WELCOMING THE UNWELCOMELY IN RAY BRADBURY'S "YLLA", "THE EARTHMEN", AND "THE THIRD EXPEDITION"

Asma Azza Dridi

Professeure agrégé
Faculty of Arts and Humanities
University of Sousse
TUNISIA

dridi.asmaazza@gmail.com

Abstract: "Ylla", "The Earthmen", and "The Third Expedition", the first three contract stories in Ray Bradbury's *The Martian Chronicles*, have been read as independent narratives whose sequence is largely arbitrary. While understandable, given the collection's publishing history, this perspective on the stories' episodic nature overlooks the thematic and structural logic that binds them. This paper proposes a different reading, arguing that these stories, in their current order, follow a narrative arc structured around the evolving dynamics of hospitality and hostility. Drawing on Hospitality Theory, the paper thus reframes this selection as a sequence that traces the progressive overtake of unconditional hospitality by different forms of hostility. The shift in the Martians' responses to human intrusion, it argues, reflects the notion that hospitality comes to an end when the guest is perceived as a threat that compels the host to react defensively in order to maintain control.

Keywords: The Martian Chronicles, hospitality, hostility, host, guest, threat

INTRODUCTION

When *The Martian Chronicles* appeared in 1950, science fiction was still an ostracised genre, demonised by concerned parents, teachers, and religious groups for its subversive potential, and degraded by mainstream critics and intellectuals for its alleged lack of literary merit. In this hostile terrain, Bradbury's manipulation of book form

and content provided a means to get out from the science fiction ghetto into the mainstream. At a time when publishers valued novels, the writer's strategy of reworking previously published short stories into a novel-like cycle, while trading the genre's technical idiom for a lyrical, morally reflective style were the gateway to mainstream markets. The dynamics of hospitality and hostility that shaped the book's production and reception also pervaded its themes. Structured around tales of human-alien contact, the collection's first-contact stories also stood out as registers of the period's hostility toward the alien and the nonconforming other in a Cold War climate saturated with paranoia, blacklisting, and ideological purges.

Within the frame of these overlapping dynamics of hospitality and hostility, this paper focuses on Bradbury's depiction of human-alien encounters in "Ylla", "The Earthmen", and "The Third Expedition", the stories of the three early expeditions to Mars. Whereas sci- fi critic Robert Plank (Plank 1981, 171) considers them as thematically and chronologically inconsistent due to the expeditions' disconnected outcomes and to the characters' inability to learn from past failures, this paper proposes a different reading that draws on hospitality theory. In doing so, it argues that the stories' current arrangement is thematically justifiable as their sequence stages the progressive collapse of hospitality under the strain of fear and miscommunication. Through these narratives, the paper argues, Bradbury not only resonates with Emmanuel Levinas's and Jacques Derrida's reflections on the tension between the unconditional ideal of hospitality and its pragmatic limitations, but he also illustrates Gerasimos Kakoliris's point about the impossibility of ethical idealism in the context of settler colonialism, i.e. when the host is faced with the arrival of the unwelcomable invading guest (Kakoliris 2024, 62). The stories' portrayal of the collapse of hospitality in the face of existential threat also reflects Fabienne Brugère and Guillaume Le Blanc's argument that hospitality collapses when the other is seen as a menace (Brugère 2017, 21). In The Martian Chronicles, the paper concludes,

hospitality is not an ideal parasitised by hostility, but a continuous conflict between the ethical responsibility towards the other and the natural instinct of self-preservation.

Literature review

Published during a time of rising xenophobia, anti-communist witch hunts, and fears of infiltration, *The Martian Chronicles*, a short story cycle about encounters between humans and aliens, seems to have been shaped by the anxieties of its era, especially the widespread fear of the Other, whether racial, foreign, or non-conformist. This climate of suspicion, which also pervaded the literary world where the book appeared, extended to Science Fiction, which was demonised by the mainstream and ostracised by the literary establishment, which often dismissed it as shallow and subversive and treated its writers and readers as outsiders, even as the genre was stepping into what would later be called its "Golden Age". The reception of Bradbury's *The Martian Chronicles* reflects this tension between "hostile" rejection and "hospitable" welcome. Within this frame, the term "hostile" refers to those readings, particularly those from Hard science fiction devotees who criticised the novel for its non-adherence to genre conventions. Conversely, the label "hospitable" refers to the more welcoming stance adopted by some highbrow critics like Christopher Isherwood and Gilbert Highet, who were among the first to endorse and praise the collection for its lyricism and philosophical depth.

This more welcoming stance was later taken by a few Bradbury scholars who aimed to raise the collection's understanding to new levels of significance by proposing readings that anchored it in the mythic tradition of American expansionism and the cultural narratives of exploration, conquest, and settlement that shaped mid-century understandings of national identity. Within this framework, Willis McNelly (McNelly 1980, 20) and David Mogen (Mogen 1986, 25) drew analogies between Frederick Jackson Turner's Frontier

Thesis and Bradbury's *The Martian Chronicles*, framing the collection as a thematically unified pioneer frontier story that reimagines American westward expansion on a planetary scale. In his paper "Aliens, Anthropologists, and American Indians: Ray Bradbury's *The Martian Chronicles*, Culture, and Difference in Midcentury US Modernism", Eric Aronoff (Aronoff 2023, 311), like James B. Mitchell (Mitchell 2003, 118), drew parallels between the fate of the Martians and that of Indigenous tribes. Focusing on the ethical tensions surrounding Martian-human encounters, Aronoff reframes the collection as an anthropological critique of American expansionism. Within this frame, Bradbury's casting of the Martians as natives and the humans as invaders is interpreted as an attempt at reframing the myth of the frontier by raising the central question of who the real alien is.

The question of alienness also informs Grace Dillon's "Bradbury's Survivance Stories", which examines the dynamics of encounter between the alien natives and the human settlers. Drawing on Gerald Vizenor's concept of "survivance", which denotes "an active sense of presence" and a "renunciation of dominance, tragedy, and victimry" (*qtd.*in Dillon 2013, 59), Dillon interprets a selection of stories "where distinctions between Earthmen and Martians blur, where Earthmen become Martians, where Martians may have been Earthmen all along" (Dillon 2013, 59), as instances of resilience through transformation. Within this framework, metamorphosis is interpreted as a way of surviving through adaptation rather than confrontation. While the main focus of Dillon's analysis is on transformation as a mode of survival, her discussion about the impact of the encounter with the Other, however, provides a bridge to the discourse of hospitality that this paper uses to frame its analysis of the early expeditions. Although Dillon does not explicitly frame her reading in such terms, her discussion, in fact, gestures toward an ethics of radical openness in which the boundaries between host and guest become porous. However, her inclusion of "The Third Expedition" alongside later survivance stories, such as "The Martian" and "The Million-Year

Picnic" (Dillon 2013, 59) is problematic insofar as it conflates narratives that precede colonisation with those that follow it. The problem here lies in the fact that "The Third Expedition" belongs to the earlier phase of contact, that is, before Mars becomes a colonised space. Thus, reading the story through the lens of hospitality theory, and within the frame of the collection's colonial subtext, which Dillon herself acknowledges, should allow for a different interpretation in which the Martians' shapeshifting appears not as an expression of cultural endurance but as a preemptive reaction to the arrival of Unwelcoming guests.

