

Rethinking hospitality, resistance and the calling: Explorations of decolonial research strategies

Kaia Schultz Rønsdal

What is hospitality, what is its content? Through explorations of decolonial research strategies this article has its starting point in a narrative from Northern Norway. I discuss conceptualisations of hospitality from theological and phenomenological perspectives, and as something that may entail resistance from and for those involved. I present the Arctic North as a very specific geographical, historical and cultural space. Certain events took place in these borderlands during the so-called refugee crisis that set in motion encounters and narratives that were worth investigating. In the explorations of hospitality, I include the perspective of lived space and the phenomenological concept of prereflexivity, which are prerequisites for a discussion of the calling and hospitality.

Introduction

This article explores decolonial research strategies, connecting to the ways in which voices, bodies and practices make up critical counter-power, and where this counter-power is rooted. Hospitality, as well as the response to the call of another human being, in this context are interpreted within a theological framework as practices of resistance and counter-conduct.

Through a narrative from Northern Norway, I explore the concepts of hospitality and calling from theological and phenomenological perspectives as something that may entail resistance from and for those involved. The Arctic North is the starting point as certain events took place there in 2015 that set in motion encounters and narratives that were worth investigating.

The research relates to decolonial thinking both indirectly, as the issue of migration, border-crossing, and the reason for these are to a large extent linked to varying remnants of colonialism and systemic racism and marginality based in colonial logics. Implicitly, the research as well as the text itself, relate to research strategies that are tied to decolonial think-

Dr. Kaia S. Rønsdal is a researcher affiliated with The Faculty of Theology, University of Oslo. Her discipline is the field of professional ethics and Christian social practice. Her research interests are in the lived practices in civil society, addressing issues such as marginality, migration, borders and peripheries, from perspectives including spatial theory, urbanity, phenomenology and theological ethics. Her research also includes methodological explorations within these perspectives and fields. She is involved with several projects allowing for further explorations on the concept of hospitality in the context of migration.

ing. Postcolonial critique, in the tradition of Edward Said (Said 1979) points to the complete objectifying of the oriental, non-white other, where this other has been observed, administrated and controlled without the freedom or power to participate, negotiate, or decide. Traditional research methods are often critiqued due to the objectification of the research subjects or matters, reflecting this postcolonial thinking. Starting with Spivak's warning of hegemonizing the other, decolonial methodology focuses on how we learn "from below, from the subaltern,

rather than only study him(her)” (Spivak 2005, 482). In their endeavors, researchers often collaborate with individuals who are not researchers, and the goal is to avoid reducing their life, experiences and practices to data. A research approach characterized by collaboration focused on subject-to-subject relationships between the researcher subject and research field may be understood as a decolonial research strategy (cf. Wyller and Lid, Forthcoming 2021). Furthermore, new knowledge developed from new spaces with other perspectives may lead to new grounds for resistance and counter-conduct (Wyller and Lid, Forthcoming 2021). Also when we research with people who are not necessarily subaltern in Spivak’s understanding, it is a question of letting the people and practices speak, and, in an attentive and embodied sense, participate and share.

To let the counter-conductive spaces, practices and bodies speak, the presentation of the geographical and historical context and the narrative of contacting and speaking with the research subjects becomes important, and may not follow the traditional composition of academic writing. I will attempt to comprehensibly weave the elements together.

In the explorations of hospitality, I include the perspective of lived space and the phenomenological concept of prereflexivity, which are prerequisites for a discussion of calling and hospitality. These perspectives also relate to encountering and affectedness, and not reducing the research subject “to the empirical alone” (Spivak 2005, 480), but to sharing experiences and knowledge production, as situated bodies. In other words, the research does not present a “general body”, as in trying to say something about general tendencies regarding hospitality; but rather, it regards concrete present bodies, sharing, also within the framework of research.

After presenting the context of the research, and some of the presently relevant history, I will recount the narrative of the encounters with the two research subjects. All these elements, related to context, history and shared encounter are part of the information that forms the discussion. Thus, the narrative will, in line with the methodology, include a present researcher subject. As it is not only the words spoken in the interviews that inform the discussion, the balance between information given in the interviews and ‘other’ information may be awry compared to traditional ethnographic and empirically developed writing.

