KUMULATIVE HABILITATIONSSCHRIFT

DR. LISA GAUPP

Kulturelle Diversität in der kuratorischen Praxis: Politik(en) globaler Künste

Leuphana Universität Lüneburg
Fakultät Kulturwissenschaften
September 2020

„Kulturelle Diversität in der kuratorischen Praxis: Politik(en) globaler Künste"
(*peer reviewed)

1. Einleitendes Rahmenpapier: Einleitung, Zusammenhang der kumulativen Schriften, (Inter-)Disziplinäre Einordnung, Zusammenfassung kumulative Habilitationsschriften
2. * Gaupp, L. 2015, 'Dekonstruktion des "Anderen" in Ethnologie und Soziologie: Ein Plädoyer für eine postmigrantische Perspektive', Kultursoziologie, Bd. 15, Nr. 2, S. 17-33. ISSN 0944-8101
3. Gaupp, L. 2021, 'Transcultural Music Studies', in M. Fuhr, K. Klenke, J. Mendívil (Hrsg.), Diggin' Up Music: Musikethnologie als Baustelle. Universitätsverlag/Olms, Hildesheim*. (Open Access: https://doi.org/10.18442/168)*
4. * Gaupp, L. 2018, 'Symbolische Räume kultureller Diversität: Verhandlungen, Grenzen und Überschreitungen in den performativen Künsten', Schriften zur Kultur- und Mediensemiotik Online, Bd. 2, Nr. 4 , S. 241-259 *(Open Access: http://www.kultursemiotik.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Raumsemiotik-Martin-Nies-Hg._SMKS-Online-No.4-2018-red.pdf)*
5. * Gaupp, L. & Kirchberg, V. 2018, 'Kulturelle Diversität in den Künsten zwischen Tradition und Zeitgenossenschaft', in L. Hieber (Hrsg.), Gesellschaftsepochen und ihre Kunstwelten. Bd. 9, Kunst und Gesellschaft, VS-Verlag/Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, Wiesbaden, S. 377-388, DOI: 10.1007/978-3-658-18468-1_17 *(Erstautor*innenschaft, Manuskriptfassung)*
6. * Gaupp, L. 2020, '"The West" vs. "The Rest"? Festival Curators as Gatekeepers for Sociocultural Diversity', in V. Durrer & R. Henze (eds.), Managing Culture: Exchange in a Global World. Palgrave MacMillan Hampshire, UK & New York, Sociology of the Arts. S. 127-153, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-24646-4 *(Best Early Career Research Paper Award in Sociology of Culture of the European Sociological Association, Manuskriptfassung)*
7. * Gaupp, L. & Bielefeldt, N. & Dill, J. & Giesel, R. & Göttsche, K. & Hasse, Z. & Laumayer, S. & Lenßen, L. & Mai, J. & Rüpcke, A. & Rummler, L. 2020, 'Listening to the Street – Urban Sounds in Hamburg-Altona between the „Right to the City" and the „Creativity *Dispositif*"'. Vol. 1, AVANT: Trends in Interdisciplinary Studies, Special Issue: Listening to the Urbanocene *(Erstautor*innenschaft; Open Access: http://avant.edu.pl/wp-content/uploads/L-Gaupp-et-al-Listening-to-the-Street.pdf)*
8. * Gaupp, L. 2020, 'Epistemologies of Diversity and Otherness', in L. Gaupp & G. Pelillo-Hestermeyer (Hrsg.), Diversity and Otherness. Transcultural Insights into Norms, Practices, Negotiations. DeGruyter Berlin & Boston & Peking *(Open Access: https://doi.org/10.1515/9788366675308-004)*
9. * Gaupp, L. 2020, 'How to curate Diversity and Otherness in Global Performance Art', in L. Gaupp & G. Pelillo-Hestermeyer (Hrsg.), Diversity and Otherness. Transcultural Insights into Norms, Practices, Negotiations. DeGruyter Berlin & Boston & Peking *(Open Access: https://doi.org/10.1515/9788366675308-014)*
10. * Gaupp, L. 2020, 'Decolonizing Otherness through a Transcultural Lens: Conclusion', in L. Gaupp & G. Pelillo-Hestermeyer (Hrsg.), Diversity and Otherness. Transcultural Insights into Norms, Practices, Negotiations. DeGruyter Berlin & Boston & Peking *(Open Access: https://doi.org/10.1515/9788366675308-016)*
11. * Gaupp, L. & Abramjan, A. & Akinay, F. M. & Hilgert, K. & Mulder, A. C. & Schmidt, R. & Schnitzler, V. & Thurich, O. & Tiemon, L. & Wurl, S. & Zimmermann, M. 2020, 'Curatorial Practices of the Global: Toward a Decolonial Turn in the Museum in Berlin and Hamburg?', Journal of Cultural Management and Cultural Policy, Special Issue: Museum – Politics – Management, pp. 107-138. Vol. 2020/2, doi:10.14361/zkmm-2020-0205, *(Erstautor*innenschaft; "Best Research Article" Award 2020 of the Journal of Cultural Management and Cultural Policy, https://jcmcp.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/Gaupp-et-al._Curatorial-Practices-of-the-Global.pdf)*
12. Resümierendes Rahmenpapier: Fazit und Ausblick

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

Kumulative Habilitationsschrift Dr. Lisa Gaupp
„Kulturelle Diversität in der kuratorischen Praxis: Politik(en) globaler Künste"

