity of individuals, but also national and social identities. Since the beginning of European culture, the European met different cultures and tried to assimilate many elements to own culture, but also it influenced the other. In European tradition, the other appears in the role of teacher - someone who helps me to find my identity. Only in the relation between "I" and "Other" I can find myself in my attitude toward the other. The first meeting and hospitality can be transformed into a decision by the guest to stay in a new country. In this situation, we need to teach each other and

respect by the other the tradition and values of autochthon. The growing number of people outside of the European Union become anxious about their own identities and see a solution of this problem by returning to national narratives and by rejecting deeper integration with other countries. In the meantime, it's the integration that allows us to fix this problem. One solution is to help migrants in their own countries but also to host them. In this last solution is important to ensure reciprocal relation between the guest and the host.

In the second part of this paper I would like to tackle the issue of **migration**. This problem can not only be considered in the context of social, political and cultural values, but also philosophical ones. European culture is formed on the basis of dialogue and therefore it's important to analyse the mutuality of the relationship. We analyse the relation between man and man in the level of the hospitality but also the emigration.

The concept of migration as viewed by philosophy is based on the close relationship between the host and the foreigner (Xenos), as discussed by Jacques Derrida in his consideration of hospitality. Particularly important here is the voice of hermeneutics, which looks for a way of indexing the issue of migration and enculturation on the basis of relationships. This seminar paper contributes to the problems of migration and integration, which appear to be one problem.

1. Integration

1.1. Etymology of integration.

The word integration brings us to the process of acknowledging Europe through the conceptual lens of the European Union. The etymology of concept of integration refers indirectly to Latin. The noun "integratio, onis" means: renewal, restore, reboot, while the verb "integro, are, avi, atum": resume, repeat, rewrite, but also refresh, strengthen, reassure. In that sense, it is back to state earlier. Another word that refers to "integrio" is the concept of "integritas, atis", which means normality, honesty, justice and innocence. Therefore, integration is

restoring and renewal something which happened before. The past is part of the present, something which happens today. We refer to the root, the origin in this case that we take part in old-age tradition. This return to the past does it mean that we refuse the present but by living in the presence we interpret the past, we complement something which emerges in the past. The European integration includes: joining, merging, or uniting based on the common tradition and realizing the ideas about normally, honesty, justice and innocence world. The ideas which revealed protoplast of European culture we can try implement to new context and new social, political and cultural situation. The implementation of ideas happened through the experience of relation between man and man. The integration expresses a strive to merge to become one, it is also understood as complement, to preservation of the otherness or differences. This integration process is not something new, but it means a return to common source. Therefore, we should refer to the roots of European culture and ask about what does it mean common sense and values to which we could return.

1.2.   Integration in the past

The process of integration and returning to sources in European culture has got a long tradition. Today, the idea of integration is based on shared traditions and common universal values. **The most important value is man and his freedom.** Since the beginning of establishing of European culture there is a theme of freedom, but also the mixing of cultures and the process of European integration.

At the roots of European culture is the material culture of Asia (Sumerian, Akkadian, Babylonian and Phoenician culture). Phoenicians, by synthesizing cultures, have become precursors of European culture, but also the process of its integration.

Integration in context of faith for freedom reveals in mythos about Europe, daughter of Agenor, the Phoenician king of Tyre, who was kidnapped by Zeus and placed on Crete. Europe was beauty. Zeus, having fallen in love with Europe,

took the form of a beautiful snow-white bull and appeared in a meadow, where Europe and her companions played. Europe seduced by the gentleness and delicacy of the bull sat on his back. Zeus-bull took advantage of this situation and kidnapped Europe. He swam through the sea and stop off in the wonderful cave in Crete. Europe born Zeus two or three other sons. Later she joined the Cretan king. The bull, on which Europe came, was placed on the skies.

The myth of settling Europe in Crete is also related to leaving the family home and emigration not only Europe but also her brother, whose father ordered his sister to return. This tired, fruitless seeker of the sisters decided not to go back to his father and intends to find a place for himself. He founded not only the city, but also created the culture that we call the Theban culture.

The mythos about Europe revels not only left home, but also creates a new culture, new identity, which influences on the culture of the whole continent.

In Crete, there was Pre-Hellenic culture which establish and initial the new period the Hellenic culture. From the Achaea, Doric and Ionic culture stem the Aegean civilization which initiates the creation of European culture. Achaea, Doric and Ionic culture differ from each other but in confront to barbarian they are characterised by tribal unity, which was called "ethnos". In Aegean culture was created the first community organizations as well as first **political organizations**, which was grown up from the home community. The home community was interpreted as the place which the house, family lived. The home community changed in the political institution.

Besides the community, social and political model they created also models **in philosophy** (for example ethics).