Refugees in the North¹

In 2015, almost one and a half million people crossed the borders into Europe. They were refugees and migrants searching for any possible route into a European country.

Norway has a 196-kilometre border with Russia. Only one road crosses the border, with one border station, called Storskog. It is illegal to make the crossing on foot, but a bicycle is considered a vehicle. At the beginning of the 21st century, an average of five asylum-seekers crossed this border annually.² In 2015, 5,465 asylum-seekers found this way into Norway, most having been granted once-through visas in Russia. As early as March 2015, a few asylum-seekers crossed this border; in August 100 people crossed. By October, 50 to 60 people were crossing daily. According to Norwegian law, asylum applications can be processed either at the border or inside the territory. Because it was impossible to differentiate between asylum-seekers and others, as well as handling the large number of people, the border authorities simply decided to let every third country national enter.

The local police, politicians, and population mobilized. The transit reception center, the refugee reception centers, and all the hotels in the area filled up. The local politicians and news station reported on the situation but were unable to catch the attention of the national authorities. International media, however, was attentive, and once they started broadcasting from Storskog, the Norwegian media and government realized that this had become an international event.

Furthermore, it became both a national and an international political issue. The refugees heading to Norway were crowding the two Russian cities closest to Storskog: Nikel and Zapoljarnyj. Russian border authorities and Norwegian police agreed to a daily maximum of 200 border crossings.

Once the Norwegian government had realized the severity of the situation, they mobilized to find means of stopping the increasing flow of migrants into Norway. The law had to be changed, and a legislative amendment was enacted within ten days. The locals were alarmed, as it was now late November and the climate was aggravating the situation.

1 Some of the narrative is also published in Rønsdal 2019.

2 The following account builds on local, national, and international reports from 2015 and 2016.



The government remained unaffected and increased the offensive. The lack of clear agreements with Russia led to migrants being sent back and forth within the border zone several times. In the end, Russia drew a line so that none of those deported from Norway were permitted to re-enter Russia. The amendment allowed the apprehending of people who were likely to be denied asylum, which led to several asylum-seekers exploring the options of church asylum.

The Artic borderlands

The frontier between Norway and Russia was first staked out in 1863. Since then, the borders between Russia and Finland have been re-drawn and fought over many times. People have inhabited the area for more than 10,000 years, regardless and irrespective of these frontiers, and people on all sides are connected to each other through family bonds and friendships. Until around 200 years ago, the population was predominantly Sami. The region played an important role in the Nordics' history as colonizers. As the Sami population was threatening to outgrow the whites in the early 1800s, the government changed policies to repopulate the region with white and "loyal" Norwegians. In the county of Sør-Varanger, industry, as well as national and international politics have thus been the decisive forces of change, influencing who settled and made up the population. Refugees have crossed these borders many times before, mainly due to wars, unrest and persecution in Russia and Finland.

Throughout the Second World War around 160,000 German soldiers were based in this county, with a population of around 7000. Many stayed in people's homes, sometimes while the families were still living there. Additionally, 65,000 Soviet war prisoners were held in the many camps in the area. Locals fled or were evacuated by force, and the area was destroyed.³ Children were sent to Sweden when the war ended, for nourishment and healing, after years of food deprivation and sickness. During the 90s, there was a direct route from Sarajevo⁴ to Sør-Varanger, as the county is a so-called reception

county, which means that the county has an established center with a specific capacity in personell and beds for reception.

Shared borderland encounters

If you can reach Murmansk, you can get to Zapoljarnyj, a city with a population of 15,000, 53.3 kilometers from Storskog and the Norwegian border. Between Zapoljarnyj and Storskog, there is only wilderness. It is very dark, and there is little passing traffic. This area is as far East as Istanbul, and once you cross into Norway, you jump two time zones.

