

Carla Abella Rodríguez, University of Salamanca, Spain

DOI:10.17951/lsmll.2026.50.2.56-67

Female African Refugees in Europe through the Cinematic Lens: Carnal Hospitality and the Longing for Touch in *Aisha* (2022) and *Drift* (2023)

ABSTRACT

This article analyses the representation of the female African refugee experience in Europe in two recent European cinematic productions: Frank Berry's *Aisha* (2022) and Anthony Chen's *Drift* (2023). The investigation suggests that, in the face of the complexity for the displaced self to reach out to the Other because of psychological and physical trauma, a language of touch emerges to cross the self-Other threshold and open the door to the fragmented and vulnerable self. Mobilising a framework that foregrounds the role of the body in hospitable encounters, a longing for touch can be traced through the presence of a physical and symbolic hand.

KEYWORDS

carnal hospitality; risk; gentleness; hand; body; touch; threshold; African women; female refugee

*no one leaves home unless / home is the mouth
of a shark / you only run for the border / when
you see the whole city running as well . . . you
only leave home / when home won't let you stay
// no one leaves home unless home chases you /
fire under feet / hot blood in your belly.*

“Home”, Warsan Shire (2009)

1. Introduction

British Somali poet Warsan Shire's verses resonate across the experience of 122.6 million people who are forcibly displaced in the world today. 37.9 million of them are refugees and 8 million asylum-seekers (UNHCR, 2024). Women and girls make up around 50% of these populations. Domestic violence, rape, female genital mutilation or forced marriage lead many to escape their homelands. Female refugees experience a “dual vulnerability” since their “exposed status

Carla Abella Rodríguez, Departamento de Filología Inglesa, Universidad de Salamanca, C/ Placentinos 18, 37008 Salamanca, carla.abella.rodriguez@usal.es, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2511-5977>

and precarious situation” puts them at risk of sexual assault or human trafficking (Apthorpe et al., 2019). Sexual and gender-based violence is thus a ubiquitous threat for refugees in the home country, in transit and in the host nation (Bartolomei et al., 2014 in the Forced Migration Research Network, 2017). Despite women making up half of the refugee population (Orav, 2023, p. 2), there is a considerable lack of studies that shed light on the displacement that women experience. This scarcity also reveals the absence of women from mainstream media and public debates on forced migration, which focus heavily on the male refugee (Apthorpe et al., 2019). In a recent study of female refugee depiction in news digital media in European countries, Amores et al. (2020) revealed the underrepresentation of female refugees and when represented, they appear as victims, inoffensive or vulnerable in “passive” and “secondary roles” (pp. 296–300). This type of representation leads to what Gerbner (1972) has called a “symbolic annihilation,” which reduces the control these women have over their representations and experiences (Amores et al., 2020, p. 298; Gerbner, 1972, p. 44). The purpose of this paper is to analyse the representation of the African female refugee experience in Europe in recent European cinematic productions. Running away from home, Aisha and Jacqueline empty themselves out in Frank Berry’s feature film *Aisha* (2022) and in Anthony Chen’s *Drift* (2023). These characterological studies try to counter the symbolic annihilation of this vulnerable group of refugees by shedding light onto their daily experiences and struggles. *Aisha* follows Aisha Osagie, a young Nigerian woman from Benin City seeking asylum in Ireland. In *Drift*, Anthony Chen explores the psychological trauma of refugees by centring the experience of Jacqueline, a refugee from Liberia who finds herself alone and homeless on a Greek island in the late 90s.

The investigation scrutinises how these two protagonists fail to find solace and comfort in the different non-spaces they traverse. A framework that centres the body in hospitable encounters between the self and the Other is mobilised. The theoretical scaffolding incorporates Kearney’s carnal hospitality, which is applied for the first time to the study of hospitable encounters in a visual or literary text, along with Dufourmantelle’s hospitality of gentleness and risk. The films reveal that the interactions between self and Other might be better understood in terms of bodily boundaries instead of spatial demarcations. Both oeuvres reflect the complexity of the displaced self to reach out and be reached out because of psychological and physical trauma. This emotional wound is difficult to access because the women have been silenced by their own trauma or shunned by a failing reception system. In the face of this inability to process trauma, the films identify a language of touch that tries to open the door to the fragmented and vulnerable self. This language of touch is reflected in the longing or yearning for touch, which provides some access to the self not simply physically but also emotionally and psychologically. The paper contends that a longing for touch can

be traced in both films through the presence of a physical and symbolic hand, which can either strive for violence or strive to bridge the gap between the self and the Other.

