Epistemologies of Diversity and Otherness

Gaupp, Lisa

Published in:
Diversity and Otherness

DOI:
10.1515/9788366675308-004

Publication date:
2021

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Lisa Gaupp

2 Epistemologies of Diversity and Otherness

Among the fundamental concepts of today's study of culture are included diversity and otherness as well as connected terms and concepts such as social inequality, difference, hybridity, transculturality, intersectionality, and so on. Cultural research in contemporary societies will not be viable without including topics such as globalization or migration. In addition, discourses on diaspora, mobility, exile, transnationalism, translation (Langenohl et al., 2015) or untranslatability (Apter, 2013), as well as addressing areas of "the own versus the unknown" (Simmel, 1996) or of cultural appropriation and authenticity, all have a long tradition in the study of culture. Both cultural and social anthropology as well as literary studies have an equally long history of looking at social inequalities, neo-colonialism and related traditions of producing knowledge while focusing on topics of diversity and otherness. Other academic disciplines have also followed this development, which has been named the "postcolonial turn" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a, pp. 131–173). In the following discussion, the historical development of these postcolonial theoretical approaches will be sketched in order to analyse the epistemologies of diversity and otherness and their normalized academic historicities in the study of culture in general, and, more specifically, their foundations for the sociology of culture and cultural sociology. These two fields of study are situated in the transdisciplinary area of the study of culture in the humanities and social sciences. It will be argued that the study of culture, and especially the sociologically oriented study of culture, needs to further acknowledge the potential of postcolonial critique for theorizing diversity and otherness. It will be shown how and in what explicit senses postcolonially defined approaches and other deconstructivist perspectives from these fields have similar views and several points of interconnection. It will be discussed to what extent stimulations between these seemingly distinct lines of thought can be set in dialogue in order to make *sensitivity to diversity* a more mainstream component within the study of culture. Such a diversity-sensitive perspective corresponds to the transcultural approach of this volume, which combines the deconstruction of persisting lines of b/ordering, and thereby focuses on ambivalent spaces and narratives and the recognition of unequal power relations. Simultaneously, conflictual articulations are taken into account when taking a look at how diversity and otherness are negotiated, standardized or practiced.

The long history of postcolonial approaches and their disciplinary contact with sociological disciplines were sketched in an email debate between Manuela Boatcă, Sina Farzin and Julian Go, which was published in the journal SOZIOLOGIE of the German Sociological Association in 2018 (Boatcă et al., 2018, pp. 423–438). Yet in response to this exchange, Markus Holzinger says that postcolonial sociology and critique of Eurocentrism remains "nothing new" (Holzinger, 2019, pp. 174–184). What is still at stake for Holzinger, though, is the "decolonization of sociology" (p. 179)

itself. My discussion aims at both offering some insights for postcolonial approaches in sociology and highlighting their relationship to other discourses in this field. This task is of great relevance not only concerning the need to decolonize knowledge production (see below), but also in order to find adequate theoretical concepts for meeting today's fundamental social challenges in times of increased political populism, right-wing extremism and growing social inequalities worldwide.

First, intersectional approaches to diversity and otherness can be related directly to the sociology of culture. Intersectional approaches characteristically look at cultural and social inequalities while understanding them as interwoven with multiple and intersecting ascriptions of identity. Here, culture is mainly understood as reification, as something which is (materially) produced through processes of social determinations (Durkheim, 2013; Bourdieu, 2010). Cultural productions and fields of culture are explored as socially and habitually incorporated as well as spatially and aesthetically constituted practices of diversity and otherness, which are interwoven with economic and organizational power-relations—also on a global scale. In this sense, diversity and otherness are seen as practices that (un-)do differences (see Hirschauer in this volume), often with a political objective. These differences are mainly debated as socio-cultural markers, and as cultural constructions, which at the same time have their *real* materialized counterpart in, for example, structures of social inequality. Thus, on the one hand, intersectional *diversity* is conceptualized as a diversity of multiple social belongings and ascriptions that tend to (or are meant to) *include* and foster social inclusion and belonging to a whole under the motto *united in diversity*. On the other hand, intersectional *otherness* mainly fulfils the discursive functions of *excluding*, by stressing the differences amongst individuals, groups or larger social bodies. At the same time and in both intersectional diversity and otherness, differences are always thought to intersect, mutually to influence other markers of difference and to have multiple effects.

Second, the usages of the terms "diversity" and "otherness" as cross-cultural[3] will be discussed from a perspective that can be squarely related to cultural sociology. Culture is understood as the construction of symbols and interpretations. Accordingly, society is analysed by focusing on the processes of signifying and interpreting. Thus, throughout this contribution, the focus will be placed on the theoretical approaches which examine how cross-cultural interconnectedness is addressed by looking at the processes of constructing, (re-)assigning and deconstructing meaning

3 Even though the transcultural approach of this volume is closely related to the concept of *cross-cultural diversity and otherness*, I do not use the term *transcultural* to describe these narratives of interconnectedness and deconstruction of cultural symbols, on the grounds that our transcultural approach goes further, and in two main ways. 1. It focuses on the unequal power relations that will be discussed in the section on intersectional diversity and otherness, and 2. It criticizes the sometimes utopian notions that are connected to the narrative of *cross-cultural diversity and otherness*, rather taking conflictual articulations into account (see also Abu-Er-Rub et al., 2019).

to diversity and otherness. In this sense, cross-cultural *diversity* will encompass all ambiguous cultural symbols of entanglement, interconnectedness and spaces in-between, that cannot be clearly assigned to specific differences or specific belongings. Cross-cultural *otherness* hence concerns the movement of the deconstruction of cultural symbols, or the de-stabilizing of cultural differences.

Furthermore, in both areas, i.e. in intersectional as well as in cross-cultural approaches to diversity and otherness, four different epistemological assumptions regarding diversity and otherness are made. These epistemologies can be called deconstructivist, constructivist, equality-theoretical and difference-theoretical, respectively. Both a postcolonial-inspired critique of Eurocentrism and a poststructuralist notion of deconstructing power discourses in these fields are also of important note. Likewise, critiques which highlight how social inequalities and multiple discrimination processes develop and take effect will be discussed, as well as how the same argument can serve followers of the *New Right* to fight hybridization. All epistemologies of diversity and otherness are placed in the context of the study of culture and the different cultural "turns" which are ongoing within the humanities and social sciences. This chapter critically outlines these different concepts of diversity and otherness, their underlying assumptions and their epistemological foundations across these disciplines. Thus, the origins of diversity and otherness in the study of culture will be explored from different theoretical perspectives, asking what traditions, assumptions and habits have emerged from the concepts of diversity and otherness and, in turn, what impact they may have had on the concepts themselves.

2.1 Epistemologies

The study of culture is such a vast field of research that there are several—sometimes diverging—streams of theoretical inquiry to examine. Also, within the terminology, there is no common understanding, let alone in the epistemological approaches. *Kulturwissenschaften* in German-speaking countries is not the same as the understanding of the term "Cultural Studies", as it originated mainly at the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, even though several similarities can be detected (Nünning, 2016, pp. 70–75). More difficulties in terminology arise when trying to translate the term *Kulturwissenschaften* as e.g. Humanities and Social Sciences or the study of culture. In addition, there are views that use *Kulturwissenschaft* in the singular, in order to refer mainly to a theoretical corpus based on Eurocentric aesthetic theories (Böhme, 2000). Others use *Kulturwissenschaften* in the plural (Wuggenig, 1998) to denote a multidisciplinary approach to common topics with a common framework of cultural theory. In this vast and complex field, it is difficult to systematize, especially when taking into account that many of the approaches in the field follow a constructivist understanding of the study of culture itself, which is explicitly directed against (binary) systematizations. Nevertheless, it is possible to lay

open recurrent tendencies which highlight the basis for important theories or (inter-) disciplinary perspectives (important because they are acknowledged widely in the field and thereby integrated into the existing *canon*). This is of course not meant to homogenize the study of culture in the vast topical field of diversity and otherness. Overlaps and contradictions within these lines of thought are pervasive. Rather, this attempt puts on display the epistemological standardizations of this canon. In addition, the contradictions and ambivalences involved mirror the transcultural approach of this volume and the tension between standardization and transcultural life-worlds in the sense of practices that do not conform to the canon. Andreas Reckwitz calls this common "research programme of *Kulturwissenschaften*" the "perspective of contingency" (Reckwitz, 2004, p. 3). By this he means that the underlying distinctions which used to form the epistemological foundations of the single disciplines are questioned, and their ambivalences and contingencies are more clearly brought into focus. This is again part of what we call the transcultural approach that identifies this volume.

From most of these perspectives, the terms "diversity" and "otherness" are not explicitly addressed,[4] and the area of the *European Other* is mainly considered as the focus of the discipline of anthropology. However, in the following sections, I will argue that dealing with issues of differences can be detected as an underlying principle of many of these approaches, no matter how differences are defined, from what perspectives, or whether differences are stabilized or deconstructed. These underlying distinctions include, for example, the distinction in sociology between modern and traditional societies, in anthropology between one's own and the other, in history between the continuing and the discontinuing, and in literary studies between text and context (Reckwitz, 2004, p. 14). For instance, when sociology was founded as a discipline at the beginning of the twentieth century, Émile Durkheim, Max Weber and Georg Simmel together laid the basis for theories of differentiation with their works on social differentiation through the division of labour (Durkheim, 2013), social stratification (Weber, 1969) and the *Intersection of Social Circles* (Simmel, 1990), respectively. Likewise, this chapter will show that "Kulturwissenschaft as a discipline can be understood as an academic reflexion based on experiences of otherness and differences" (Metten, 2016, p. 6).

Moreover, to look at the *Other* is not reserved for anthropology, let alone to academia, even though *Othering* has been (and still is) a prominent and critical concept of contemporary anthropological research. By this is meant how a foreign *Other* is being constructed through discriminatory language, exclusionary practices and public discourses (Sökefeld, 2004, p. 24). This often encompasses symbolic power, a "power that creates things with words"[5] (Bourdieu, 1992, p. 153). The construction of foreignness and its many accompanying epistemological assumptions are therefore

4 An exception is: Salzbrunn, 2014.

5 "Symbolische Macht ist die Macht, Dinge mit Worten zu schaffen" (Bourdieu, 1992, p. 153).

mostly part of a wider societal context, the manifold life-worlds. As Friese writes, "[s]cientific categorizations stand—often uncritically—in discursive coalitions with juridical and political terminology, that construct the figure of the stranger, migrant, refugee, asylum seeker and determine their daily life"[6] (Friese, 2014, pp. 29–30).

Epistemes are thereby understood as powerful and structuring symbolic orders. Following Michel Foucault, epistemes are thought of as an *a priori* symbolic order (Foucault, 1974, p. 22), which function as a dispositive of what is scientifically acceptable (or true) and what is not (or false) (Foucault, 1978, p. 124). Thus, knowledge can only be produced within the framework of this epistemic order. For Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, this symbolic order has a violent basis that prevents political agency. For her, "epistemic violence" can especially be seen as being "orchestrated from a distance, [as] an extensive and heterogenic project to constitute the colonial subject as the Other"[7] (Spivak, 1988, p. 91). This is the main reason for Walter Mignolo's text *Epistemic Disobedience*, that calls for the decentralization of "occidental thought" and the decolonization of dominant epistemologies (Mignolo, 2012).

Even though, in my discussion, the history of epistemology is widely summarized as a merely *Western-centric* story, and the majority of approaches discussed here belong to this *Western* canon, which is composed mainly of white male authors, this contribution also seeks to offer a non-standard view by combining approaches to diversity and otherness from the *Western* canon with deconstructivist, decolonial, postcolonial, queer and entangled perspectives. This is not meant to oppose *Western* theories with *non-Western* ones, but rather to place emphasis on some of the destabilizing momentums in the historicities of the epistemologies of diversity and otherness, no matter how the respective authors are situated relative to them.

These cultural theories on diversity and otherness mainly stem from disciplinarily rooted fields, such as anthropology, philosophy and sociology or the social sciences in general. Of course, this order is as constructed as any other, and is not meant to exclude larger disciplines, such as literary or media studies, but rather seeks to express a common theoretical ground which is applied in several overlapping or exclusionary disciplinary fields, including ones which are not mentioned here. As for the theories of diversity and otherness in this vast field, this paper will seek to uncover some of the different epistemological assumptions and situate them in their respective cultural turns (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a).

---

6 "Wissenschafliche Kategorisierungen stehen damit–nicht selten unkritisch–in diskursiven Koalitionen mit juristischen und politischen Begrifflichkeiten, mit denen die Figuren des Fremden, Migranten, Flüchtlings, Asylsuchenden geschaffen werden und deren Alltagsleben bestimmt werden kann" (Friese, 2014, pp. 29–30).

7 "das aus der Distanz orchestrierte, weitläufige und heterogene Projekt, das koloniale Subjekt als Anderes zu konstituieren" (Spivak, 1988, p. 91).

Doris Bachmann-Medick first published her German version of the book *Cultural Turns – New Orientations in the Study of Culture* in 2006; in 2016 the English translation and in 2018 the sixth revised German edition were published, respectively. In this book, a turn—which is first and foremost the cultural turn itself—is clearly distinguished from a paradigm shift (Kuhn, 2009), mere theoretical trends, or a new (interdisciplinary) focus on a specific topic. As Bachmann-Medick explains, a turn develops when "the new research focus shifts from the object level of new fields of inquiry to the level of analytical categories and concepts... if the potential turn does not merely identify new objects of study, but becomes a tool and medium of knowledge itself" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a, p. 16). This approach involves an "epistemological shift necessary for turns to provide an analytical framework for understanding the constellations of the social problems from which they emerge" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a, p. 17).

In this sense, this chapter intends to direct the postcolonial turn towards the transcultural approach which is adopted in this volume, in order to both draw the topics of diversity and otherness closer to a transcultural methodological approach, and to theorize diversity and otherness as a medium of postcolonial critique. The first encompasses a methodological approach that, while focusing on processes of interconnectedness, acknowledges the conflicts involved, seeking persistently to lay open and deconstruct dichotomizations, homogenizations and standardizations. The latter, conversely, refers to how this chapter calls for the implementation of a global, postcolonial, translational perspective to negotiations and practices of diversity and otherness, as a tool for criticizing inequalities. In this sense, the cultural change which Aleida Assmann sees as developing "through the interaction of political, social, medial and epistemological changes, influenced by the academic discourse"[8] (Assmann, 2016, p. 42) lies at the core of the theoretical consideration of negotiations and practices of diversity and otherness in this chapter.

Epistemology, which was one of Greek philosophy's central disciplines, asks:

> what is knowledge ... how is it produced, and what can be called true. ... Through poststructuralist theories, constructivism has gained more and more importance for epistemology. In accordance with skepticism, knowledge production is regarded as a mere construction of an observer. Reality and therefore a universal truth do not exist. (Gaupp, 2010, p. 200)

These questions have already been raised in Indian ancient philosophy, such as in the doctrines of the Upanishads and in the Greek ancient world by philosophers such as Heraclitus, Parmenides, Socrates and Aristotle. Plato's theory of ideas assumes

8 "Solcher Kulturwandel entsteht durch das Zusammenwirken politischer, sozialer, medialer und epistemologischer Veränderungen, an dem auch der wissenschaftliche Diskurs einen wichtigen Anteil hat" (Assmann, 2016, p. 42).

an *a priori* existence of ideas or signs which stands in separation from the world of sensible phenomena (Natorp, 1903). This means that knowledge can only be achieved regarding an idea and not regarding a reality that exists apart from that idea, paving the road for semiotics which discusses how meaning is attributed in processes of knowledge acquisition. In the 4th century A.D., Augustine developed his theological epistemology, which was further extended by (among others) Thomas Aquinas to become the scholasticism of the twelfth century under the influence of Arabic philosophers such as Averroës (Abū al-Walīd Muhammad Ibn Ahmad Ibn Rushd). From now on, there were two opposing streams of epistemology present: the one deductivist, in which truth can be recognized by reason, and the other inductivist, in which truth can only be derived from experience. With his famous statement *cogito ergo sum* [I think, therefore I am], René Decartes founded the tradition of early modern rationalism, that assigns the capacity of objective cognition to the human mind in the sixteenth century. In opposition, knowledge according to the empiricism of Francis Bacon is deducted only from sensory experience. In both cases, knowledge is seen as the classification of information and the assignment of meanings or ideas through sensory discrimination, i.e. (re-)cognition (Gaupp, 2010).

These two approaches were in turn combined by Immanuel Kant in the idealist tradition of the 18th century (Kant, 2015). Based on Plato's theory of ideas, Kant sees existence as a mere image or sign of ideas. However, he establishes a relation between thought and experience by stating that the mind has to form the terms for recognition itself. Only that of which the consciousness has an idea or a meaning can be recognized. This understanding later led to the linguistic turn in the study of culture (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a).

In the wake of poststructuralist theories, constructivism gains importance for epistemology. Being based on scepticism, knowledge is accordingly seen as a mere construction of the observer, and there is no reality or universal truth. This is also the premise of feminist epistemology that developed in the 1970s as a critique of science (Harding, 1999; Butler, 1990; Kristeva, 1974; Haraway, 1992). These approaches seek to uncover and deconstruct absolutist universalisms, power discourses and essentialist concepts such as gender-specific role models. As we will see in the following sections, constructivism is one of the major story-lines for how diversity and otherness are conceived in the study of culture. Equally, many approaches seek to deconstruct power-relations based on hegemonic ways of conceiving, forming, influencing and ruling the production of knowledge. Thus, constructivism is nowadays the state of the art in the study of culture. The underlying premise of constructivism that meaning which is assigned to the world is a part of those theories that can be assigned to the interpretative turn.