13 kilometers from Storskog, across the border, in the county of Sør-Varanger is Kirkenes, a town with 3,500 inhabitants. The locals travel 'next door' to do their shopping. Many go to Russia once a week to fill up their cars' gas tanks, as the price on gas and diesel is considerably lower than in Norway. Locals have "grenseboerbevis" (a local border traffic permit) and may cross the border without visas.

Some say that there is something called Northern Norwegian hospitality. If it exists, does it relate to the geographical, historical and social context of being a borderland? The context of the borderlands was a starting point for exploring hospitality, and one of the dimensions of hospitality became the concept of calling and, eventually, that led to finding practices and voices of resistance and counter-conduct.

I read about two people, Lars and Maria in countless news articles. Two ordinary people who took action when 'the refugees came' to Norway. Through a friend and colleague in Kirkenes, I managed to get the phone numbers to these two people.

I booked flights to Kirkenes, booked a hotel, and planned to contact Lars and Maria to arrange interviews. I had a reminder in my calendar every day for two months, "call Kirkenes", but I kept hesitating. It felt insignificant to be a researcher and to talk to people three years afterwards, to interpret and think about what *they* did.

I travelled there, just to be there, as a situated body. It is a place that calls to be experienced, lived and felt. The people, culture and history needs to be experienced *there*. Three days after my arrival, I still had not called, really struggling with the question of why it was important to talk to them. On the fourth day, I could not procrastinate anymore, and I called Lars, fully prepared for him to say that he had no time to talk to me. "Hello, it's Lars!" came the response.

3 Kirkenes endured 328 bombardments, and in October 1944, it was burned to the ground, leaving only 39 houses.

4 There are different reports of origin city; Skopje, Pristina, Sarajevo, and Kosovo.

I introduced myself, and explained why I had called, and told him that my friend had recommended I talked to him about “the refugees” and that he had given me his number. He replied that it was nice to hear that the other man thought he was someone interesting to talk to. I told him that I knew it was short notice, but I hoped he had the chance to talk to me about his experiences. “Yes, sure, I’d like that. How about tomorrow? Where can we meet?”

I met Lars in the hotel lobby. We talked for 2.5 hours. He talked about those months in 2015/16, about everything that happened, and all the things that had happened in his life because of those experiences. I asked about Maria, who I had learned was moving from Kirkenes. He told me she was still around, and that I should call her. At the end of our conversation, I asked him for a hug.

Lars, who is a man in his late forties, told me how he is one of the many locals who goes to Russia for cheap gas. During the fall of 2015, he met families wandering the desolate road between Zapoljarnyj and Storskog. More and more people and many small children, walking or bicycling. People who were not dressed for the harsh climate here. He, a man who used to be an adamant adversary of immigration, an “unknowing sceptic” as he calls himself, was moved to action.

When I got to my room, I called Maria. “Hello, it’s Maria?” I went through the introduction again. “I can meet you tomorrow, no problem!” She told me her story of those months when the refugees came. We talked about Kirkenes as a historic place of hospitality. She told me of doors that are always open in Kirkenes. People will enter each other’s homes and get a cup of coffee, even when there is no one home. She thinks this has to do with the war (WWII). As the Germans occupied people’s homes for their own use, families would move into other families’ homes. Maria’s grandparents had told her how they lived several families together in one home, and that this was part of people’s narratives, thus shaping them as perhaps more welcoming and open.

Maria, a nurse with two grown children, told me how she was watching the news, seeing the families who were walking or bicycling in the nothingness between Zapoljarnyj and Storskog. She saw small children and their exhausted parents. Almost invisible bodies in the Arctic darkness. She saw people in danger and was moved to action.

Both told me about how they were arrested for helping transport refugees from the reception cen-

ter to church asylum. Maria paid her fine. Lars refused and spent three years getting exonerated from the sentence. Both said that *their lives would never be the same again*. When we talked about hospitality, they both claimed the refugees as most hospitable. *That they had never received so much hospitality as when the refugees came*.