2. Risking ourselves, risking the Other: Carnal hospitality and ethics of care

In an increasingly mobile world, the question of hospitality is still of paramount importance. Hospitality is an ancient notion, referring to the practice of receiving strangers into one's home, which has its origins in Graeco-Roman societies, where it was a duty to protect and host any stranger (Dufourmantelle, 2013, p. 14). In recent years, hospitality theory has experienced a "renaissance" (Still, 2010, p. 1) to discuss not only the encounter between self and Other, but also the integration of displaced people in different nation-states. Building on Levinasian philosophy that foregrounds the ethical responsibility towards the Other, French philosopher Jacques Derrida (2000a; 1997/2000b) proposed an ethico-political approach to hospitality which recognised hospitality as inseparable from hostility and identified the paradoxical relationship between conditional and unconditional hospitality (pp. 77, 79; and p. 14). To find an answer to the challenging question of what hospitality is (Derrida, 2000a, p. 6), hospitality theory has been mobilised for the analysis of texts and films dealing with displacement and encounters between self and Other. This growing scholarship on hospitality has primarily focused on the spaces of welcome, the relationships between the host and guest, security protocols, linguistic hospitality and (in)hospitable gestures in a range of films and literary traditions (Clapp & Ridge, 2016; Gerke et al., 2020, Manzanos & Benito, 2017; Manzanos & Hernández, 2021). The body has received limited attention in the analysis of hospitality encounters. Mica Hilson (2016) has examined the hospitality and security of the non-normative body of little people in fiction but does not discuss the body as a site of hospitality, which Manzanos and Benito (2017) do to study the biopolitical control of immigrants in films and literary texts. This article places the focus on the body as a theoretical tool to better understand the aporetic nature of hospitality through touch and the physical and symbolic hand. Specifically, the study addresses the lack of scholarship discussing carnal hospitality, as theorised by Richard Kearney (2019), in the analysis of filmic and literary texts. Only Arias (2020) has explained the relevance of the concept in her introduction to an issue on hospitality in neo-Victorian fiction, though it is never applied to any specific work.

Hospitality as an embodied practice helps foreground the vulnerability of African female refugees in cinema. As Butler (2004) notes, vulnerability is part of the relational relationship that the self has with the Other since bodies "expose us to the gaze of others, but also to touch, and to violence, and bodies put us at risk of becoming the agency and instrument of all these as well" (pp. 26–27). The question of hospitality, I argue, might benefit from a discussion of this notion as

an embodied practice of vulnerability. In this sense, the films address relationality as an ethical question of caring, in its polysemy, towards the displaced individual: Who cares about refugees and who takes care of them? Caring holds many ambivalences, as it can mean both to help others feel good or to oppress them (Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017, p. 1). In her meditations on what “ethics of care” means, Puig de la Bellacasa (2017) foregrounds care as “vital in interweaving a web of life” that emphasises “interconnection and interdependency” (p. 4). Focusing on touch allows to “rethink relationality in its corporeal character” and understand caring not only in ethical and affective ways but also as materiality and embodiment (pp. 95–97). Both *Aisha* and *Drift* reclaim this interconnection and interdependency through the act of caring by touching. The body and its relationship to cinema have received significant attention in film studies. In accented cinema, made by filmmakers in diaspora or displacement and usually aimed at those communities, there is a recurrent “tactile optics” (Naficy, 2001, p. 28) that foregrounds “images and memories of the non-visual, the haptic, or the olfactory” (Elsaesser & Hagener, 2015, p. 141). The importance of touch in displacement films is taken up in this article to analyse the relationship between self and Other. In this vein, the study follows Paszkiewicz’s work on Isabel Coixet’s filmography (2020), which underscores the relevance of touch for the study of ethics of relationality, and furthers her attention to the role of the hand for the extension of ethico-political gestures of carnal (in)hospitality.