The philosophy such as Ionic philosophers: Anaximander, Anaximenes and Heraclitus, which asked about element of the world. Another philosopher, Pythagoras put accent on the sphere which is beyond the material world, is psyche. Plato and Aristotle laid the foundations for the culture of contemporary Europe. They systematize meaning and understanding views about the nature of world, but also reveal the problem of the internal experiences of man, does it mean: psyche, spirit.

In the Roman Empire, a Greek thought is complemented by legal order. It expands the categories of culture to spiritual categories. **The world of values applies not only to the citizens of Rome but also to all countries and communities.** These common values and spiritual culture have given rise to the unity of European culture and civilization.

The huge influence on the unity of European culture had also Christian and with their concept of spirit and soul, but also with the culture of Asia. In the early Christian communities, the faith in Christ extends, which also took advantage of the influence of Greek culture.

This is reference to St. Paul and his reception of Greek and Roman thought, including concepts of psyche. Christianity has made the idea of freedom grafted from the Greeks, who had a political dimension as belonging to the Roman Empire, became the freedom of man as an individual. Freedom concern individuals and was centred on man and his relationship with God. Man is created in the image and likeness of God, Christianity introduces the notion of immortality of the soul and goodness which has universal character.

The next stage in which the integration of European culture is the crisis, is the fall of the Roman Empire and the transfer of the super-state capital to Constantinople. Christianity sees in the Franconian state the possible support for the idea of "christianitas". The preservation of common values was possible thanks to Christianity and the integration of Europe around common values. This state lasted until the Reformation, and later the French Revolution.

The emergence of nation states caused that the Christianity is built on inherited common values as well as values of the other. Christianization of particular countries was made through the connection of the altar and the crown. Christianity, being responsible for preserving common values, abandons the ideas of individual freedom for many centuries. The ruler took care of preserving and propagate of Christianity together with its values.

The relationship between the state and the Church has caused a serious crisis that has led to the collapse of the monarchy and the crisis of the Church, which has divided and lost its authority. They are emerging a new fraction in the

Church which will take care of their values. This crisis will take a couple of centuries. Also, the emergence of nation states will contribute to disintegration, to the divergence of European universal values. Today, this problem appears through the prism of the discussion of Europe of nations or of Europe as unity.

Humanism returned to common values and modern philosophical thought concentrates on man and his ability to know about himself and the world. Descartes points to the freedom and rationality of man. In contrast to them, British philosophers such as Hume, Berkeley referred to empiricism. The world will begin to divide itself into rational and sensual principles that characterize irrationality.

The development of science and philosophy has contributed to new social change. The population moves to cities creating a new social group. The world of values is becoming more and more particular.

The universal values that the Church has so far preserved, transform in the period of time the great French Revolution (1789) under the guardianship of the state. freedom, equality and fraternity are the main values. They have not been universal values for all, but for one nation. During the Napoleonic period, the tendency to build a super-state was renewed, but with new values.

It will be joined by a crisis of science, which was initiated by the ancient Greeks. Time and space, which was supposed to be something stable, thanks to the development of science, seems to be something that depends on the observer. A model based on general laws changes into an experimental model. There are new directions and fields in science. The natural and mathematical sciences have become dominant. Philosophers often pointed to the serious differences between science and philosophy. They started looking for new methods and new language.

Besides science also in system of value there appears a serious crisis. Nietzsche notes we need to abandon universal values and concentrate on subjective experience of myself.

Theology, but also philosophy find antidote for such a situation. Dilthey sees the necessity of separation the explanation of characterized the natural sciences from the humanities by proposing a reflection based on understanding.

Using the crisis of values, they show the need for reflection on "I". Hermeneutical reflection was developed, but also established the philosophy of dialogue. In 1923, there is an attempt to show that besides the most important values are the relationship between "I" and "you". Therefore, problem of value there is on the new background. It is about understanding of good from the perspective of my relationship to myself and to another person. In this philosophy, called the philosophy of dialogue, interlocutor plays an important role. In this manner, it shows the true origin of good and values that have an age-old tradition.

The thought of man's relationship to man in the prism of responsibility and freedom comes before the outbreak of World War II. It is aftermath of focusing on myself and of reducing of the perception of the world to myself and my own needs. Buber's philosophy, the philosophy of dialogue, arose before the outbreak of war and showed a serious crisis of European thought, which grew out from the natural sciences and the practical character of science. thought based on values had to be practical.

In retrospect, there is talk of totalitarian regimes, which mean the reduction of what is different to one system. However, the value of Europe was its multiplicity. This was result of the atomization of values. Therefore, we need otherhood to find our identity.