Hospitality and calling

The question of hospitality is in some instances one of life or death. It can therefore not be a question of courtesy or civility, and in this discussion, it is not a political question. On the human level, what is ultimately at stake is tied to ethics. Hospitality is conceptually linked to theology, and ultimately appears as an ethical demand in one form or another, as an “ethics-as-hospitality” (Dikeç, Clark and Barnett 2009, 9). “When it is the ethical challenge of the other that is central, and this is confronted in action, then a theologically relevant practice takes place” (Wyller 2008). The Danish philosopher and theologian Knud Løgstrup’s most famous work is *The Ethical Demand* (Løgstrup 2000 [1956]). In this work on relational ethics, he stated that you can never engage with another human without holding pieces of her life in your hand. This demand is also part of Løgstrup’s work on vocation. Vocation is when humans see themselves called by God to certain actions, ways of life or professions. Over the last half of the 1900s, theological thinkers like Løgstrup developed a theology and philosophy that included specific ideas of vocation. Central here is that in the *calling*, the term I will use, we are called by the other, by our neighbor. This is not a religious concept, but instead a universal concept that every human being is called to heed this other life and take care of and protect it. This should mean that when refugees come to our door, they are the life placed in our hand to care for, to show hospitality.

Lars and Maria both stated that hospitality was something that came with the refugees. If that is the case, it turns the concept on its head. If hospitality comes with the other, the concept of calling from traditional thinkers such as Løgstrup is contested and challenged. In an attempt to explore what this may mean, it is fitting to reflect on the Nordic emphasis on traditional ideas of calling, as they can be used to say something about hospitality.



Embodied spatial calling

The theoretical premise is spatial thinking, primarily in the tradition of the French sociologist Henri Lefebvre, and his production of space (Lefebvre 2003 [1970]; 2007 [1974]; 2008 [1961]). The very short introductory version of Lefebvre's theory on the production of space, in this context is that space is to be understood in an active sense as an intricate web of relationships that is continuously produced and reproduced. Spaces are formative. Space is to be understood less as something that is, but as something we do, or in the interpretation of Kirsten Simonsen, space is a verb rather than a noun (Simonsen 2010, 45).

I will draw on prior explorations on the concept of calling, which emphasizes the fact *that individuals are placed in the sometimes disruptive calling relationship as equals* – the actions taken in the encounter determine the meaning for those involved (Rønsdal 2018). The theological premise for this particular understanding of calling is the tradition sometimes referred to as Scandinavian creation theology, where Løgstrup was a central figure.

One starting point of this position is that life is created and given to us. We did not create it ourselves. This life is continuously created, in the *here and now* (Wingren 1995, 35–36; 39–40). Our relationships and encounters with other people thus shape our world (Løgstrup 2000, 39). There are, according to Løgstrup, phenomena and aspects of human life that are not subject to our power, that belong to life itself (Løgstrup 2000, 30; 35, 38–39). Løgstrup rejected making the question of compassion and care a religious one. Rather, he made them a universal challenge, in a reciprocal interdependence regardless of faith or creed (Løgstrup 2000, 34). As we are created (by God), life is expressed as care for and reception of the other. Løgstrup's view of creation is that it is universal, and that it is characterized by motion, change, and life. That the world and other humans are not *our* creations is decisive in how we think about and act toward them.

The Other has always been an important figure and phenomenon for theology; part of “the task of perceiving the other” (Heimbrock and Meyer 2010, 1999). This emphasis links to phenomenology, where the fact that we share a [created] life, reality, and world makes us part of the same *lifeworld* [with divine presence]: “A human is inherently related to others, to nature, culture and society” (Wyller 2010, 190). Furthermore, we “share the same planet, there-

fore unavoidably live at the expense of other life-forms, and repeatedly do so at the expense of others” (Gregersen, Uggla and Wyller 2017, 21).