The interpretative turn is characterized by Bachmann-Medick as being based on the linguistic turn as "mega-turn" and by the metaphor of understanding culture as text (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a, pp. 39–71). In the tradition of Max Weber's

interpretative sociology,[9] Clifford Geertz's interpretative cultural anthropology, and with reference to the "politics of science ... the decolonization processes beginning in the 1950s and the liberation movements in the so-called Third World" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a, pp. 40–41), culture is understood as being constructed as symbols, signs and interpretations. At the same time, culture is seen as actually constituting social reality (Fischer & Moebius, 2014, p. 10). This stream of thought can be traced back to the first institutionalized founding of the discipline of sociology at the beginning of the twentieth century, when Georg Simmel, Max Weber and Émile Durkheim developed their theories on society and culture in the wake of dominating positivistic scientific approaches and their division of humanities and natural sciences.

This tradition's focus on the sense-making processes of humans is again revived in the so-called philosophical anthropology (Plessner, 1975) after the Second World War, in order to oppose the dominant paradigms of structural functionalism[10] and historical materialism at that time. It was further elaborated internationally from the 1970s onwards in the cultural turn across a range of different disciplines and in cultural sociology itself.

Andreas Reckwitz calls this approach the "meaning-oriented understanding of culture"[11] (Reckwitz, 2000, p. 109) in opposition to the formerly dominant "normative understanding of culture" (Reckwitz, 2008b, pp. 69–93). This cultural sociology is interested in the analysis of symbolic regimes[12] in society that allow for meaningful action, their genesis and connected practices, involved actors and social formations, as well as life-styles, everyday life and artefacts (Albrecht & Moebius, 2014, pp. 12–13). However, Monika Wohlrab-Sahr sees a fundamental difference between the approaches of Weber and Reckwitz: whereas for Weber meaning is always subjective, the "praxeological" approach of Reckwitz, which draws on poststructuralist theories, neglects subjects as independent variables and sees them rather as a "result of modes of subjectivation and cultural forming"[13] (Wohlrab-Sahr, 2010, pp. 14–15). For Reckwitz, the permanent de-stabilization of cultural regimes, structures and boundaries, and thus the contingency of cultural symbols, becomes an important focus of analysis (Reckwitz, 2004). We will come back to poststructuralist deconstruction below, since it can be seen as being connected to the reflexive turn.

Close to Reckwitz's "praxeological" approach, Joost Van Loon distinguishes between cultural sociology and the sociology of culture and argues in favour of the latter, situating it within the performative turn. He intends to place focus on what

9 "verstehende Soziologie" (This and the following translations without references are mine).
10 "Strukturfunktionalismus".
11 "bedeutungsorientierter Kulturbegriff" (Reckwitz, 2000, p. 109).
12 "symbolische Ordnungen".
13 "Resultat von Subjektivierungsweisen und kulturellen Formungen" (Wohlrab-Sahr, 2010, pp. 14–15).

he calls "the practical dimension of the generation of cultural meanings and experiences. It seeks to understand the generative and transformative aspects of culture on the basis of events, practices, material embodiments and media forms" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a, p. 73). Though famously divided by the cultural sociologist Jeffrey Alexander in 1996 (German translation in 2004), in cultural sociology every action and every institution needs to be connected with "structured sets of symbols" (p. 59) that determine it, and that can be read to a connected audience, which is thus able to "read" this action. For Alexander, the sociology of culture focuses only on the "context" that is separated from the "sphere of meaning", and leaves out the reading of the "text" itself. In response, Van Loon, in his theorization of sharing, sameness and belonging, criticizes this division between the idealist and the materialist. He suggests not to follow cultural sociology in thinking that "belief governs action", but to rather take not only materialism but also performative practices into account. As such, collectives are not bound together by "shared beliefs, norms and values" but by "sharing-believing", being "conceptualized as a practice, not as a separate product" (Van Loon, 2019). Moreover, for Van Loon it is important to acknowledge the "historicity-under-erasure of the performativity of shared beliefs", which includes how the "forgetting of the historicity is itself a crucial part of the way in which the symbolic operates" (Van Loon, 2019). Merely mental approaches can indeed lead to a negation of the violence involved. Instead, taking into account all the "violence of starvation, of racist-colonial-genocidal exploitation, of misogyny" allows the sociology of culture to become a "political sociology" (Van Loon, 2019). Likewise, such a perspective invites one to consider practices of belonging, sharing, diversity and differences, inclusion and exclusion in dialogue with the postcolonial agenda which is proposed in this contribution.

Let us come back to these matters later on, in the section devoted to intersectional diversity and otherness, and instead turn now to the development of the reflexive turn mentioned above. As part of (or actually preceding) the reflexive turn, the discipline of anthropology underwent a so-called *crisis of representation*, with its peak in the 1960s after the posthumously published diaries of the anthropologist Bronislaw Malinowski. The founding father of empirical fieldwork revealed himself to be a shocking racist, exhibiting a discriminating attitude towards his research subjects in the field (Malinowski, 1967). Accordingly, the whole discipline had to question its own premises grounded in colonialism.

The question behind these discussions was: How can one possibly solve the dilemma of deciding whether an ascription is correct without ascribing new labels at the same time? Critical reflection on the researcher's own objectives, competences and knowledges can reveal what desires, assumptions and biases lead his*her own epistemic interests. However, whether the reality represented by the researcher is *true* or *false* cannot be demonstrated by merely following the established rules of field research. This skepticism is a part of the crises of representation in anthropology, which encompasses: "not only the poststructuralist drifting apart of signifier and

signified, but also the asymmetry of power relations underlying every representation of the other and every description of culture—with anthropology and beyond" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a, p. 103). From a postcolonial perspective, anthropology/ethnology is criticized for aiding colonial rule by describing, categorizing, interpreting and thereby standardizing the *Other* from a *Western* point of view.

Whether understandings and *true* or *objective* statements about the *Other* are ever possible is treated by recourse to a numerous array of theoretical concepts. For example, cultural xenology is dedicated to *intercultural understanding* or rather the impossibility of representing the *Other* or a *truth* objectively.

In particular, intercultural philosophy is devoted to questions of *intercultural understanding*. As one of the leading authors in this field, Ram Adhar Mall asks whether the different cultures of this world can be compared to each other, how much they resemble each other, and whether mutual understanding is possible. He claims that there is "no pure *own culture* … no more than there is a pure *other culture*. … it is no different when it comes to philosophy, [which is] placeless"[14] (Mall, 1993, pp. 1, 4).

Postcolonial authors have also asserted their belief in such a "placelessness" and deconstruct the hegemonic *Western* representation of the *Other*.[15] Every (academic) description of a situation, human being, and his*her actions is necessarily a representational practice, which, in trying to structure observed reality with terminological precision, him- or herself (re-)produces narratives and mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion. As Chambers writers:

> Representation is nothing natural or obvious. It is, both in its political as well as in its aesthetic dimensions, a continuing process of construction, articulation and interpretation. … Otherness is swallowed up: The observed is taken out of a very specific historical and cultural context and fitted in to academic, literary and philosophical typologies, which serve to describe, determine and explain the "other".[16] (Chambers, 1996, pp. 153, 155)[17]

Hence, in every new narrative something is always left out and an image is constructed. Following Homi K. Bhabha, a representation is "always only an add-on to

---

14 "Eine reine eigene Kultur gibt ebenso wenig, wie es eine reine andere Kultur gibt … nicht anders verhält es sich mit der Philosophie, [die] ortlos [ist]" (Mall, 1993, pp. 1, 4).

15 See further below in this section on epistemologies.

16 "Repräsentation ist jedoch nichts Natürliches oder Offensichtliches. Sie ist, sowohl in ihren politischen wie auch in ihren ästhetischen Dimensionen, ein fortwährender Prozess der Konstruktion, der Artikulation und Interpretation. … Andersheit wird verschluckt: Das Beobachtete wird aus einem genau umrissenen historischen und kulturellen Kontext herausgelöst und dann in die wissenschaftlichen, literarischen und philosophischen Typologien eingepasst, die dazu dienen, das 'andere' zu beschreiben, festzulegen und zu erklären" (Chambers, 1996, pp. 153, 155).

17 In this context, the work by Stuart Hall on cultural representation and signifying practices needs to be mentioned, as he similarly focuses on how meaning in any cultural production is produced, constructed and negotiated (Hall, 1997).

authority and identity; it should never be read mimetically as an image of reality" (Bhabha, 2005, p. 376).

Throughout the 1970s and with the book *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography* published in 1986 by the US-American anthropologists James Clifford and George Marcus, the *writing culture debate* shook the discipline of anthropology. As stated above, these epistemological debates were influenced by parallel discussions in philosophy and sociology and can be identified as part of the reflexive turn. Accordingly:

> culture is no longer seen as a unified objectifiable container of symbols and meanings. Rather, it is regarded as a dynamic network of relationships between communication practices and representations, through whose representational dynamics culture comes into being in the first place. ..., cultural objects are not simply "givens", but emerge through (symbolic) interaction, through an "othering" that is influenced by the type of representation in question. (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a, p. 122)

An ethnographic "thick description" (Geertz, 1973) is no longer seen as simply the subjective interpretation of an ethnographer. In addition, the literary style of the academic text which is produced is analysed linguistically or used strategically. Culture is seen by a variety of authors no longer as a representation, but instead:

> as composed of seriously contested codes and representations; they assume that the poetic and the political are inseparable, that science is in, not above, historical and linguistic processes. They assume that academic and literary genres interpenetrate and that the writing of cultural descriptions is properly experimental and ethical. Their focus on text-making and rhetoric serves to highlight the constructed, artificial nature of cultural accounts. It undermines overly transparent modes of authority, and it draws attention to the historical predicament of ethnography, the fact that it is always caught up in the invention, not the representation, of cultures. (Clifford, 1986, p. 2)

When ethnography is viewed as contextual, rhetorical, institutional, gender-specific, political and historical, an ethnographic description can nevertheless be called a "true fiction" which always omits something. To underline this perspective, some authors of this *writing culture debate* use stylistic elements in their ethnographic texts. Moreover, "[o]nce dialogism and polyphony are recognized as modes of textual production, monophonic authority is questioned" (Clifford, 1986, p. 15). In keeping with the perspective that ethnography is fiction, anthropology turns toward the "other within us" and self-construction processes associated with it. As Clifford writers, "[c]ultural poesis—and politics—is the constant reconstitution of selves and others through specific exclusions, conventions, and discursive practices" (Clifford, 1986, p. 24).

Bachmann-Medick also assigns the cultural critique of Clifford and Marcuse to the interpretative turn, as it:

> first clearly emerged as a critique of power relations and became politically pointed under the influence of poststructuralism and deconstructionism, at which point the unavoidable question still looms large as to just how the power of representation systems impacts human actions and spawns symbolical orders. (2016a, p. 64)

Moreover, with the implied course of the study of culture being "directed against the established, yet problematic, principle of dichotomous difference" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a, p. 105), the postcolonial turn as well as the translational turn can also be assigned to the writing culture debate. As Bachmann-Medick writes, "[i]t was exactly this strand of the critique of dichotomies an anti-essentialism that was pursued and further radicalized in the postcolonial turn" (p. 123). Yet, Bachmann-Medick distinguishes the reflexive turn from the postcolonial turn by defining the reflexive turn as focusing primarily on the "self-reflections by Europeans" (p. 125), whereas the postcolonial turn encompasses mainly "the concrete level of the contacts and relations between these two worlds" (p. 126). However, this distinction is in itself reproducing of a dichotomous order rather than a bid to find alternative transcultural perspectives. Postcolonial approaches are still often assigned only to a separate sphere of neo-colonial structures which is not taken into account in mainstream research. It seems as if the conventional distinction is still operative that distinguishes between anthropology being solely responsible for researching the *colonial Other* and sociology, which is focused on *Western* societies (García Canclini, 2013).

In opposition to this, I argue that postcolonial critique can serve as a tool to theorize diversity and otherness from a transcultural approach. Similarly to the way that Manuela Bojadžijev and Regina Römhild (2014, pp. 10–24) call the need for a "migrantization of research", whereby migration is shown to be such a prominent underlying principle of today's societies that it has to be taken into account for any research question, I would like to suggest the transculturalization of the cultural study of diversity and otherness. The postcolonial turn is acknowledged in the study of culture as a *mainstreaming principle* instead of a separate topic, in which the two main features of postcolonial critique are acknowledged as a guiding analytical tool to theorize diversity and otherness: first, the political aim of decolonizing power structures, and, second, the deconstruction of dichotomies in thinking. Decolonizing thereby refers to liberation not only from persistent imperialistic structures based in the colonial era but also from any unequal power structures.

The first wave of postcolonial critique was indeed preoccupied mainly with the heritage of colonial ages. However, similarly to the way that "gender" was conceived as a "universally relevant issue" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a, p. 28), which "runs through all the turns in the study of culture as a key epistemological axis that structures not only the social system but also the knowledge order—while taking a stand against essentializations, universalizations, identity claims and dichotomizations" (p. 29), and since "the difference-based understanding of culture … has increasingly characterized the study of culture since the postcolonial turn" (p. 30), I see the postcolonial approach to diversity and otherness as reaching beyond narrowly colonial issues. It

provides the opportunity to look at diversity and otherness both from a power-critical perspective and from a deconstructivist stance at the same time. The postcolonial can thereby describe "a programmatic political concept that was critical of hegemonic discourse" (p. 131), which is "capable of counteracting the ongoing problematic constructions of the other" (p. 132). Thus, "a postcolonial analytical approach … examines how domination functions and how alterity is modelled" (p. 153). This does not mean that the study of culture should be homogenized into a single postcolonial theory, but rather that exactly these ambivalent, contradictory, diverse and destabilizing moments should be taken into account in order to deconstruct hegemonic and homogenous views.

The prefix *post* does not imply that colonialism is over, but instead focuses on its continuing influence in typically less obvious ways. As Reckwitz writes:

> The movement of postcolonialism posits that only now—in relation to the past and the present—has it become apparent that the intertwined relations of stereotypical internal and external representations of ethnicity, religion, nationality etc. were fundamental for the modern constellation.[18] (2008a, p. 97)

These theories can be seen as poststructuralist answers to postmodern theories of diversity, which, even though they are presented as pluralistic, are still based on differences. Postcolonial theorists such as Edward Said, Homi K. Bhabha, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak and the authors of the Birmingham Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies, such as Stuart Hall and Paul Gilroy, have especially pointed to the othering mechanisms with which a stereotype *Other* is constructed in academia, the arts, and politics in the *West*. The last century saw freedom movements such as the struggles for independence from colonial powers, the Black civil rights movement, and multiple waves of feminism; in academia too, the dichotomous thinking of modernity was questioned and deconstructed. Related to this deconstructivism, postcolonial critique analyses, rethinks and challenges those cultural forms which are based on colonial suppression and representation or imperialism today.

The founding postcolonial critics, such as Edward W. Said, refer to the influential works of Frantz Fanon (1952) in their critiques of universalism and of the way that diversity and otherness are constructed based on colonial power regimes. Said shows how "Orientalism" drives interests that construct the "Orient" from "Western" academic, institutional, economic, social, historical and aesthetical experience, as the counter-image of the "Occident", as "its contrasting image, idea, personality, experience" (Said, 1995, p. 2). The "Occident" thereby contributes to the domination

18 "Die Bewegung des Postkolonialismus [geht] davon aus, dass erst jetzt, auf die Vergangenheit und auf die Gegenwart bezogen, sichtbar wird, dass die verwickelten Relationen der stereotypen Selbst- und Fremdrepräsentationen, von Ethnizität, Religion, Nationalität etc. … für die moderne Konstellation bisher grundlegend gewesen sind" (Reckwitz, 2008a, p. 97).

and normalization of the "Orient", and at the same time perpetuates and bolsters the legitimation of its own superiority. Said shows that every production of a text of any kind implies certain ideological assumptions. Likewise, every author remains bound to his*her context which excludes an objective truth (p. 2). Said draws attention to "Western" binaries, which are unmasked not as being false but as being led by power interests.[19] In addition, he shows that "the colonial project … was underpinned by a discursive infrastructure, a symbolic economy, a whole apparatus of knowledge, the violence of which was as much epistemic as it was physical" (Mbembe, 2008, p. 8).

Critics of postcolonialism see this critique as a theory by privileged intellectual immigrants who do not live in the present (economic) realities in the former colonies (Moore-Gilbert, 2000). For example, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak addresses the impossibility of taking part in the discourse from subaltern positions, which is doomed always to be the represented (Spivak, 1988). In this widely discussed article, drawing on Foucault and Derrida, she does not exclude herself from producing neocolonial ideologies while working in the "Western" academic system. Spivak suggests that the subaltern experience should be maintained as an inaccessible blankness to demonstrate the limits of the "Western" academic system instead of ascribing identities to the "Other" (Moore-Gilbert, 2000).