Dillon's emphasis on transformation and ethical relation resonates with the Levinasian framework adopted in Adam Lawrence's paper "A 'Night Meeting' in the Southwest: Hospitality in *The Martian Chronicles* and Christian Ylagan's "Why Do The Heavens Beckon Us? Revisiting Constructions of Home and Identity in Ray Bradbury's *The Martian Chronicles",* two studies that address the ethics of hosting in *The Martian Chronicles*. Drawing on Emmanuel Levinas' philosophy, particularly his idea of encountering the Other as Subject, Ylagan argues that Bradbury's text invites readers to reimagine encounters with the Other as opportunities for ethical engagement and hospitality rather than domination and subjugation (Ylagan 2009, 30). Within this framework, "Night Meeting", a story about an encounter between an earthling and a Martian, together with the collection's final vignette, "The Million-Year Picnic", is framed as a critique of the violent imperial ethos of colonisation and a call for embracing hybridity and peaceful coexistence (Ylagan 2009, 39).

Also situated within a Lévinasian framework that connects Bradbury's narrative to the concept of infinite responsibility toward the Other, Adam Lawrence's paper focuses on Bradbury's critique of the destructive consequences of colonisation and his call for ethical engagement with the other. Whereas the dynamics of human-alien encounters in the early expeditions are dominated by hostility and a mutual failure to engage in genuine self-other relations as a result of the human visitors' entitlement and

expectations of immediate hospitality, the short story "Night Meeting", in which the characters engage in a respectful exchange despite their inability to understand each other's realities, represents, for Lawrence, a turning point where hostility gives way to a more philosophical contemplation of hospitality as an encounter characterized by openness to difference (Lawrence 2013, 72).

However, while both Ylagan and Lawrence have explored Bradbury's engagement with the themes of hospitality and hostility, their analyses tend to downplay the element of risk that underlies the early human–alien encounters in *The Martian Chronicles*. To address this gap, the present paper takes Ylagan's idea of "the violent imperialistic ethos of refashioning home" (Ylagan 2009, 29) as a point of departure to examine the perversion of hospitality in the shadow of potential colonisation. It also extends Lawrence's discussion of the early expeditions to argue for a progression in Martian responses from openness to hostility, while it departs from his primary focus on the human guests and the reception that they receive by shifting the focus to the Martians and to their perception of risk, their recognition of the guest as a potential threat, and the strategies they develop to manage that threat.

This reversal of perspective accords with the observation that "Bradbury turns reader expectation on its head by having the Martians be xenophobic and the humans be curious and friendly" (Gale 2015). Such an inversion demands, in fact, that we take the hosts' point of view seriously, for it is they who occupy the role of hosts and who respond with suspicion and violence to the human "guests" intruding upon their home. In this light, Guillaume Le Blanc and Fabienne Brugère's claim in *La Fin de l'hospitalité* that hospitality collapses once the guest is perceived as a danger (Brugère 2017, 21) provides a useful framework for rereading the early expeditions. This perspective also invites reconsideration of the claim that "the first three expeditions are met by extraordinary xenophobia, with all three crews murdered by unwelcoming Martians" (Gale 2015). In fact, not only does this claim reduce the Martians' behaviour to moral failure rather than recognising it as a

rational response to perceived danger, but it also frames them as "unwelcoming" hosts, thus overlooking Bradbury's portrayal of hospitality as an ideal that may collapse from fear. Likewise, this language also reflects an anthropocentric bias whereby the hosts are judged from the coloniser's point of view, in a way that reproduces the logic of entitlement that Bradbury's stories seem to critique at the level of commentary.

Rather than considering the Martians' response as a form of "extraordinary xenophobia", this paper reframes it as an instinctive reaction to a perceived existential threat. Seen from this angle, the escalating hostility of the early encounters may be seen as the reflection of a developing logic of risk management. This reorientation not only accounts for the increasingly violent reception of the human explorers but also clarifies the later ethical reconnections that Dillon, Ylagan, and Lawrence identify in stories such as "Night Meeting" and "The Million-Year Picnic", where, quite tellingly, coexistence becomes imaginable only after the Martian race has been decimated.

"Ylla", a foundational yet often underrated story in most scholarly discussions of the early expeditions, inaugurates this paper's exploration of human/alien encounters from the perspective of hospitality theory. In fact, Lawrence gives the story short shrift in favor of the later, more spectacular expeditions, while the Cengage study guide reduces it to a representation of cultural decline, suggesting that Bradbury communicates his disapproval of "this fear of strangers" (Gale 2015) through his portrayal of the apathetic Martian household which symbolizes a civilization gone "past its peak" and "descended into apathy" due to its cultural hermeticism. Michel Dyer, by contrast, considers "Ylla" one of the few stories in which the Martians themselves occupy the central point of view, arguing that the story has an "active effect on the following chapters" (2023). This effect, Dyer argues, is largely premised the story's portrayal of the Martians as "subtle and in the right" and its depiction of the human explorers as "shameless invaders", a strategy that urges the readers to empathise with the

former. This observation about the story's reversal of moral polarity and its effect on both the narrative and the readers is particularly relevant for this paper since it not only foregrounds "Ylla"'s significance as the story that builds the ethical and emotional groundwork for the subsequent expeditions but also introduces the elements of fear and risk that justify their fates.

The importance of "Ylla" is also stressed in "The Last Martian: Postcolonial Metaphors of the New Frontier", in which Mia Lindenburg's considers *The Martian Chronicles* as a work that questions the transplantation of the American project of Manifest Destiny onto Mars by revealing its destructive consequences. "Mars", Lindenburg writes, "is certainly changed at the end of Bradbury's stories, and it may be that it is better for the Earthling settlers [...] But it is certainly not better for the Martians" (Lindenburg 2023, 26), whose civilization, as revealed by her close reading of the opening passage of "Ylla", was already thriving before the arrival of the Earthmen. Zooming in on Bradbury's use of imagery, particularly his description of settlers as "locusts" and "steel-toothed carnivores", Lindenburg draws attention to the fact that the humans' alleged exploratory expeditions are only disguised military reconnaissance missions meant to pave the way for a full-blown imperial incursion. "The comparison to 'carnivores'", she points out, "underscores that they are the threat approaching Mars, not the saviours coming to fix it".