This is a theology that is “particularly interested in thinking of reality as a radically open concept, which leaves space to think otherness and changeability for the world. Such extensions into discourse are open for discussion, not holy laws to be either condoned or condemned” (Heimbrock and Meyer 2010, 1999). It is a normative, philosophical, life-interpreting approach towards God, life, humans, and the world. The so-called Scandinavian creation theology “stands and falls with the claim that there are shared aspects of human life that offer room for open-minded discussions of how to live the human condition alongside people of other faiths, and with people of no professed faith at all. [It] leaves ample room for common sense and common commitments, even where worldviews differ or even drift apart. Everyday life constitutes a third realm between a purely political realm, and a purely religious domain” (Uggla, Wyller and Gregersen 2017, 8).

These two lines of thought regarding human life are distinctive to this theological interpretation. The first is the understanding of creation, meaning interpreting the world as “already God's creation, a reality which should be cared for and enjoyed for its own sake, by believers and non-believers alike” (Uggla, Wyller and Gregersen 2017, 11). Humans partake in continuous creation, a condition shared by all.

The other distinction is the profession of a divine presence also outside religious or sacred spaces – in the everyday. This is also true in the everyday lives, practices and spaces of people who do not necessarily think of themselves as being religious. This gives a sacredness to everyday life and to everyday spaces that are open to theological interpretations of practices and locations of life traditionally not thought of as sacred. The other human being, the one who is fundamentally other to myself, is also a part of this shared condition of living in a world that is continuously created.

Bodies and prereflexivity

The Norwegian professor of the science of nursing, Kari Martinsen, claims that in the confrontation with another body, there is an embodied reaction to this body, even before one begins to think about who this person is (Martinsen 2014 [2000], 19–23).

She refers to this embodied reaction as *prereflexivity*, meaning something that occurs before conscious consideration. Bodies are aware of and respond to other bodies.

Prereflexivity is significant in my interpretation of the calling. I argue that the significant moment is when encountering bodies respond to each other momentarily, before all conscious considerations and assessments of the situation can occur. These moments are significant because in the prereflexive, the encountering bodies are equal; they are just equal bodies without predefined positions. In the calling and in the encounter, in the prereflexive, it is not as obvious who these vulnerable bodies are (Rønsdal 2018).

There are several phenomenologists contributing to the concept of prereflexivity (cf. Løgstrup 2000; Martinsen 2014 [2000]; Merleau-Ponty 1962), among them Bernard Waldenfels, placing prereflexivity in the body. “The domain of our body includes all that really has to do with me without being done by me” (Waldenfels 2007, 75). Waldenfels also emphasizes the encounter. He uses the concept of *pathos*, noting that they are “those events which are not at our disposal, as if merely waiting for a prompt or command, but rather happen to us, overcome, stir, surprise, attack us,” (Waldenfels 2011, 26). They are events that happen to us and do not belong to a “first-person perspective as an act I perform, nor to the third-person perspective as an objective process registered or effected from the outside” (Waldenfels 2007, 74). He states, “In sum, everything that appears to us has to be described not simply as something which receives a sense, but as something which provokes sense without being meaningful itself yet still as something *by which* we are touched, affected, stimulated, surprised and to some extent violated. I call this happening pathos, *Widerfahrnis* or af-fect, marked by a hyphen in order to suggest that something is done *to us*” (Waldenfels 2007, 74).

This prereflexivity as pathos is a central feature in how I interpret calling. It places the prereflexive in an ethical discourse, as being in the world is in itself ethically and morally significant. It is human to encounter others with empathy and pathos, but it is not necessarily something we decide ourselves. In his contemplations on vocation, the Swedish theologian Gustaf Wingren claimed that solidarity, which is linked to empathy and hospitality, is something we have to “endeavour to shake off” (Wingren 1995 [1974], 39), in encounters with suffering. To shake

off or ignore empathy or solidarity demands consciousness, not pathos.

In the moment of encounter, in the disruption, there is a prereflexive moment of equality, where the calling and the pathos may be pointed out. This changes the space of encounter momentarily – and thus changes the production of space. Space and prereflexivity are thus closely connected.

The body and being bodies in a common life-world – sensing and physically feeling with the entire body – is something common to us all regardless of our religious position. Being aware of our sensing the other in our encounters is related to being affected by the other, which also relates to ethics.