Barker highlights the importance of touch for the embodied dimension in our perception of the Other: “Tactility is a mode of perception and expression wherein all parts of the body commit themselves to, or are drawn into, a relationship with the world that is at once a mutual and intimate relation of contact” (Barker, 2009, p. 3). Nevertheless, touch holds an ambivalence which underpins the contact between the self and the Other and which is revealed in its etymology: “‘Touch’ is a word that comes from the old French *toucher*, which is related to the Italian *tocco*, to knock, stroke, and *toccare*, to strike or hit, both of which emphasize the violence of contact” (Dumm, 2008, p. 156; Dumm, 2008 as cited in Puig de la Bellacasa, 2017, p. 100). As Puig de la Bellacasa (2017) puts it, “*Touché* is a metaphorical substitute for wounded”. To be touched is to open ourselves to hurt (p. 99). In other words, our physical and emotional bodies can be opened and exposed to violence. A hand can open or close. It can comfort and welcome or hurt. In this sense, it can be said that the act of touching is reminiscent of Derridean “hostipitality”. In this neologism, Derrida (1999) captured the hostility inherent to hospitality due to “the risk of the other coming and destroying the place, initiating a revolution, stealing everything, or killing everyone” (p. 71). Opening ourselves to a comforting touch also opens our vulnerability to potential violence. We cannot touch without risking ourselves or risking the Other. Richard Kearney (2019) puts forward the notion

of “carnal hospitality” to foreground the embodied experience in hospitable exchanges (p. 79). Indeed, for Kearney, carnal hospitality is the cornerstone of many hospitality encounters: “Civilization begins with the handshake. Instead of reaching for a sword to smite the stranger one offers one’s hand. The fist becomes an open palm. The *hostis*-enemy becomes the *hostis*-friend” (p. 78). Touching is thus an act of hospitality, which can be inviting and accepting, but also rejecting and violating. For Kearney (2019), a “two-way” touch allows a “reciprocal feeling, empathy, attention” towards Otherness, a hospitable gift that can be perverted when turned into an imposing “one-way touch” (pp. 79–80). Carnal hospitality, when reciprocal, seems closest to a form of unconditional or pure hospitality in which self and Other disappear in an embrace. Then, the hand represents the genuine encounter between guest and host.

Carnal hos(ti)pitality implies the paradox that we cannot touch without risking ourselves and the Other. In *Praise of Risk*, Dufourmantelle (2011/2019)¹ explains “zero risk” has become the “ethical law,” the “obligatory horizon of our collective and individual decisions” in our societies (pp. 34–35). Indeed, European countries try to attain “zero risk” by increasing security and closing off their borders to the Other, who is seen as a peril. Dufourmantelle (2011/2019) contends that risking our lives should not be understood as negative or as dying. Rather, it is as way of “being the world” and building a “horizon” (pp. 1–2):

To risk one’s life at decisive moments of our existence is an act that pushes ahead of us on the basis of a still unknown knowledge, like an intimate prophecy; it is a moment of conversion . . . As an act, risk lets chance take hold. We would wish it to be voluntary but it originates in obscurity, the unverifiable, the uncertain. (p. 2)

In a hospitable reading of “risking our lives,” risking would mean welcoming the uninvited and unknown Other. Hospitality emerges as a form of risk taking. It is precisely the protagonists of the films, Aisha and Jacqueline, who, by risking the most, their physical and emotional bodies, are able to connect with the Other. The body is a threshold, which can open or close itself to the relationality with the Other violently or gently. In *Power of Gentleness: Meditations on the Risk of Living*, Anne Dufourmantelle (2013/2018) articulates gentleness or “*douceur*” as a form of hospitality:

Gentleness is an enigma. Taken up in a double movement of welcoming and giving, it appears on the threshold of passages signed off by birth and death. Because it has its degrees of intensity, because it is a symbolic force, and because it has a transformative ability over things and beings, it is a power . . . We cannot possess gentleness. We offer it hospitality. (p. 1, p. 55)

¹ I would like to thank Dr Isabelle Keller-Privat for bringing Dufourmantelle’s oeuvre to my attention.