Lindenburg's observation about the threat caused by the earthlings' arrival, along with her assertion that "the story arc of *The Martian Chronicles* goes from a pristine precolonial land that thrives in its own culture to one defined and nearly destroyed by the culture that settles on it", further supports this paper's argument that the progression of the Martians' attitudes towards their "unwelcomable guests" is indeed motivated by the hosts' increasing awareness of the magnitude of the threat. Lindenburg's reading of "The Locusts" metaphor also opens interesting avenues into a discussion of the connection between risk perception and the progression of Martian responses. Indeed, as Lindenburg notes, locusts might seem initially

harmless as individuals, but when they come in swarms, they may become a threatening presence. Interestingly, the progression that characterises the Martians' reactions is paralleled by a notable increase in the number of visitors. In fact, only two explorers arrived in the first expedition. In the second, the number multiplies. In the third expedition, it jumps to sixteen explorers, recalling the swarms of locusts that Lindenburg talks about. Read in light of this understanding, the growing number of visitors reflects an intensification of risk that may account for the hosts' increasing hostility.

Taken together, these readings present *The Martian Chronicles* as a text that is deeply concerned with the ethics of encounter. Yet, while critics such as Dillon, Ylagan, Lawrence, and Lindenburg have gestured towards the moral and ethical issues within a number of stories from *The Martian Chronicles*, few have examined the progressive nature of these encounters. The early expeditions, in particular, remain underexplored in this regard. This paper seeks to fill this gap by rereading the first three expeditions through the lens of hospitality theory, arguing that the order of Bradbury's stories is far from arbitrary. Looked at from this vantage point, "Ylla", "The Earth Men", and "The Third Expedition" coalesce into a coherent narrative about the gradual collapse of the ethical ideal of hospitality under the pressures of threat and risk perception. Seen in this light, the collection's depiction of the failed expeditions may be seen as a meditation on the failure of hospitality in conditions where fear and the instinct of self-preservation come into play.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

To sustain its argument, this paper draws on a theoretical framework that brings together a set of theoretical insights, which include but are not limited to, Emmanuel Levinas' musing on self-other encounters, Immanuel Kant's reflections on the right of visitation, Jacques Derrida's deconstruction of hospitality and its aporias,

Gerasimos Kakoliris's critique of the limits of hospitality, Fabienne Brugère and Guillaume Le Blanc's reflections on the breakdown of welcome in the face of fear, and Lorenzo Veracini's analysis of settler-colonial logic. A synthesis of these insights will inform this paper's exploration of the gradual failure of hospitality across the three early expeditions as a consequence of the Martian hosts' increasing awareness of risk.

The triangular dynamic of host, guest, and third forms the basis for much of the theoretical discussion around hospitality. In these discussions, the host is often the one who bears the burden of responsibility, the one who is confronted with the question and ethical decision of whether to welcome, how to welcome, and under what conditions and risks. The guest, for their part, is approached as a controversial figure who is vulnerable for some, and potentially dangerous for others. Meanwhile, the Third, represented by entities like the law, family, community, or the nation-state, functions as the mediating force that structures the encounter. This triadic configuration underlies Immanuel Kant's framing of hospitality as a juridical principle that grants the stranger the right of entry, visitation and movement but not settlement. For Étienne Balibar, Kant's endorsement of state sovereignty and geopolitical stability over ethical openness "is one of the most severe limitations of his system, which has a philistine aspect"[1] (Balibar 2018, 176; my translation). For Gerasimos Kakoliris, however, Kant's delimitation of hospitality to a right of visitation is the pragmatic response of someone who was writing against the backdrop of violent abuses of hospitality committed in the name of European colonial expansion (Kakoliris 2024, 24), that is a response to the fear that the guest may overstay their welcome, become a conqueror, and repay the generosity of the host with dispossession. In a similar vein, Anne Dufourmantelle views it as a response triggered by affective anxiety. Kant's moral reflection, she thus argues, is animated by the question of "how [. . .] s/he who welcomes the stranger [can] guarantee his safety and protect him/herself from the possible violence of the newcomer"[2] (Dufourmantelle 2012, 59; my translation). In light of

this understanding, the host's decision is reframed as an instinctive response to vulnerability, which transforms the moral obligation to welcome into a question of survival.

The conditionality of Kant's model is transcended by Emmanuel Levinas. In Levinas' reflections on the ethics of welcome, hospitality is condensed into the image of the self as a hostage of the *Other*, whom he depicts as a vulnerable figure, like a stranger, an orphan, or widow, and whose cry, he contends, calls the self into responsibility:

> My responsibility in spite of myself - which is the way the other's charge falls upon me, or the way the other disturbs me, that is, is close to me - is the hearing or understanding of this cry. It is awakening. The proximity of a neighbour is my responsibility for him; to approach is to be one's brother's keeper; to be one's brother's keeper is to be his hostage. (Levinas 2012, 168)

Levinas's formulation reflects an almost organic progression from spatial to ethical relation. The sequence progresses along two axes, the first being the axis going from proximity, approach, to substitution; and the second being the axis that goes from neighbour, brother, to hostage. "Proximity", which simultaneously implies physical nearness and the exposure to the face of the other, signals the moment when the self is summoned into responsibility before thought or choice. The self's response to the call through "approach" becomes the moment when obligation turns into action and when the "neighbour" morphs into a "brother". Responding to the ethical summons of human fraternity redefines the self's identity, turning the host into a hostage who is held accountable for the Other to the point of self-erasure.

In theory, the encounter with the Other, in Levinas's statement, constitutes an awakening to an obligation that does not stem from choice but "falls upon" the self and binds it to an infinite responsibility that precedes law, social contract, and kinship. Yet even for Levinas, this ideal collapses when confronted with the political real. In fact, Levinas' response to his interviewer Shlomo Malka, following the massacres of Sabra and Shatila, exposes the

limits of philosophical idealism when transposed from theory to practice. When asked whether the Palestinian is not the "Other" for the Israeli. Levinas responds that "in alterity we can find an enemy... there are people who are wrong" (Levinas 1982, 294). This statement, as Howard Caygill notes, "opens a wound in his whole oeuvre" (Caygill 2005, 192), because it reduces the ethical encounter to an assessment of risk and rightfulness. This moment of rupture, however, is significant since it reintroduces the test of reality into the most idealised visions of ethical openness, thus reframing hospitality as a fraught situation and a dynamic scene of negotiation and risk assessment.

In "hospitality", Jacques Derrida makes this rupture the foundation of his reflections on the limits of hospitality. With its etymological link to both "host" and "hostage", the word "hospitality", as Derrida observes, holds a paradox within itself. Derrida calls this paradox an "aporia" (Derrida 2000, 4), which stems from the fact that hospitality, or the act of receiving the stranger into one's space, simultaneously requires openness and generosity towards the "other" while essentially implying mastery over that space and the power to decide who enters it. Hospitality, thus understood, is always already compromised as it carries within itself the seeds of its own undoing. The act of welcome is also complicated by the notion that true hospitality must confront the risk of welcoming the "unwelcomable" and accepting the radical otherness of those who arrive uninvited, while cognizant of the possibility "of the other coming and destroying the place, initiating a revolution, stealing everything, or killing everyone". (Derrida 1993, 70–71). "In effect, the one I welcome", as Derrida also points out in "Une hospitalité à l'infini", "can be a thief, a murderer; he can ransack my house"[3] (Derrida 1999, 100). Unlike formulations that rest in principle or in theory (where hospitality might be conceived as pure and transcendental), this "in effect" marks a movement from philosophical prescription to socio-political implication.