Even a small event, explicitly tied to embodied affectedness, prereflexive response, and equal bodies in lived space, has implications for how we interpret and understand calling. Because the bodies share the same circumstances – in the moment of encounter, in the shared lived space – these individuals are the same, equal bodies *as bodies*. The body does not stop to consider whether this is someone that it *wants* to aid: It simply responds.

Spaces and calling

I have established certain aspects with respect to calling: it applies to us all, equal individuals encounter each other in the calling, and we are all situated, sensing bodies in the world. There is an explicitly embodied calling, happening inside a space produced by the people there. It is an ethically normative notion – one may become affected. To return to phenomenology, the affectedness and pathos belong with those who experience it.

Calling has to do with *embodied and spatial* practices and socialities (Rønsdal 2018). This take on calling also has implications for how we may understand the concept of hospitality. By emphasizing lived space, we may learn more about calling. The calling is not only a disruption or an encounter or sensuousness; it also takes place in lived spaces. The calling is also in the nonspaces, those not included in churches or ecclesial notions on calling. Borderlands or borderspaces may be such nonspaces. Such nonspaces may be counterspaces, in that they, through their very differences, direct criticism toward society, threatening general discourse and challenging ethical discourse (Foucault 1984). Michel Foucault called these heterotopic spaces, and they are rich and socially complex. Who calls and



who responds in these spaces is not something decided beforehand. Nor are the spaces themselves.

Lars and Maria's experience of having met great hospitality when encountering the refugees may indicate something similar in terms of the undecided. The premise is *not* that if you do not believe in a god you are not in a reciprocal commitment toward fellow human beings (Rønsdal 2018). Our bodies are called, and they meet and respond in pathos when undisturbed by thought. The action, in accordance with Wingren, is latent, lying in wait, rooted in human existence, something that can be executed to exemplary perfection by anyone, regardless of knowledge or education (Wingren 1995 [1974], 101–102).

Fluid hospitality

The reason for taking the perspective of calling, and thus hospitality, is that it may also become a means for exploring resistance.

Lars, Maria and I talked about a lot of things, but I am not going to analyze their actions, thoughts, ideas, and conceptualizations about what happened in 2015. Rather, the narrative with them, their context, our experiences, and the one little sentence about hospitality gives means to discuss certain theological and phenomenological concepts that lets me explore aspects of hospitality. The one statement on hospitality as something *they* experienced may point out something.

The events took place so close to the border where someone who was not supposed to come came. They had nothing, and that is the reason they had nothing to give, and no one on either side had the time to make up an opinion. Certain circumstances fell together in a way that made certain encounters possible. This is the point where bodies can express needs and where other bodies can respond in pathos.

In the often hostile border situations in borderlands, there are also openings. There may be creative potential, human encounter and connectedness, in-betweenness and rupture, all opening up for change, counter-action and thus resistance. We live in a world where there is little time or sympathy for detours and delays – hospitality and calling are in themselves counter to this. However, it is the detours and delays that disturb, break, and open for the potential, the creative, and the resistance. In the perspective of Henri Lefebvre space is constantly in motion, always different, always being moved for-

ward, being produced – the world is moved forward by contrasts, contradictions, and tensions (Lefebvre 2007 [1974], 42).

There is an inherent, embodied reciprocity in the calling. The calling is not something someone comes to another with; rather, those involved meet each other as equals *with* and *in* the calling with pathos. The prerequisite is that we produce and share lived space, which is why it is *spatial*. The other prerequisite is the *body*: The body is attuned to the other body, sensing it and acting on it, *prereflexively*.

Even someone who seemingly has nothing to give, nothing to offer a guest, may offer hospitality unlike anything experienced before. Subjectivity is created when the offer is acknowledged, accepted and shared. Becoming the subject is resistance. It is an absolutely radical transformation of the calling, and an extension of hospitality.