Gentleness is an invitation, a hospitality, that is continuously extended and given to the Other: “There is no limit to gentleness, rather a continual invitation to become infected by it—and that invitation can be broken in an instant” (p. 22). It can be intellectual or carnal, and appear in many senses, including tact, to give “opening access” (p. 8, p. 20). Dufourmantelle (2012) insists that Derridean unconditional hospitality can only truly be possible towards an Other who is recognised existing before the self, to whom the self opens themselves to recognise a relationality, and who appears as a figure of gentleness in Levinasian terms: “The Other precisely reveals himself in his alterity not in a shock negating the I, but as the primordial phenomenon of gentleness” (Dufourmantelle, 2012, p. 59; Lévinas, 1961/1969, p. 150). Gentleness thus seems to be a form of pure hospitality that can help to the opening of the self, as it will be argued in the analysis of the two films.

3. Touch as threshold crossing in contemporary refugee cinema

Aisha and *Drift* centre the experiences of two young women who find themselves in spaces of welcome where they are unable to process their physical and psychological trauma due to the lack of suitable systems of care and reception. Their inability to talk about their past experiences leaves both women further touched or wounded, as Puig de la Bellacasa (2017, p. 99) puts it, since both protagonists close off and avoid connection with the individuals they encounter in the host country. Aisha has been in Ireland for over a year and resides in a centre for refugees in Dublin after fleeing Nigeria. She escaped after being raped by the men who murdered her father and brother for not paying a debt and who intended to make her work as a prostitute to pay them off. While waiting for a decision on her request to be recognised as a refugee, Aisha works as a beauty assistant in a salon in the city. In a scene at the beginning of the film, Aisha is holding the hands of a client while doing her nails (Berry, 2022, 26:22). They are sitting in the middle of the almost empty beauty salon. The camera is on the same frame during the whole scene: The two women face each other, with Aisha barely looking into the woman’s eyes. Aisha avoids commenting on why she is seeking asylum, deflecting the question with “I just had to move” (Berry, 2022, 26:42). There is no close-up in the scene, and the distance between the camera and the women reinforces the distance between Aisha and the woman, as well as the viewers, who at this point of the film remain unaware of Aisha’s sexual abuse. The client expected her to be a refugee of war and makes generalised comments about how asylum seekers can now work in Ireland. Aisha corrects her to explain that asylum-seekers can only start to work after nine months in the country and not everyone gets the chance (Berry, 2022, 26:53).

This transactional act of touching hands, which for Dufourmantelle (2013/2018) is the opposite of genuine gentleness (p. 58), is symbolic of the partial integration of asylum seekers like Aisha into the system of the host country, which also

appears in *Drift*. Back in Liberia, Jacqueline was the daughter of a minister in Charles Taylor's government. She fled the country after her family was murdered in a rebellion. She finds herself hiding in an unnamed Greek island. She is homeless and destitute among white tourists who enjoy their displacement on a paradisiacal enclave. Her main shelter is a cave by the beach, where she sleeps on a bed made of plastic bags filled with sand. At the start of the film, we are introduced to a Jacqueline in starvation, unable to pay for food. Shortly after, she steals an oil bottle from a terrace to give massages to tourists in exchange for money. The hands of labour appear in this case to massage her first client, a woman relaxing on a sunchair next to her husband (Chen, 2023, 13:36). The camerawork shows Jacqueline at her feet, in a lower position compared to the white couple. While Jacqueline is massaging her feet, the close-up frames do not show the two women in the same frame. When the husband asks how Jacqueline got to the island, she evades the question, just like Aisha. She responds "Same as everyone else. Plane. Ferry. Boat. Luck" (Chen, 2023, 15:52). The camerawork in both films conveys that a gesture of touch does not translate into connection or openness, but into distance and separation.