Kulturelle Diversität in der kuratorischen Praxis: Politik(en) globaler Künste

1 Einleitendes Rahmenpapier

1.1 Einleitung

Diversität ist in aller Munde; Diversität dabei verstanden als Diversität von Menschen mit verschiedenen sozialen, nationalen oder kulturellen Hintergründen, als Diversität von (multiplen) sozialen Zugehörigkeiten, als Diversität von kulturellen Ausdrucksformen, als Diversität von Weltbildern sowie Methodenrepertoires, um nur einige Interpretationen zu nennen. Je mehr Diversität in der Öffentlichkeit sichtbar (gemacht) und zum Inhalt politischer Strategien sowie öffentlicher Debatten wird, desto schwammiger wird einerseits, was genau unter Diversität verstanden wird beziehungsweise werden soll und andererseits, welche Implikationen das jeweilige Diversitätsverständnis für die gesellschaftlichen Praktiken und Prozesse des Zusammenlebens verschiedener Menschen und sozialer Gruppen besitzt. Denn es werden teilweise sehr unterschiedliche Ziele und Interessen verfolgt, wie zum Beispiel politische Debatten um die "Grenzen von Toleranz" oder stereotypisierte Formen von kultureller Hybridität in Bereichen wie Ökonomie und Mode, aber auch in kultureller Bildung und Kulturpolitik zeigen. Die Dekonstruktion von exotisierenden Repräsentationen, anhaltenden Vorannahmen, unbewussten Vorurteilen und etablierten eurozentristischen kultur- und bildungspolitischen Konzepten gehört zu den aktuell dringlichsten Aufgaben der aktuellen Kulturwissenschaften und Kultursoziologie. Dies nicht nur, um zu verstehen und zu zeigen, wie Kultur und die Künste politisch machtvoll wirken, sondern vor allem auch um Möglichkeiten aufzuzeigen, solche Zuschreibungsprozesse zu vermeiden und Felder kultureller Praxis zu dekolonialisieren, also ungleiche Machtrelationen zu verringern.

Konzepte wie Diversität und verwandte Theorielinien und Begriffe wie Differenzen, Hybridität oder Transkulturalität gehören zum Standard kulturwissenschaftlicher Forschung. Sozialwissenschaftlich orientierte Kulturforschung fokussiert sich dabei häufig auf soziale Ungleichheit oder Intersektionalität von Individuen. Themen wie Migration, (Neo-)Kolonialisierung und Globalisierung stellen weitere wichtige Forschungsgebiete dar. In diesem weit gefassten inter- und transdisziplinären Feld der Kulturwissenschaften ordnen sich

diese Habilitationsschriften als postkolonial orientierte soziologische Kulturforschungen ein. Sie leisten aus einer transkulturellen Perspektive heraus einen Beitrag, um sowohl vielfältige Prozesse der Standardisierung und Dekonstruktion von Diversität sowie dabei entstehende Ambivalenzen und konflikthafte Verhandlungen in verschiedenen kulturellen Feldern zu verstehen, als auch um Zurückweisungen von etablierten Zuschreibungen und somit Dekolonialisierungstendenzen von ungleichen Machtverhältnissen zu ermöglichen.

Damit liegt die Relevanz der Arbeiten einerseits in der Brisanz, mit der Begriffe und Konzepte sowie politische Maßnahmen zu Diversität, Migration oder Integration in Öffentlichkeit und Politik verhandelt werden, und andererseits darin, wie der gesellschaftliche Zusammenhalt durch lautstarke populistische Positionen in solchen Verhandlungen unter Druck gerät und immer wieder aufs Neue Bestätigungen suchen muss. Diese und weitere *Politik(en) der Macht* unterliegen dabei nicht nur *top-down*-Diskursen von politisch erfolgreicheren oder auch lediglich lautstärkeren Positionen, die gegenüber *bottom-up*-Gegendiskursen in Widerstreit geraten, sondern weitaus komplexeren *Zwischentönen*, die nicht in ein solch binäres Bild zu passen scheinen. Normierungen, Konventionen, Synergieeffekte, Standardisierungen und weitere komplexe Verhandlungen spielen eine größere Rolle, als es auf den ersten Blick aussieht.

Mit *Politiken* von Diversität (im Plural) sind dabei Konzepte von Diversität gemeint, welche vorrangig diskursiv in der Gesellschaft verhandelt werden, die beispielsweise Identitätspolitiken von nicht-staatlichen Akteur*innen oder etablierte Normen und Konventionen umfassen, denen gefolgt wird. Im Englischen wird hierfür der Begriff *politics* verwendet. Mit *Politik* (im Singular) sind hingegen vor allem Steuerungs- und Gestaltungsaktivitäten von Regierungs- und Nicht-Regierungsorganisationen gemeint, also regulierte Handlungspläne, die diese Konzepte in globalen beziehungsweise globalisierten Feldern oder Kunstwelten umzusetzen versuchen. Im englischen Sprachgebrauch wird hierfür der Begriff *policies* verwendet.

Die vorliegenden Schriften zeichnen einige dieser komplexen sozialen Prozesse exemplarisch nach und decken damit auf, wie die *Politik(en) der Macht* in Bezug zu Diversität im Feld der globalen Künste wirken und welche Effekte und Gegenmaßnahmen daraus resultieren. Diese Untersuchungen konzentrieren sich auf kuratorische Praktiken in den Künsten, da hier sowohl die genannten Normierungen und Konventionen als auch die strukturierenden Rahmenbedingungen, die diese Prozesse beeinflussen, deutlich zu Tage treten, wenn zum

Beispiel Kurator*innen durch die Auswahl und Darstellungsformen von Kunstformen bestimmte Diversitätsverständnisse festigen.