The different possible scenarios and the multiple guises of the guest in Derrida's statement reflect this movement. The guest may

be vulnerable, but he may also turn out to be a thief or a murderer. The impossibility of fully anticipating or controlling who the other will be thus makes risk inseparable from welcome. For Derrida, this element of risk is an integral component of hospitality itself. In fact, his neologism "hostipitality", which fuses hospitality with hostility, embodies the paradox that pure, unconditional hospitality presupposes the acceptance of risk and the willingness to welcome the other even at the cost of one's own safety, which is precisely what makes such hospitality impossible in practice.

In Fabienne Brugère and Guillaume Le Blanc's *La Fin de L'Hospitalité*, risk perception is presented as the key factor that brings hospitality to an end. Both authors, in fact, go so far as to argue that the world is witnessing the end of hospitality because people now live in fear, "under the constant threat of attacks and imagine the other as a potential enemy, an 'implicit terrorist'"(Brugère 2017,21). However, while they consider this fear unreasonable in the context of the refugee and migrant crises and advocate for a more humane, politically grounded hospitality, Le Blanc and Brugère do not address situations in which the threat posed by the guest is not unreasonable but well-founded. Such cases include first-encounter scenarios between coloniser and colonised. In this type of encounter, Lorenzo Veracini argues in his book, *Settler Colonialism*, the settler does not simply arrive as a guest but comes to stay, imposing a one-sided relationship in which the so-called guest becomes the de facto owner of the host's land. This scenario of colonial encounter is played and replayed in tragic variations in *The Martian Chronicles*, and more specifically in "Ylla", "The Earthmen", and "The Third Expedition", which depict the natives' reactions to the human guests' reconnaissance missions. Taking into consideration the collection's colonial subtext, the Martians' reactions, though sometimes violent, ought to be seen not as unreasonable but rather as preemptive or reactive responses shaped by the host's perception of risk, which in the case of *The Martian Chronicles*, escalates with each successive expedition.

These scholarly insights, together with Levinas's notion of

infinite responsibility, Derrida's aporia of hospitality, and Le Blanc and Brugère's account of hospitality's breakdown under fear, will serve to reframe hospitality *in the Martian Chronicles* as a site of negotiation between openness and self-preservation. Within this frame, the following sections recast Bradbury's Martian hosts as figures caught in the paradox of welcome, tracing how the first three expeditions translate this paradox into narrative form by mapping the progressive collapse of hospitality into hostility.

"YLLA": HORIZONS OF EXPECTATION AND THRESHOLDS OF SUSPICION

Bradbury's *The Martian Chronicles* opens not with Mars but with Earth in a short passage titled "Rocket Summer" (January 1999). The passage, which is strategically positioned before the first story "Ylla" (February 1999), functions as a bridge chapter that depicts the transformative impact of a Rocket launch on Ohio's atmosphere, landscape, and people, while simultaneously foreshadowing the changes that the earthlings' exploratory visits will bring upon Mars and its inhabitants. In "Ylla", the setting shifts from Earth to Martian soil after a one-month temporal lag that highlights the disjunction between the two worlds: one whose settlement project has already been set in motion and another, which, despite being the target of this project, has so far remained oblivious to it. Rather than framing the arrival of the first exploratory mission as a grand geopolitical event, the story stages it as a domestic disturbance in the household of Ylla, a married Martian woman who telepathically senses the impending arrival of Nathaniel York, the captain in charge of the first expedition. The possibility of first contact is soon undermined when Ylla's husband, Yll, who feels disturbed by the prospect of the visit, kills the crew upon landing.

That the encounter is framed as a domestic disturbance, however, does not diminish its symbolic weight. Quite the contrary,

for Mars in *The Martian Chronicles* is feminised and actually referred to at one point as "she" (Bradbury 1963, 102), in a gesture that evokes the familiar trope of the feminised frontier within the colonial imaginary. Ylla, as the female protagonist of the collection's opening chapter, may hence be taken as a metaphor for the land itself. By extension, York's intrusion into the psyche of a married woman may be read as a prelude to the coming invasion of an already inhabited land. Yll, for his part, may be seen as the first line of resistance to this intrusion. He is, in fact, the equivalent of the native who is guarding himself from a threatening presence that might compromise the sanctity of his home, a space which, as Mia Lindenberg argues in "The Last Martian: Postcolonial Metaphors of the New Frontier", operates as a microcosm of the planet to be invaded (Lindenberg 2023, 11). This section, thus, focuses on the profiles of Ylla and Yll as potential hosts and how their opposing reactions to the arrival of York, the unwelcoming guest, represent hospitality within the context of settler colonialism as a complex relational structure shaped not only by the guest's intentions but also by the hosts' perceptions.

While Ylla's dream stages the possibility of a different relation with the Other, one that is marked by fascination rather than fear, Yll's defensive stance makes clear that the arrival of the guest may be perceived as a threat that leads to the collapse of hospitality into hostility and violence. These differing responses, when read through the lens of hospitality theory, may help justify the story's position within the collection as a foundational piece that stages the essential debate at the heart of hospitality theory between pure, unconditional hospitality and the fears and risks that accompany and complicate the act of welcome. In fact, the couple's conflict, which is framed within the intimate setting of a household, may be seen as a small-scale representation of hospitality theory's conundrum of reconciling the ethical ideal of unconditional welcome with the specificities of real-world hosting.

In this first contact story, Ylla embodies the desire to welcome the stranger. Her openness to the other recalls Derrida's depiction

of the host who "waits without waiting… waits without knowing whom he awaits" (Derrida 2000, 10). Ylla, too, waits for the guest without knowing. "She wait[s]. She watche[s] the blue sky of Mars as if it might at any moment grip in on itself, contract, and expel a shining miracle down upon the sand" (Bradbury 1963, 3). Within the framework of Derrida's formulation of unconditional hospitality, she embodies the principles of unconditional hospitality, which "consists not only in not knowing, or pretending not to know, but in avoiding all questions about the other's identity, desire, rules, language, capacity to work, to integrate, to adapt" (*qtd.* in Kakoliris 2024, 16). Like Derrida's ideal host, she is open to the transformative arrival of the stranger and does not even ask where York is from, what he wants, or whether he belongs. Whatever knowledge she acquires about her guest, she receives through the dream and accepts without suspicion.