In the films, the hand symbolises and reinforces the power of the host nation to withhold care. In *Aisha*, two members of the Garda come unannounced into Aisha's room looking for her roommates, another Black woman and her two children (Berry, 2022, 10:00). The male policeman informs them that they are going to be deported. His hand imposes a bureaucratic and empty language of order, which syntax closes on itself and never opens: "We are here to execute this transfer," he says (Berry, 2022, 10:42). A series of close-ups show a defiant Aisha hugging one of the children and begging for the family to have the chance to call for a lawyer or assistance (Berry, 2022, 10:55). She is threatened to step back by the policeman, a white male. Instead of an open hand of welcome, the man points his finger at her, his hand closed in a fist. The hand creates a bodily threshold not to be crossed. The camera frames show Aisha next to the disembodied hand, since the policeman is left out of the frame (Berry, 2022, 11:10). This way, Frank Berry foregrounds the dehumanised hand that exerts the power of the nation-state. The frame hides the face of the policeman, which is only visible for a few seconds and from the side. Even though the hand never touches Aisha, its closeness produces carnal inhospitality and instils fear.

The family is forced to leave the centre through the back door, but Aisha follows them and defiantly stands outside the building to console the family and say goodbye. Her body and her care towards the family are deviant and disruptive of the law of the hand, of the nation-state. The manager, who controls the space of the refugee centre, warns her: "There is no need for you to be out here" (Berry, 2022, 12:07). Gestures of care such as hugging a family that is soon to be deported are seen as defiant. As a woman and a person of colour, she is

perceived as problematic and “insubordinate” by her white male manager (Berry, 2022, 38:58), which will cause her to be further isolated as she is moved to two remote accommodations in the Direct Provision System, a system for housing people seeking international protection in place in Ireland since 2000 (Amnesty International, 2021). The isolation is further revealed through touch in *Drift*. Jacqueline is introduced to the audience on the beach. We see a shot of her walking down the beach packed with white tourists when, suddenly, a child bumps into her, as if he had not seen her walking (Chen, 2023, 2:23). This uninvited harsh gesture causes Jacqueline pain, as evident in her face and moan. This moment of touch does not open the door to carnal hospitality. She momentarily holds the child, but he does not speak to her or apologise and quickly runs away into the arms of his mother. Jacqueline resumes walking as a spectral presence invisible to the surrounding tourists. The aliveness that can be heard in this scene full of families contrasts with Jacqueline’s solitude, exacerbated by the fact that she is the only Black woman on the island, and silence, which predominates throughout the film.

The hand helps convey the struggle of both protagonists to process their psychological trauma. In *Drift*, the hand evokes violence, family loss and struggle to let go of emotional pain. Jacqueline soon befriends Callie, an American tour guide who resides on the island. After a dinner date, Jacqueline gets sick and Callie takes her to her apartment, where the former asks the latter for permission to take a bath (Chen, 2023, 1:14:20). In the bathtub, a vulnerable Jacqueline finally opens up about her family’s murder. A series of flashbacks takes the viewer to her family being tortured and killed by an armed youth back home in Liberia (Chen, 2023, 1:16:00). Jacqueline was forced to watch her pregnant sister being raped and murdered by having her belly cut open (Chen, 2023, 1:18:00). The film problematises the abuse of the hand as carnal inhospitality: In the moment of her killing, the camera focuses on a boy holding a knife and we hear a cut, which happens outside the frame (Chen, 2023, 1:19:09). While recounting the past, Jacqueline holds tight to her underwear, which was worn by her sister before being abused (Chen, 2023, 1:17:00). She holds it in a tight fist, refusing to let go of the piece of clothing and her sister, to protect the only lasting memory of her. Despite Callie’s effort to reach out to Jacqueline after the confession, the latter rejects her care: “Don’t think for a second there is anything to do here,” Jacqueline says before running away from her (Chen, 2023, 1:22:52).