Das Thema *kulturelle Diversität*, häufig mit Alternativbegriffen wie *interkulturelle Projekte* oder ähnlichem bezeichnet, kam in den vergangenen beiden Jahrzehnten vermehrt auf die gesamtpolitische Agenda und damit auch in die öffentliche Debattenlandschaft. Das Thema Integration ist zu einem der Leitthemen in der bundesdeutschen Politik geworden und von der Bundeskanzlerin Angela Merkel zur Chefsache erhoben worden. In der bundesdeutschen Öffentlichkeit, in der einerseits Thilo Sarrazin zum Bestseller-Autor wird[1], und die Bundeskanzlerin konstatiert, Multikulti sei gescheitert[2], ist häufig die Rede von Parallelgesellschaften oder von sozialen Problemfällen. Andererseits wird fast zeitgleich die UNESCO-Konvention zum Schutz kultureller Vielfalt verabschiedet[3], und der erste Bundestagsabgeordnete türkischer Herkunft wird zum Bundesvorsitzenden einer großen Partei gewählt[4]. Fortwährend ist dabei die Rede von kultureller Vielfalt oder von Toleranz und Begegnung *auf Augenhöhe*. In dieser öffentlichen Debatte um Zuwanderung, Integration und multikulturellen Zusammenleben wird vor allem mit kulturellen Zuschreibungen hantiert, und es werden Analogien und Parallelen zwischen topografischer Herkunft und Kulturzugehörigkeit gezogen.

In der bundespolitischen Debatte um Integration wird eine *multiethnische* Gesellschaft einerseits als konfliktbehaftetes Spannungsfeld gesehen, in dem *Parallelgesellschaften* neben einer *deutschen* Gesellschaft existieren, die in dieselbe zu integrieren sind, um die angenommene destruktive Spannung aufzulösen. Andererseits wird diese Spannung als produktiv dargestellt oder ganz aufgelöst und kulturelle Vielfalt als Potential und Chance, auch

---

[1] Der ehemalige Berliner Finanzsenator Thilo Sarrazin provoziert mit seinen diffamierenden Thesen u. a. über „Kopftuchmädchen" in einem Interview im Jahre 2009 und in seinem Buch „Deutschland schafft sich ab" 2010 eine hitzig geführte öffentliche Debatte über die Integration von Zuwanderer*innen. U. a. Sezgin, Hilal (2010). „Deutschland schafft mich ab. Debatten, wie Thilo Sarrazin sie führt, haben mich als türkischstämmige Intellektuelle muslimifiziert. Was ist in diesem Land nur schiefgelaufen?" In: Die Sarrazin Debatte. Eine Provokation – und die Antworten. Hrsg. v. Patrik Schwarz und DIE ZEIT. Hamburg: Edel, S. 183-191.

[2] Angela Merkel auf dem Deutschlandtag der Jungen Union (JU) in Potsdam am 16.10.2010.

[3] Die „Konvention über den Schutz und die Förderung der Vielfalt kultureller Ausdrucksformen" wird 2005 von der UNESCO-Generalkonferenz verabschiedet und 2007 von Deutschland ratifiziert. Im Jahre 2009 werden von der Deutschen UNESCO-Kommission politische Handlungsempfehlungen in und für Deutschland in einem „Weißbuch" veröffentlicht. http://www.unesco.de/kulturelle-vielfalt.html [16.9.2012].

[4] Cem Özdemir wird 1995 Bundestagsabgeordneter. Im Jahre 2008 wird er zum Bundesvorsitzenden der Partei BÜNDNIS 90/DIE GRÜNEN gewählt.

im ökonomischen Sinne, gesehen. Mittlerweile ist von Inklusion[5] anstelle von Integration die Rede. Es geht bei beiden Begriffen, Inklusion wie Integration, um ein Ganzes (die Gesellschaft), an dem ökonomische, soziale oder kulturelle Teilhabe ermöglicht werden muss.

Im letzten Jahrzehnt drängten diese Debatten immer wieder in das Blickfeld der Öffentlichkeit, wobei die Argumentationsmuster im Wesentlichen gleichblieben. Die so genannte „Flüchtlingskrise" im Jahr 2015 sowie die Öffnung der Grenze durch die Bundeskanzlerin Angela Merkel und ihr Leitspruch „Wir schaffen das" kann als weiterer Höhepunkt dieser Debattenkulturen gelten. Zwei oppositionelle Seiten scheinen sich dabei weiter zu verfestigen: Einerseits das Erstarken populistischer Strömungen wie Pegida („Patriotische Europäer gegen die Islamisierung des Abendlandes") und der Einzug der rechtspopulistischen Partei AfD („Alternative für Deutschland") zunächst im Jahr 2014 in das Europarlament und anschließend in alle Länderparlamente sowie 2017 in den Deutschen Bundestag oder aktuell die rechtsextreme Unterwanderung so genannter „Hygienedemos", in denen gegen die Maßnahmen der Bundesregierung gegen die Corona-Pandemie demonstriert wird. Andererseits scheint sich eine diversitätssensible und diskriminierungskritische Perspektive unter anderem in Feldern der Künste weiter zu etablieren, in der auf bestehende Machtungleichheiten und die Unterrepräsentanz bestimmter Bevölkerungsgruppen – häufig allerdings ebenfalls anhand von kulturellen Zuschreibungen – im Kulturbetrieb hingewiesen wird und die koloniale Vergangenheit von Kulturorganisationen hinterfragt wird. Vor allem das Feld der „globalen Künste" versteht sich als grenzenlos, diskriminierungskritisch und inklusiv. Im globalen Austausch von Kulturorganisationen, Kurator*innen und Künstler*innen wird der herrschende Habitus als „kosmopolit" bezeichnet, und internationale Kulturprojekte sollen die propagierte Inklusivität des als transkulturell verstandenen eigenen Handelns unterstreichen.

