1. Does a radical critique of the tradition of western philosophy/of western society, that is, the effort to construct, create, constitute the basis for an emancipatory project as resistance to a system of domination, necessitate/demand a radical style/form? In other words, does radical critique demand a different language? If so, does this involve a commitment to being misunderstood in order to avoid being coopted, categorized, classified by the tradition/society that is the object of critique?

Martin Jay: (Referring to forms of resistance in the 1960s) “Here too the mechanisms of absorption and cooptation have shown themselves to be enormously effective. **The result of all this is that the intellectuals who take their critical function seriously have been presented with an increasingly rigorous challenge to outdistance the culture’s capacity to numb their protest**.”

“Defiance of society includes defiance of its language.”

If one accepts this, it is not without problems: Dismissal as irrelevant, “misinterpretations,” misappropriation, an audience (to whom does one speak this language?)

2. The central concept in Derrida’s deconstruction is undecidability. For Derrida, it is the necessary “position” from which both ethics and politics begin. It is both ending and beginning, as ending, it is the place to which deconstruction takes us, a place where we are open to the voice of the other. As beginning, it is the place that calls for a response to the other, and demands a genuine decision. In terms of the emancipatory project, can undecidability be the basis for such a project. Put another way, can an I-Other ethics be the basis for resistance to a system of domination? If so, can Derrida’s ethical theory, the ethic of hospitality, provide the basis for resistance?

“A decisions can only come into being in a space that exceeds the program that would destroy all responsibility . . . there can be no moral or political responsibility without this trial and this passage by way of the undecidable.”

3. Derrida’s later works confront/engage a variety of social issues-terror, terrorism, refugees, rogue states, sovereignty, justice. He analyzes, explains, illuminates these issues by the “application” of a “refined” deconstruction, some call a genealogy of concepts. Rather than deconstructing texts and calling into question the entire tradition, he engages authors (Arendt, Kant), their work, and the tradition in trying to understand the issue, and always in trying to come to an understanding of the issue, he seeks to give a voice to the “voiceless” and “nameless.” The questions: are these encounters genuine “interventions” on behalf of the other? Are they examples of resistance to the system of power? Are structures and systems of power demystified in this deconstructive process?In order to attempt to answer this, I am directing my thought and paper to one issue, refugees, which Derrida deals with in a talk. It is called On Cosmopolitanism.