In *Aisha*, the hand reveals how the Irish immigration system fails to provide care for psychological trauma. Soon after being moved from Dublin to an isolated camp of caravans in rural Glentill, Aisha will learn that her mother was murdered while hiding in Lagos. After losing her emotional support, Aisha will then be taken to a remote hotel in the mountains. The night before her appealing interview, where she will have to recount her rape, Aisha leaves the hotel to throw herself in front of a passing car (Berry, 2022, 1:12:07). The paramedics

who take her to the hospital. Otherise her by assuming she does not speak English, depriving her of speech (Berry, 2022, 1:12:35). Barriers to the (ethics of) care emerge on the health workers's part. Aisha leaves the hospital alone with a carpal tunnel brace (Berry, 2022, 1:13:00). Her physical pain has been taken care of but not her emotional one. Her hand points to a devaluation of the economic value of her labour after her psychological wounds have worsened. Outside the hospital, Conor, the young local security guard working at her residence in Dublin and with whom she has struggled to start a romantic relationship due to her uncertain future, is waiting for her. The shot shows Conor facing the camera while we only see Aisha's back and never her face, which she keeps down (Berry, 2022, 1:13:08). The lack of tact of the medical care contrasts with Conor's precaution after Aisha leaves the hospital: His hug is an act of gentleness, a "threshold crossing" (Kearney, 2019, p. 82) to reach a fragile Aisha. This act of unconditional hospitality opens the door to vulnerability. Kearney (2019) remarks that "the open palm and naked lips are thresholds of vulnerability. Which is why the kiss and the handshake are paramount symbols of peace and hospitality" (pp. 79–80). An embodied approach to hospitality does not only imply that the body is the means of extending carnal hospitality, it also extends the spatiality of (in)hospitality to that of the body.

At the end of both films, touch allows the self to open their emotional and physical vulnerability to the Other. Jacqueline remains silent for most of the film as she is painfully unable to speak about her trauma to those few people around her, including Callie. One day, Callie takes Jacqueline to the hospital after having an accident on the island. Jacqueline runs away from the hospital and Callie to avoid the police, and isolates herself in an abandoned block of apartments under construction, a building which bears the traces of her failure to re-build her life. However, the next day, in a luminous moment in the film, memory appears as her guiding force. Her mother's voice and touch visit Jacqueline in her lowest moment in isolation (Chen, 2023, 57:46). We see her mother's hand appear in the frame when Jacqueline is sleeping in an empty apartment and then gently touch her face prompting her to wake up and go to town to reconnect with Callie by inviting her to have dinner together. After the above-mentioned confession scene in Callie's apartment, the latter will eventually discover Jacqueline's hiding spot and will come to comfort her (Chen, 2023, 1:24:52). Jacqueline stands silent in the empty concrete apartment. She refuses Callie's touch when she tries to give her a side hug. Immediately after, a long shot shows Callie moving behind her: She hugs Jacqueline from behind in a full embrace to comfort her while we hear her cry. A close-up then reveals Jacqueline weeping while holding onto Callie, who kisses her back (Chen, 2023, 1:26:35). The scene shows Callie and Jacqueline in the same frame, totally embraced and opposite to the first tactile encounter in the film on the beach. The longing of Jacqueline for the Other's touch, for intimacy,

which she has been unable to verbalise or demand, is realised at the end of the film. After this touch, this embrace, Jacqueline slowly starts to reconstruct her life and memory with Callie. Here, to risk one's life is to let the Other in, to be dependent on the Other (Dufourmantelle, 2011/2019, p. 9).