Like Levinas's guest, York is an unexpected arrivant whose intrusion into Ylla's world disturbs her, interrupts her self-centred existence and places a demand upon her that cannot be ignored or deferred. Unlike Levinas's guest, however, he does not appear at the hostess's actual door, claiming hospitality. Rather, he bypasses the threshold and infiltrates her subconscious instead. "I didn't think him up on purpose", she says. "He just came in my mind while I drowsed" (Bradbury 1963, 5). "It wasn't like a dream" (5), an ordinary one that is, she adds, but a dream from which she awoke as if "struck in the face" (4). Ylla's experience of this dream as a "strike" "in the face" also bears an echo of Levinas's formulation of the ethical relation as a pre-reflective responsibility that is elicited by the face of the Other. York's introduction: "I've come from the third planet in my ship. My name is Nathaniel York" (Bradbury 1936, 5) signals for her that moment of ethical awakening when she feels "the other's charge falling upon [her]" (Levinas 2012, 168) drawing her into a relation that implicates her both with the face and the fate of the Other.

Unlike Ylla, Yll is cautious about the unexpected visit. Actually, he adopts a dismissive and defensive stance right from the moment

he hears about the dream and closes himself off to the possibility of encounter. Indeed, the way his appearance is staged in the story reflects his role as a regulating presence in Ylla and York's scenario of encounter. Actually, the character not only appears at the precise moment when Ylla wakes up from her dream, but he also appears "in a triangular door", asking, irritated, "Did you call?" (Bradbury 1968, 4). More than a quirky Martian architectural design, the triangular shape of the door at which Yll appears recalls the triadic host-guest-third relation developed by Levinas, wherein the intimacy of the face to face encounter is mediated by the presence of the third who "interrupts the face to face of a welcome of the other man, interrupts the proximity or approach of the neighbor" (1998, 150), and marks the transition from the relation to the Other to the relation to others and from the ethical to the political.

The moment Ylla awakens from her dream under Yll's panoptical gaze allows Bradbury to stage the ethical moment before colonisation by entertaining the fleeting possibility of a different relation, and then to show, through Yll, how hospitality collapses when the third comes into the equation, recasting the guest as a threat. Through the introduction of the third, Bradbury, Like Levinas, makes the "difficult move from the realm of intersubjective ethics to that of politics, in which we must make decisions, render judgments, and negotiate alternatives" (Popke 2003, 305). Yll's coming does just that, as it takes the ethical relationship from the private space of the dream and reintroduces hospitality into a social and political framework. Yll's appearance, as the third, in fact, reveals to Ylla "the existence of a whole world outside of (her)self" (Davis 1997) in the same way as she reveals to him the existence of a world outside his. Through Ylla's dream, Yll discovers that Earth may not be the empty planet Martian scientists declared it to be. However, while the dreams confront both characters with the existence of others, what it does is to open for Ylla the possibility of a world she's willing to embrace, whereas it awakens Yll to the existence of a world he would rather deny. This denial transpires through Yll's questions and dismissive comments, which introduce

a dimension of "tyrannical violence" (Kakoliris 2024, 195) into Ylla's initial gesture of unconditional welcome by forcing it back into the language of reason. For instance, when Ylla asks, "Do you ever wonder if... well, if there are people living on the third planet?" Yll insists that "The third planet is incapable of supporting life". (Bradbury 1963, 5) His earlier remarks about her "wishful thinking" (5) and her "emotional wailing" (6) also delegitimise her impulse to welcome the other and dismiss it authoritatively.

It is worth noting, though, that Ylla's openness is contingent on the fact that York, in the dream, poses no danger and is described as "pleasant" (Bradbury 1936, 10), "handsome" (5) and soft-spoken. Although the details of the "black hair, blue eyes, and white skin" (5) mark his face as completely other, Ylla marvels at the strangeness, repeating with fascination "how strange, how very strange" (4) York looks. Conversely, Yll sees Ylla's dream not as an innocent fantasy but a disturbing event. The details that fascinate her, namely York's appearance, his "strange uniform", and his descent "out of the sky" in a "metal thing that glittered in the sun" (4), combine to produce in his mind's eye the image of a potentially threatening intruder whom he decides to eliminate. His attitude, in this sense, recalls Derrida's concept of conditional hospitality, where welcome is granted only under specific, controlled circumstances. For Yll, guests, like the Martian neighbour, Dr Nile, are granted welcome, since, unlike York, they are familiar and neither disrupt his established order nor challenge his understanding of the universe. Whether Yll's reaction comes from jealousy or fear of the unknown is left unsaid in the text. However, the dream clearly introduced into domestic space a figure whose arrival destabilised Yll's certainty about his world. Even if Yll's first defence was to brush the idea off, his violent act of killing York upon landing reveals how hospitality collapses the moment the guest is no longer seen as a face to respond to but as a threat to neutralise.

Yll's wearing of a mask to kill York may be seen as a refusal to engage with the face of the other, which Levinas identifies as the basis of ethical responsibility. The mask, in a way, lifts the burden

of responsibility from the host's shoulders. Without recognition, there is no obligation to extend hospitality. His return after York's execution and his casual attempt to normalise the situation by saying that he was "just hunting" (Bradbury 1963, 13) also illustrate this logic. Framed as a hunt, the killing reduces the guest to prey, which holds no claim to subjecthood. Conversely, Ylla's confession "I don't know, I don't know, but I can't help it. I'm sad and I don't know why, I cry and I don't know why, but I'm crying" (17) echoes the melancholic reflection articulated by Le Blanc and Brugère in *The End of Hospitality*, that "we become inhospitable sometimes in spite of ourselves"[4] (Brugère 2017, Chap. 6). Her struggle to remember York's song, as well, may be seen as a metaphor for humanity's struggle to recall the ideal of pure hospitality amidst the realities of fear and control that curtail its fulfilment.

THE EARTHMEN: ASYLUM SEEKERS; ASYLUM FINDERS!

Following the aborted encounter in "Ylla", Bradbury inserts a bridge chapter titled "The Summer Night", where what starts as a psychic intrusion into one Martian woman's consciousness turns into a global pandemic as Earth songs and nursery rhymes telepathically seep through the minds of other Martians. A Martian's warning that "something terrible will happen in the morning" (Bradbury 1963, 20) foreshadows the arrival of the second expedition in "The Earth Men" (August 1999), the story of a crew of earthlings who land on Mars expecting a hero's welcome, only to find themselves dismissed as lunatics and executed by a Martian psychiatrist who mistakes them for hallucinations.

Unlike "Ylla", where anticipation and anxiety are depicted from the host's perspective, "The Earth Men" shifts the focus to the expectations of the guests and to the frustration they feel when the long-awaited meeting between two alien worlds turns into a farce. The encounter, which was only a potentiality in "Ylla", becomes a reality in "The Earth Men", which begins with the quintessential

gesture of hospitality seekers, the knock on the door. The first line of the story, "Whoever was knocking at the door didn't want to stop" (Bradbury 1963, 21), is reminiscent of the Levinasian scenario of the stranger's arrival at the threshold of the host's *chez soi,* disturbing their being-at-home and summoning them into ethical responsibility. Neither the nature of the knock nor that of the visitors, however, corresponds to Levinas's portrait of the guest as a vulnerable figure. Rather than reflecting the humility of Levinas's vulnerable strangers, the persistence of the knock shows the impatience and entitlement of visitors, who are, in reality, not benign wanderers but explorers looking for new lands to occupy.