The crisis in science and the collapse of values have made that the idea of European integration was found in come back. Thus, preparing the desire to dominate the rest of the nations by their conquest. The outbreak of the second war made that the Europeans want to rebuild their common future.

The idea of integration is rooted in many ideas. One of the most important issues is building a **common market for coal and steel**. However, this mercantile nature of integration has basis on cultural and philosophical integration. Today's integration is not just a common market but, above all, integration, a return to common cultural origin through their diversity.

1.3.   Dis-integration

As we can see in the past, apart from integration, there also emerged the phenomenon of disintegration. The process of disintegration has its own cause, but it is also an indication in which direction can be followed integration as a restoration of the original unity. We see that the process of disintegration, the atomization of common values has been accompanied since the beginning of establish of European culture, but has also become the root of the quest for the restoration of primordial unity.

The establishment of nation states, on the one hand, is the result of growing man's consciousness and willingness to be responsible for own state, on the other hand, as a result of the tendency to separate themselves, separate from common age tradition. What has previously become the cause of atomization, or increasing human consciousness, is also today the basis for a return to common roots, to a common tradition. Man understood that he is not only bound by the national spirit, but also universal values. This return enables science, philosophy or religion. The natural sciences that brought about changes in society, the population moved to the city, creating new social groups influenced the emergence of nation states. Now the development of technology based on the development of natural and mathematical sciences makes the possibility of benefiting from the common good of civilization pushing us towards the re-emergence. integration. Humanistic sciences, for which the source and inspiration is man and its age, are the background and complement.

Also, religion, especially Christianity, refers to common roots. This idea inspired the founders of the European Union Robert Schuman or Alcide De Casperi. Although this idea goes far back, into the pan-European movement as well as earlier ideas, such as the mentioned "christianitas".

Today's crisis of integration is based on the one hand, in the tension **between the ideal and the real sense of integration** (not always European citizens see the empirical nature of integration) and, on the other, **on the tension between particularism and universal values** (the values of the individual and his will, National identity over universal values).

In both cases the essential element is the problem of identity and

individual understanding of what is European integration all about. It is not something new, but a return to the cultural roots from which grown our national identity.

1.4.   Integration and identity

The establishment of nation states as well as the development of human consciousness influenced on the looking for man's own identity. Man is not only a member of a community on which he has influence, but is a citizen who influences on the decisions and take part direct or indirect in government. The establishment of nation states does not have to go against the European integration, but - one can say - they are mutually conditioned. The condition for integration is a strong social and political bonding, which has the basis on the sense/feeling of bonding around our home.

The question about the identity was express, especially in European philosophy, by Descartes, but also by Kant and representatives of German idealism. At this time, it was asked about **identity,** but also about **dialectics**. This confrontation with reality leads us to feel **fear, anxiety and concern.** This confrontation is striving at anxiety for another world, another man who threatens me. These feelings are, however, a normal phenomenon of a precarious future and a fear of one's own identity.

European culture arises in confrontation with the new reality. But are these fears justified? This question addresses us to the content of fear, ie of what we are afraid. This sphere of fear can have a basis on our experience of fear, which has a rational basis based on the consequences of what is already and what we feel. We can capture them based on some rational elements. Some reason makes that we can predict in case of the deduction some kind of collapse and fall. It may also have an irrational cause, some kind of prejudice, for which it is difficult to give, rationalize the reason. The subject of fear research can be a field of science such as psychology, and when it refers to more people social psychology, and anxiety may have an outlet in politics and then politics science must reach for it. Each of

these disciplines reveals something, what arouses fear (content), but also its dimension. However, there are various fears as to cause and intensity. It may be fear of war, fear of violence, of alienation in society, fear of truth and fear of lying, which becomes a political *mythos*. Philosophy can do the analysis of this aspect of anxiety, then this philosophy can be a political philosophy. A sequence of causes and effects can explain - somehow more or less true - some kind of behaviour and events. But we still move around the content, but first of all, the fear is always **a fear of someone**. So aside from the content is the subject of fear. This anxiety breaks down, embraces man in such a way that it fills in his thinking. Anxiety reveals a sense of cause but also of what accompanies this cause. Anxiety is an irrational experience that need to be rationalized. In the context of contemporary political events such as the aggression of Russia to Ukraine is of special importance. There are fears of widening the fears of society, the people for their future, the possibility of war. But are fears justified, or they are the result of our imagination? This analysis is still reflected in the prism of cognition and evaluation. This state indicates to necessity to face the problem of what we are afraid.

The fear crops up from outside such as the rise of terrorism, but also by the phenomenon of xenophobia and extreme nationalism or isolationism within Europe, may jeopardize the security of Europe.