In the second wave of postcolonial theory from the 1990s onwards, the focus changed more and more to regard unequal power structures as being generally based on a capitalism-critical approach and the deconstruction of hegemonic knowledge (production) as being influenced by globalization. "The conceptual focus shifted to include a fundamental critique of the modern knowledge order and the universalizing hegemonic discourse of Western rationalism" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a, p. 132). The postcolonial turn is now debated in several contexts and academic disciplines. Susanne Leeb and Ruth Sonderegger, for instance, call for:

> a relentless reflection on essentialist and colonialist power structures inherent in the concept of culture, particularly in the German-speaking world … and for the provincialization of European aesthetics as well as for the acknowledgement of the manifold entanglements between European and non-European accounts of aesthetics. (2016, p. 57)

Also, Joseph-Achille Mbembe asks in his influential books *On the Postcolony* and *Critique of Black Reason*, as well as in numerous other works, how it is possible to speak about Africa without falling back on narratives that are based on imperialist, colonial-rooted and capitalist logics. He questions "what is 'today', and what are we today, … and how could it give birth to something else?" (Mbembe, 2008, p. 15). The epoch of the postcolony—understood not only as a descriptive undertaking, but

19 There are a number of publications dedicated to the work of Said; see for instance Ismaiel-Wendt (2014) and Haus der Kulturen der Welt (2014).

also as having a transformative objective—is conceptualized by Mbembe as enclosing "multiple *durées* made up of discontinuities, reversals, inertias, and swings that overlay one another, interpenetrate one another, and envelope one another: an entanglement" (Mbembe, 2001, p. 14). The postcolony consists of a "combination of several temporalities: ... the transit, ... the emerging time, ...the time of entanglement" (Mbembe, 2001, pp. 15–16), and is at the same time "a thought of responsibility in terms of the obligation to answer for oneself, to be the guarantor of one's actions" (Mbembe, 2008, p. 16). Mbembe intends to find an answer to the question of how to "think together difference and life, equality and inequality, excessiveness and the common"[20] (Mbembe, 2014, p. 24). One of his guiding principles for this task is to reflect on questions instead of positions, while acknowledging that "the elsewhere is the constituent of the here, and *vice versa*" (Mbembe, 2008, p. 17). I will come back to these postcolonial approaches to theorize life-worlds of conviviality instead of othering in my other contribution in this volume, on *How to Curate Diversity and Otherness in Global Performance Art*.

Within the epistemological terrain, a growing number of scholars are seeking to decolonize academic thinking. The sociologist Gurminder Bhambra, for example, is trying to decolonize sociological concepts of modernity (2007). For Reckwitz, the differentiation between "modern society" and "traditional society" was a constituent part of the theory of modernity in the discipline of sociology. Rationality is ascribed to modern "Western" societies only, and the evolution from a traditional to a more modern society is thought of as a linear and inevitable development (Reckwitz, 2004, p. 10). Owing to this, "modernity itself as a phenomenon has been primarily understood in the perspective of Western rationalism" (Mbembe, 2001, p. 10).

Bhambra also states that most sociological theories of modernity are based on dichotomous differentiations such as culture/nature, modernity/postmodernity or diversity/otherness. Postcolonial sociological approaches, such as hers, intend to lay open these colonialist foundations of linear progress; "... yet, while there is increasing hesitancy in equating Westernization with progress, it is my contention that the West is still seen as the leader or 'signifier' of change" (Bhambra, 2007, p. 1). The concept of modernity is further deconstructed and decolonized (Dussel, 1998; Santos, 2010), and is conceived as uneven modernities, being based in entangled histories (Randeria, 2002), as "other modernities" (Randeria, 1999, p. 379), or as multiple modernities (Eisenstadt, 2003).

What is at stake in these theories is precisely how modern thought has both dichotomized the modern and the traditional, one's own and the foreign, while at the same time has allowed these divisions to be perpetuated as universal. "The dispute thus bears not on the Westernness of modernity but on what the Enlightenment

20 "Wie können wir Differenzen und Leben, Gleiches und Ungleiches, Überschießendes und Gemeinsames denken?" (Mbembe, 2014, p. 24).

bequeathed 'us' and on the possibilities of accomplishing in reality the promises of universality contained in the ideals of the *Aufklärung*" (Mbembe, 2001, p. 11). With the attempt to decolonize, for example, the most canonical sociologists for the theory of modernity, Max Weber and Georg Simmel, postcolonial critics such as Gurminder Bhambra (2014) or Syed Farid Alatas and Vineeta Sinha (2017) reread these texts and show, for example, the Orientalism detectable in Weber's work (Alatas, 2017). Such approaches instead call for an interwoven and cross-cultural concept of diversity and otherness, which is based on symbols and signs that are not rooted merely in an Eurocentric tradition but which are rather relativized by concepts and approaches such as "entangled histories"[21] (Gould, 2007), "histoire croisée"[22] (Werner & Zimmermann, 2006) or "double critique"[23] (Khatibi, 1985).

Reckwitz also lists other contemporary approaches from the study of culture that question the "dualism of 'modern' and 'traditional' sociability" (Reckwitz, 2004, p. 10), such as the exercise of finding similarities between rituals in modern and traditional societies (M. Castells), defining the modern as rather a "historical-cultural specific particularity" (L. Boltanski, S. Lash) or by studying the "relativization of rationality in organization and science and technology studies" (H. Simon, B. Latour) (Reckwitz, 2004, p. 10). We will come back to these developments around the material, the spatial, the performative turns and postconstructivism below.

Of course there are numerous other examples of postcolonial and deconstructivist approaches to diversity and otherness which I have not mentioned at this point. One common denominator of these perspectives is often an approach that can be called 'critical of Eurocentrism or *Western*-centrism', as well as which conceptualizes diversity and otherness in an equality-theoretical manner (see below, on the section on intersectional diversity and otherness) or as a difference-theoretical manner (see below, on poststructuralism). Moreover, the critique of Eurocentrism has a longer tradition in different academic disciplines (see the writing culture debate and the crisis of representation above, as well as Said's *Orientalism*). For instance, Ella Habiba Shohat

21 "Entangled histories" refers to the realization "that each belonged not to one community but to several, and that those communities together constituted–indeed, still constitute to this day–an interconnected yet porous and open-ended whole" (Gould, 2007, p. 786).

22 "Histoire croisée"—as developed by Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann—can be called a transculturally theoretical, as well as methodological, approach to history, which takes into account all the different fragmented and interconnected relations between different regions of the world. "The relational, interactive, and process-oriented dimensions of histoire croisée lead to a multiplicity of possible intercrossings" (Werner & Zimmermann, 2006, p. 39).

23 Double critique was developed by the Moroccan sociologist and author Abdelkebir Khatibi, and denotes a concept that focuses on hybridity, androgyny and bilingualism, when Arab researchers are forced to become translators "in the shadow of the Western episteme", and which "requires a plurality of languages and of thoughts inscribed in them" (Khatibi, 1985, p. 17). Khatibi states: "Indeed, Occident, I am a split self, but my identity is an infinity of games, of desert flowers" (Khatibi, 1985, as cited in Lionnet, 2011, p. 390).

and Robert Stam (1994) call for a move from Eurocentrism to pluricentrism. Other authors seek to decolonize academic thought and education. Conventional dichotomous thinking should be overcome, such as the divide between human/nature; and instead, universities should be organized more as networks, allowing for a "more open critical cosmopolitan pluriversalism" (Mbembe, 2016, p. 37), rather than

> a dominant academic model based on a Eurocentric epistemic canon. A Eurocentric canon is a canon that attributes truth only to the Western way of knowledge production. It is a canon that disregards other epistemic traditions. It is a canon that tries to portray colonialism as a normal form of social relations between human beings rather than a system of exploitation and oppression. (p. 32)

For William Jamal Richardson, however, the decolonization of thought is not sufficient; for him, "marginalized communities and decolonial scholars need not only to intervene in epistemic debates but also to intervene politically in the physical spaces in which these debates often take place" (2018, p. 232). With this quest, the political-activist claim of equality-theoretical approaches discussed in the next section below is touched upon.

And yet, the popularity of postcolonial theory in "Western" academic contexts has also led to allegations of its Eurocentrism. Based mainly at the academic centres of the "West", postcolonial theory is reproached for only helping intellectuals of the "Global North" to redeem themselves of their colonialist past and present (Reuter & Villa, 2010). On the other hand, postcolonial theorists from the "Global South" "do not want to be seen on the other side of the line. ... [they] want to eliminate the line" (Santos, 2014, p. 4).

As an example of this latter critique, the historian Dipesh Chakrabarty is widely known for calling for the provincialization of Europe, and can be taken as a further example of transcultural approaches that bridge the epistemological gap between a mere "Occident-Orient" dichotomy. On the one hand, he criticizes how both historicism and the concept of political modernity is deeply Eurocentric, such as in the following:

> Historicism is what made modernity or capitalism look not simply global but rather as something that became global *over time*, by originating in one place (Europe) and then spreading outside it. This "first in Europe, then elsewhere" structure of global historical time was historicist. (Chakrabarty, 2000, p. 7)

On the other hand however, drawing on both Marx and his analytical approach to "'demystify' ideology in order to produce a critique that looks towards a more just social order" (p. 18) and Heidegger and his hermeneutic tradition, and producing "affective histories" that offer in detail "an understanding of the diversity of human life-worlds" (p. 18), Chakrabarty applies a combination of these two authors to the South Asian context. This can be seen as part of the second wave of postcolonial

theory (see also Appadurai, 1996), that seeks to find new ways of theorizing inequalities in thought as well as in social realms, and to offer emancipatory or connecting alternatives. As such, he writes:

> provincializing Europe is not a project of rejecting or discarding European thought. ... provincializing Europe becomes the task of exploring how this thought–which is now everybody's heritage and which affect us all–may be renewed from and for the margins. But of course, the margins are as plural and diverse as the centers. Europe appears different when seen from within the experiences of colonization or inferiorization in specific parts of the world. (Chakrabarty, 2000, p. 16)

Even though he uses Marx's category of "capital" to acknowledge the importance of Marx's "figure of the abstract human" for "understanding the globe that capitalism produces", for Chakrabarty "this abstract human occludes questions of belonging and diversity" and needs to be destabilized, in order to offer some "insights on human belonging and historical difference" (p. 18). This can be read as combining, in a postcolonial critique of Eurocentric thought, both a difference-theoretical and an equality-theoretical approach, as well as perspectives from cultural sociology together with perspectives from the sociology of culture.[24] Thereby, he proposes to create "plural normative horizons specific to our existence and relevant to the examination of our lives and their possibilities" (Chakrabarty, 2000, p. 20). This again connects to the transcultural approach of this volume.

There are again several more theories that can be called "decolonial" and which at the same time also offer new perspectives. Julia Reuter and Paula-Irene Villa, for example, intend to "provincialize sociology" by relativizing, locating and contextualizing social theory (Reuter & Villa, 2010). In addressing the place and development of postcolonial philosophy, Patricia Purtschert suggest re-reading the "Western history of thought" in order to decolonize the "epistemic violence" of philosophical texts, such as Kant's representation of colonial subjects (Purtschert, 2012). Manuela Boatcă and Sergio Costa again criticize the Eurocentric foundations of the sociological theory of modernity (Boatcă & Costa, 2016). Moreover, Wolfgang Gabbert's sociology of globalization disapproves conventional theories of globalization that only assign dynamic developments to the "center", while ignoring the majority of developments in the world (Gabbert, 2010). Last but not least, Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodriguez calls for the decolonizing of epistemology by taking into account decolonial feminist-queer southern epistemologies and new subjectivities (Gutiérrez Rodriguez, 2016). All these approaches have in common the fact that they seek to de-stabilize and re-think established thinking, ascriptions and borders.

Furthermore, in the study of culture, there is a longer tradition of questioning and deconstructing borders. The academic deconstruction of borders and boundaries can

24 See below both sections on intersectional diversity & otherness and on cross-cultural diversity & otherness.

be found in e.g. migration and globalization studies, postcolonial studies as well as queer and gender studies. These various approaches can be called either difference-theoretical, when the focus is placed more on how differences are carried out, and/or deconstructivist, where the focus is laid on how differences are un-done. As Bachmann-Medick writes:

> A difference-oriented approach in the study of culture however makes borderlands and shifts between the disciplines–here in direction of sociology–productive. Likewise, fractures, deviations and discrepancies are marked more strongly in order to analyse them further: as social and societal inequalities.[25] (Bachmann-Medick, 2016b, p. 52)

Originally, Derrida developed the notion of deconstruction as a language-philosophical instrument in order to apply it to texts or systems of symbols in semiotics. Deconstruction for Derrida is a kind of re-reading of a text, in order to lay open the ambivalence of written signs. No *a priori* meaning can be assigned to a text. Accordingly:

> The act of deconstruction is ... intended as self-liberation of thought from its usual border-drawing and hierarchies, especially from the conventional dichotomies of subject and object, mind and body, ... good and evil, true and false, oppositions that often enough have served to legitimize the hegemonic claim of one culture, class, race or gender over the other.[26] (Zapf, 2001, p. 101)

Derrida demonstrates inconsistencies and irregularities in texts with the two versions of "différence" and "différance". The difference between these two words can only be detected in the written form; it is not audible. The perspective of "différance" "supposes that the text has no present being"[27] (Derrida, 2004, p. 138). This means that no symbols, meanings, practices and identities of diversity and otherness should be regarded as static, but that they should rather be deconstructed. In this way, "every seemingly strong and irreducible *opposition* ... is declared [a] theoretical fiction"[28] (p. 135).

---

25 "Eine differenzorientierte kulturwissenschaftliche Herangehensweise hingegen macht Grenzbereiche und Verschiebungen zwischen den Disziplinen–hier in Richtung der Soziologie–produktiv. So markiert sie stärker die Brüche, die Abweichungen und Missverhältnisse, um sie dann weitergehend zu analysieren: als soziale und gesellschaftliche Ungleichheiten" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016b, p. 52).

26 "Der Akt der Dekonstruktion ist ... intendiert als Selbstbefreiung des Denkens aus gewohnten Grenzziehungen und Hierarchisierungen, insbesondere aus den herkömmlichen Dichotomien von Subjekt und Objekt, Geist und Körper, ... gut und böse, wahr und falsch, Gegensätzen, die oft genug zur Rechtfertigung des Hegemonieanspruchs einer Kultur, Klasse (class), Rasse (race) oder eines Geschlechts (gender) über das andere missbraucht wurden" (Zapf, 2001, p. 101).

27 "dass der untersuchte Text nicht 'ist', also 'kein gegenwärtig Seiendes' sei" (Derrida, 2004, p. 138).

28 "So wird jeder scheinbar strenge und irreduzible Gegensatz ... für 'theoretische Fiktion' erklärt" (Derrida, 2004, p. 135).

This procedure corresponds to deconstructivism as a poststructuralist methodology that is based on Derrida's deconstruction. This perspective criticizes the logo-centrism of modernity that is based on binary oppositions, and negates a static meaning of a sign. Deconstructivism has been established especially in literary and cultural theory as a methodology to lay open power-hierarchies and essentialist concepts which follow the poststructuralist argument to de-stabilize fixed meanings. As Boatcă and Costa write following Stuart Hall, "the notion of *différance* [is used] to deconstruct the antinomic discourses that counter the 'I' and the 'other', the 'we' and the 'they'" (Boatcă & Costa, 2016, p. 25). It is important to note, however, that the poststructuralist perspective on differences does not eliminate borders, but "rather broaches the issue of their ambivalences and traces the cultural processes crossing these"[29] (Reckwitz, 2008b, p. 309).

Another concept that needs to be addressed at this point is Gilles Deleuze's and Felix Guattari's concept of the *rhizome*:

> The multiplicities are the reality itself and do not suppose any unicity, do not fit in any totality, nor refer to a subject. On the contrary, the subjectivations, the totalizations, the unifications are processes that are produced and emerge in multiplicities. The characteristic principles of multiplicities are concerned with their own elements, that are singularity; with their own relations, that are becoming; with their own events, that are haecceities (that is, individuations without subjects); with their own space-time, that are spare time and spaces; with the model of its realization, which is the rhizome (in opposition to the tree model); with its composition plan, that is constituted by plateaus (continuous zones of intensity); with their vectors that cross them and constitute territories and degrees of "deterritorialization". (Deleuze & Guattari, 2011, pp. 10–11, 34)

Critics of deconstructivism complain that texts which seek to deconstruct are based on prior assumptions themselves and are thus paradoxical towards their own approach. The *writing culture debate* described above addresses this problem from ethnography and has developed in parallel to poststructuralism. Quite often, postcolonial theory is also described as belonging to poststructuralism for its deconstructivist perspectives (Angermüller & Bellina, 2012). Following Urs Stäheli, the common denominator of poststructuralist approaches (Butler, 1990; Bhabha, 2000; Haraway, 1992; Latour, 2017) is the assumption that there are no longer static systems of differences, so that the border itself moves into focus. Both "subversive, political agencies develop as well as the policing of the border takes place"[30] (Stäheli, 2000, pp. 62–63). For Stäheli, everything could be different, and so everything is de-stabilized from the start and only becomes meaningful in its relation with something else, which in turn involves

29 "sondern deren Uneindeutigkeit thematisiert und die kulturellen Prozesse nachzeichnet, welche diese kreuzen" (Reckwitz, 2008b, p. 309).

30 "da hier sowohl subversive politische Handlungsmöglichkeiten entstehen wie auch ein policing, d. h. ein Regulieren der Grenze stattfindet" (Stäheli, 2000, pp. 62–63).

contingent "battles of articulation"[31]. Referring to Judith Butler's term of performativity, Stäheli locates these battles of articulation within the context of the performative turn, which "focuses … on the practical dimension of the generation of cultural meanings and experiences. It seeks to understand the generative and transformative aspects of culture on the basis of events, practices, material embodiments and media forms" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a, p. 73). It is important, in this respect, to observe how differences are enacted or un-done and to understand these actions as practices (see e.g. Hirschauer in this volume; Van Loon, 2019). In poststructuralist theory, differences are "either captured along a 'constituent outside' (be it as the radical Other or as the necessarily discarded), or they are otherwise explained from a process based always on a given diversity of socials"[32] (Stäheli, 2000, p. 67).

Bruno Latour would call these socials not a specific social sphere, but rather a "peculiar movement of re-accumulating and again associating"[33] (Latour, 2017, p. 19). In this conception, the social is understood as fluid and circulating, and the world has to be constantly built "from utterly heterogeneous parts that will never make a whole, but at best a fragile, revisable, and diverse composite material" (Latour, 2010, p. 474). As stated above, most of the study of culture follows a constructivist stance. Latour, along with Michel Callon and John Law (Callon et al., 1986), has also developed the so called Acteur-Network-Theory and can be taken as an example of what is now being called post-constructivism (Gertenbach, 2017). Here, the differentiation between reality and construction should be overcome on the grounds that any construction has always possessed its material execution. Reality is not thought to be constituted discursively but becomes reformulated by bringing into focus the relations and interconnectedness of nature, society, technology, science, and ostensibly any heterogeneous material. Post-constructivism not only seeks to overcome dichotomies but further orientates itself to affects and emotions, senses and spaces (Gertenbach, 2017). Likewise, post-constructivism touches upon poststructuralist deconstruction as well as relating itself to the performative, sensory, material as well as spatial turns, as will be further explained below and in my other contribution in this volume.