Mrs Ttt's refusal to accept the ethical charge that falls upon her also challenges the idealistic Levinasian scenario of unconditional welcome. Unlike Levinas's host, who is summoned by the face of the stranger and called into ethical responsibility, Bradbury's host is forced to set boundaries to prevent the intruders' assault on domestic order. In response to the visitors' persistent knocks, the hostess feels no obligation to answer. More importantly, she does not even recognise the earthmen as guests but as filthy strangers standing at her clean doorstep. Her reply, "I speak what I speak" (Bradbury 1963, 21) to their remark that she speaks "perfect English" (21) also indicates a refusal to communicate with the strangers on their own terms. Her words and gestures (raised eyebrows, scrutinising gaze, door slamming), as well, show the guests that their presence is irritating and undesirable. Yet, despite the hostess's unwillingness to extend welcome, the guests continue to impose themselves not only spatially but discursively by imposing their own binarisms and evaluative frameworks on her. When Mrs Ttt asks what the crew wants, for instance, Captain Williams ignores the question altogether and rushes instead to declare, "You are a Martian!" in an act of epistemic colonial violence that subordinates the host's inquiry to the visitor's urge to label and classify. Mrs Ttt's sceptical "Martian?", however, exposes the arbitrariness of the label by revealing that the planet is not "Mars" but "Tyrr" (22), which makes the word "Martian" meaningless within her own frame of

reference and exposes the earthlings' hubris. The impossibility of reconciling unconditional welcome with the reality of colonisation becomes apparent in this scene. Captain William, outraged by the Martian's repeated door slamming, protests that "this is no way to treat visitors!" (22), revealing his obliviousness to the fact that Earthly logic does not apply on Mars. For her part, Mrs Ttt fails to ascribe any meaning to the visit other than disturbance. Interestingly, despite the fact that both guest and host speak the same language, the dialogue, which could have marked the beginning of understanding, becomes a communicative impasse wherein the guest's speech patronises while the host refuses to submit.

Even when their persistence pays off as Mrs Ttt reluctantly lets them into the house, the guests' expectations of welcome are thwarted when she leaves them waiting for over an hour, forgetting that she had let them in. Instead of a banquet and a celebration, the guests receive a note of referral from the hostess's husband, who also refuses to see them and redirects them to "Mr Aaa" (24). The farce goes on as the Earthmen are passed from one Martian authority to another, from Mrs Ttt to Mr Ttt, to Mr Aaa, to Mr Iii. Each door becomes a checkpoint, echoing Derrida's observation about the perversion of hospitality by law and protocol. The deferral also recalls Le Blanc and Brugère's assertion in *La Fin de l'hospitalité* that "hospitality is no longer that double standard of intimacy by which we ask the stranger to come into our home, magnifying him as that sumptuous unknown from afar to whom, for a certain time at least, we owe everything... It is becoming the result of a prudent reasoning"[5] (Brugère 2017, 23; my translation). Le Blanc and Brugère's "prudent reasoning" is staged in "The Earth Men", where the tension between the heroes' welcome that the Earthmen expect and the careful restraint of the Martian hosts structures every encounter.

Mr Iii response to Captain's plea to give them "a place to sleep", hand them "the key to the city", and "shake [their] hands and say 'Hooray'" (Bradbury 1936, 28) also reveals the Martians' refusal to

commit to this standard of intimacy. In fact, the "key" that the earthmen are eventually granted does not open the gates of the city but the doors of the asylum, where a moment of apparent welcome realises the colonisers' fantasy of being received as heroes by the Martian inmates who cheer, lift them onto their shoulders, and cry out in celebration. That this celebration should take place in an asylum satirises the ideal of pure hospitality by representing it as a gesture that can only be extended unconditionally by the insane. The word "asylum" itself, with its double meaning of shelter and madhouse, captures the irony of the story. The Earthmen come seeking asylum in the sense of refuge, but they end up finding "asylum" in its psychiatric sense.

The farce reaches its climax when the psychiatrist, Mr Xxx, diagnoses the Earthmen as mass hallucinations and refuses to recognise the rocket as tangible proof of their existence. This failure of communication leads him to execute the Earthmen and then commit suicide. The Earthmen's colonising mindset brings their doom, and their tragic death becomes the symbol of the fate of encounters that are founded on entitlement rather than vulnerability and humility. While seeking asylum, only to find a different kind of asylum, the Earthmen discover the fate of the guest who imposes him/herself on the host. Conversely, Mr Xxx's final act shows the perversion of hospitality by the host's own fears. For the psychiatrist, acknowledging the Earthmen's reality meant surrendering the coherence of his own world, so in order to preserve it, he destroyed the possibility of encounter, mirroring the violence by which the colonised, faced with the intruder's epistemic and territorial claims, destroy both the invader and the self to assert agency.

The Third Expedition: Doorway to Heaven/ Hell?

In "The Earth Men", the risks of hospitality are managed through the exclusion of unwelcome visitors via systems of regulation and

deferral. "The Taxpayer", the short bridge chapter that follows, shifts the scene back to Earth but continues this meditation on exclusion through the story of Pritchard, who pleads for a place aboard the third rocket to Mars, only to face the hostility of officials hiding behind wire screens and opaque regulations. Bradbury's next story, "The Third Expedition" (August 2000), continues the cycle by depicting a new form of hostility, which is all the more dangerous since disguised as unconditional hospitality. The story follows Captain John Black and his crew as they land on Mars. Ignorant of the fate of the earlier missions, the men come prepared with "superior weapons" (Bradbury 1963, 51) and plan to land far from the previous landing sites "in case a hostile local tribe of Martians killed off York and Williams" (44). To their surprise, the scenario they expect does not materialise. Instead, they find a small, familiar Midwestern town with white fences and green lawns. The coloniser's dream of settlement and their wish to find another Earth already waiting finally comes true. Feeling disoriented by the uncanny familiarity, though, the crew members start to speculate, offering explanations ranging from human-alien collaboration, divine intervention, time travel, to a psychological experiment. Curiously but cautiously, a few volunteers venture into town to scout the area.