In antiquity, philosophy has shown the process of cognition based on a similar is known by similar. In modernity, this is particularly evident in Hegel, self-awareness is the assimilation something what is different from me, what is the other. This difference introduces anxiety because the otherhood brings about uncertainty and fear. However, European culture has been looking for its own identity from the very beginning in other cultures. Search for Identity is accompanied by a desire for the identity and integration of European culture, but also the fear of it. Despite differences from the perspective of nationality, culture and tradition is a common essence, roots for Europeans.

We expect not only a particular nation to respect the value of man and his freedom, but also we expect all countries and nations to do so. Respect for the

common values are expected by all citizens and nations. Integration is just a response to the return to common cultural roots and values. An obstacle to integration is the value crisis. It is the result of misunderstanding them. Instead of perceiving them through the prism of experiences of other and my identity, we base them on abstract concepts, which contributes not only to the crisis of values, but to the crisis of integration.

Fear connected with the crisis of values, science, culture and society is multiplied by the phenomenon of increased migration which is readability as external threats. The process of migration influences on the social moods in which we feel the crisis of value.

Therefore, we are concentrating on the idea of hospitality and migration now.

2. Migration:

The problem of European integration is the result of the migration of a large part of the population, not only within the Union but also, above all, from outside of its borders. The Other ones are the reason for it.

People's self-reflection has been observed since the rise of the human community, of civilization. Currently, the reason of making decision and choosing about change place of residence and living may be different. One of the most basic is the bad economic (economic migration) or political (political) situation.

This problem can be considered not only in the social, political, cultural but also philosophical context. Philosophy ask not only about conditions, causes and dependencies, but also about the source of our identity and the relationship with another man, but also the culture and traditions which bears one selves the emigrants. Migration brings within the phenomenon of alienation, the removal of man from the traditions and culture of his ancestors. In confront to another culture, migrant becomes stranger for another. He also becomes another for himself. Therefore, he is looking for an answer for his identity. Who am I? What

is close to my heart?

Not only an emigrant or a refugee has to ask a question about himself and see a new situation in which he becomes other for others.

This analysis of the other shows two levels/dimensions which are very important in situation of meeting with another.

Firstly, when an emigrant arrives to another country and **establishes first relationship with autochthon, when the visitor becomes a guest**. On this subject writes Levinas, who observes this relation from perspective of the ethical character.

Secondly, when an **emigrant settle and needs a stronger relationship with people who have lived from the generations**. Then we are dealing with migration. However, the philosophy of migration becomes important, if not the most important, in the first contact. In this relation, we bring in contact and meet together in face to face. This is exactly what I would like to be involved. Both kind of relations differ from what I fear. In the first case, I fear myself, in the second about my culture and community. In both cases, it is about another, with which I have to establish a bond. What connects the two cases is my relationship with another, which becomes part of my world. This is closely related to the experiences of identity that each of us possesses.

2.1. Hospitality

European culture arises on the ground of dialogue, and therefore it is important to analyze the reciprocal relationship. The philosophy of migration is based on a close relationship between the host and the guest. In the Old Slavic word the "gospodarz" [host] contains the term host, but also the guest. It is based on two Old Slavic words: "gosti", and "poti". The first word "gosti" meant guest, friend, but also stranger, but the second term "poti": master, the authority to which the farm belongs. From the perspective of the host "gosti" may be a guest who may come to their aid, but also is a threat for family of host.

Plato states in *Sophist* – in the reference to Homer - that Theodor takes the

guest home, he does not does not take a guest, but some god. Theodore responds Socrates, in whose words Plato puts his thoughts that he is not a god, but there is something divine in him. Socrates asks Theodore or this guest is credible and he is not the man who leads to the fall of the city to which he comes. The term "xenos" means the guest, but also the enemy. Theodor assures Socrates that this guest is credible and can help solve the problem of knowledge.

About hospitality *Immanuel Kant* mentions the third definitive article in the treatise *On Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*. Kant draws attention to the laws of universal hospitality that should apply to those who come to another state and world citizens. They should have the same responsibilities and rights as the people living in the country on which they host. For the law of hospitality, however, it is a restriction, if the guest threats the host. The idea of hospitality complements the ideas of the federation, which in its own way is attempting to create international organizations that will take care of peace in the world, settling disputes between states. This treatise, however, is still only an idea that is unrealistic, as evidenced by the title of the treatise referring to the signage above one of the Dutch inns, which represents the cemetery. This idea is not only a model of hospitality, but also a right of migration.

Descartes, like the aforementioned Kant, focused on the subject, contributes to the articulation of the problem "I". During the period of German idealism, this problem is increasing and is analysed by many philosophers such as Schelling, Fichte and Hegel. The problem of the relationship between "I" and "Non-I" is revealed until at the beginning of the twentieth century. Then philosophers concentrate on the relations for which the basis of discussion is not the relation of "I" and "Non-I" as by Hegel's dialectic in which is presented the problem of attaining consciousness, but "I-Thou" relationship. Martin Buber,

Ferdinand Ebner and Franz Rosenzweig draw attention to the dialogical character of the interpersonal relationships, which should be the basis of all philosophical reflection. Hospitality is gaining importance.