In the following, all these different approaches to diversity and otherness will be subsumed under two major perspectives, which Reckwitz pointedly calls the two opposing regimes of culturalisation: hyperculture and cultural essentialism (Reckwitz, 2016). For Reckwitz, these two regimes of culturalisation denote "two opposing views, what culture *means,* and in accordance with it two contrary formats in which

31 "Artikulationskämpfe".

32 "Entweder wird Differenz über ein 'konstitutives Außen' erfasst (sei es als der radikal Andere oder das notwendig Verworfene) oder Differenzen werden aus einem Prozess erklärt, dem eine immer schon gegebene Vielheit des Sozialen zu Grunde liegt" (Stäheli, 2000, p. 67).

33 "eigentümliche Bewegung des Wiederansammelns und erneuten Assoziierens" (Latour, 2017, p. 19).

the cultural sphere is organized"[34] (Reckwitz, 2016, p. 2). The first regime of hyperculture describes the "cultural opening of life forms ... a pluralisation of life styles"[35] (p. 1), in which "diversity" and "cosmopolitanism" are both taken as "leading semantics" (p. 4) of this regime of culturalisation. In opposition, the position of cultural essentialism is presented as a "cultural closure of life forms, in which a new rigid moralisation takes place"[36] (p. 1). This form of culturalisation constructs collectives based on fixed, essentialized identities with a fierce dualism of inclusion and exclusion of morally defended imagined communities.

Gurminder Bhambra, while speaking of diversity in Europe, similarly distinguishes between multiculturalism and cosmopolitanism, in stating that whereas the first often speaks of visible differences within nation states, the latter operates as a more overarching principle which encompasses the differences between nation states (Bhambra, 2019). In this contribution, however, the divide between these two regimes will be considered more openly as intersectional diversity and otherness and cross-cultural diversity and otherness, respectively. It will be shown which premises these two perspectives in the study of culture are based on and discussed whether they can be systemized in this way at all. Following the postcolonial quest of this chapter, as has been explained above, this schematic representation seeks to combine transcultural and postcolonial approaches with approaches to diversity and otherness from the sociology of culture and cultural sociology.

2.2 Intersectional Diversity & Otherness

As stated in the introduction to this chapter, one finds intersectional approaches to diversity and otherness most often in the fields of the sociology of culture. Frequently, the difference between these fields and approaches from cultural sociology are emphasized as lying in the opposition between materialistic versus idealistic perspectives. This means that, in the field of intersectional diversity and otherness, differences are mostly regarded as stemming from social differences and from how these are lived out empirically in manifold life-worlds. In contrast, cultural sociology assigns the meaning-making processes to the human mind. Actions and cultural patterns result from these mentally constructed differences. As always, there are also

34 "zwei konträre Auffassungen darüber, was Kultur überhaupt bedeutet, und dem entsprechend zwei konträre Formate, in denen die Kultursphäre organisiert ist" (Reckwitz, 2016, p. 2).

35 "kulturelle Öffnung der Lebensformen ..., eine Pluralisierung von Lebensstilen" (Reckwitz, 2016, p. 1).

36 "kulturelle Schließung von Lebensformen, in denen eine neue rigide Moralisierung wirksam ist" (Reckwitz, 2016, p. 1).

many approaches which combine these seemingly distinct methodological and epistemological perspectives.

In Weber's sense of the "ideal-type" (Weber, 2005), intersectional approaches therefore look at the differences—or inequalities—as being (materially) produced, and therefore done or undone, by and in (e.g.) incorporated practices. These cultural differences are often thought to be determined by social positions if one considers the wide corpus of academic literature based on Bourdieu's field theory. As such, the sociology of culture looks at the field of cultural production as a field in which there reigns a permanent struggle for social recognition interwoven with economic and organizational power-relations. Quite often, these approaches not only seek to lay open how social inequalities take shape, but also want to counteract these tendencies following set political objectives. Diversity and otherness in this sense are understood as multiple, intersecting social belongings that either include or exclude.

In taking into account (material) productions that are constituted repeatedly in spatial practices of inclusion or exclusion, intersectional diversity and otherness can be related directly to the spatial turn, which is again connected to a "distinct re-materialization" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a, p. 211). For Bachmann-Medick, academic thought has shied away from spatial thinking after WWII, as it was seen to be connected to the "racist blood-and-soil ideology" (p. 212) of Nazism. Therefore, the spatial turn was developed mainly in the 1980s. "As a key feature of globalization, interconnections and cross-linkages have made the spatial perspective inevitable" (p. 213). Deterritorializations, social conflicts, and "unequal global developments rooted in the spatial division of labor" (p. 214) then became major issues in spatial research, while the "social production of space [became regarded] as a complex and often contradictory social process" (p. 214).

Also in postcolonially oriented research, a spatial turn can be detected, which further underlines the political mission which is often connected with it (Soja & Hooper, 1993; Harvey, 1989; Soja, 2010). Eurocentric world-mapping and exclusion based on geographical divisions of center-periphery are heavily criticized (Said, 1995; Appadurai, 1996; Bhabha, 1997). Other approaches, drawing among others on Foucault's concept of *heterotopia* (Foucault, 2006*)* or Bourdieu's production of social space (Bourdieu, 1991), "study the spatial effects of social strata, ethnicity and gender relations from the perspective of their exclusions and inclusions, ... and their capacity to liberate 'other' concealed spaces" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016a, p. 217; Massey, 1994). These developments eventually lead into theories of transnationalisation (Glick-Schiller et al., 1995; Anderson, B., 1986), glocalisation (Robertson, 2003, p. 30) and border studies (Wille, 2016), as well as to migration and mobility studies (Lash & Urry, 1994). Simmel's *Stranger*, for example, is said to represent one of the founding texts for the sociology of migration and can be taken as a social type that is not rooted in a specific locality (Le Grand, 2019). Accordingly, the stranger rather evolves from strangeness in social relationships in which social distance and proximity are

related. Even though Simmel applies a rather problematic schematization, strangeness is depicted as relational and constructed (Saalmann, 2007).

Migration and mobility studies also mainly follow such a constructivist approach (Bojadžijev, 2018; Karakayali, 2016). A "mobility turn" and a "transnational turn" is hence diagnosed with a strong focus on global developments (Johler et al., 2011). As a result, many of these studies follow a global perspective (Go & Krause, 2016), which will be further highlighted in my other chapter in this volume. Yet in fact, there are probably as many macro-theoretical perspectives focusing on exclusionary global practices (Buchholz, 2008) as there are micro-studies devoted to the practices of inclusion and exclusion in everyday life (Anderson, E., 2015).

The overarching principles of these approaches not only lie in their common interest in the practices of inclusion, exclusion and social inequalities, but also their political objective or quest to decolonize unequal power structures. The critique that is often addressed to deconstructed hybrid notions of diversity and otherness, as will be discussed in the next section as only neglecting existing social inequalities, is another common denominator of these theories.

Quite often in this area, practical fields of application are also discussed, for instance in order to reach out to a more inclusive environment (Behrens et al., 2016; Yıldız, 2018) or to use diversity as an advantage in recruiting processes in diversity management. For example, the model of the political scientist Andrew Stirling is used to look at different aspects of diversity when variety, disparity and balance of elements as a whole are measured. For Stirling, variety is defined as the number of elements in the mix, while disparity denotes their degree of differences, and balance means the evenness in the elements' contribution. He uses these models in his analysis of economic diversity and in understanding the way that this can be optimised (Stirling, 2007). Lately, there have also been post- and decolonial approaches in diversity management literature (Jack, 2015; Kaasila-Pakanen, 2015), while previously diversity management was widely criticized in social sciences for only labelling their target-individuals (Bendl et al., 2015; see also Pelillo-Hestermeyer & Cismondo in this volume).

In the following, the first intersectional approaches to *diversity* which are meant to foster *inclusion* will be discussed, followed by a sketch of those intersectional approaches to *otherness* which have been exposed to *exclusionary* practices. Regularly, the same practices can have both inclusionary and exclusionary outcomes at the same time. This is again only a heuristic systematization.

Certain theories of intersectional diversity can be called equality-theoretical, as they are often based on a philosophical argument of the equality of all people or are otherwise focused on political strategies to achieve more equity. In political theory, the struggles surrounding political, social or cultural representation, equal access, identity politics and minority rights, form a vast area of research (Meer & Modood, 2014; Neubert et al., 2013), and are often derived from earlier theories of multiculturalism (Taylor, 1994; Benhabib, 2002).

For example, Charles Taylor's *The Politics of Recognition* (1994) is seen as one of the earliest theories of multiculturalism and is situated in the field of political theory. This influential work covers the Francophone minority in Quebec, Canada and how such minorities fail to be politically recognized. For Taylor, this is a question of identity, which is especially negotiated "through dialogue, partly overt, partly internal, with others" (Taylor, 1994, p. 34). This identity can be formed but also malformed. This is why, for him, it is important to establish a "politics of difference", in which "*everyone* should be recognized for his or her unique identity" (p. 38). This also entails "equal respect to actually evolved cultures" (p. 42). Apart from the problematic equation of one cultural trait in an individual's identity with the "culture" of a whole group, Taylor's approach is assembled on the basis of much of the identity politics which remains prevalent nowadays. For example, as will be stressed in my other contribution in this book, in German cultural policies there are many groups who are still fighting for equal representation in public cultural life, for instance in the fight for equal access to funding resources. The keywords in this field are, among others, participation, representation[37] and access.

Taylor criticizes approaches such as liberalism for having enforced that, even though diversity is becoming more respected, the "politics of equal respect ... is inhospitable to difference, because ... it insists on uniform application of the rules defining these rights" (Taylor, 1994, p. 60). One can see that liberalism is not as neutral as it seems. Instead, in Taylor's conception of multiculturalism, "the equal value of different cultures" (p. 64) should be recognized and fostered by the government, such as through positive discrimination practices like quotas or other affirmative action plans (Cuyler, 2013). However, this implies a rather static conception of culture, where it has to be negotiated which cultures are worthy of protection. Moreover, this politics of difference leads inevitably to other exclusions. This communitarianism, where cultures are seen as entities that should have political rights, and where the diversity of individuals depends on being recognized in a dialogical process, could also lead to a totalitarian equality.

The political philosopher Seyla Benhabib instead argues in favour of taking cultures as hybrid and negotiated in narratives. Even if not all individuals have the opportunity to "exit" (Benhabib, 2006, p. 386) their community which was assigned to them by birth, she sees "the possibility of narrative resignification and re-appropriation" (p. 387). For this view, Benhabib is heavily criticized by the philosopher Nikolas Kompridis, for whom "a culture that is strictly non-identical with itself would be a culture without a past" (Kompridis, 2005, p. 340). In this academic discussion, Reckwitz's and Bhambra's above-mentioned oppositional cultural regimes of hyperculture versus cultural essentialism (Reckwitz, 2016), or cosmopolitanism versus multiculturalism

37 In this context, representation is not understood in line with e.g. Stuart Hall's understanding (Hall, 1997) but rather as political representation of minority groups.

(Bhambra, 2019), come into play. Benhabib and Kompridis both endorse and criticize each other for the other's normative agenda that again shows the political objective I touched upon before. Similarly, both approaches rely on adopting a certain perspective towards differences, as Benhabib writes: "Cultures are formed through binaries because human beings live in an evaluative universe" (Benhabib, 2002, p. 7).

However, the aforementioned critique of cross-cultural diversity expressed by Kompridis as only neglecting differences is also used by followers of the *New Right* (for example in France the *Nouvelle Droite*), in order to serve their argument that the diversity of cultures and people should be maintained without mixing and without hybridization in order not to lose one's own culture or identity. As Taguieff writes: "As a result, this particular version of the 'right to difference' is organized around a 'mixophobic' core: it is 'haunted' by the threat of the destruction of identities through interbreeding—physical and cultural crossbreeding" (Taguieff, 1993, p. 101). So in this and other cases, the celebration of diversity in combination with essentializing cultural differences can even be called the "politics of cultural apartheid" (Wuggenig, 2015) or, in the context of this contribution, "intersectional otherness", i.e. exclusion along multiple discriminatory lines.

Miranda Christon also argues in this direction that difference became a central concept of postmodernity that has been colonized by the Far Right[38] (Christon, 2019). Referring to Jean-François Lyotard's argument that "postmodern knowledge ... refines our sensitivity to differences and reinforces our ability to tolerate the incommensurable" (Lyotard, 1984, p. xxv), Christon states that this same argument leads to new racisms. As such, "theorists of difference have not indicated where the line is to be drawn between forms of difference which foster democracy [intersectional diversity; inclusion] and forms of difference which reflect anti-democratic aspirations [intersectional otherness; exclusion]" (Benhabib, 1994, p. 3).

Several other terms and concepts belong to this discourse, such as "creolization" (Hannerz, 1992; Müller & Ueckmann, 2013), "diaspora" (Clifford, 2006) or "super-diversity" (Vertovec, 2007; Arnaut, 2012; Johler et al., 2011). Creolization is defined by Ulf Hannerz, for example, as "a combination of diversity, interconnectedness, and innovation in the context of global-center periphery relationships" (1992, p. 67). For Steven Vertovec, super-diversity as a demographic and social pattern means:

> a notion intended to underline a level and kind of complexity surpassing anything the country [Britain] has previously experienced. Such a condition is distinguished by a dynamic interplay of variables among an increased number of new, small and scattered, multiple-origin, transnationally connected, socio-economically differentiated and legally stratified by immigrants who have arrived over the last decade. (2007, p. 1024)

38 In German, the anthology *Großerzählungen des Extremen. Neue Rechte, Populismus, Islamismus, War on Terror* [Great Narratives of the Extreme. New Right, Populism, Islamism, War on Terror] offers more insights on the matter (Schellhöh et al., 2018).

Vertovec looks not only at these "configurations of diversity" and how they have diversified in the last decades, but also takes into account "representations of diversity", by which he means "how diversity is imagined ... in images, representations, symbols and meanings", such as in multiculturalism (Vertovec, 2009, p. 14). For him, multiculturalism has only taken on another name in politics: diversity (p. 16). Vertovec finally also covers the area of "how diversities are actually experienced or encountered" (p. 23). In all three areas he sees super-diversity taking shape.

Karel Arnaut takes Vertovec's concept of super-diversity to amount to a critical socio-linguistic study. With this in mind, Arnaut uses super-diversity as a "lens for looking at diversity as discourse and social practice" (Arnaut, 2012, p. 1) in a transnational approach. This entails "taking into account the fluidity and intricacies of the new diversity in times of heightened mobility and transnational communication" (p. 3). He criticizes the established hegemonic diversity discourse (p. 3) and rather pleads for a postcolonial approach of socio-linguistics, which constitutes, following Makoni and Pennycook, "the dis-inventing and reconstituting of languages both in the ex-metropoles and their former colonies" (p. 11), in order to decolonize both the human and social sciences. As we can see, there are similar quests for a post- and decolonial approach as the one which this contribution follows in other disciplinary areas in the study of culture, diversity and otherness.

Steven Vertovec is also the editor of the *Routledge International Handbook of Diversity Studies* (2015),[39] that offers a wide range of approaches related to diversity, mainly understanding the term as denoting "social difference" (Vertovec, 2015, p. 1). The handbook not only intends to reflect upon both public and academic uses of the term "diversity", offering a vast field of descriptive analysis of "intersectionality, multiplicity and boundary-crossing dynamics of social categories" (p. 9) across different societies, but it also calls into question the neglect "of including historical and non-Western contexts" (p. 10) in mainstream diversity studies. This also applies to the postcolonial approach of this chapter.

Similarly to what is called intersectional diversity and otherness by this study, Vertovec suggests that "diversity studies should entail ... studies of diversity as *modes of social differentiation* ... (and) of diversity as *complex social environments*" (p. 10). Equally, his topics of interest are laid out in the same field which is looked at in my undertaking: categorizations, social inequality, in-group/out-group, self-ascription and ascription by others, group and category, symbolic and social boundaries, identity and (last but not least) intersectionality (pp. 12–13). It would go beyond the scope of this chapter to discuss all these different approaches, but what is important to stress at this point is the focus on mechanisms of stratification.

39 In the German-speaking context there is a similar handbook on *Diversity Studies* (Krell et al., 2007) which focuses on discourses and practices of diversity from different disciplines, such as education, anthropology, medicine, politics, law and marketing/management.

The German Sociological Association's[40] 2012 biennial conference was held under the title *Diversity and Cohesion*[41]. As stated in the conference proceedings, diversity in this context is understood as "the growing amount of orientating options, self-ascriptions and external ascriptions as well as social conditions and life-styles. ... Many differentiations intersect and overlap with each other in daily life"[42] (Löw, 2014, p. 1). The contributions encompass, among others, topics such as ethnic diversity, social inequality, diversity of private life forms, new forms of cohesion, and theoretical approaches such as intersectionality or stratification. As we can see again, these include many of the same topics that have been touched upon in this contribution. In addition, many approaches call for the overcoming of "methodological nationalisms" (Beck & Grande, 2010, p. 189) which are still often prevalent in sociological research, especially when devoted to issues of diversity. The combination of two topics, of "horizontal dimensions of social differentiation" and of "vertical social inequalities" (Liebsch et al., 2014, p. 841), brings us to the field of intersectionality studies. This again is, of course, the eponym of my categories of intersectional diversity and otherness. In this case, when social inequalities are discussed in relation to issues of discrimination and exclusion rather than equal representation and inclusion, we have come to what I understand as intersectional *otherness*.

