


An idea for a recipe deemed not sufficiently vital was pepped up through the interaction with the Bing chatbot. In the text it is called Bingbot for short.

Rereading Derrida’s lecture on *hospitality*, I realised how much the world has changed since I read it last time. The statement, to which Derrida returns to iteratively—we do not know what *hospitality* is—remains: but while he does so stealthily, in the way of deconstruction, we now may have to walk in the front door. With digital intermedia everyone is getting exposure: visibility appears to be inversely proportional to availability. We are increasingly busy in each other’s presence, taken with coding ourselves and decoding others on digital platforms. Being in business is being unavailable.

Derrida’s discussion churns on Kant’s statement: “Cosmopolitan Right shall be limited to Conditions of Universal Hospitality.” And the discussion takes place on the backdrop of natural law. His analysis of passages of Klossowsky’s *Roberte ce soir*, lingers on ambivalence: the share of hostility in hospitality in a situation where it is both demanded and delimited. And Derrida manages to make bring gender into the bargain of hospitality in ways that relates to the oikos, and oikonomia. The action of existential constraints on the essence of hospitality, in its gendered aspects. In tension, struggle and ambivalence. We depart for hospitality but we never arrive.

The problem that is being worked on—the inquiring travail of deconstruction—becomes per-



Before even beginning, I will read. I will reveal with you by way of an epiphany, a long and celebrated passage from Kant.

To begin with, I will read it almost without commentary. But in each of its works, it will preside over the whole of this lecture and all questions of hospitality, the historical questions—these questions of once timeless, archaic, modern, current, and future [à venir] that the single word “hospitality” magnetizes—the historical, ethical, juridical, political, and economic questions of hospitality.

As you have no doubt already guessed, it is a question in *Perpetual Peace* of the famous “Third Definitive Article of a Perpetual Peace [Dritter Definitivartikel zum ewigen Frieden],” the title of which is: “Das Welbürgerrecht soll auf Bedingungen der allgemeinen Hospitalität eingeschränkt sein”: “Cosmopolitan Right shall be limited to Conditions of Universal Hospitality.” Already the question of conditionality, of conditional or unconditional hospitality, presents itself.²³

Two words are underlined by Kant in this title: “cosmopolitan right” [Welbürgerrecht: the right of world citizens]—we are thus in the space of right, not of morality and politics or anything else but of right determined in its relation to citizenship, the state, the subject of the state, even if it is a world state—it is a question therefore of an international right; the other underlined word is “hospitality” [der allgemeinen Hospitalität, universal hospitality]. It is a question therefore of defining the conditions of a cosmopolitan right, of a right the terms of which would be established by a treaty between states, by a kind of UN charter before the fact, and one of these conditions would be what Kant calls universal hospitality, the *allgemeine Hospitalität*.

I quote this title in German to indicate that the word for “hospitality” is a Latin word

jacques derrida

translated by barry stocker with forbes morlock

HOSTIPITALITY!

[Hospitalität, a word of Latin origin, of a troubled and troubling origin, a word which carries its own contradiction incorporated into it, a Latin word which allows itself to be parasitized by its opposite, “hostility,” the undesirable guest [hôte] which it harbors as the self-contradiction in its own body, and which we will speak of again later).

Kant will find a German equivalent, *Wirtbarkeit* (which he will put in parentheses as the equivalent of *Hospitalität*), for this Latin word, *Hospitalität*, from the first sentence which I am now going to read.

The equivalent Kant reveals is *Wirtbarkeit*. Kant writes: “As in the foregoing articles, we are concerned here not with philanthropy, but with right [Es ist hier ... nicht von Philanthropie, sondern vom Recht die Rede]” (in specifying that it is a question here of right and not philanthropy; Kant, of course, does not want to show

The exteriority of cultural existence constrains the essence of linguistic self-presence: “we do not know what hospitality is” loads the notion with the hopes for a future in which we *might*. In this sense, the English translation is expected and already exists in the structure of the Germano-French mirroring in Derrida’s original. As though hospitality is not really played out before it involved a third (other) element, or instance: that *cannot* be assumed (as the English translation in the French original) but is always already *assigned*. As uncle Octave’s embrace, in Klossowsky’s *Roberte*, follows

its internal tendency, but in the hope and expectation of being released and redeemed by the entrance of a 3rd: the visitor. Her hospitality mitigated by the fact of her being the mistress.