Das den vorliegenden Habilitationsschriften zugrundeliegende Forschungsprojekt fragt daher, wie kulturelle Diversität in kuratorischer Praxis im Rahmen von globalen Kulturprojekten allgemein und auf globalen Performing Arts- beziehungsweise Musik-Festivals im Speziellen (de-)konstruiert wird. Kuratorische Praxis wird dabei als ein diskursiver Prozess angesehen, der durch die Auswahl, die Präsentationsform und die Bewertung des Dargestellten Wissen

---

[5] Gaupp, Lisa (2016). Die exotisierte Stadt. Kulturpolitik und Musikvermittlung im postmigrantischen Prozess. Center for World Music – Studies in Music, Bd. 1, Universitätsverlag Hildesheim & Olms Verlag, Hildesheim, Open Access: https://hildok.bsz-bw.de/frontdoor/index/index/docId/547

schafft beziehungsweise konstruiert, und damit als Dispositiv[6] *kultureller Diversität* mit allen seinen Machtbeziehungen wirkt. Das Dispositiv produziert durch Klassifizierungen Bilder und Narrative über kulturelle Diversität, die als Vergleichsmodell Kriterien liefern, mit denen Ereignisse und Menschen bewertet werden.[7] Globale Kulturprojekte sind im Sinne der Fragestellung der Raum, in dem das Dispositiv inszeniert wird, und somit als komplexes Beziehungsgeflecht von Identitätsstrategien zu sehen und beispielsweise nicht als reine zweiwöchige Zeitspanne eines Festivals an einem bestimmten Ort. Im Feld der Künste liegt der Forschungsfokus sowohl auf dem Bereich Musik als auch auf den Performing Arts, die sowohl Theater-, Tanz-, Musikperformances als auch Mischformen beziehungsweise genreüberschreitende Formen, diskursive Praktiken, Installationen oder so genannte „Site-specific-Performances" umfassen.

Mit der Eingrenzung auf *globale* Kulturprojekte oder global agierende Kulturorganisationen ist eine Abgrenzung und Gegenüberstellung zu *interkulturellen* Projekten und Organisationen gemeint, deren übergreifende Gemeinsamkeit die Inszenierung von kultureller Vielfalt anhand von mehr oder minder als *traditionell* und *exotisch* dargestellten Kunstformen ist. Hier spielen vor allem Selbst- und Fremdethnisierungsprozesse eine Rolle. In Bezug auf den *interkulturellen* Musikbereich ist festzustellen, dass die so genannte „Weltmusik" in Deutschland ein Image hat, das sich auf den soziokulturellen Sektor beschränkt und *außereuropäische authentische traditionelle Musikausdrücke* umfasst. Thomas Burkhalter nennt diese Musik mit Bezug auf Veit Erlmann „Weltmusik 1.0", eine Musik,

> die immer für ein westliches Mittelklasse-Ohr gestylt war. [...] Weltmusik (1.0) will unversehrte musikalische Formen und Idiome hochleben lassen, mischt dann aber Sounds der vollständig kommerzialisierten Gegenwart mit der pseudohistorischen „Patina anderer Zeiten und Orte".[8]

Die auswärtige Kulturpolitik und globale Kulturprojekte geben sich dagegen kosmopolit und transkulturell. Projekte des Goethe-Instituts InterNationes oder des Hauses der Kulturen der Welt in Berlin werden in Zusammenarbeit mit internationalen Partner*innen und Künstler*innen entwickelt und lassen sich schwer in einen *deutschen Kanon* einordnen. Auch aktuelle „Weltmusik" wird als kosmopolit und transkulturell präsentiert. „Weltmusik 2.0 [ist]

---

[6] Foucault, Michel (2008). Dispositive der Macht: Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit. Merve Verlag Berlin.

[7] Hall, Stuart (1994). Rassismus und kulturelle Identität. Ausgewählte Schriften 2. Argument Verlag Hamburg.

[8] Burkhalter, Thomas (2011). Weltmusik 2.0. Musikalische Positionen zwischen Spaß- und Protestkultur. Goethe-Institut e. V., Fikrun wa Fann. November 2011. http://www.goethe.de/ges/phi/prj/ffs/the/a96/de8626484.htm [09.09.2020].

das Produkt von raumzeitlich entgrenzter Kommunikation jenseits territorialer Grenzen. Sie stellt überkommene Vorstellungen von Kultur, Identität und Gemeinschaft in Frage."[9]

So treten bei globalen Kulturprojekten vor allem nationalstaatliche und ethnische Bezüge in den Hintergrund. Stattdessen wird unter verschiedenen Thematiken oder auch *globalen Narrativen* zwar ebenfalls kulturelle Diversität inszeniert, diese jedoch als transkulturell, kosmopolit und innovativ konstruiert. Globale Kulturprojekte behandeln topografisch entkoppelte Themen und präsentieren aktuelle globale Fragestellungen. Sie genießen dementsprechend einen Ruf, sich *am Puls der Zeit* zu befinden und hohe Qualität aus den zeitgenössischen Künsten zu präsentieren.