Similarly, Aisha struggles to start a romantic relationship with Conor, who himself experienced sexual abuse as a child. Sexual assault appears as the ultimate violation of carnal hospitality with a "one-way touch." After her hospital visit, Conor accompanies Aisha to the hotel to stay the night before her interview (Berry, 2022, 1:13:33). However, Conor cannot visit Aisha in her room as her guest. He can only enter the hotel as a paying guest staying in a room on a different floor. Aisha and Conor spend the night together, simply lying next to each other. Aisha comes into Conor's room (Berry, 2022, 1:16:40). A backshot of Conor shows them sitting far away from each other on the bed. Aisha, the only one facing the camera, starts opening herself by asking for his consent to lie next to him: "I just want to lie down here with you. Is that okay?" (Berry, 2022, 1:17:25). The camera then shows a close-up of the empty bed, where they risk themselves by lying in proximity, but not touching. In a close-up of only their faces without their bodies, Aisha extends her hand, caresses his and holds it. Then, they interlock their fingers. The hand, reaching out to touch and not to harm, offers a new language of gentleness, of openness to vulnerability and painful memories, a language of reciprocity that goes both ways. By sharing their traumas and daring to touch or be touched physically and emotionally, the two women cross the body into the Other for interdependence.

In their films, Frank Berry and Anthony Chen put forward an ethics of care through touch that helps visibilise and nuance the underrepresented experiences of female refugees, largely absent from media and public debates. *Aisha* and *Drift* portray an embodied (in)hospitality that foregrounds the lived experiences of African female refugees and their interpersonal encounters in their migratory process from their homelands to Europe. The investigation reveals that, by shifting the attention from studying spatial demarcations in hospitality encounters to hospitality as an embodied practice, the displaced individual, usually considered a guest in the host country, is centred as the self who opens their bodies, in both physical and emotional dimensions, to a guest or Other. This approach of embodied hospitality can be productive for analysing other films that reflect not only migratory experiences, but also any traumatic process to highlight the lived experiences of those with limited access to care and support.

Announcement

This investigation was made possible thanks to the grant *Ayuda para la Formación del Profesorado Universitario* (Ref. Ayuda FPU21/03856), funded by El Ministerio de Ciencia, Innovación y Universidades of the Spanish Government, to the Erasmus+ project *Migration Narratives in*

European Media: Teaching, Learning, and Reflecting (Ref. 2023-1-DE01-KA220-HED-000154375), funded by the European Union, and to the research project *Historia crítica de la literatura étnica norteamericana VI: Más allá de la hospitalidad: Revisión de la acogida y rechazo en la cultura norteamericana* (Ref. PID2019-108754GB-I00), funded by La Agencia Estatal de Investigación and El Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación of the Spanish Government.