At the same time, Heidegger's philosophy establishes, which draws attention to the problem of identity from the perspective of relationship. "I" to "me". In my going out from "I" I am coming to "myself". This thought - although he is expressed by the term of transcendence - is based on movement around myself.

Emmanuel Levinas argues with this standpoint and he indicates on another as the basis for philosophy. Heidegger's interpretation is *de facto* a movement around myself, but Levinas proposes to go beyond myself by entering into a relationship with absolutely other. In this attitude is revealed the important theme what is hospitality.

At the internality level, Levinas perceives hospitality[1] in which it does not yet appear other, but in which the problem of the emergence of man is revealed from the element. At this stage, a man is presented in his relation to the world. The house - as Levinas explains - cannot be held like other things, such as furniture. The house is owned because it is welcoming us. The house inhabits the one that precedes all the household members.

Besides the dwelling and possession, work is an essential element. In relation to the world, man builds a home, but also, he tries to adapt the world to himself by work, which is the removal of matter from the element. Work is a capture from the element, indeterminate. Hospitality appears in the prism of home and work. Levinas shows the importance of home and work in which man prepares himself for hospitality. The house is shown by a woman's warmth symbol. The symbol of hospitality is femininity. Hospitality means separating "I" from another.

As Levinas claims, the world of things is very important in establishing relationships with others. Thank to him I come to another man with something.

---

[1] See also about Hospitality in book Levinas: *Totality and Infinity*, pp. 180, 181, 198, 201, 241, 306, 360, 361, 369.

Just what is called **economics** is very important because it prepares the ground for the meeting. Through interiority man separates himself from the world and he is a distinctness thanks to which it is enable for him to enter in relation with other.

Hospitality is understood as openness to the Other; it is a desire for absolute transcendence, which is made only in face-to-face meeting with another. Through hospitality I also experience my own separation, my distinctiveness, which begins with the departure from the element, but its true essence appears only in contact with another.

In discourse, which precedes full consciousness a meeting of man with man takes place. This discourse goes beyond consciousness by embodying one's perception of another's face. By discourse is embodied, what constitutes metaphysics. Through discourse men has the ability to receive, give and hospitality. In language appears openness and hospitality. As Levinas says, hospitality is not the character of love because it has the character of need, while hospitality is the desire. The need can be satisfied, but thirst is an increasingly intense desire for intimacy.

Levinas emphasizes that separation as well as attitude towards another is not enable in the presentation, or in memory, but in hospitality, in openness to another. Thanks to hospitality I experience my separation from the natural world, but also distinct from another human being. This is because when I experience my distinctiveness I can open up to absolutely other. Only being separated I can offer hospitality. The original hospitality, which Levinas reminisced, was connected with the home and work in which appears the idea of infinity, opening to another, which would become later the experience of the other face such as a widow, an orphan, or a foreigner. For Levinas, hospitality will become a sacrifice for one's own freedom. Sacrifice is in some sense responsibility. I respond to the other on his ethical call in his face, responding to the call is also responsibility of the other and responsibility for the other.

Levinas analysing the relation "I-Other" reveals also fact that my responsibility comes too late. It is only a response to the ethical call. He shows that we cannot prepare for the guest but open to another questioned my own

identity which I tried to find by construct my home and to change the world by the work. The challenged freedom and my identity gain a new dimension. It is only through the other I becomes myself, I confirm my identity, because I am for other. Nobody can replace me. Tischner emphasizes that chosen by another, chosen from among others, I receive my identity. I cannot be replaced by anyone.

Levinas shows the problem of identity in a meeting through presenting the obsession in his next work *Otherwise than being or beyond essence*. He presents an important problem that is the arrival of another, the haunting. In the experience of another I abandon myself to be for another. The neighbours haunt me earlier than I can make decisions, then I can make a choice for hosting. He's the one who chooses me[2]. In *Otherwise than being or beyond essence* Levinas develops the problem of responsibility and associates one's own identity with another. He clarifies what is the experience of responsibility, perhaps one of the most important experiences of the present European culture, in which the concept of justice is replaced by the experience of responsibility for oneself and others.

This philosophy concentrates on another and on its meaning for the identity of "I". It is a response to the crisis of values. Considered from the perspective of "I" values did not bring to mind the European problem of relation between man and man. Only after concentrating on this relation values have regained their importance. It is not about discussing the issue of minorities, but about presenting another person as other. Minority is a ambiguous term, but other who stands in front of me, is concrete. But there is something very important that connects the problem of minorities, refugees and the philosophy of other, it is the relationship "I-Other". The philosophy of the other goes even further, because it see otherhood in every man.