Es stellten sich daher die Fragen, welche Bedingungen, welche Verortung in globalen Kulturdiskursen, welche kulturpolitischen Konzepte, welche kuratorischen Strategien, welche Lebensentwürfe von Künstler*innen und welche Kunstformen bei globalen Kulturprojekten, insbesondere auf Festivals dazu beitragen, dass der eigentlich gleiche Inhalt wie der bei interkulturellen Projekten kein Image eines exotischen Nischendaseins hervorruft, sondern als innovativ, aktuell, kosmopolit und transkulturell inszeniert und wahrgenommen wird. Diese Untersuchung der Inszenierung kultureller Diversität durch kuratorische Praktiken vor allem auf weltweit renommierten Musik- und Performing Arts-Festivals zeigt damit die Bedeutung globaler Diskurse für aktuelle Kunstformen.

1.2   Zusammenhang der kumulativen Schriften

Die dargelegten Fragestellungen zur Inszenierung, Standardisierung und Dekonstruktion kultureller Diversität in kuratorischer Praxis der globalen Künste werden in den vorliegenden Schriften für verschiedene Kontexte diskutiert. Gemäß der kulturwissenschaftlichen Perspektive wird eine interdisziplinäre Herangehensweise verfolgt (siehe Abschnitt 3), die von den folgenden kulturtheoretischen Prämissen gehalten wird: Die untersuchten sozialen Prozesse der Verhandlung von Diversität unterliegen einer gemeinsamen praxeologischen sowie prozessualen Perspektive, die aus konstruktivistischer Sicht Kontingenzen im menschlichen (Ver-)Handeln anerkennt und gleichzeitig ihre Routinisierungen fokussiert. Konflikthafte Prozesse werden in der angewendeten transkulturellen Perspektive anerkannt,

---

[9] Burkhalter, Thomas (2011). Weltmusik 2.0. Musikalische Positionen zwischen Spaß- und Protestkultur. Goethe-Institut e. V., Fikrun wa Fann. November 2011.
http://www.goethe.de/ges/phi/prj/ffs/the/a96/de8626484.htm [09.09.2020].

so dass auch soziale In- und Exklusionsprozesse, die nicht klar bestimmt werden können, das heißt multiple Interpretationsmöglichkeiten zulassen, beispielsweise als Verhandlungen von Uneindeutigkeiten theoretisiert werden können, oder – um mit Homi K. Bhabha[10] zu sprechen – als Hybridität eines „Dritten Raumes" erklärbar werden. Dabei geht es nie darum aufzuzeigen, was Diversität *ist*, sondern lediglich, wie sie in spezifischen Kontexten situational *gemacht wird,* wie also Diversität praktiziert wird.

Neben dieser praxeologischen, prozessualen, situationalen und konstruktivistischen Perspektive auf transkulturelle Kontingenzen des menschlichen Zusammenlebens zeichnen alle vorliegenden Schriften zwei weitere gemeinsame epistemologische Grundannahmen aus: eine differenz-theoretische sowie eine gleichheits-theoretische Herangehensweise, die beide den Blick darauf wenden, wie gleichzeitig die Konstruktion und die Dekonstruktion von Differenzen parallel dazu dienen, sowohl soziale Inklusions- als auch Exklusionspraktiken zu fördern und damit soziale Ungleichheiten sowohl zu unterlaufen als auch zu festigen. Dieses Spannungsfeld von Praktiken der Diversität zwischen Normierung und Dekonstruktion, zwischen Standardisierung und Dekolonisierung zu beschreiben widmen sich alle vorliegenden Schriften in verschiedenen Kontexten und aus interdisziplinären Perspektiven auf verschiedenen Mikro-, Meso- und Makroebenen der Gesellschaft. Gesellschaft wird dabei nicht als singuläre und homogene Entität verstanden, sondern eben als jenes komplexe Zusammenspiel sozialer Praktiken, Diskurse und Strukturen, welche die Darstellungen und Verhandlungen von Diversität beeinflussen.

Die Schriften behandeln daher in verschiedener Schwerpunktsetzung 1) globale **Diskurse** kultureller Diversität (Narrative), 2) die **Performanz** kultureller Diversität (Praktiken) als auch 3) die **Repräsentation** (Strukturen) kultureller Diversität. **Diskurse** umfassen dabei alle Narrative, theoretischen Konzepte und Begriffe von Diversität, was einem bedeutungsorientierten, semiotischen Zugang zum symbolischen Tun im Sinne einer kultursoziologischen Sichtweise entspringt. **Performanz** bedeutet wiederum die kulturellen Praktiken und die Inszenierungsstrategien kultureller Diversität, die einem praxeologischen Kulturbegriff Rechnung tragen, die die sozialen Beziehungen fokussieren, und an denen ebenfalls die Diskurse von Diversität ablesbar werden, beziehungsweise die die Diskrepanzen und Gemeinsamkeiten zwischen diesen beiden Ebenen offenlegen. **Repräsentation**

---

[10] Bhabha, Homi K. (2000). Die Verortung der Kultur. Stauffenburg Verlag Tübingen.

schließlich zielt auf die institutionelle, strukturelle und politische Verortung von Diversität in kulturellen Räumen und deren Machtbeziehungen ab, welche den genannten *Politik(en) der Macht* entsprechen und auf soziale Ungleichheiten abzielen im Sinne einer aus der Soziologie der Kultur inspirierten Lesart. Alle drei Bereiche, die Diskurse/Narrative/Symbole, die Praktiken/Performanz/sozialen Beziehungen sowie die Repräsentationen/Politik(en)/ Strukturen sind eng miteinander verwoben und zeigen erst in der Analyse ihres Zusammenspiels sowohl die Normierungen und ihre Dekonstruktionen von Diversität als auch soziale Ungleichheiten und ihre Dekolonialisierungen im Forschungsfeld auf.