Concluding remarks

A fluid hospitality takes the concept of calling and makes it universal, becoming an interesting and fruitful extension of both concepts in decolonial development. Traditional notions of both hospitality and the concept of calling may become passive, while fluid hospitality may be pinpointed as a *prereflexive, or even subreflexive, action*. “The foreigner, indeed, does not pose the question – he/she/it is the question – a question that begs my response and my responsibility” (Dufourmantelle 2013, 21).

In this embodied calling – in the pathos – we are all equally vulnerable and exposed, and it is unclear who calls and who responds – there is a potential for a rupture or breach that transgresses prior power status and knowledge. In the embodied spatial calling, *every* body is an otherbody; *no* body is in command, and *no* body is defined beforehand.

The same could be claimed for hospitality. Hospitality does not belong to *any one*, completely and always, it is continuously changing. The one who comes has our lives in their hands. What is given, shown and shared in human relationships, for shorter or longer time periods, is just that – shared. It concerns much more than the question of who is guest and who is host, who deserves what and who is to receive: thus challenging traditional binaries used to maintain destructive power structures.

In the power play that Lars and Maria have entered into by taking action, by their specific *disruptive* encounters, there is another production of space

going on at the same time. Maybe the fluid hospitality they experience in this lived space opens up new subjectivities, thus pointing to counter-spaces of resistance.

Presuming fluid hospitality, like calling, entails equal bodies encountering each other in pathos, there is a glimpse of universal better life, of equality, reciprocity, and human interconnectedness. It is immaterial, a transcendent, sensing, and embodied hospitality. In the fluid hospitality the encountering bodies surrender, or even entrust themselves to each other, holding pieces of each other's lives in their hands, transcending the usual conceptions of (the boundaries of) hospitality.

This spatial, embodied exploration and subsequent reflection on prereflexivity was actualized by the methodology founded in decolonial thinking. In the venture of the decolonizing of academic milieus, this may also reflect on fundamental methodological issues. Research related to various forms of marginality, such as migration, often involve delegating "the voice and agency of migrants to legitimised actors or native activists, mostly in the name of their status" (English, Grazioli and Martignoni 2019, 204), once again leaving other voices and narratives out. Multisensory, embodied methodology, experiencing with those we research with may enable emerging into fields where many voices can speak, in multiple ways. Donna Haraway claims that "[T]here is a premium on establishing the capacity to see from the peripheries and the depth" (Haraway 1988, 583). She goes on to warn of the dangers of romanticizing the visions of those marginalized through the claim of seeing from their perspective. The methodology I am arguing for here, however, does not have as its claim that it sees from the positions of the others. It does, rather, attempt to discover new perspectives when research is based on the *shared experience* we have with the people we research with.