Unlike their predecessors, this crew experiences the purest form of unconditional hospitality. A local woman, described as "a kind-faced lady" (48), offers help and answers all their questions, fulfilling every expectation the previous expeditions failed to realise. Still unsure, though the men continue their exploration tour, conjecturing about and debating possible scenarios, until one of them, a man by the name of Lustig, suddenly begins to "cry", his hands shaking, and his face "all wonder and joy and incredulity" at the sight of a house that looked familiar to him. Overjoyed, Lustig runs forward, "beating at the door, hollering and crying" for his grandparents, who appear before him, resuscitated from death, and "rush[] out to embrace [him]" (51). The image of the elderly couple standing at the wide-open screen door, inviting the visitors to "come

in" (52) and drink iced tea, stands out as the illustration of pure hospitality. A more rational look at the situation, however, reveals Bradbury's irony, for the scene is in fact not an idealisation of unconditional hospitality as much as it is a testament to its impossibility, since, as Robert Plank rightly observes, the hosts are "the dead returned to life" (Plank 1981, 173). Bradbury's choice to make dead people the only hospitable figures, in this sense, is the perfect illustration of the idea that absolute openness can exist only when the host no longer has anything to lose. Bearing the story's colonial subtext in mind, this scene may also be read as a satirical interlude that exposes the settlers' cultural fetish of perfect openness and reveals how this fantasy of unconditional welcome, which is central to the colonial imagination, may turn into its own trap.

In the story, however, the guests do not resonate rationally. The hosts' generosity and the guests' compliance operate automatically like a social contract. The visitors forget their caution the moment hospitality is extended, and even when they do voice uncertainty, their doubts are neutralised by the ritual of welcome itself. For instance, when Captain Black is taken aback by Lustig's remark that his grandparents have been dead for decades, the grandmother dismisses his objections with an assertive tone that makes asking any further questions seem almost an offence to the hostess. In an attempt to provide tangible proof of life, the old woman also invites Black to "feel" (52) her wrist. The latter, however, concedes not to the authenticity of the miracle, but to the codes of couretous guestmanship, which he continues to observe as he rises "in a casual fashion" (53), thanks the elderly couple for their hospitality, and announces that he must return to his ship.

Black's decision to leave marks the character's first attempt to reassert rational judgment. Yet, this attempt is soon thwarted when he discovers that the other crew members "abandoned the ship" (54) to meet and celebrate with the townspeople. Alarmed by the crew's insubordination, Black shouts, curses and rejects Lustig's plea for him to put himself in the shoes of those men who could not resist once they saw their beloved ones outside the ship. In a

second attempt to reassert reason, the captain exclaims that he "would have obeyed orders" (54) even if he were in the same situation. His assertion, however, proves to be mere hubris that falters the moment he is approached by his own resurrected brother, whom he subsequently accompanies to the family home. In the heat of the moment, Black, like the whole crew, suspends disbelief and joins in the performance. Overwhelmed by joy and nostalgia, he and the other astronauts cannot think, so much so that he describes the sensation as being "soaked to the skin with emotion", as if he had "been out in a pounding rain for forty-eight hours without an umbrella or a coat" (57). It is only in the quiet of the night that Bradbury finally lets reason rule. Lying awake in bed, the captain begins to calmly process the day's events. The Martians, he conjectures, "saw [the] ship coming and saw [the crew] inside and hated [them]" (59). Knowing their guests' intentions, he concludes, they must have staged the perfect welcome to secure themselves against this risky visit.

The Martians' reaction, as imagined by Black, recalls Gerasimos Kakorilis' observation in his discussion of the limits of unconditional hospitality that risks are high when "those standing at one's doorstep is a regiment of European colonialists" (Kakorilis 2024, 62), especially considering the history of European explorers who were welcomed by Indigenous peoples only to use that openness to seize power (40). In Bradbury's story, the Martians seem to have imbibed this awareness, yet they reproduce this pattern with a twist. Instead of refusing the regiment, the Martians receive it by extending a welcome that is theoretically impossible, while converting it into a practical self-defence strategy. When we take Black's theory, as Robert Plank suggests, as "correct within the framework of the story" (Plank 1981, 175), then the Martians' actions can be seen as a form of weaponized hospitality wherein the performance of welcome allows them to neutralize the threat of the invaders, who, sucked into this emotional rollercoaster, mistake hostility for hospitality and surrender their weapons, their ship, and finally their judgment.

Building on this premise, the Martians' sham hospitality can be read as a calculated form of risk management.

What is striking, though, is how closely this perverse form of hospitality approximates the ideal that it mimics and subverts. In fact, "hospitality", as Gerasimos Kakoliris explains, "implies that you allow the other to enter into yourself, to enter your space" (Kakoliris 2024, 2). Bradbury's Martians do this by "taking in" their human visitors on multiple levels, simultaneously mimicking and subverting hospitality. First, in the most literal sense of "taking in", the Martians allow the humans to enter their houses. Second, they also "take them in" in the sense of deceiving or fooling them by creating the illusion of safety and familiarity while hiding lethal intentions. Third, they also literally "take in" the visitors in the sense of absorbing them completely by adopting human forms and memories. The Martians' welcome, in this sense, both reflects and subverts the notion of the host becoming a hostage of the guest. On the one hand, they become hostages as they assume human shapes, open their homes, and let the Earthmen "enter into themselves". On the other hand, their hospitality is temporary and calculated, since they become hostages only long enough to transform their guests into captives.

The story's portrayal of the way risk perception affects the dynamics of hospitality is also interesting. The Martians' prudent reasoning turns hospitality into risk management. The Earthmen's reaction, for its part, reveals that even the guest cannot sustain unconditional openness once risk is perceived. For instance, as long as Captain Black and his men experience the Martian town as safe and familiar, they accept and enjoy the welcome. Lustig runs joyfully into his grandparents' arms, and so do Hinkston, Captain Black and the others. But the moment Black begins to sense danger, hospitality collapses as fear replaces faith. Whether he dies by Martian hands or by the terror of his own realisation is beside the point because what matters is that the moment when risk perception marks the end of hospitality.

The burial scene at the end closes the cycle. The mayor gives a speech, and the brass band plays while the relatives weep for the departed. For critics such as Jörg Hienger, the scene is irrelevant, since it pointlessly continues the masquerade after the humans are dead. However, when looked at from the lens of hospitality theory, the ceremony gains significance since it buries both the guest and the illusion of the perfect host. The ceremony also foreshadows the fate of the hosts by referring to their melting faces. Hospitality, Kakorilis observes, "implies that you allow the other to enter into yourself, to enter your space; it is, in fact, the conquest of the integrity or dominion of the self by the other. Hospitality means that you are able to change or, better yet, that you allow the other to change you" (2). This is actually what happens to the Martians. Once the performance is over, the shapeshifting hosts shed their human skin to return to their true forms, but not without a cost, since the melting also symbolises their irreversible contamination. Their performance has, in fact, changed them.

The scene becomes all the more significant when read as a prelude for "And the Moon Be Still as Bright", the story of the fourth expedition. When the last reconnaissance expedition lands, the planet is found emptied of its inhabitants who perished from chickenpox, a disease carried by the guests of "The Third Expedition". The Martians' attempts to manage risk merely deferred it, because even as they survived the ethical collapse of hospitality, their exposure to the Earthmen brought their destruction. Yet Bradbury transforms this biological extinction into an ethical reawakening as one of the Earthmen, Spender, becomes a "Martian hostile" (Mogen 1986, 86), a science-fantasy echo of the "white Indian", or the frontier settler who goes native. The label "hostile", usually reserved by the settler for those who resist colonisation, is now applied to a human who resists his own species' imperial project. The coloniser, now identifying with the colonised, becomes the guest who assumes the moral burden of the host, and his turn to hostility is revealed as the inevitable consequence of violated hospitality.