Die vorliegenden Schriften untersuchen dieses Zusammenspiel der drei Analyseebenen anhand der folgenden theoretischen Konzepte: *Transkulturalität*, *Dekonstruktion* und *Transformation*. Im Konzept *Transkulturalität* sind Begriffsentwicklungen wie das der Postmigrancy, Vernetzung und Übersetzung eingeschlossen. Das Konzept der *Dekonstruktion* betrachtet unter anderem theoretische, praktische und institutionelle Modi der Grenzauflösung. Mit dem Begriffskonzept *Transformation* schließlich sind Formen kulturellen Ausdrucks gemeint, die Antworten auf die aktuellen Entwicklungen *nach der Dekonstruktion* darstellen und Strategien der Dekolonialisierung aufzeigen. In diesen drei Bereichen wurden die Fragestellungen des Forschungsprojekts ausgelotet. Dies bedeutet, dass dabei jeweils die Themen und Begriffe aufgegriffen und die Fragen gestellt werden, die im Folgenden erläutert werden.

Zu 1) Diversität als globaler Diskurs:

„Diversität" scheint neben Begriffen wie „Transkulturalität" (im deutschen Sprachraum vor allem von Wolfgang Welsch in die Debatte eingeführt)[11], „Kreolisierung" (ein Begriff, der aus der Literaturwissenschaft stammt und wieder an Bedeutung gewinnt)[12], „Transnationalismus"[13], „Hybridität"[14] oder „super diversity"[15] das neue Trendkonzept

[11] Welsch, Wolfgang (2012). Was ist eigentlich Transkulturalität? In: Kimmich, Dorothee (Hrsg.): Kulturen in Bewegung : Beiträge zur Theorie und Praxis der Transkulturalität. Bielefeld Transcript. S. 25-40.

[12] Müller, Gesine/Ueckmann, Natascha (2013) (Hrsg.). Kreolisierung revisited. Debatten um ein weltweites Kulturkonzept. Bielefeld Transcript.

[13] 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

[14] Ha, Kien Nghi (2010). Unrein und vermischt : postkoloniale Grenzgänge durch die Kulturgeschichte der Hybridität und der kolonialen „Rassenbastarde". Bielefeld Transcript; Bhabha, Homi K. (2012). Über kulturelle Hybridität: Tradition und Übersetzung. Wien Turia & Kant.

[15] Vertovec, Steven (2010). Super-diversity and its implications. In: Anthropology of migration and multiculturalism, S. 39-63; Arnaut, Karel (2012). Super-diversity: elements of an emerging perspective. In: Diversitites: Language and Superdiversities II. Vol. 14, Nr. 2. S. 1-16. www.mmg.mpg.de/diversities.

kulturwissenschaftlicher Forschung zu sein, wie weiter oben bereits für die öffentliche Debattenkultur dargelegt wurde. Alle diese Konzepte beruhen zuvorderst auf der Annahme, dass die großen Narrative der Moderne dekonstruiert wurden, und dass, wenn überhaupt, ein Diskurspluralismus im Sinne der Postmoderne auszumachen sei. Die vorliegenden Schriften gehen dieser dekonstruktivistischen Spur in Bezug auf den Begriff der *kulturellen Diversität* nach und fragen, in welcher Weise theoretisch das Modell der kulturellen Diversität fassbar gemacht werden kann. Dafür wird das Konzept *Diversität* aus kulturtheoretischer und transkultureller, aus postkolonialer und aus migrationstheoretischer Perspektive beleuchtet. Einige zugrunde liegende Fragestellungen sind: Stellt *Diversität* lediglich ein neues globales, womöglich selbst neo-koloniales oder zumindest *Weißes* Narrativ dar? Wie wird Diversität konstruiert und dekonstruiert? Wohnen dem Begriff (darüber hinaus) Möglichkeiten inne, als Kulturanalyseinstrument zu fungieren, indem er eine Beschreibungskategorie bietet, die selbst nach dem postmodernen „anything goes" und der poststrukturalistischen Dekonstruktion die Möglichkeit zur Strukturierung oder Beschreibung von kultureller Vielfalt gibt? Beziehungsweise wie kann nach der Betonung des Einzelnen und nach der Dekonstruktion der großen Narrative die kulturelle Vielfalt einer Gesellschaft gesehen werden, ohne essenzialisiert und ohne in Einzelteilen pluralisiert zu werden? Und schließlich: Ist Diversität eine Rückbesinnung auf kulturrelativistische Modelle aus den ethnologischen Disziplinen, wenn komplementäre Kulturbeschreibungen als gleichwertig anerkannt werden? Um diesen Fragen näher zu kommen, wird auf der Basis von den genannten und weiteren Theoriebildungen und Konzepten der Kulturwissenschaften, der Soziologie, der Cultural Studies und der Postkolonialen Studien die historische epistemologische Entwicklung von Vielfaltsmodellen sowie ihre kulturellen Bezeichnungspraktiken und Differenzkonstruktionen untersucht, um deren Erkenntnispotentiale zu eruieren. Ausgehend von und in Gegensatz und Ergänzung zu etablierten migrationsbezogenen Kulturmodellen wie Inter- und Multikulturalität oder Hybridität wird erörtert, inwiefern sich eine vielschichtige Gesellschaftsform anhand des Begriffes Diversität beschreiben lässt, und ob der Begriff eine Antwort auf die Frage geben kann, was nach der Dekonstruktion kommen kann. Dabei wird einer Definition von kultureller Diversität als Inhalt empirischen Wissens im Gegensatz zu kultureller Differenz als Sinngebungsprozess gefolgt, die sich an Bhabhas kritisches Verständnis anschließt:

> 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.[16]

Bisher existieren auch von Seiten der Postkolonialen Studien kaum zufriedenstellende Antworten auf die Frage, was nach der Dekonstruktion kommen kann beziehungsweise wie eine womöglich erfolgreiche Dekolonialisierungsstrategie übergreifend auch für andere Kontexte fruchtbar gemacht werden kann. In diesem Sinne werden die kuratorischen Prozesse globaler Kulturprojekte als mögliche Antwortstrategien auf diese Frage untersucht. Im Sinne der Postkolonialen Studien fragen diese Arbeiten danach, inwiefern nicht nur auf interkulturellen Festivals, sondern auch auf vermeintlich dekonstruktivistischen globalen Festivals Paradigmen etabliert und Bilder des *Anderen* konstruiert werden. Es wird gezeigt, welche Paradigmen, Bilder und globale Diskurse in solchen Zusammenhängen existieren, und ob und wie es kuratorisch gelingt, ein dekonstruktivistisches und dekoloniales Festivalprogramm zu inszenieren.

Zu 2) Performanz von Diversität:

Welche Diskurse im Raum globaler Kulturprojekte inszeniert werden, hängt in großem Maße vom der*m jeweiligen Kurator*in ab, weshalb in den vorliegenden Forschungsschriften die*er Kurator*in als handelndes Subjekt, und kuratorische Praxis als wissensschaffende Praktiken definiert werden. Das theoretische Verständnis von *Kuratieren* basiert dabei auf kultursoziologischen praxeologischen Modellen. Angelehnt an Andreas Reckwitz wird Kuratieren beziehungsweise werden globale Festivals als soziale Praktiken verstanden, die nach Theodore Schatzki „a temporally unfolding and spatially dispersed nexus of doings and sayings"[17] darstellen.

Das Berufsfeld der*s Kurators*in ist zu einem hart umkämpften, aber auch umschwärmten Bereich *verkommen*.

---

[16] Bhabha, Homi K. (2006). Cultural Diversity and Cultural Differences. In: Ashcroft, B. & Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (Hrsg.): The Post-Colonial Studies Reader. New York Routledge, S. 155–157. Hier S. 155.

[17] Schatzki, Theodore R. (1996). Social Practices. A Wittgensteinian Approach to Human Activity and the Social. Cambridge. S. 89. Zitiert in: Reckwitz, Andreas (2008). Unscharfe Grenzen. Perspektiven der Kultursoziologie. Bielefeld Transcript. Hier S. 44.

> Der Kurator ist heute das, was vor langer Zeit einmal der Regisseur, der Poet oder der bildende Künstler selbst war: der Traumberuf der jugendlichen Avantgarde. [...] Der Kurator hat die Macht der Entscheidung, er hat die gleiche Funktion wie ein DJ, er sorgt für die richtige Mischung und entdeckt für uns die neuen heißen Trends. Er führt auch das Leben eines international erfolgreichen DJs (der Traumberuf der Hipster in den neunziger Jahren).[18]

Die neu entstandenen Studiengänge zu kuratorischer Praxis beispielsweise an den Hochschulen in Berlin, Frankfurt, Leipzig, Zürich, London, New York und Hamburg seit 2009 zollen dieser Entwicklung Rechnung. So wie es in der interkulturellen Kulturarbeit um Migration geht, ist bei globalen Festivals Mobilität der Künstler*innen und Kurator*innen unabdingbare Voraussetzung.

> Als müsste er die Theorien von den globalen Nomaden verifizieren, reist der Kurator ohne Unterlass um die Welt. [...] In dem Beruf des Kurators kulminieren also gleich mehrere Tendenzen des globalisierten Lebens und Arbeitens: Ein freier Kurator führt das durchflexibilisierte Leben eines globalen Nomaden; er ist ein großer sozialer Netzwerker; und er übernimmt die Funktion eines Siebs, mit dem man aus der Flut des Angebots das vermeintlich Wichtige herausfiltern kann.[19]

Längst ist das Kuratieren nicht mehr auf die Bildenden Künste beschränkt.

> Gut 150 verschiedene Kunstbiennalen soll es inzwischen geben, aber weil es dennoch weitaus mehr Kuratoren als Ausstellungen gibt, wird heute alles mögliche kuratiert, von Magazinen über Filmabende, von Modenschauen bis zu Blogs, selbst Podiumsdiskussionen.[20]

Dennoch beschäftigen sich diese neuen Kurator*innen selten bis kaum mit Musik als Schwerpunktthema. Im Musikbereich heißen die Kurator*innen vielmehr Intendant*innen, Programmdirektor*innen oder künstlerische Leiter*innen. Bei vielen Musikfestivals ist die programmatische Künstlerauswahl den Booker*innen vorbehalten. Die Gründe für ein musikalisches Programm werden daher auch für Festivals oder Kulturorganisationen erfragt, deren Hauptthemen aus anderen Sparten entstammen. Gleichwohl wird bei reinen Musikfestivals ebenfalls aufgedeckt, welche Strategien die*er Kurator*in, Indendant*in oder Booker*in verfolgt.