Jacques Derrida, in reference to Levinas, is trying to present hospitality in his lecture entitled "Step of Hospitality / No hospitality" which was delivered at Ecole pratique de Haut Rtudes[3].

---

[2] About visitation Levinas writes in *Totality et Infinity*, p. s. 140 and the first guest, p. 145.

[3] Derrida delivered lectures from December 1995 To March 1996.

He shows the ethical issue, but also the political aspect of hospitality. Hospitality is the border that appears when another, foreign, foreigner haunts me.

Derrida states that the hospitality either it is unconditional or it does not exist at all. When we consider who we are to accept and who we are not, we are not hospitable. Hospitality is unconditional and absolute openness to a stranger. Hospitality has a certain ambiguity in it, requires preparation from us, which at the time of the meeting makes our preparation questionable. Therefore, we lack words to express them. The other has something mysterious what makes that our certainty and knowledge is questioned, which has served us to prepare for hospitality. In a meeting of strangers there happens something that makes challenges to our preparation. Can we be unprepared? Derrida claims we could not. If we were not preparing, it would be impossible to make a decision. Therefore, there are also opposing threats, unprepared myself and planned, prepared meeting with strangers which causes that my preparation became unprepared. In that sense, Derrida's position overlaps with Levinas, who sees that one cannot prepare for a meeting. When we do this, the relationship is already past.

Derrida depicts the tension between **absolute responsibility understood as being toward someone else, other,** and **social responsibility** interpreted from the perspective of anyone who will come. Hospitality is willingness, openness to admit other, take to own home or state. It is unconditional and is primordial openness to another. This primordial openness is a responsibility that is unconditional and infinite. It is something else than legal or political condition. The hospitality anticipated them and makes them possible. Without hospitality, it would not be possible to make a decision about admit and rejection. Responsibility as a response, given answer, is not about planned action, but an event which is individual and uniqueness for me.

Hospitality is a cornerstone that tends to be legal or political regulator, which will become in finite shape, e.g. **immigration policy**. Unconditional hospitality without legislation, standards, laws would lead to a variety of aberrations, and the law of hospitality would be merely an idea, a wish, if not a

legal-political form.

There is still a question about the border between "I" and "others". If I host another, I take him to myself. It is changing my mind to be myself, to be at home. Unlimited and endless hospitality meets the legal-political form that embodies it.

The hospitality is a kind of duty, responsibility for other. Boundless offering to another, who may be a foreigner, a foreigner or exile, a man who comes from afar and whom we know nothing is open to another who can hurt me. That is why, ie between offering one to another and the dangers which the guest takes, it appears the possibility of making a decision.

The real decision is risky because I can let an enemy intro home who ravages my home, my world. But precisely because I do not know what he really brings with him, whether it threatens me and my home, and also, I do not know or I do not give him to understanding what he is not at home, causes that I must make a decision for hospitality. Hospitality is independent from a stranger who haunts my home. Derrida in hospitality sees the opportunity to make choices, make decisions. Without alternative I could not make a decision and would not be free.

The right decision appears in the horizon of two extreme positions: **first, when the other becomes one of us**, losing his otherness. Arriving to us, he forgets his language and culture, **second, when we do not require him to learn our language and tradition.** In the philosophy of dialogue, but also in the philosophy of Derrida, the crucial issue is openness to another. Other joining us comes into relationship not only with us, but with our culture. When we analyse the philosophy of other, we can come to the conclusion that **it is not about whether or not given hospitality, but how?** That's how it gets better in case of immigration problem. How do you learn cultures from each other?

How is it to remain separate in another culture by accepting the laws, traditions of the country to which it is coming, but also openness to the culture of another.

In which manner, we can combine our own culture and participation in

other culture with which we live together? So we will look at the process of migration and learning foreign culture.

2.2. Migration and enculturation.

Migration is normal process observed in different communities. Migration may happen in the framework of the community, but also in different administrative units. The problem of moving from hospitality to immigration is a process in which the issue of reciprocity is highlighted. It is only possible when cultural, linguistic and axiological approximation is possible. In the case of hospitality, Derrida speaks of the unconditionally of hospitality, but in the first and second cases it is also about symmetry in relationships. In *Sophist* Plato's you can learn something from the guest. Migration makes that the people became more and more a host, but also a visitor, emigrants and newcomer. There are migrations intra-country, largely due to economic reasons, but also external migrations in which a newcomer resides in another country. The immigrant changes his place of residence for economic and political reasons, often becoming a refugee.