Thus, this viewpoint from which to look at many overlapping and intersecting social identities, combined by individuals such as "race", gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation and so on, can be described as intersectionality studies. In the earlier days of intersectionality studies, the three intersecting categories *race, gender, class* were often looked at; many other categories were included in intersectional research thereafter. These studies highlight how social inequalities and multiple discrimination processes develop and take effect (Winker & Degele, 2009).[43] First incorporated into the academic debate by Kimberlé Crenshaw, a Black feminist legal academic (Crenshaw, 1989, pp. 139–167), the term became rapidly more used in other academic fields as well. Gabriele Winker and Nina Degele, for instance, define intersectionality as "the interweaving of categories of inequality ... as the interplay of inequality-causing social structures that are context-specific, object-oriented and derived from social practices"[44] (Winker & Degele, 2009, p. 15). These two authors have conducted

40 "Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie DGS".

41 "Vielfalt und Zusammenhalt".

42 "die wachsende Zahl an Orientierungsangeboten, Selbst- und Fremdzuschreibungen sowie an sozialen Lagen und Lebensstilen. ... Viele Differenzierungen überkreuzen und überlagern sich im Alltag" (Löw, 2014, p. 1).

43 Other studies from this field include (among others): Lorde, 1996; Alexander-Floyd, 2012; Bilge, 2013; Collins, 2000; McCall, 2005; Puar, 2012.

44 "als Verwobenheit von Ungleichheitskategorien ... als kontextspezifische, gegenstandsbezogene und an sozialen Praxen ansetzende Wechselwirkungen ungleichheitsgenerierender sozialer Strukturen" (Winker & Degele, 2009, p. 15).

a structural analysis of these mentioned categories of social inequalities, proceeding from the assumption of a "capitalistic structured society based on the fundamental dynamics of economic profit maximization"[45] (p. 25). By analysing the four structural categories of *class*, *gender*, *race*, and *body*, their interplay and elated power relations, Winker and Degele lay open multiple discriminations, symbolic representations and identity constructions.

To locate the categories of *gender* and *race* within the context of *class* and the capitalistic world-system is another line of research by which to critique global capitalism that can again be related to the sociology of culture and intersectional otherness. Here, the (again) very vast academic corpus of scholarly literature, which is based on the theories of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels (*The Capital*, 1872), Max Weber (*The Spirit of Capitalism*, 2016), Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello (*The New Spirit of Capitalism*, 2003), Richard Sennett (*The Corrosion of Character*, 1999) or Uwe Bröckling (*The Entrepreneurial Self*, 2015), is challenged by postcolonial (Mbembe, 2001; Bhambra, 2007), decolonial (Groys, 2008; Dussel, 2009; Nederveen Pieterse & Parekh, 1995; Escobar, 2004) and global perspectives (Sassen, 2015; Robinson, 2004; Stiglitz, 2002). Of course there are also numerous other authors devoted to different aspects of social inequality and social stratification (Solga et al., 2009; Weiß, 2017) that go beyond the scope of this chapter.

In the context of this contribution, it is especially Pierre Bourdieu's theory (Bourdieu, 2010) that is relevant to matters of intersectional otherness. Bourdieu explains how the different positions of actors in a shared social space are determined by the combination of the different forms of capital which are incorporated in a specific habitus; this he defines as economic, social, and cultural/symbolic capital. For Bourdieu's counterpart Bernard Lahire, the concept of habitus does not take into account the singular manifold ways of dispositions which individuals can make use of (Lahire, 1995; 2005). Despite all their academic disputes, both these theorists discuss how the diversity and otherness of people depend on unequal social structures, individual dispositions, struggles for recognition, and related factors.

bell hooks can be taken as another example of a theorist of intersectional otherness with her *Ain't I a Woman* (1995). hooks discusses especially how certain white feminist women are racist and complicit of white patriarchy based on colonialism. Thus, she is another theorist who brings together various issues of diversity and otherness from an intersectional, anti-racist, and postcolonial point of view. A similar position is adopted by Sara Ahmed in discussing, for example, the connection between colonialism and the fetish for the stranger (2000), the socio-cultural heritage of whiteness (2007), and how in organizations the topic of diversity has become

45 "kapitalistisch strukturierte Gesellschaft mit der grundlegenden Dynamik ökonomischer Profitmaximierung" (Winker & Degele, 2009, p. 25).

the focus, while at the same time an "institutional wall" conceals still ongoing acts of discrimination (2012).

There are again many more authors devoted to these views from different disciplines in the study of culture, including cultural studies (Hall, 2017), critical whiteness (Anderson, E., 2015) and "race" studies (Thompson, 2015), anti-racism (Espahangizi et al., 2016), or social sciences. Some have coined the term "postmigrant" to convey an "analytical perspective that grapples with the conflicts, processes of identity construction, social and political transformations which start after migration ... has taken place"[46] (Foroutan, 2019, p. 232).

All these different intersectional approaches are mainly based on a difference-theoretical perspective. The difference-oriented paradigm of approaches of intersectional diversity and otherness sees differences as contributing to social inequality and thus does not aim primarily at the deconstruction of differences, but rather the unveiling of dichotomies which (continue to) serve unequal power structures. However, as discussed above, in cultural theory drawn from the poststructuralist philosopher Jaques Derrida, difference does not connote a substance but functions rather as a descriptive category for the cognitive uncertainty that often comes into play while theorizing social and cultural complexity. As such an analytic instrument, difference can serve the concept of deconstruction which was also developed by Derrida. The difference-oriented paradigm is further destabilized in the 1980s, mainly through postcolonial approaches, to become a hybridization paradigm, which will be discussed in the next section.

2.3 Cross-Cultural Diversity & Otherness

The perspective, which I call *cross-cultural diversity and otherness*, focuses on processes of interweaving and interconnectedness in the sense-making processes of humankind. Approaches to cross-cultural diversity and otherness can be rooted especially in interpretative approaches to the study of culture, such as in cultural sociology or cultural and social anthropology, and are thus linked to the interpretative turn and also to the reflexive and postcolonial turns. In addition, the translational turn is related to this field, as Bachmann-Medick writes:

> There has been an ongoing effort in the study of culture to explore new methodological approaches to the "in-between spaces" that transcend dichotomous demarcations and binary epistemological attitudes. It is in the category of translation that these approaches have an empirical

46 "eine Analyseperspektive, die sich mit den Konflikten, Identitätsbildungsprozessen, sozialen und politischen Transformationen auseinandersetzt, die nach erfolgter Migration ... einsetzen" (Foroutan, 2019, p. 232). See also Canan & Foroutan, 2016.

> basis. ... The translation perspective reveals concrete structures of difference ... not only between cultures but within cultures and across cultural boundaries. (2016a, pp. 26, 184)

Most approaches follow deconstructivist notions of diversity and otherness, whereas the constructivist paradigm is acknowledged in all of these theories, which use terms such as hybridity, transculturality, or creolization. What is at stake in the context of this contribution is not only the focus on differences, such as the last section's discussion on *intersectional diversity*, but rather on how they can be de-stabilized. So transculturality, along with terms such as hybridity, relies on the assumption that the great narratives of modernity have been deconstructed, and that the post-modern pluralism of discourses does not suffice to describe the complex social and cultural processes in today's postmigrant societies either. Rather, the implementation of border-crossing concepts is favoured. Each of these terms and concepts carries its own connotations, but on different levels they all concentrate on the hybridization of cultures, the blurring of cultural borders, and life in spaces of (post-)migrancy in times of globalization. Culture is no longer regarded as static and definable. On the contrary, dynamic aspects of culture stand at the forefront when pluralistic and ambivalent identities are recognized. In this contribution, this field of hybrid cultural concepts is subsumed under the terms *cross-cultural diversity* and *otherness*. As stated above, a postcolonially oriented perspective on cross-cultural diversity and otherness thereby centers on what Mbembe calls the postcolony, defined as "the experience of a period that is far from being uniform ..., but in which instants, moments, and events are, as it were, on top of one another, inside one another. ... [T]he postcolony is a period of embedding" (Mbembe, 2001, p. 242).

Similarly, with his concept of the *Black Atlantic*, Paul Gilroy refers to transcultural and transnational formations of identities and ideas that contribute to the destruction of nationalistic paradigms of thought on cultural history (Gilroy, 1993). Creolization, métissage, and hybridity are inevitable occurrences and necessarily result from the mixing of ideas and the instability and variability of identities; they thereby stand against cultural absolutism. Gilroy sees identities as always unfinished and always constructed anew. The idea of the *Black Atlantic* is of a cultural and political system which spans the whole Atlantic, seen as an entity for historical analysis from a transcultural perspective. The boats, the sailors and the passage over the Atlantic stand in the *Black Atlantic* for an "in-between". Accordingly, the *Black Atlantic* goes beyond simple binaries of "nation versus diaspora" by consideration of the Atlantic as a network of the local and the global. Gilroy gives examples of contemporary music and films that can establish counter-cultures to modernity from a transnational perspective.

The co-founder of British cultural studies, Stuart Hall, also seeks to dissolve binary social identificatory processes and rejects dichotomous ascriptions (Hall, 1994). Through globalization, he contends, the individual becomes more and more dislocated. Even though Hall acknowledges the importance of history, language and

culture for the construction of identity, he points out that representation and discourses can only take place within a specific framework. Mechanisms of representation have epistemic power over the "Other". These narratives should not merely be reversed; instead, they should counteract the binary system of representation through the recognition of diversity and new creative expressions. Identity from this perspective becomes a processual hybrid production, a crossing-point where new cultural expressions and theoretical discourses develop.

This view on the construction of identity can also be found in postcolonial positions taken by Iain Chambers and Homi K. Bhabha. Following Iain Chambers, the former dichotomous model of center and periphery is deemed to be untenable in today's globalized complexity and cultural diversity. The "other" can no longer be pushed off to the periphery, but "this other embodies … the disturbing questioning, the alienation, we all carry inside" (Chambers, 1996, p. 8). As a result, "[t]his also means of course to understand the other being not as something that can comfortably be transferred somewhere else, but that is always there" (p. 26).

Likewise, migration does not have a fixed starting or ending point, but is instead a permanent process. Surprising turns, border-crossings and cultural complexities should be allowed to take place:

> The impossible mission that seeks to preserve the singularity of a culture must paradoxically negate its fundamental element: its historical dynamic. Post-colonialism is perhaps the sign of an increasing awareness that it is not feasible to subtract a culture, a history, a language, an identity from the wider, transforming currents of the increasingly metropolitan world. It is impossible to "go home" again. (Chambers, 1996, p. 89)

Chambers describes this "homelessness" by depicting musical forms which decenter structures of center and periphery through the random combination of different musical styles. Musical meaning should always be contextualized and the existence of "authenticity" negated. It is impossible "to attach the meaning of such [musical] differences to any of those places" (p. 98). Hence, Chambers does not intend to establish a counter-discourse to the dominant one, but instead to demonstrate how a contingent, decentralized space with ever-changing meanings develops through, for example, the duplication of meanings and symbols.

This approach to going beyond the binaries, as depicted by Said, can also be found in Homi K. Bhabha's figure of the "third space". The "third space" is a no-space, a space of hybridity, where the subject constructs itself as a "neither-nor" between the space of the subjective home and historical space. The subject thereby disappoints all expectations by going beyond simple binaries.

Hybridity is often falsely equated with diversity. For Bhabha, hybridity is not the same concept as hybrid cultural diversity, which he also clearly differentiates from cultural difference, as in the following:

> Cultural diversity is an epistemological object … whereas cultural difference is the process of the enunciation of culture as "knowledgeable", authoritative, adequate to the construction of systems of cultural identification. If cultural diversity is a category of comparative ethics, aesthetics, or ethnology, cultural difference is a process of signification through which statements of culture or on culture differentiate, discriminate, and authorize the production of fields of force, reference, applicability, and capacity. (Bhabha, 2006, p. 155)

In this quotation, Bhabha both relies on the difference-oriented and on the interpretative approach to culture. Meanings are assigned in order to "do differences" (see Hirschauer in this volume). Bhabha's definition of diversity, however, can also be assigned to an intersectional approach.[47] Yet what is more instructive at this point to offering a possible understanding of the here-discussed concepts of *cross-cultural diversity* and *otherness* is Bhabha's concept of "hybridity" and how this hybridity describes a "third space".

This is because Bhabha does not see hybridity as the mixing of culturally "pure" elements; instead he describes it precisely as those in-between spaces from which power relations can be challenged. In this "third space", ascribed identities are dissolved, since they lose their national and cultural determinations. Meanings and references are not given *a priori*. Borders are blurred; one has to re-think and question established categories of culture and identity.

In such a space, to produce meaning and construct cultural difference, the ambivalent and contradictory "third space", where meaning loses its clarity, has to be crossed. The "third space" therein constitutes:

> though unrepresentable in itself … the discursive conditions of enunciation that ensure that the meaning and symbols of culture have no primordial unity or fixity; that even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, re-historicized and read anew. (Bhabha, 1997, p. 37)

To demonstrate this ambiguity, Bhabha describes how the hybridity of ideas is revealed through repetition in different contexts. In postcolonial discourse, these possibilities for "cultural reconfiguration" (Bronfen et al., 1997, p. 8) are displayed as strategies to re-think identity and otherness, not as a dichotomous opposition but as interwoven and as a permeation of centre and periphery. This strategy of resistance can involve practices both subversively through the uncovering of power hierarchies and affirmatively, for example by the reinterpretation of dominant symbols. The latter process Bhabha calls "mimicry". "In this repetition and at the same time distortion of dominant discourses a subversive difference develops in which the hegemonic references and meanings are reinterpreted, contaminated, hybridized" (Ha, 2005, p. 87).

For Bhabha, mimicry does not mean a return of the dominant discourse as a counter-discourse, but rather: "mimicry is repeating instead of re-presenting" (2000, pp. 129–130). Mimicry can be threatening to the dominant, as it constitutes the process

47 See above the section on intersectional diversity & otherness.

of what is expressed "between the lines". Mbembe pointedly summarizes these deconstructivist features of postcolonial thinking, in asserting that they "stress the fact that identity arises from multiplicity and dispersion, that self-referral is only possible in the in-between, in the gap between the mark and demark, in co-constitution" (Mbembe, 2008, p. 4).

A postcolonial and poststructuralist view in cultural sociology calls, therefore, for the reinterpretation of ascribed identities. An analysis in this case will be motivated by the guiding principle:

> that the cultural representation of the other as well as of the "own" identity are characterized in colonial discourse and beyond by a fundamental ambiguity. The task of postcolonial analysis is therefore to lay open these polysemous conditions of representation.[48] (Reckwitz, 2008a, pp. 99–100)

This unfixability of cultural symbols can also be regarded as one of the major advantages of the term "transculturality" or "transculturalization" (Sandkühler & Lim, 2004; Hoerder et al., 2005; Ha, 2010; Hühn et al., 2010). In this connection, the Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz already used the term "*transculturación*" in his book *Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y el azúcar* in the 1940s. Ortiz was describing the movement of one culture into another without influencing each other [*mestizaje*]. In Spanish-speaking countries, the term "transculturality" was introduced in the 1960s to denote the linguistic processes of hybridization. Later, the cultural theorist Ángel Rama from Uruguay introduced the term into the theories of modernity and dependency in literary analysis in Latin America. Rama still thought of a Latin American culture as homogeneous. Next, in the mid-1970s, the Peruvian literary scholar Antonio Cornejo Polar (1994) developed a cultural theory of heterogeneity in literary terms that focuses on "migrating subjects". "This [migrating] subject creates different spaces or communication contexts for its internalized cultural conditions from different cultures" (Schmidt-Welle, 2006, p. 90). Influenced by postcolonial theory, many approaches were subsequently developed, such as Néstor García Canclini's focus on the non-essentialist concepts of identity and culture, together with heterogeneous, hybrid societies and the spaces between them (2013).

In Anglo-Saxon countries, the reception of the term "transculturality" increased in the 1980s, for example through the writings of the anthropologist Alexander A. Ervin (1980) and the literary scholar Mary Louise Pratt (1992). Also since the 1980s in the humanities, more and more theoretical models of hybridity have been developed in an attempt to theoretically grasp the unobservable. Graham Huggan observes that

---

48 "Der Leitgedanke [motiviert], dass die kulturelle Repräsentation des Anderen wie auch umgekehrt der 'eigenen' Identität in kolonialen Diskursen und darüber hinaus durch eine grundsätzliche Mehrdeutigkeit geprägt sind. Das Ziel der postkolonialen Analyse muss entsprechend darin bestehen, diese polysemen Repräsentationsverhältnisse aufzudecken" (Reckwitz, 2008a, pp. 99–100).

postcolonial studies especially started this "transcultural turn", where cultures are no longer regarded as definable entities and the focus is placed instead on transcultural formations (Huggan, 2006).

As the prefix *trans* suggests, what is at stake is a matter of a metaphorical approach to transitions, interlinking, in-between spaces and going beyond. Accordingly, a "more fluid and transient paradigm of relations between societies" is favoured and the "idea of the nation … is contextualized between the local and the global" (Bond & Rapson, 2014, p. 9). For Jutta Ernst and Florian Freitag, two different notions of the term can be distinguished following Affef Benessaieh's notion of "cross-cultural competence" (Benessaieh, 2010, pp. 23–38), which denotes practices that are located beyond certain cultures, and a "plural sense of self" (ibid), which can especially be described as multiple-relational networks that transcend these cultures (Ernst & Freitag, 2015, p. 13). Applied to this contribution, the first notion has been delineated in this paragraph, whereas the latter was discussed in the section above on intersectional diversity and otherness.