References

- Amnesty International. (2021). End Direct Provision. <https://www.amnesty.ie/end-direct-provision/>
- Amores, J. J., Arcila-Calderón, C., & González-de-Garay, B. (2020). The gendered representation of refugees using visual frames in the main Western European media. *Gender Issues*, 37(4), 291–314. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12147-020-09248-1>
- Apthorpe, M., Burtshell, C., Burton, S., Gibson, L., & Lightfoot, F. (2019). Challenges for Female Refugees and Asylum Seekers. *Anthropology of Aid at Manchester University*. <https://sites.manchester.ac.uk/anthropology-of-aid/the-issues/refugees-and-asylum-seekers/2019-2020-challenges-for-female-refugees-and-asylum-seekers/>
- Arias, R. (2020). Neo-Victorian negotiations of hospitality: An introduction. *European Journal of English Studies*, 24(3), 197–207. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13825577.2020.1875978>
- Barker, J. (2009). *The Tactile Eye. Touch and the Cinematic Experience*. University of California Press.
- Bartolomei, L., Eckert, R., & Pittaway, E. (2014). “What happens there ... follows us here”: Resettled but still at risk: Refugee women and girls in Australia. *Refuge: Canada's Journal on Refugees*, 30(2), 45–56. <https://doi.org/10.25071/1920-7336.39618>
- Berry, F. (Director, Writer). (2022). *Aisha* [Film]. BBC Film; Screen Ireland; Subotica; Wavelength.
- Butler, J. (2004). *Precarious Life: The Powers of Mourning and Violence*. Verso.
- Chen, A. (Director). (2023). *Drift* [Film]. Aim Media; BFI; Cor Cordium Productions.
- Clapp, J., & Ridge, E. (Eds.). (2016). *Security and Hospitality in Literature and Culture*. Routledge.
- Derrida, J. (1999). Hospitality, Justice and Responsibility: A Dialogue with Jacques Derrida. In R. Kearney, & M. Dooley (Eds.), *Questioning Ethics* (pp. 75–93). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203450833>
- Derrida, J. (2000a). Hostipitality (B. Stocker, & F. Morlock, Trans.). *Angelaki*, 5(3), 3–18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09697250020034706>
- Derrida, J. (2000b). *Of Hospitality* (R. Bowlby, Trans.). Stanford University Press. (Original work published 1997)
- Dufourmantelle, A. (2012). L'hospitalité, une valeur universelle? [Hospitality: A Universal Value?]. *Insistance*, 8(2), 57–62. <https://doi.org/10.3917/insi.008.0057>
- Dufourmantelle, A. (2013). Hospitality – Under Compassion and Violence. In T. Claviez (Ed.), *The Conditions of Hospitality* (pp. 13–23). Fordham University Press.
- Dufourmantelle, A. (2018). *Power of Gentleness: Meditations on the Risk of Living* (K. Payne, & V. Sallé, Trans.). Fordham University Press. (Original work published 2013).
- Dufourmantelle, A. (2019). *In Praise of Risk* (S. Miller, Trans.). Fordham University Press. (Original work published 2011)
- Dumm, T. (2008). *Loneliness as a Way of Life*. Harvard University Press.
- Elsaesser, T., & Hagener, M. (2015). *Film Theory: An Introduction through the Senses* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Gerbner, G. (1972). Violence in Television Drama: Trends and Symbolic Functions. In G. A. Comstock, & E. A. Rubinstein (Eds.), *Television and Social Behavior* (pp. 28–187). Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior.
- Gerke, A. E., Rodríguez Guerrero-Strachan, S., & San José Rico, P. (Eds.). (2020). *The Poetics and Politics of Hospitality in US Literature and Culture*. Brill.

- Hilson, M. (2016). A Dwarf at the Table: Hospitality and the Non-Normate Body in Modern Literature. In J. Clapp, & E. Ridge (Eds.), *Security and Hospitality in Literature and Culture* (pp. 94–107). Routledge.
- Kearney, R. (2019). Double hospitality: Between word and touch. *Journal for Continental Philosophy of Religion*, 1(1), 71–89. <https://doi.org/10.1163/25889613-00101005>
- Lévinas, E. (1969). *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority* (A. Lingis, Trans.). Duquesne University Press. (Original work published 1961)
- Manzanas, A. M., & Benito, J. (2017). *Hospitality in American Literature and Culture*. Routledge.
- Manzanas, A. M., & Hernández, D. (Eds.). (2021). *Cine y Hospitalidad*. Ediciones de la Universidad de Salamanca.
- Naficy, H. (2001). *An Accented Cinema*. Princeton University Press.
- Orav, A. (2023). Migrant Women and the EU Labour Market: Overcoming Double Discrimination. *European Parliamentary Research Service*. [www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2023/747905/EPRS_BRI\(2023\)747905_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2023/747905/EPRS_BRI(2023)747905_EN.pdf)
- Paszkiwicz, K. (2020). Touch as proximate distance: Post-phenomenological ethics in the cinema of Isabel Coixet. *Film-Philosophy*, 24(1), 22–45. <https://doi.org/10.3366/film.2020.0127>
- Puig de la Bellacasa, M. (2017). *Matters of Care*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Shire, W. (2009). Home. *Amnesty International*. <https://www.amnesty.ie/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/home-by-warsan-shire.pdf>
- Still, J. (2010). *Derrida and Hospitality*. Edinburgh University Press.
- The Forced Migration Research Network, University of New South Wales. (2017). The World's Biggest Minority? Refugee Women and Girls in the Global Compact on Refugees. <https://www.unhcr.org/sites/default/files/legacy-pdf/59e5f4447.pdf>
- UNHCR. (2024). *UNHCR's Refugee Population Statistics Database*. <https://www.unhcr.org/refugee-statistics>