The problem of refugees in Europe is a very important issue. The fundamental misunderstanding is association refugees with terrorism. Meanwhile, refugees are mostly people who run away before the war. Negative evaluation of refugee is also a result of poor information on emigration policy and protection against terrorism. Cases of attacks on civilians in France or Germany raise us to take care of our security. But the cause of terrorism is not the migration of the people, but the radicalization of attitude (position) and the behaviours of extreme Islamic factions. Migrants are similar victims of terror as Europeans who fear of their own lives and the situation of increasing terrorist attacks in Europe. The solution to the conflict in the Middle East and the abolition of criminal networks is only possible with increased European integration. Meanwhile, Europe is struggling with the problems of nationalism and radical attitudes of national states wishing to undermine the European community, which ensured peace and security in Europe after 1945. The gradual development of European integration has also

provided relative prosperity for the citizens. Human rights are a guarantee of stability and paying special attention to ethnic and religious minorities. Stability is ensured not only by a representative majority, but also by respect for the rights of minorities.

The problem of immigration as well as refugees is becoming a serious one, which demands deeper European integration. This fear is a fear of common values and the threat to them by the influx of people from other cultures, but also the fear of losing their national or cultural identity. How we tried to show earlier fear has also a positive meaning, but it is worse if it takes the character of a dialectic which based on seeking scapegoat and exclusion of minority groups.

It is important from the point of view of the of immigration phenomenon is the process of meeting the cultures, immigrant culture and the "indigenous" population, their mutual relations. Prepare the host to admit foreign groups that constitute a minority plays important role.

These differences in approaching the newcomer and the group classified as minority analyses Rainer Forst in his work *Toleranz im Konflikt*[4]. He presents four model of tolerance.

The first concept of tolerance entitled the **permission conception** (Erlaubnis-Konzeption) deal with majority or authority which grant minorities the right to live according to their own rights. This concept is vertical, moving only towards minorities. Majority tolerates minority, but minority does not enjoy same rights and duties as majority. The minority must be subordinate to rights and duties which was proclaimed by majority. This relation is asymmetrical.

The second model, which was expressed by the **coexistence conception** (Ko-existenz), and like as the first, concern avoiding of conflicts, but has horizontal character. In this sense, tolerance is comprehending on pragmatic and instrumental ground. Tolerance has not normative character, but first of all is the experiences of co-existence. In this model does not deal with consent but with get together. Tolerates are also tolerated and therefore, it has a symmetrical character.

---

[4] Forst, Rainer: *Toleranz im Konflikt.* Berlin 2003, pp. 42-48.

The third model is the **respect conception** (Respekt-Konzeption). The basis of this concept is the morally well-founded respect for the other person and the respect of the other person to me. This concept is a dialog based on respect for each other. This acceptance is based on respect for the autonomy of the individual.

The fourth model is the **esteem conception** (Wertschätzung-Konzeption). He brings in a new spirit that shows a kind of multicultural community. It is based not so much on the legal and political legitimacy of which each community and individual has the same rights, but on the practical ethical reverence for the values that carry them.

The process of European identity as well as the migration of the population confront us not only with the challenge of accepting migrants, but especially about possible "assimilation" of different cultures. This very last concept shows the need for respect for the values which each of us brings.

We have many kinds of relation between cultures for example acculturation or enculturation.

Acculturation is the rejection of one culture to cultivate other common. It seems that from this last model of tolerance comes the consequence which means the symbiosis, the learning of the culture of the "neighbour", the culture of another, with the respecting one's own. This model requires learning by the individual's behaviour, the rights and traditions of the group and also learning by the group the culture of the newcomers. It must be said that esteem conception does not overcame the difference, does not neutralize and does not threaten identity, but learns sensitivity for each other. Therefore, it has a more ethical and moral than political dimension, which must be grounded on the ethical. The esteem conception does not demand a rejection of my own culture and take over the culture of the immigrant, but respect their values and traditions. However, it assumes cultural differences and teaches them to be sensitive for each other. This respect is typical for the many-ages tradition and identity of European culture.

The idea of tolerance as sensitivity demands also respect for the other group. This respect is based on the background of European tradition, which was

originated from of Aegean culture. Tolerance has got its limit which is **reciprocity. It demands not only respect for other traditions, as well as respect for European customs, values and culture.**

The phenomenon of meeting demands the process of assimilating the cultures, values and behaviour of the inhabitants of the community to which one comes. Therefore, we need a process which was called as enculturation. This process is based on cultural and religious differences of individuals such as groups. In the process of enculturation people learn the requirements of the surrounding culture and accept values, customs, behaviours that are appropriate for the culture in which they choose to live. This process affects the individual, but also families and generations. The result of enculturation is knowledge of the language, values and traditions of the existing, living culture.