Not uncle Octave's mistress, but the mistress of the house. In a recent post-covid house-warming event, a *similar* three-way linguistic play-and-stop extended from a dish that was prepared for the event: Kanarikål—Norwegian for canary-cabbage (derived from a precedent of goose and/or mutton). Since it would have to be yellow to accommodate one linguistic level of canary, *saffron* became an essential ingredient. Another linguistic turn comes with the alliteration of kanarikål in canard-i-kål. The dish was prepared with *duck-confit*, and thereby became conceptually a [canard](#).

The dish stage a complicated mesh of hosting relationships: the hosting of a side-board cabinet built by Bjørn Blikstad in the kitchen of a private address, the hosting of the event of a vernissage by the gallery HULIAS at this private address, and the hosting during the event itself by the owners. Alongside a telescoping string of names starting with Igory Mansotti—a pseudonym for *ghost writers* employed by HULIAS—HULIAS, in the [invitation-text at the event-site](#), and finally the words of the private host, when the gathering was complete and ready to ingest kanarikål.

Singing-like-a-canary if the work of a *stool-pigeon*, a *rat*, a *snitch*. In this reception, the canary is subject to witness-protection programmes. But it is also kept in mines where the workers will be alerted by the diffusion of poisonous gas, when the canary stops singing. The lateral drift from canary to canard is therefore not that far fetched. And like hospitality it manifests from the *lateral drift* in the between-space of two languages: in this case between Norwegian and French. English comes in as the translating, releasing and redeeming third language: the language of the *other*.

In the canary-dish—mitigated with saffron and canard—the inheritance from a Danish-Norwegian dish (with either goose or mutton) prevailed heavily on the prospects of *executing* the recipe. So, I decided to use the Bingbot (AI) with the idea in mind to give the recipe a creative twist. I put the Bingbot in a creative mode (by pushing the button 'creative'). It wasn't very creative, which I fed back to it, thereby provoking a response that provided a real basis for a creative twist on the recipe. Which severed the loop of a dish that would have been *traditional* but in my *embrace*.

We got interrupted and saved, as it were, by the appearance on stage and the intervention of a third: the Bingbot. The alterations from the basic recipe were not sky-rocketing, but were *sufficient* in order to manifest the presence and action of a 3rd. Prompting some reflections on the relationship between hospitality engaging 3rd party readability by the inclusion—in a hospitable relation—of a 3rd. In this case the Bingbot. The lateral drift in the ornamental profusion from the canary above becomes functionalised, as it were, by the redeeming advent/intervention of a 3rd.

Including the Bingbot as a 3rd reader makes sense of the compiled metadata it accesses through a linguistic model based on deep learning, as a *readership*. With this take, the use and accommodation of AI as a form of proxy-authorship, is category-mistake. Moreover, all the dangers accused in public opinion—amongst the variety of of intelligent people who have been gazing into their crystal-balls—is linked to that category mistake. If we move from authorship to readership, the landscape changes. Here, an adequate understanding of AI is more important than its "mind".



A red-beaked canary: a little bird told me to add sun dried tomatoes to the dish, to articulate the beak. Here in bot-version.

That is, understanding it in terms of Maurice Blanchot's *other*—in the sense of the 3rd—might be a step in the direction of a more adequate understanding. The entrance of the 3rd before the consummation of the embrace, whereby the *upbeat* before the consummation—or, the event—is where the matters concerning hospitality are lingering: that is, in the future anterior. At the intervention of the 3rd this is all we have. The embrace *in progress*, its interruption and its passage unto the *future anterior* (which is Derrida's *à venir*): or, Bergson's counterpoint of the *virtual* to the actual. Always already still not quite. The virtual.

Hospitality may therefore be updated as the play-ground of the expanded self. Days before the HULIAS-event at the private address, featuring Bjørn Blikstad's *homage to Igory Mansotti*, the owners were themselves hosted in a home outside Stockholm. The ways, domestic atmosphere and the natural habitat, lasted for many days after we came back home. As if when preparing for the HULIAS event I was moving around with the quality of those days abroad incorporated while I was preparing for the event. *Hospitality begets hospitality...*