The transcultural turn was not bound to anthropology or philosophy, but rather spread across a variety of disciplines concerned with the study of culture, being linked to related terms such as literary studies (*creolization; métissage*; Glissant, 1997; Ette, 2001; Febel, 2007; Müller & Ueckmann, 2013), memory studies (Bond & Rapson, 2014; Erll & Nünning, 2008; Tota & Hagen, 2015), gender studies (Butler, 1990; see Höhne in this volume), performance studies (*interweaving performance cultures*; Fischer-Lichte et al., 2014; see Oettl in this volume), media studies (see Pelillo-Hestermeyer in this volume; Hepp, 2015), music studies (Binas-Preisendörfer & Unseld, 2012; Freist et al., 2019), migration, diaspora, transnational and mobility studies (Glick-Schiller et al., 1995; Anderson, B., 1986; Charim & Borea, 2014), border and space studies (Do Mar Castro Varela, 2018; Bleuler & Moser, 2018; Wille, 2016; Kimmich & Schahadat, 2014), and translation studies (*untranslatability*; Bachtin, 1990; Apter, 2013). Since it is so extremely varied in its approaches, terms and concepts, the *transcultural* in these studies allow for the: "conceptual capture of phenomena that are in a process of becoming and that are composed from opposed structures, logics, dynamics and functionalities. "Trans" therefore does not refer to closed ideas of identity but rather includes fluid border demarcations"[49] (Rau et al., 2016, p. 7).

In the 1990s, transculturality was introduced into the humanities in German-speaking countries by the philosopher Wolfgang Welsch (Kalscheuer, 2005, pp. 221–223). Welsch defines transculturality as the separation of cultural and national or ethnic identities. In particular, transculturality describes cultural diversity as

49 "die konzeptuelle Erfassung von Phänomenen, die sich in einem Prozess des Werdens befinden und aus entgegengesetzten Strukturen, Logiken, Dynamiken und Funktionsweisen bestehen. 'Trans' verweist folglich nicht auf geschlossene Identitätsvorstellungen, sondern enthält fluide Grenzverläufe" (Rau et al., 2016, p. 7).

interwoven, border-crossing and blending, in opposition to many single entities existing next to each other. It opposes essentialization and exoticization. Welsch also wants to move beyond the idea of individual homogeneous cultures and dissolve territorial metaphors. If we are to reflect on the networked structures of culture, this approach requires interconnected instead of linear thinking. Moreover, Welsch uses the term in opposition to mechanisms of homogenization and separation. Yet in his approach, it appears as if cultures were traditionally homogeneous (or still are in the *non-West*) and only today are hybridized. He does not differentiate in his discussion between transculturality in the humanities and the concept of the *development* of cultures. Nevertheless, transculturality for Welsch does not mean the side-by-side mixing of cultural elements, but instead, as there is no *Other*, describes transcultural networks of identity which can form everywhere from a processual perspective. "The dividing line between one's own and another culture is obsolete. Within a culture there are as many othernesses as in its external relations to other cultures" (Welsch, 2005, p. 325). It is important to keep in mind that this perspective regards the idea of transculturality as a symbolic one.[50] There are no real connections to transcultural practices; these are merely assumed.[51]

However, Stephanie Lavorano points out how Welsch's concept of transculturality indeed adheres to the racist ideology of Immanuel Kant by imposing a "thinking pattern of the West as 'naturalized diversity'", in which "contemporary" is taken to denote modern, *Western* societies as are thought to be pluralized in opposition to a contrary image to the *West*[52] (Lavorano, 2016, p. 151). The transcultural logic constructs the borders on the first hand, which again—although blurred—stabilize the borders and the "perspective on difference that always stems from the 'West'"[53] (p. 153).

On the one hand, Welsch's transcultural approach can lay open predetermined thinking patterns in order to demonstrate how such a perspective can reveal an alternative view in the humanities, both in theory and in empirical research. But on the other hand, *transculturality* in itself can be seen as a hegemonic Eurocentric concept, which comprises a normative perspective in the manner in which Welsch conceives the term. Thus, the limits of Welsch's concept have to be taken into account. Furthermore, the utopian claims that are often connected to such concepts have to be critically considered. In contrast, by focussing on a case study from the global art worlds, the conflictual articulations of *transculturality* will also be stressed in my

50 For a critical comparism of Welsch's term transculturality and Vertovec's term super-diversity see Knecht, 2011 or Koch, 2011.

51 In my other contribution I will come back to transcultural practices though.

52 "die rassistische Ideologie Kants und das Transkulturalitätskonzept Welschs treffen sich in einer Denkfigur des Westens als 'naturalisierte Diversität'" (Lavorano, 2016, p. 151).

53 "die stets vom 'Westen' ausgehende Perspektivierung dieser Differenz wird zementiert" (Lavorano, 2016, p. 153).

other contribution in this volume. In this discussion, in addition to the theoretical and methodological implications of the concept, the "lived" practices of diversity and otherness in transcultural life-worlds will be sketched more fully.

As some parts of Welsch's theory have to be viewed critically, I would extend Welsch's understanding of transculturality to the poststructuralist and postcolonial approaches described above. This focus on individual ambivalent and contingent identities would allow practices of diversity and otherness to be studied from a transcultural perspective. Based on empirical studies, I have shown, for example, that the identities of young people in Germany do not correspond to the identities ascribed to them in concepts of music education (Gaupp, 2016). There I demonstrated that there are no permanent identity-constructions bound to a "particular community" (Reckwitz, 2016). On the other hand, in the musical life-worlds of the young people researched in this study, one finds both a rejection as well as an overcoming of the identities ascribed to them. The social spaces evolving in this process can be conceptualized as Bhabha's "third space" (Gaupp, 2016). Connected to this are subversive ideas facing social inequalities, as discussed above. The crossing of borders will always involve the border itself and thus comprise not only inclusion but also exclusion. Trans-theories which conceptualize the transcendence of borders and limits will "encounter the limits of transcending"[54] (Rau et al., 2016, p. 16). Yet all trans-formations could be described as the "small sibling of deconstruction", when former problematic terms and concepts are deconstructed by adding the prefix "trans" in order to point out their problematic functions (Kimmich, 2016, p. 266).

2.4 Conclusion

To sum up, this discussion explored the epistemologies of diversity and otherness in the study of culture, mainly in cultural sociology and the sociology of culture. Their underlying premise is based on the conception and theorizing of differences, irrespective of whether differences are stabilized or deconstructed. At first, the epistemologies of diversity and otherness were situated in the vast field of the study of culture, the major "turns" in this field, and especially the context of postcolonial theory. It was shown how constructivism is, and has been, one of the major standardizations in these studies. Numerous other approaches to the question of what it means to develop, normalize, deconstruct or decolonize certain epistemes of diversity and otherness were also sketched. Four main epistemological assumptions were explored, among them the constructivist orientation just mentioned, as well as the deconstructivist, equality-theoretical and difference-theoretical perspectives.

54 "Theorien der Überschreitung stoßen an die Grenzen der Überschreitung" (Rau et al., 2016, p. 16).

Many of the studies presented can be grouped under two major understandings of diversity and otherness: as intersectional or as cross-cultural. While intersectional *diversity* describes mainly intersecting social belongings that include, in intersectional *otherness* differences are rather emphasized to exclude. Here, influential streams of social scientific thought, such as multiculturalism, intersectionality and social inequality, were discussed and mirrored with lesser-known concepts from, among other fields, postcolonial theory. This concept of diversity and otherness can be especially related to the sociology of culture that looks at how differences and inequalities materialize or become incorporated in cultural production.

In contrast, cross-cultural diversity and otherness are conceptualized as symbols of interconnectedness and border-crossings, and can therefore be assigned to cultural sociology. Cross-cultural *diversity* connotes ambiguous cultural symbols, whereas cross-cultural *otherness* involves the movement of de-stabilizing difference. Again, major theoretical concepts were discussed along with lesser-known approaches, mainly from the disciplinary fields of cultural studies, philosophy and, again, postcolonial studies.

It was argued that parallel assumptions regarding differences are made in both postcolonial and poststructuralist approaches. This leads to the call to "transculturalize" the study of culture regarding diversity and otherness. This means that the two main quests of postcolonial theory should be taken into account as an underlying principle for research, since diversity and otherness are such underlying features of today's societies. Hence, cultural research on diversity and otherness should be oriented along the many examples discussed that seek to decolonize power structures by, for example, un-veiling them. Equal importance should be paid to the deconstruction of persistent dichotomies in thinking. To this end, this chapter has tried to make a contribution to critically rethinking the categories of diversity and otherness and to include alternative perspectives and standpoints no matter whether in studies from a more idealistic or more materialistic perspective, or from a combination of both of these. Eventually this could help to "rethink a Europe Otherwise" (Boatcă, 2010).

References

Abu-Er-Rub, L., Brosius, C., & Meurer, S. (Eds.). (2019). Engaging with. Engaging transculturality: Concepts, key terms, case studies. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Ahmed, S. (2000). Strange encounters: Embodied others in post-coloniality. Transformations Thinking through feminism. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. https://www.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy0649/00028076-d.html

Ahmed, S. (2007). Queer phenomenology: Orientations, objects, others (2. printing). Duke University Press.

Ahmed, S. (2012). On being included: Racism and diversity in institutional life. e-Duke books scholarly collection. Duke University Press. http://lib.myilibrary.com?id=366424

Alatas, S. F. (2017). Max Weber (1864–1920). In S. F. Alatas & V. Sinha (Eds.), Sociological Theory Beyond the Canon (1st ed., pp. 113–142). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Alatas, S. F., & Sinha, V. (Eds.). (2017). Sociological Theory Beyond the Canon (1st edition 2017). Palgrave Macmillan UK.

Albrecht, C., & Moebius, S. (2014). Die Rückkehr der Kultur in die Soziologie: Zur Gründungsgeschichte einer Sektion. In S. Moebius & C. Albrecht (Eds.), Kultur-Soziologie (pp. 9–22). Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.

Alexander-Floyd, N. G. (2012). Disappearing acts: Reclaiming intersectionality in the social sciences in a post-black feminist era. Feminist Formations, 24(1), 1–25.

Alexander, J. C. (1996). Cultural Sociology or Sociology of Culture? Newsletter of the Sociology of Culture, Section of the American Sociological Association, 10(3–4), 1–5.

Alexander, J. C. (2004). Kultursoziologie oder Soziologie der Kultur? Auf dem Weg zu einem überzeugenden Programm. In C. Albrecht (Ed.), Kultur, Geschichte, Theorie: Vol. 1. Die bürgerliche Kultur und ihre Avantgarden (pp. 59–63). Ergon-Verl.

Allolio-Näcke, L., Kalscheuer, B., & Manzeschke, A. (Eds.). (2005). Differenzen anders denken: Bausteine zu einer Kulturtheorie der Transdifferenz. Campus-Verlag. https://d-nb.info/971011648/04

Anderson, B. (1986). Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism. Thetford Pr. Lim.

Anderson, E. (2015). "The White Space". Sociology of Race and Ethnicity, 1(1), 10–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/2332649214561306

Angermüller, J., & Bellina, L. (2012). Poststrukturalismus und Postkolonialismus: Jacques Derridas "Grammatologie" sowie Gilles Deleuzes und Félix Guattaris "Tausend Plateaus". In J. Reuter & A. Karentzos (Eds.), Schlüsselwerke der Postcolonial Studies (pp. 27–37). Springer VS.

Appadurai, A. (1996). Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization ([ACLS Humanities E-Book edition]). University of Minnesota Press. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.06472.0001.001

Apter, E. S. (2013). Against world literature: On the politics of untranslatability. Verso.

Arnaut, K. (2012). Super-diversity: Elements of an emerging perspective. DIVERSITIES, 14(2), 1–16.

Assmann, A. (2016). Die Grenzenlosigkeit der Kulturwissenschaften. Kulturwissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, 1(1), 39–48. https://doi.org/10.1515/kwg-2016-0005

Bachmann-Medick, D. (2016a). Cultural turns: New orientations in the study of culture (A. Blauhut, Trans.). De Gruyter textbook. De Gruyter. https://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110402988

Bachmann-Medick, D. (2016b). Kulturwissenschaft in der Ermüdung? Anmerkungen zu einer Neuorientierung. Kulturwissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, 1(1), 49–55. https://doi.org/10.1515/kwg-2016-0006

Bachtin, M. (1990). Literatur und Karneval: Zur Romantheorie und Lachkultur. Fischer-Taschenbuch-Verl.

Beck, U., & Grande, E. (2010). Jenseits des methodologischen Nationalismus: Außereuropäische und europäische Variationen der Zweiten Moderne. Soziale Welt 61(3–4), 187–216. https://www.soziale-welt.nomos.de/fileadmin/soziale-welt/doc/Aufsatz_SozWelt_10_3-4.pdf

Behrens, M., Bukow, W. D., Cudak, K., & Strünck, C. (Eds.). (2016). Inclusive City: Überlegungen zum gegenwärtigen Verhältnis von Mobilität und Diversität in der Stadtgesellschaft. Springer VS. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-09539-0 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-09539-0

Bendl, R., Bleijenbergh, I., Henttonen, E., & Mills, A. J. (Eds.). (2015). Oxford handbooks. The Oxford handbook of diversity in organizations (First edition). Oxford University Press.

Benessaieh, A. (2010). Multiculturalism, Interculturality, Transculturality. In A. Benessaieh (Ed.), Amériques transculturelles - Transcultural Americas (pp. 23–38). University of Ottawa Press / Les Presses de l'Université d'Ottawa.

Benhabib, S. (1994). Democracy and Difference: Reflections on the Metapolitics of Lyotard and Derrida. Princeton Univ. Press.

Benhabib, S. (2002). The claims of culture: Equality and diversity in the global era. Princeton Univ. Press. http://www.loc.gov/catdir/description/prin021/2001058083.html

Benhabib, S. (2006). The "claims" of culture properly interpreted: Response to Nikolas Kompridis. Political Theory, 34(3), 383–388. https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591706286779

Bhabha, H. K. (1997). The location of culture (Repr). Routledge.

Bhabha, H. K. (2000). Die Verortung der Kultur. Stauffenburg Discussion: Bd. 5. Stauffenburg-Verl.

Bhabha, H. K. (2005). Die Frage der Identität: Frantz Fanon und das postkoloniale Privileg. In L. Allolio-Näcke, B. Kalscheuer, & A. Manzeschke (Eds.), Differenzen anders denken: Bausteine zu einer Kulturtheorie der Transdifferenz (pp. 361–395). Campus-Verlag.

Bhabha, H. K. (2006). Nation and narration. Routledge.

Bhambra, G. K. (2007). Rethinking modernity: Postcolonialism and the sociological imagination. Palgrave. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230206410

Bhambra, G. K. (2014). Connected Sociologies. Theory for a Global Age Series. Bloomsbury Academic. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781472544377

Bhambra, G. K. (2019, August 22). European Cosmopolitanism and Atavistic Nationalism: The Twin Conditions of Brexit. European Sociological Association, Manchester.

Bhambra, G. K., Gebrial, D., & Nişancıoğlu, K. (Eds.). (2018). Decolonising the university. Pluto Press.

Bilge, S. (2013). Intersectionality Undone: Saving Intersectionality from Feminist Intersectionality Studies. Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race, 10(2), 405–424. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X13000283

Binas-Preisendörfer, S., & Unseld, M. (Eds.). (2012). Musik und Gesellschaft. Transkulturalität und Musikvermittlung: Möglichkeiten und Herausforderungen in Forschung, Kulturpolitik und musikpädagogischer Praxis. Peter Lang D. https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-02470-8

Bleuler, M., & Moser, A. (Eds.). (2018). ent/grenzen. transcript. https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839441268

Boatcă, M. (2010). Multiple Europes and the Politics of Difference Within. In H. Brunkhorst & G. Grözinger (Eds.), The Study of Europe (pp. 51–66). Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co KG. https://doi.org/10.5771/9783845225487-51

Boatcă, M., & Costa, S. (2016). Postcolonial sociology: A research agenda. In E. Gutiérrez Rodriguez, M. Boatcă, & S. Costa (Eds.), Global connections. Decolonizing European sociology: Transdisciplinary approaches (pp. 13–31). Routledge.

Boatcă, M., Farzin, S., & Go, J. (2018). Postcolonialism and Sociology: E-Mail-Debate. SOZIOLOGIE, 47(4), 423–438.

Böhme, H. (2000). Kulturwissenschaft. In H. Fricke (Ed.), Reallexikon der deutschen Literaturwissenschaft (3rd ed., Vol. 2, pp. 356–359). De Gruyter.

Bojadžijev, M. (2018). Migration und Integration: Zur Genealogie des zentralen Dispositivs in der Migrationsgesellschaft. Migration und soziale Arbeit, 40(1), 54–61.

Bojadžijev, M., & Römhild, R. (2014). Was kommt nach dem "transnational turn"? Perspektiven für eine kritische Migrationsforschung. In Labor Migration (Ed.), Berliner Blätter: Heft 65. Vom Rand ins Zentrum: Perspektiven einer kritischen Migrationsforschung (pp.10–24). Panama Verlag.

Boltanski, L., & Chiapello, È. (2003). Der neue Geist des Kapitalismus. UVK Verlagsgesellschaft mbH.

Bond, L., & Rapson, J. (2014). Introduction. In L. Bond & J. Rapson (Eds.), Media and Cultural Memory / Medien und kulturelle Erinnerung: Vol. 15. The Transcultural Turn: Interrogating Memory Between and Beyond Borders (pp. 1–26). De Gruyter.

Bourdieu, P. (1991). Sozialer Raum und "Klassen" (Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft: Vol. 500, 2. Aufl.). Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, P. (1992). Rede und Antwort. (Edition Suhrkamp: 1547 = N.F., Bd. 547, 1. Aufl.) Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, P. (2010). Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste. Routledge classics. Routledge.

Bröckling, U. (2015). The Entrepreneurial Self: Fabricating a New Type of Subject (1st ed.). SAGE Publications.