In the process of enculturation, it is not just about admit one's self, but also learning a kind of coexistence form, or even more than just one, that is, respecting the other person and respecting the host and guest culture. Entrance into the traditions and culture of new citizens, which was chosen by emigrants, and the already existing culture of autochthon, which respect for newcomer citizens and their value which they cultivate. Enculturation, in opposite to acculturation, is not a takeover of all elements from another cultural tradition, but its socialization. The process of enculturation has become particularly necessary in the event of an escalating problem of migration of community and societies. The basic issue is the cultural difference between people and communities. It is necessary to the initiated feel of "I – Other", or as Levinas says in his philosophy of other - the experience of separation. This problem of identity of "I" in relation with "Other" is useful in context of European integration.

How can we look at the European integration and possibilities which it gives? Answer for this question is depended by on the intensity of integration and understanding of integration inside European country and their citizens. As the philosophies of dialogue depict, but also Tischner, the essential problem of modern man and man relations is its **reciprocity and openness to "each other".**

In the second case, about we talked, does it mean problem of emigration, when the guest intends to settle in the country to which he arrived. It is not only the meeting of man with another man, but also the penetration of each cultures. Reciprocity takes on new shape. It concerns not only the human problem, but also the culture, from which he grows, and tradition and values which he cultivates. In case the guest wants to live in the country, in where was him admitted hospitality, the hospitality should turn in a process of adapting to the rights of the host into **coexistence, respect and esteem for man and culture.** This adaptation is not so much related to the law, but also to moral and cultural norms. This process is based on respect for the inherent traditions with accepting and respect for European norms and values.

Conclusion

European integration is a process that is slow but permanent. The processes of disintegration are also occurring anormal processes of shaping European consciousness and identity. Integration is nothing new but a return to common cultural values.

The serious problem of immigration seems to stop this process, but in fact shows that we are interested in the integration of Europe. We see common values which we have not seen before. Contemporary philosophy shows that each of us is a migrant. The philosophy of dialogue as well as the deconstructivism of Derrida brings to our thinking an important theme that is the relationship between "I", understood as an individual, but also the whole community, and others who come to me. Not only Europe, who came to Crete, initiate to establish a new culture, but also the age-old tradition shows that Europe draws its inspiration for integration through encounter with other cultures. Values which we did not notice before, are based on the relationship between man and man, on a culture of tolerance and critical reflection on our self. European culture is a culture that comes to know oneself in relation to the surrounded world.

At present, the path to full European integration is hindered by the wave of nationalism triggered not only by incitement to integration but also by fear of

foreign culture. The only way to prevent these problems may be to integrate, which should have a reflection on the human being and his understanding of the community at its background.

The important role for its played by the process of enculturation, which is an attempt to learn the requirement of culture and acquire values, which are essential and appropriate to the citizen and culture, for which we make a decision to live by. These values may have religious and ethical nature. Another solution may be **assimilation and isolation**. European culture knows the term of dialectics better than another culture. Dialectically understood extreme as the necessarily to eliminate an element, as Marxism or totalitarian systems proclaimed, brought Europe unforeseen damage. Dialectic in the Old Greek sense is a dispute over the principle in which we come together to discover a new ourselves.

Connection of Integration and Enculturation is possible only through mutual understanding and cooperation, in which we rediscover ourselves through the prism of tolerance and freedom.

References:

Forst, Rainer: *Toleranz im Konflikt. Geschichte, Gehalt und Gegenwart eines umstrittenen Begriffs*. Suhrkamp Taschenbuch Wissenschaft: Berlin 2003.

Heidegger, Martin: *Being and Time*. State University of New York Press: Albany 1996.

Heidegger, Martin: *Phänomenologie der religiösen Lebens*. Vittorio Klostermann: Frankfurt am Main 1995. Vol. 60 Gesamtausgabe.

Levinas, Emmanuel: *Totality and Infinity*. Duquesne University Press: Pittsburg 1996.

———. *Otherwise than being or beyond essence*. Duquesne University Press: Pittsburg 2009.

Derrida, Jacques: *Foreigner question*. in: *Of hospitality Anne Defourmantelle invites Jacques Derrida to respond*, Stanford 2000.

———. *Step of hospitality/no hospitality*. in: *Of hospitality Anne Defourmantelle invites Jacques Derrida to respond*, Stanford 2000.

Platon: *Sämtliche Werke*, Rewohlt Taschenbuch Verlag: Hamburg 2004, vol. 3.

Kant, Immanuel: *Perpetual Peace. A Philosophical Essay*. Swan Sonnenschein and Co.: London 1903.

Martyniak, Katarzyna: *Mitologia Grecka i Rzymska*, Wydawnictwo Szkolne PWN: Warszawa-Bielsko 2010.