References

- Dikeç, Mustafa, Nigel Clark, and Clive Barnett. 2009. "Extending Hospitality: Giving Space, Taking Time." *Paragraph* 32 (1): 1–14.
- Dufourmantelle, Anne. 2013. "Hospitality – Under Compassion and Violence." In *The Conditions of Hospitality. Ethics, Politics, and Aesthetics on the Threshold of the Possible*, edited by Thomas Claviez, 13–24. New York, NY: Fordham University Press.
- English, Claire, Margherita Grazioli, and Martina Martignoni. 2019. "Migration Solidarity in Postcolonial Europe. Challenging Borders, Creating Mobile Commons." In *Routledge Handbook of Radical Politics*, edited by Ruth Kinna and Uri Gordon, 194–210. Oxford: Routledge.
- Foucault, Michel. 1984. "Of Other Spaces (1967), Heterotopias." In *Architecture/Mouvement/Continuité*, Oct. 1984, 1–9. <https://web.mit.edu/allanmc/www/foucault1.pdf>.
- Gregersen, Niels Henrik, Trygve Wyller, and Bengt Kristensson Uggla (eds). 2017. *Reformation Theology for a Post-Secular Age: Løgstrup, Preter, Wingren, and the Future of Scandinavian Creation Theology*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Haraway, Donna J. 1988. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." *Feminist Studies*, Autumn, 14 (3): 575–599.
- Heimbrock, Hans-Günter and Peter Meyer. 2010. "Theology as Model for Perceiving the Other." In *Perceiving the Other. Case Studies and Theories of Respectful Action*, edited by Trygve Wyller and Hans-Günter Heimbrock, 192–201. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Isin, Engin. 2012. *Citizens without Frontiers*. NY/London: Bloomsbury.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 2003 [1970]. *The Urban Revolution*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 2007 [1974]. *The Production of Space*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lefebvre, Henri. 2008 [1961]. *Critique of Everyday Life Vol. II. Foundations for a Sociology of the Everyday*. Malden, MA: Verso Books.
- Lid, Inger Marie and Trygve Wyller (eds.). 2017. *Rom og etikk: Fortellinger om ambivalens*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Lid, Inger Marie and Trygve Wyller (eds.). Forthcoming 2020. *Motstand og Motmakt*. Oslo: Cappelen Damm Akademisk.
- Løgstrup, Knud E. 1997. *The Ethical Demand*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Løgstrup, Knud E. 2000 [1956]. *Den etiske fordring*. Oslo: Cappelen.
- Machado, Daisy L., Bryan S. Turner, and Trygve E. Wyller. 2018. "Traces of a Theo-Borderland." In *Borderland Religion: Ambiguous Practices of Difference, Hope and Beyond*, edited by Daisy .L Machado, Bryan S. Turner, and Trygve E. Wyller, 4–14. Oxford: Routledge.
- Martinsen, Kari. 2014 [2000]. *Øyet og kallet*. Bergen: Fagbokforlaget.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1962. *Phenomenology of Perception*. London: Routledge.
- Rønsdal, Kaia S. 2018. *Calling Bodies in Lived Space: Spatial Explorations on the Concept of Calling in a Public Urban Space*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Rønsdal, Kaia.S. 2019. "Hospitality in the Hands of Who?" In *Contested Hospitalities in a Time of Migration: Religious and Secular Counterspaces in the Nordic Region*, edited by Synnøve K. N. Bendixsen and Trygve Wyller, 175–187. Oxford: Routledge.
- Said, Edward. 1979. *Orientalism*. New York, NY: Vintage.



- Schmid, Christian. 2008. "Henri Lefebvre's Theory of the Production of Space: Towards a Three-Dimensional Dialectics." In *Space, Difference, Everyday Life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*, edited by Kanishka Goonewardena, Stefan Kipfer, Richard Milgrom, and Christian Schmid, 27–45. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Simonsen, Kirsten. 2010. "Rumlig praksis: Konstitution af rum mellem materialitet og repræsentation." *Vendingen mot rummet*, Slagmark, 57: 35–58.
- Soja, Edward W. 1996. *Thirdspace – Journeys to Los Angeles and Other-Real-and-Imagined Places*. Malden MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Spivak, Gayatri C. 2005. "Scattered Speculations on the subaltern and the popular." *Postcolonial Studies* 8 (4): 475–408.
- Waldenfels, Bernhard. 2007. *The Question of the Other*. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.
- Waldenfels, Bernhard. 2011. *Phenomenology of the Alien. Basic Concepts*. Translated by Tanja Stähler and Alexander Kozin. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- Wingren, Gustaf. 1995 [1974]. *Credo. Den kristna tros- och livsåskådningen*. Skellefteå: Artos.
- Wyller, Trygve. 2008. "Compassion as an Interruption of the Power of Inscription. A Contribution to Diaconal Studies." In *Lived Religion: Conceptual, Empirical and Practical-Theological Approaches; Essays in Honor of Hans-Günter Heimbrock*, edited by Heinz Streib, Astrid Dinter, Kerstin Söderblom, and Hans-Günter Heimbrock, 171–182. Leiden: Brill.
- Wyller, Trygve. 2010. "Religion and Professional Ethics in a Post-Secular Society." In *Perceiving the Other. Case Studies and Theories of Respectful Action*, edited by Trygve Wyller and Hans-Günter Heimbrock, 188–191. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Wyller, Trygve and Hans-Günter Heimbrock (eds.). 2010. *Perceiving the Other. Case Studies and Theories of Respectful Action*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.