Within the collection's broader narrative structure, "The Third Expedition" completes the tragic arc begun in "Ylla". In the first encounter, the guest dies. In the second, both host and guest die. In the third, the guest dies first, but the host dies an ethical death that foreshadows his actual demise. Whether read as an allegory of Cold War paranoia or of colonial encounter, "The Third Expedition" reflects the idea that the ethical ideal of welcome cannot survive once risk is imagined. Bearing in mind the collection's colonial subtext, the Martians' weaponisation of welcome may be interpreted as a last resort and a mode of survival under threat of colonisation. Within this frame, their apparent cruelty is less a moral failure than a political necessity. Yet the ethical cost remains.

Conclusion

Throughout the first three expeditions of *The Martian Chronicles*, Mars, which is initially imagined as a space of cultural communion, gradually disintegrates into a stage of warring imperatives of hospitality versus hostility. From potential hospitality to perverse hostility, Bradbury's early Mars stories stage the erosion of the ethical ideal of welcome as risk perception and self-preservation overwhelm its possibility. Since published at a time marked by xenophobia, ideological purges and cultural gatekeeping, Bradbury's fiction may be seen as a record of the era's profound ambivalence toward the figure of the outsider. Beyond the collection's Cold War context, the three expeditions also offer a timeless reflection on the fragility of hospitality, not as an ideal parasitised by hostility, but as an idea that is always already haunted by the possibility of its perversion. This paper has attempted to trace the perversion of this idea through the image of the door. In the first expedition, the door never opens. In the second, it opens only to be shut down by misunderstanding and miscommunication. In the third, it opens fully, but fatally. The progression from desire and defensive dismissal to deferral, then to deception and destruction, traces the complete arc of hospitality's collapse in the face of risk.

NOTES

1. Kant "définit l'hospitalité comme un droit de visite seulement... est l'une des limitations les plus sévères de son dispositif qui a un aspect philistin" (Balibar 2018, 176).
2. "(…) comment celui qui accueille l'étranger va pouvoir se garantir et se protéger contre la violence éventuelle du nouveau venu ? (Dufourmantelle 2012, 59).
3. "En effet, celui que j'accueille peut être un violeur, un assassin, il peut mettre le désordre dans la maison" (Derrida 1999, 100).
4. "Nous devenons inhospitaliers parfois malgré nous» (Le Blanc and Brugère 2017, Chap. 6).
5. "L'hospitalité n'est plus ce double moral de l'intimité par lequel on prie l'étranger d'entrer chez soi en le magnifiant comme cet inconnu somptueux venu de loin et à qui, pour un certain temps du moins, l'on doit tout… Elle devient le fait d'un raisonnement prudent" (Le Blanc and Brugère 2017, 23).

REFERENCES

Primary Sources

Bradbury, Ray. 1963. The Martian Chronicles. New York: Time Incorporated.

Secondary Sources

Aronoff, Eric. 2023. "Aliens, Anthropologists, and American Indians: Ray Bradbury's *The Martian Chronicles*, Culture, and Difference in Midcentury US Modernism." *MFS Modern Fiction Studies* 69 (2): 309–40.

Balibar, Étienne, et al. 2018. "Le fantasme du corps étranger." *Esprit* 7: 173–82.

Caygill, Howard. 2000. "Levinas's political judgement." *Radical Philosophy* 104: 6–15.

Davis, Colin, Jr. 1997. *Levinas: An Introduction*. United States: University of Notre Dame Press.

Derrida, J. 2000 "Hospitality." *Angelaki* 5 (3): 3–18. https://doi.org/10.1080/09697250020034706.

Derrida, J. 1999. "Une hospitalité à l'infini." In *Autour de Jacques Derrida: Manifeste pour l'hospitalité*, sous la direction de Mohammed Seffahi, 97–106. Grigny: Éditions Parole d'Aube.

Dillon, Grace. 2013. "Bradbury's Survivance Stories." In *Orbiting Ray Bradbury's Mars: Biographical, Anthropological, Literary, Scientific and Other Perspectives*, 57–69. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company.

Dufourmantelle, Anne. 2012. "L'hospitalité, une valeur universelle?" *Insistance* 8 (2): 57–62.

Dyer, Michel. 2023. *Martian Chronicles: By Ray Bradbury*. Belgium: BrightSummaries.com.

Gale, Cengage Learning. 2015. *A Study Guide for Ray Bradbury's "The Martian Chronicles."* Farmington Hills, MI: Gale, Cengage Learning.

Kakoliris, Gerasimos. 2024. *Jacques Derrida on the Aporias of Hospitality*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer Nature Switzerland.

Lawrence, Adam. 2013. "A 'Night Meeting' in the Southwest: Hospitality in *The Martian Chronicles*." In *Orbiting Ray Bradbury's Mars*, edited by Gloria McMillan. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Le Blanc, Guillaume, and Fabienne Brugère. 2017. *La Fin de l'hospitalité: Lampedusa, Lesbos, Calais… jusqu'où irons-nous?* Paris: Flammarion.

Lévinas, Emmanuel. 1998. *Otherwise Than Being: Or, Beyond Essence*. Translated by Alphonso Lingis. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Lévinas, Emmanuel. 1991. *Totality and Infinity: An Essay on Exteriority*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Lindenburg, Mia. 2023. "The Last Martian: Postcolonial Metaphors of the New Frontier." *Soaring: A Journal of Undergraduate Research* 1: 9.

Mitchell, James B. 2003. "Cul-De-Sac Nightmares: Representations of Californian Suburbia in Science Fiction During the 1950s and '60s." *Iowa Journal of Cultural Studies* 3 (1).

Mogen, David. 1986. *Ray Bradbury*. Boston: Twayne.

Plank, Robert. 1981. "The Expedition to the Planet of Paranoia." *Extrapolation* 22 (2): 171–85.

Popke, E. Jeffrey. 2003. "Poststructuralist Ethics: Subjectivity, Responsibility and the Space of Community." *Progress in Human Geography* 27 (3): 289–316. https://doi.org/10.1191/0309132503ph431oa.

Veracini, Lorenzo. 2010. *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Wolfe, Gary. 1980. "The Frontier Myth in Ray Bradbury." In *Ray Bradbury*, edited by Martin Harry Greenberg and Joseph Olander, 195–218. New York: Taplinger.

Ylagan, Christian. 2015. "Why Do the Heavens Beckon Us? Revisiting Constructions of Home and Identity in Ray Bradbury's *The Martian Chronicles*." *Fafnir – Nordic Journal of Science Fiction and Fantasy Research*. journal.finfar.org.