Bronfen, E., Marius, B., & Steffen, T. (Eds.). (1997). Stauffenburg Discussion: Bd. 4. Hybride Kulturen: Beiträge zur anglo-amerikanischen Multikulturalismusdebatte. Stauffenburg-Verl.

Buchholz, L. (2008). Feldtheorie und Globalisierung. In B. v. Bismarck & T. Kaufmann (Eds.), Nach Bourdieu: Visualität, Kunst, Politik: [eine Publikation des EIPCP im Rahmen von translate. Beyond culture: the politics of translation] (pp. 211–238). Turia + Kant.

Butler, J. (1990). Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity. Thinking gender. Routledge.

Callon, M., Law, J., & Rip, A. (Eds.). (1986). Mapping the Dynamics of Science and Technology: Sociology of Science in the Real World. Palgrave Macmillan. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-07408-2

Canan, C., & Foroutan, N. (2016). Deutschland postmigrantisch III: Migrantische Perspektiven auf deutsche Identitäten - Einstellungen von Personen mit und ohne Migrationshintergrund zu nationaler Identität in Deutschland. BIM, Berliner Institut für empirische Integrations- und Migrationsforschung. https://www.projekte.hu-berlin.de/de/junited/deutschland-postmigrantisch-3.pdf

Chakrabarty, D. (2000). Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference ([ACLS Humanities E-Book edition]). Princeton University Press.

Chambers, I. (1996). Migration, Kultur, Identität. Stauffenburg discussion: Bd. 3. Stauffenburg-Verl.

Charim, I., & Borea, G. A. (Eds.). (2014). Kultur und soziale Praxis. Lebensmodell Diaspora: Über moderne Nomaden. transcript. http://lib.myilibrary.com/detail.asp?id=631337

Christon, M. (2019, August 21). The Appropiation of "Difference" by the Extreme Right. European Sociological Association, Manchester.

Clifford, J. (1986). Introduction: Partial Truths. In J. Clifford & G. Marcus (Eds.), Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography (pp. 1–26). Univ. of California Press.

Clifford, J. (2006). Diasporas. In P. James (ed.), Globalization and Violence (pp. 227–263). SAGE Publications Ltd.

Clifford, J., & Marcus, G. (Eds.). (1986). Writing culture: The poetics and politics of ethnography; a School of American Research Advanced Seminar. Univ. of California Press.

Collins, P. H. (2000). Gender, Black Feminism, and Black Political Economy. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 568(1), 41–53. https://doi.org/10.1177/000271620056800105

Cornejo Polar, A. (1994). Escribir en el aire: Ensayo sobre la heterogeneidad socio-cultural en las literaturas andinas (1. ed.). Critica Literaria: Vol. 11. Editorial Horizonte.

Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the intersection of race and sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. University of Chicago Legal Forum, 1(8), 139–167. http://chicagounbound.uchicago.edu/uclf/vol1989/iss1/8

Cuyler, A. C. (2013). Affirmative Action and Diversity: Implications for Arts Management. The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 43(2), 98–105. https://doi.org/10.1080/10632921.2013.786009

Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (2011). A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia (Repr). Continuum.

Derrida, J. (2004). Die différance: Ausgewählte Texte (P. Engelmann, Ed.). Philipp Reclam jun.

Do Mar Castro Varela, M. (2018). Grenzen dekonstruieren – Mobilität imaginieren. In M. Bleuler & A. Moser (Eds.), ent/grenzen (pp. 23–34). transcript. https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839441268-003

Durkheim, É. (1984). Die Regeln der soziologischen Methode (Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft: Vol. 464, 1. Aufl.). Suhrkamp.

Durkheim, E. (2013). The Division of Labour in Society (S. Lukes, Ed.) (2nd edition). Macmillan Education; Palgrave.

Dussel, E. (1998). Beyond eurocentrism: The world-system and the limits of modernity. In F. Jameson & M. Miyoshi (Eds.), The cultures of globalization (pp. 3–31). Duke Univ. Press.

Dussel, E. D. (2009). Ética de la liberación en la edad de la globalización y la exclusión (6. ed.). Colección Estructuras y procesos. Serie Filosofía. Trotta.

Eisenstadt, S. N. (2003). Comparative civilizations and multiple modernities. Brill.

Erll, A., & Nünning, A. (Eds.). (2008). Media and cultural memory: Vol. 8. Cultural memory studies: An international and interdisciplinary handbook. De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110207262

Ernst, J., & Freitag, F. (2015). Einleitung. Transkulturelle Dynamiken: Entwicklungen und Perspektiven eines Konzepts. In J. Ernst & F. Freitag (Eds.), Mainzer historische Kulturwissenschaften: Vol. 19. Transkulturelle Dynamiken: Aktanten - Prozesse - Theorien (pp. 7–30). De Gruyter; transcript. https://doi.org/10.14361/transcript.9783839425633

Ervin, A. M. (1980). A Review of the Acculturation Approach in Anthropology with Special Reference to Recent Change in Native Alaska. Journal of Anthropological Research, 36(1), 49–70. https://doi.org/10.1086/jar.36.1.3629552

Escobar, A. (2004). Beyond the Third World: Imperial Globality, Global Coloniality and Anti-Globalisation Social Movements. Third World Quarterly, 25 (1 After the Third World?), 207–230.

Espahangizi, K., Hess, S., Karakayali, J., Kasparek, B., Pagano, S., Rodatz, M., & Tsianos, V. (2016). Rassismus in der postmigrantischen Gesellschaft. Movements: Journal für kritische Migrations- und Grenzregimeforschung, 2.2016,1. http://www.transcript-verlag.de/978-3-8376-3570-6

Ette, O. (2001). Literatur in Bewegung: Raum und Dynamik grenzüberschreitenden Schreibens in Europa und Amerika (1. Aufl.). Velbrück Wiss.

Fanon, F. (1952). Peau noire- masques blancs. Ed. du Seuil.

Febel, G. (Ed.). (2007). Edition lendemains: Vol. 3. Écritures transculturelles: Kulturelle Differenz und Geschlechterdifferenz im französischsprachigen Gegenwartsroman. Narr. http://deposit.d-nb.de/cgi-bin/dokserv?id=2970517&prov=M&dok_var=1&dok_ext=htm

Fischer-Lichte, E., Jost, T., & Jain, S. I. (Eds.). (2014). Routledge advances in theatre and performance studies: Vol. 33. The politics of interweaving performance cultures: Beyond postcolonialism. Routledge.

Fischer, J., & Moebius, S. (2014). Einleitung. In J. Fischer & S. Moebius (Eds.), Kultursoziologie im 21. Jahrhundert (pp. 9–16). Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-03225-8

Foroutan, N. (2019). Die postmigrantische Gesellschaft: Ein Versprechen der pluralen Demokratie. X-Texte zu Kultur und Gesellschaft. transcript.

Foucault, M. (1974). Die Ordnung der Dinge: Eine Archäologie der Humanwissenschaften (1. Aufl.). Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft.

Foucault, M. (1978). Dispositive der Macht: Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit. IMD: Vol. 77. Merve Verl.

Foucault, M. (2006). Von anderen Räumen. In J. Dünne (Ed.), Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft: Vol. 1800. Raumtheorie: Grundlagentexte aus Philosophie und Kulturwissenschaften (1st ed., pp. 317–329). Suhrkamp.

Freist, D., Kyora, S., & Unseld, M. (Eds.). (2019). Praktiken der Subjektivierung: Vol. 13. Transkulturelle Mehrfachzugehörigkeit als kulturhistorisches Phänomen: Räume - Materialitäten - Erinnerungen. transcript. http://www.transcript-verlag.de/978-3-8376-4528-6

Friese, H. (2014). Grenzen der Gastfreundschaft: Die Bootsflüchtlinge von Lampedusa und die europäische Frage. Kultur und soziale Praxis. transcript. http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=11014620 https://doi.org/10.14361/transcript.9783839424476

Gabbert, W. (2010). Das Eigene und das Fremde im "globalen Dorf" - Perspektiven einer kritischen Soziologie der Globalisierung. In J. Reuter & P.-I. Villa (Eds.), Postcolonial studies: Band 2. Postkoloniale Soziologie: Empirische Befunde, theoretische Anschlüsse, politische Intervention (pp. 159–179). transcript.

García Canclini, N. (2013). Culturas híbridas: Estrategias para entrar y salir de la modernidad (nueva edición, 6. reimpresión). Paidós estado y sociedad: Vol. 87. Paidós.

Gaupp, L. (2010). Erkenntnistheorie. In A. Kreutziger-Herr & M. Unseld (Eds.), Lexikon Musik und Gender (pp. 200–201). J. B. Metzler.

Gaupp, L. (2016). Die exotisierte Stadt: Kulturpolitik und Musikvermittlung im postmigrantischen Prozess. Studies in Music: Vol. 1. Olms. https://hildok.bsz-bw.de/frontdoor/index/index/docId/547

Geertz, C. (1973). Thick description: Toward an interpretive theory of culture. In C. Geertz (Ed.), The interpretation of cultures: selected essays (pp. 3–30). Basic Books.

Gertenbach, L. (2017). Postkonstruktivismus in der Kultursoziologie. In S. Moebius, F. Nungesser, & K. Scherke (Eds.), Springer Reference Sozialwissenschaften. Handbuch Kultursoziologie: Band 1: Begriffe - Kontexte - Perspektiven - Autor_innen (pp. 1–24). Springer.

Gilroy, P. (1993). The black Atlantic: Modernity and double consciousness. Harvard Univ. Press.

Glick-Schiller, N., Basch, L., & Blanc, C. S. (1995). From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration. Anthropological Quarterly, 68(1), 48. https://doi.org/10.2307/3317464

Glissant, É. (1997). Poétique de la relation ([Réimpr.]). Poétique / Édouard Glissant: Vol. 3. Gallimard.

Go, J., & Krause, M. (2016). Fielding Transnationalism (1. Auflage). Sociological Review Monographs. John Wiley & Sons.

Gould, E. H. (2007). Entangled Histories, Entangled Worlds: The English-Speaking Atlantic as a Spanish Periphery. The American Historical Review, 112(3), 764–786.

Groys, B. (2008). Art power. MIT Press. http://lib.myilibrary.com?id=210084

Gutiérrez Rodriguez, E. (2016). Decolonizing Postcolonial Rhetoric. In E. Gutiérrez Rodriguez, M. Boatcă, & S. Costa (Eds.), Global connections. Decolonizing European sociology: Transdisciplinary approaches (pp. 49–67). Routledge.

Ha, K. N. (2005). Hype um Hybridität: Kultureller Differenzkonsum und postmoderne Verwertungstechniken im Spätkapitalismus. Cultural Studies: Vol. 11. transcript.

Ha, K. N. (2010). Unrein und vermischt: Postkoloniale Grenzgänge durch die Kulturgeschichte der Hybridität und der kolonialen "Rassenbastarde". Postcolonial studies: Vol. 6. transcript.

Hall, S. (1994). Rassismus und kulturelle Identität (1. Aufl., 1. - 2. Tsd). Argument-Sonderbände: N.F., 226. Argument-Verl.

Hall, S. (2017). The Fateful Triangle: Race, Ethnicity, Nation. Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvqht03

Hall, S. (Ed.). (1997). Culture, media and identities. Representation: Cultural representations and signifying practices. Sage. http://www.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy0656/96071228-d.html

Hannerz, U. (1992). Cultural complexity: Studies in the social organization of meaning. Columbia Univ. Press.

Haraway, D. (1992). Primate visions: Gender, race, and nature in the world of modern science. Verso.

Harding, S. G. (1999). Feministische Wissenschaftstheorie: Zum Verhältnis von Wissenschaft und sozialem Geschlecht (3. Aufl.). Argument.

Harvey, D. (1989). The urban experience. Blackwell.

Haus der Kulturen der Welt Berlin. (2014). A Journey of Ideas Across: In Dialog with Edward Said. http://journeyofideasacross.hkw.de

Hepp, A. (2015). Transcultural communication. Wiley.

Hoerder, D., Hébert, Y., & Schmitt, I. (Eds.). (2005). Transkulturelle Perspektiven: Bd. 2. Negotiating transcultural lives: Belongings and social capital among youth in comparative perspective (1. Aufl.). V und R Unipress.

Holzinger, M. (2019). Alter Wein in neuen Schläuchen oder was ist neu am "neuen Postkolonialismus"? SOZIOLOGIE, 48(2), 174–184.

hooks, b. (1995). Ain't I a woman: Black women and feminism (5. print). Pluto Press.

Huggan, G. (2006). Derailing the 'trans'? Postcolonial studies and the negative effects of speed. In H. Antor (Ed.), Anglistische Forschungen: Vol. 362. Inter- und Transkulturelle Studien: Theoretische Grundlagen und interdisziplinäre Praxis (pp. 55–61). Winter.

Hühn, M., Lerp, D., Petzold, K., & Stock, M. (Eds.). (2010). Region - Nation - Europa: Vol. 62. Transkulturalität, Transnationalität, Transstaatlichkeit, Translokalität: Theoretische und empirische Begriffsbestimmungen; [Leitthema der im Oktober 2009 an der Viadrina in Frankfurt (Oder) abgehaltenen Tagung.] LIT-Verl. http://www.h-net.org/reviews/showrev.php?id=32959

Ismaiel-Wendt, J. (2014). "Off" and Maybe Out of Place. https://norient.com/stories/popular-orientalisms-1/

Jack, G. (2015). Advancing Postcolonial Approaches in Critical Diversity Studies. In R. Bendl, I. Bleijenbergh, E. Henttonen, & A. J. Mills (Eds.), Oxford handbooks. The Oxford handbook of diversity in organizations (pp. 153–174). Oxford University Press.

Johler, R., Matter, M., & Zinn-Thomas, S. (Eds.). (2011). Mobilitäten: Europa in Bewegung als Herausforderung kulturanalytischer Forschung; 37. Kongress der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde in Freiburg im Breisgau vom 27. bis 30. September 2009. Waxmann.

Kaasila-Pakanen, A.-L. (2015). A Postcolonial Deconstruction of Diversity Management and Multiculturalism. In R. Bendl, I. Bleijenbergh, E. Henttonen, & A. J. Mills (Eds.), Oxford handbooks. The Oxford handbook of diversity in organizations (pp. 175–194). Oxford University Press.

Kalscheuer, B. (2005). Interkulturalität: Einleitung. In L. Allolio-Näcke & B. Kalscheuer (Eds.), Differenzen anders denken: Bausteine zu einer Kulturtheorie der Transdifferenz (pp. 221–226). Campus-Verlag.

Kant, I. (2015). Die drei Kritiken: Kritik der reinen Vernunft (1781/87); Kritik der praktischen Vernunft (1788); Kritik der Urteilskraft (1790). Anaconda.

Karakayali, S. (2016). Für einen New Deal der Migration. Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik: Monatszeitschrift, 61(3), 13–16.

Khatibi, A. (1985). Double Criticism: The Decolonization of Arab Sociology. In H. I. Barakat (Ed.), Contemporary North Africa: Issues of development and integration (pp. 9–19). Croom Helm.

Kimmich, D. (2016). Nachwort: Was kommt? Was bleibt? Zur Zukunft der Trans_Konzepte. In S. Lavorano, C. Mehnert, & A. Rau (Eds.), Edition Kulturwissenschaft: v.97. Grenzen der Überschreitung: Kontroversen um Transkultur, Transgender und Transspecies (1st ed., pp. 263–270). transcript.

Kimmich, D., & Schahadat, S. (Eds.). (2014). Kultur- und Medientheorie. Kulturen in Bewegung: Beiträge zur Theorie und Praxis der Transkulturalität. transcript.

Knecht, M. (2011). Einleitung zum Panel: Konsequenzen der Mobilität? "Superdiversität" und "Transkulturalität" als Herausforderungen empirisch-ethnographischer Forschung. In R. Johler, M. Matter, & S. Zinn-Thomas (Eds.), Mobilitäten: Europa in Bewegung als Herausforderung kulturanalytischer Forschung; 37. Kongress der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde in Freiburg im Breisgau vom 27. bis 30. September 2009 (pp. 217–225). Waxmann.

Koch, G. (2011). Transkulturalität: Reichweite und Potenzial eines Begriffs für die kulturanalytische Forschung. In R. Johler, M. Matter, & S. Zinn-Thomas (Eds.), Mobilitäten: Europa in Bewegung

als Herausforderung kulturanalytischer Forschung; 37. Kongress der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Volkskunde in Freiburg im Breisgau vom 27. bis 30. September 2009 (pp. 235–239). Waxmann.
Kompridis, N. (2005). Normativizing Hybridity/Neutralizing Culture. Political Theory, 33(3), 318–343. https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591705274867
Krell, G., Riedmüller, B., Sieben, B., & Vinz, D. (Eds.). (2007). Diversity studies: Grundlagen und disziplinäre Ansätze. Campus-Verl.
Kristeva, J. (1974). Des Chinoises. Éd. des femmes.
Kuhn, T. S. (2009). The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. The University of Chicago Press.
Lahire, B. (1995). Tableaux de familles: Heurs et malheurs scolaires en milieux populaires. Hautes études. Gallimard.
Lahire, B. (2005). Portraits sociologiques: Dispositions et variations individuelles. Collection essais & recherches. Armand Colin.
Langenohl, A., Poole, R. J., & Weinberg, M. (Eds.). (2015). Basis-Scripte: Band 3. Transkulturalität: Klassische Texte. transcript. http://d-nb.info/1008786489/04
Lash, S., & Urry, J. (1994). Economies of signs and space (1. publ., repr). Theory, culture & society. SAGE.
Latour, B. (2010). An Attempt at a 'Compositionist Manifesto'. New Literary History, 41, 471–490.
Latour, B. (2017). Eine neue Soziologie für eine neue Gesellschaft: Einführung in die Akteur-Netzwerk-Theorie (G. Roßler, Trans.) (4. Auflage). Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft: Vol. 1967. Suhrkamp.
Lavorano, S. (2016). Transkultureller Rassismus: Zum Diversitätsbegriff bei Wolfgang Welsch und Immanuel Kant. In S. Lavorano, C. Mehnert, & A. Rau (Eds.), Edition Kulturwissenschaft: v.97. Grenzen der Überschreitung: Kontroversen um Transkultur, Transgender und Transspecies (1st ed., pp. 149–162). transcript.
Lavorano, S., Mehnert, C., & Rau, A. (Eds.). (2016). Edition Kulturwissenschaft: v.97. Grenzen der Überschreitung: Kontroversen um Transkultur, Transgender und Transspecies (1st ed.). transcript.
Le Grand, E. (2019). Conceptualising Social Types and Figures: From Social Forms to Classificatory Struggles. Cultural Sociology, 13(4), 411–427. https://doi.org/10.1177/1749975519859962
Leeb, S., & Sonderegger, R. (2016). Plädoyer für eine kulturwissenschaftliche Ästhetik aus Perspektive der cultural studies. Kulturwissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, 1(1), 56–62. https://doi.org/10.1515/kwg-2016-0007
Liebsch, K., Tuider, E., Weiß, A., & Zifonun, D. (2014). Einleitung zum Plenum: Diversität und Intersektionalität. In M. Löw (Ed.), Vielfalt und Zusammenhalt: Verhandlungen des 36. Kongresses der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie in Bochum und Dortmund 2012 (Vol. 2, pp. 841–842). Campus-Verl.
Lionnet, F. (2011). Counterpoint and double critique in Edward Said and Abdelkebir Khatibi: A transcolonial comparison. In A. Behdad & D. Thomas (Eds.), A companion to comparative literature (pp. 387–407). Wiley-Blackwell.
Lorde, A. (1996). Age, Race, Class, and Sex: Women Redefining Difference. The Audre Lorde Compendium: Essays, Speeches and Journals. Pandora.
Löw, M. (2014). Vorwort. In M. Löw (Ed.), Vielfalt und Zusammenhalt: Verhandlungen des 36. Kongresses der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie in Bochum und Dortmund 2012 (Vol. 1, pp. 1-6). Campus-Verl.
Lyotard, J. F. (1984). The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge. Theory and history of literature: Vol. 10. University of Minnesota Press.
Malinowski, B. (1967). A diary in the strict sense of the term (N. Guterman, Trans.) (1. ed.). Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Mall, R. A. (1993). Begriff, Inhalt, Methode und Hermeneutik der interkulturellen Philosophie. In R. A. Mall & D. Lohmar (Eds.), Studien zur interkulturellen Philosophie: Vol. 1. Philosophische Grundlagen der Interkulturalität (pp. 1–28). Rodopi.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1872). Das Kapital: Kritik der politischen Oekonomie. O. Meissner.

Massey, D. (1994). Space, Place, and Gender. University of Minnesota Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.cttttw2z

Mbembe, A. J. (2001). On the Postcolony ([ACLS Humanities E-Book edition]). University of California Press. http://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb.02640.0001.001

Mbembe, A. J. (2008). What is postcolonial thinking? An interview with Achille Mbembe. Esprit Eurozine. http://www.eurozine.com/what-is-postcolonial-thinking/

Mbembe, A. J. (2014). Kritik der schwarzen Vernunft (M. Bischoff, Trans.) (Erste Auflage). Suhrkamp.

Mbembe, A. J. (2016). Decolonizing the university: New directions. Arts and Humanities in Higher Education, 15(1), 29–45. https://doi.org/10.1177/1474022215618513

McCall, L. (2005). The Complexity of Intersectionality. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 30(3), 1771–1800. https://doi.org/10.1086/426800

Meer, N. & Modood, T. (2014). Cosmopolitanism and integrationism: is British multiculturalism a 'Zombie category'?, Identities, 21(6), 658-674. https://doi.org/10.1080/1070289X.2013.875028

Metten, T. (2016). Konturen der Kulturwissenschaft/en – einleitende Überlegungen. Kulturwissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, 1(1), 5–16. https://doi.org/10.1515/kwg-2016-0002

Mignolo, W. D. (2012). Epistemischer Ungehorsam: Rhetorik der Moderne, Logik der Kolonialität und Grammatik der Dekolonialität (J. Kastner & T. Waibel, Trans.). Es kommt darauf an: Bd. 12. Turia + Kant.

Moore-Gilbert, B. J. (2000). Postcolonial theory: Contexts, practices, politics (Reprinted.). Verso.

Müller, G., & Ueckmann, N. (Eds.). (2013). Postcolonial studies: Vol. 12. Kreolisierung revisited: Debatten um ein weltweites Kulturkonzept. transcript. https://doi.org/10.14361/transcript.9783839420515

Natorp, P. (1903). Platons Ideenlehre: Eine Einführung in den Idealismus. Dürr.

Nederveen Pieterse, J., & Parekh, B. (Eds.). (1995). The decolonization of imagination: Culture, knowledge and power. Zed Books.

Neubert, S., Roth, H.-J., & Yıldız, E. (Eds.). (2013). Interkulturelle Studien. Multikulturalität in der Diskussion: Neuere Beiträge zu einem umstrittenen Konzept (3. Aufl.). Springer VS.

Nünning, A. (2016). Perspektiven der Kulturwissenschaften im internationalen Kontext. Kulturwissenschaftliche Zeitschrift, 1(1), 70–75. https://doi.org/10.1515/kwg-2016-0009

Ortiz, F. (1983). Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y el azúcar. Pensamiento cubano. Ed. de Ciencias Sociales.

Plessner, H. (1975). Die Stufen des Organischen und der Mensch: Einleitung in die philosophische Anthropologie (3., unveränderte Auflage, im Original erschienen 1975). Sammlung Göschen: Vol. 2200. De Gruyter. http://www.reference-global.com/doi/book/10.1515/9783110845341 https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110845341

Pratt, M. L. (1992). Imperial eyes: Travel writing and transculturation. Routledge. http://www.h-net.org/review/hrev-a0a0o3-aa

Puar, J. K. (2012). "I would rather be a cyborg than a goddess": Becoming-Intersectional in Assemblage Theory. PhiloSOPHIA, 2(1), 49–66.

Purtschert, P. (2012). Postkoloniale Philosophie: Die westliche Denkgeschichte gegen den Strich lesen. In J. Reuter & A. Karentzos (Eds.), Schlüsselwerke der Postcolonial Studies (pp. 343–354). Springer VS. http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-531-93453-2_25

Rama, Á. (2012). Writing across cultures: Narrative transculturation in Latin America. Latin america otherwise. Duke Univ. Press.

Randeria, S. (1999). Jenseits von Soziologie und soziokultureller Anthropologie: Zur Ortsbestimmung der nichtwestlichen Welt in einer zukünftigen Sozialtheorie. Soziale Welt Zeitschrift Für Sozialwissenschaftliche Forschung, 50, 373–382.

Randeria, S. (2002). Entangled histories of uneven modernities: Civil society, caste solidarities and legal pluralism in post-colonial India. Civil Society Network. Wissenschaftszentrum für Sozialforschung Berlin (WZB).

Rau, A., Lavorano, S., & Mehnert, C. (2016). Vorwort: Zum Status der Trans_Konzepte. In S. Lavorano, C. Mehnert, & A. Rau (Eds.), Edition Kulturwissenschaft: v.97. Grenzen der Überschreitung: Kontroversen um Transkultur, Transgender und Transspecies (1st ed., pp. 7–24). transcript.

Reckwitz, A. (2000). Die Transformation der Kulturtheorien: Zur Entwicklung eines Theorieprogramms (1. Aufl.). Velbrück Wiss.

Reckwitz, A. (2004). Die Kontingenzperspektive der 'Kultur': Kulturbegriffe, Kulturtheorien und das kulturwissenschaftliche Forschungsprogramm. In F. Jaeger, B. Liebsch, J. Rüsen, & J. Straub (Eds.), Handbuch der Kulturwissenschaften: Band 3: Themen und Tendenzen (Vol. 3, pp. 1–20). J.B. Metzler.

Reckwitz, A. (2008a). Subjekt (1., Aufl.). Einsichten. transcript.

Reckwitz, A. (2008b). Unscharfe Grenzen: Perspektiven der Kultursoziologie (2., unveränderte Auflage 2010). Sozialtheorie. transcript. http://dx.doi.org/10.14361/9783839409176

Reckwitz, A. (2016). Zwischen Hyperkultur und Kulturessenzialismus: Die Spätmoderne im Widerstreit zweier Kulturalisierungsregimes. Soziopolis. https://soziopolis.de/beobachten/kultur/artikel/zwischen-hyperkultur-und-kulturessenzialismus/

Reuter, J., & Villa, P.-I. (2010). Provincializing Soziologie: Postkoloniale Theorie als Herausforderung. In J. Reuter & P.-I. Villa (Eds.), Postcolonial studies: Band 2. Postkoloniale Soziologie: Empirische Befunde, theoretische Anschlüsse, politische Intervention (pp. 11–46). transcript.

Richardson, W. J. (2018). Understanding Eurocentrism as a Structural Problem of Undone Science. In G. K. Bhambra, D. Gebrial, & K. Nişancıoğlu (Eds.), Decolonising the university (pp. 231–247). Pluto Press.

Robertson, R. (2003). Globalisation or glocalisation? In R. Robertson & K. E. White (Eds.), Globalization: Critical concepts in sociology (pp. 31–51). Routledge.

Robinson, W. I. (2004). A theory of global capitalism: Production, class, and state in a transnational world. Themes in global social change. Johns Hopkins Univ. Press. http://www.loc.gov/catdir/description/jhu051/2003018298.html

Saalmann, G. (2007). Simmels Bestimmung des Fremden im Exkurs von 1908. https://socio.ch/sim/on_simmel/t_saalmann.pdf

Said, E. W. (1995). Orientalism: Western conceptions of the orient (Reprinted with a new afterword). Penguin history. Penguin Books.

Salzbrunn, M. (2014). Vielfalt, Diversität. transcript. https://doi.org/10.14361/transcript.9783839424070

Sandkühler, H. J., & Lim, H.-B. (Eds.). (2004). Philosophie und Geschichte der Wissenschaften: Vol. 57. Transculturality - epistemology, ethics, and politics. Lang.

Santos, B. de Sousa. (2010). From the Postmodern to the Postcolonial: And Beyond Both. In E. Gutiérrez Rodriguez, M. Boatcă, & S. Costa (Eds.), Global connections. Decolonizing European sociology: Transdisciplinary approaches (pp. 225–243). Ashgate.

Santos, B. de Sousa. (2014). Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide. Paradigm Publ.

Sassen, S. (2015). Ausgrenzungen: Brutalität und Komplexität in der globalen Wirtschaft. S. Fischer.

Schellhöh, J., Reichertz, J., Heins, V., & Flender, A. (Eds.). (2018). X-Texte zu Kultur und Gesellschaft. Großerzählungen des Extremen: Neue Rechte, Populismus, Islamismus, War on Terror. transcript.

Schmidt-Welle, F. (2006). Transkulturalität, Heterogenität und Postkolonialismus aus der Perspektive der Lateinamerikastudien. In H. Antor (Ed.), Anglistische Forschungen: Vol. 362. Inter- und Transkulturelle Studien: Theoretische Grundlagen und interdisziplinäre Praxis (pp. 81–94). Winter.

Sennett, R. (1999). The corrosion of character: The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism (1. publ. as a Norton paperback). Norton.

Shohat, E., & Stam, R. (1994). Unthinking Eurocentrism: Multiculturalism and the media. Sightlines. Routledge. http://www.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy0648/93041501-d.html

Simmel, G. (1990). Über sociale Differenzierung: Sociologische und psychologische Untersuchungen (Repr [der Ausg.] Leipzig, Duncker & Humblot, 1890). Staats- und socialwissenschaftliche Forschungen: / hrsg. von Gustav Schmoller; Bd. 10, H. 1 = H. 42. Schmidt Periodicals.

Simmel, G. (1996). The stranger (1908) and the web of group affiliations (1908). In W. Sollors (Ed.), Theories of ethnicity: a classical reader (pp. 37–51). New York Univ. Press.

Soja, E. W. (2010). Seeking spatial justice. Globalization and community series: Vol. 16. University of Minnesota Press.

Soja, E., & Hooper, B. (1993). The Spaces that Difference Makes: Some Notes on the Geographical Margins of the New Cultural Politics. In M. Keith & S. Pile (Eds.), Place and the politics of identity (pp. 183–205). Routledge.

Sökefeld, M. (2004). Das Paradigma kultureller Differenz: Zur Forschung und Diskussion über Migranten aus der Türkei in Deutschland. In M. Sökefeld (Ed.), Kultur und soziale Praxis. Jenseits des Paradigmas kultureller Differenz: Neue Perspektiven auf Einwanderer aus der Türkei (1st ed., pp. 9–34). transcript.

Solga, H., Powell, J. J. W., & Berger, P. A. (Eds.). (2009). campus Reader. Soziale Ungleichheit: Klassische Texte zur Sozialstrukturanalyse. Campus Verlag. http://www.socialnet.de/rezensionen/isbn.php?isbn=978-3-593-38847-2

Spivak, C. G. (1988). Can the subaltern speak? In C. Nelson & L. Grossberg (Eds.), Marxism and the interpretation of culture (pp. 66–111). Univ. of Illinois Press.

Stäheli, U. (2000). Poststrukturalistische Soziologien. Einsichten. Themen der Soziologie. transcript.

Stiglitz, J. E. (2002). Globalization and its discontents. Penguin Politics. Penguin Books.

Stirling, A. (2007). On the Economics and Analysis of Diversity. SPRU. Electronic Working Papers Series. http://www.sussex.ac.uk/spru/

Taguieff, A. (1993). From race to culture: The New Right's view of European identity. Telos (98/99).

Taylor, C. (1994). The politics of recognition. In C. Taylor & A. Gutmann (Eds.), Princeton paperbacks Philosophy, political science. Multiculturalism: Examining the politics of recognition (pp. 25–73). Princeton Univ. Press.

Thompson, V. E. (2015). Black Jacobins in Contemporary France: On Identities, on Politics, Decolonial Critique and the Other Blackness. Sociological Focus, 49 (1 Special Issue on Black Movements), 44–62.

Tota, A. L., & Hagen, T. (Eds.). (2015). Routledge International Handbook of memory studies. Routledge.

Van Loon, J. (2019, August 22). Against Culture? Sharing, Sameness and Belonging. European Sociological Association. Research Network Sociology of Culture, Manchester.

Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30(6), 1024–1054.

Vertovec, S. (2009). Conceiving and Researching Diversity. Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity. MMG Working Paper. www.mmg.mpg.de/workingpapers

Vertovec, S. (2015). Introduction: Formulating Diversity Studies. In S. Vertovec (Ed.), Routledge international handbook of diversity studies (pp. 1–20). Routledge.

Vertovec, S. (Ed.). (2015). Routledge international handbook of diversity studies. Routledge.

Weber, M. (1969). Class, status, party. In C. Stopnicka Heller & C. Helle (Eds.), Structured Social Inequality: A Reader in Comparative Social Stratification (pp. 24–34). Macmillan.

Weber, M. (2005). Gesamtausgabe (E. Hanke, Ed.). J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

Weber, M. (2016). Klassiker der Sozialwissenschaften. Die protestantische Ethik und der “Geist“ des Kapitalismus (K. Lichtblau, & J. Weiß, Eds.). Springer VS.

Weiß, A. (2017). Soziologie globaler Ungleichheiten (Erste Auflage). suhrkamp taschenbuch Wissenschaft: Vol. 2220. Suhrkamp.

Welsch, W. (2005). Auf dem Weg zu transkulturellen Gesellschaften. In L. Allolio-Näcke & B. Kalscheuer (Eds.), Differenzen anders denken: Bausteine zu einer Kulturtheorie der Transdifferenz (pp. 314–341). Campus-Verlag.

Werner, M., & Zimmermann, B. (2006). Beyond Comparison: Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity. History and Theory, 45(1), 30–50.

Wille, C. (2016). Theoretical and methodological approaches to borders, spaces and identities: Methodology and situative interdisciplarity. In C. Wille, R. Reckinger, S. Kmec, & M. Hesse (Eds.), Culture and social practice. Spaces and identities in border regions: Politics - media - subjects (pp. 44–62). transcript.

Winker, G., & Degele, N. (2009). Intersektionalität: Zur Analyse sozialer Ungleichheiten. Sozialtheorie: Intro. transcript.

Wohlrab-Sahr, M. (2010). Einleitung. In M. Wohlrab-Sahr (Ed.), Kultursoziologie: Paradigmen - Methoden - Fragestellungen (pp. 9–22). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften / GWV Fachverlage GmbH Wiesbaden. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-92300-0 https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-92300-0

Wuggenig, U. (1998). Cultural Studies und Kulturwissenschaften. In Merz Akademie (Ed.), Merz Akademie 2 (pp. 43–56). Verlag der Merz Akademie.

Wuggenig, U. (2015). Diversity. Leuphana Universität Lüneburg. Startwoche Leuphana, Lüneburg.

Yıldız, E. (2018). Das Quartier als Experimentierwelt einer inklusiven Stadt. In N. Berding, W.-D. Bukow, & K. Cudak (Eds.), Die kompakte Stadt der Zukunft: Auf dem Weg zu einer inklusiven und nachhaltigen Stadtgesellschaft (pp. 159–178). Springer VS.

Zapf, H. (2001). Dekonstruktion. In A. Nünning (Ed.), Metzler-Lexikon Literatur- und Kulturtheorie: Ansätze - Personen - Grundbegriffe (2nd ed., p. 101). Metzler.