Wie im nächsten Abschnitt zu „Repräsentation" weiter erläutert wird, ist kuratorische Praxis jedoch nicht nur vom Handeln und symbolischen Entscheidungen sowie Konzepten einer*s Kurtors*in oder eines Kurator*innenteams abhängig, sondern unterliegt weiteren komplexen strukturierenden Rahmenbedingungen und sozialen Beziehungen der beteiligten

---

[18] Timm, Tobias: Die Macht der Geschmacksverstärker. In: ZEIT online. Kunst. 5. Mai 2011. http://www.zeit.de/2011/19/Kunst-Kuratoren [6.12.2012].
[19] Ibid.
[20] Ibid.

Akteur*innen. Dieses Verständnis eines Felds des „curatorials"[21], das sowohl soziale als auch politische Implikationen aufweist[22], wird in den vorliegenden Arbeiten verfolgt. Zum „curatorial" gehört auch die jeweilige Organisationsform, wie im Folgenden erläutert wird.

Zu 3) Repräsentation:

Performing Arts, die Bildenden Künste und Musik sind in der Vergangenheit zunehmend in ökonomischen Zusammenhängen inszeniert worden. Die Festivallandschaft boomt. Expert*innen sprechen von einer „Festivalisierung"[23] der Kultur und von Eventkultur. Immer mehr Festivals wurden in den vergangenen vierzig Jahren gegründet.[24] Mittlerweile bilden Musikfestivals den viertgrößten Anteil am gesamten Musikmarkt Deutschlands.[25] Das Festival scheint als gängiges Format die einzig mögliche Präsentationsform für drittmittelfinanzierte Projekte darzustellen. Auch längerfristig finanzierte Kulturorganisationen setzen häufig auf das zeitlich eingegrenzte Festivalformat. Im Trend sind zum Beispiel internationale Biennalen. Auch im Feld der globalen Musik- und Performing Arts-Festivals ist eine tiefgreifende Umstrukturierung in den letzten beiden Jahrzehnten zu beobachten: Die weltweite Mobilität und Vernetzung der Künstler*innen, Kurator*innen und Veranstalter*innen sowie die Verzahnung von Kunst, Inszenierungsprozessen des Kulturmarketings und Finanzierungsstrategien sind nur zwei dieser Entwicklungen. Sie erfordern die Bearbeitung einer Reihe von Forschungsfragen zu kulturellen und sozialen Themen als Forschungsfeld. Denn „Festivals sind [...] Ausdruck unseres Zeitgeistes."[26]

---

[21] von Bismarck, B., Schafaff, J., & Weski, T. (2012). Introduction. In B. von Bismarck, J. Schafaff, & T. Weski (Hrsg.), Cultures of the curatorial (S. 7–16). Berlin: Sternberg, Hier S. 8.

[22] Rogoff, I., & von Bismarck, B. (2012). Curating/curatorial: A conversation between Irit Rogoff and Beatrice von Bismarck. In B. von Bismarck, J. Schafaff, & T. Weski (Hrsg.), Cultures of the curatorial (S. 20–38). Berlin: Sternberg, Hier S. 37.

[23] Wolfgang Kaschuba (2015). Vom Wissen der Städte. Urbane Räume als Labore der Zivilgesellschaft. Berliner Blätter 69/2015, S. 13–29.

[24] Zwischen dem Beginn der 1980er Jahre bis circa 2008 wurden in Deutschland 281 Musikfestivals mit überregionalem Charakter gegründet. Im Gegensatz dazu haben sich in den 110 Jahren davor 80 Musikfestivals gegründet: Gründungsjahre der Festivals in Deutschland. http://www.miz.org/intern/uploads/statistik89.pdf [23.8.2020].

[25] So liegen Veranstaltungen von Musikfestivals sowohl bezüglich ihres Umsatzes von 341 Millionen Euro als auch bezüglich ihrer Besucherreichweite von 6,5 % dicht hinter den Veranstaltungen im Bereich Oper, die lediglich von den Bereichen „Konzerte klassischer Musik" und „Musicals" überrundet werden: Kennzahlen zu Musikveranstaltungen 2011. http://www.miz.org/intern/uploads/statistik124.pdf [23.8.2020].

[26] Franz Willnauer (2006). „Musikfestspiele und Festivals", in: Musik Almanach 2007 ⁄ 08. Daten und Fakten zum Musikleben in Deutschland, hrsg. v. Deutschen Musikrat, Regensburg, S. 63. Zit. in: Musikland Niedersachsen gGmbH (2012) (Hrsg.). Musik an allen Orten. Festivals im Musikland Niedersachsen 2012. Hannover, hier S. 11.

Globale Festivals im Bereich *kulturelle Diversität* werden weltweit bislang wissenschaftlich kaum berücksichtigt. Infolgedessen sind die kuratorischen Praktiken, die Kunstformen und die durch sie konstruierten Narrative selten Untersuchungsgegenstand. „Durch seine hohe räumliche wie zeitliche Konzentration ist ein Musikfestival prädestiniert für einen intensiven Austausch zwischen Künstlern, Machern und Publikum."[27] Daher fokussieren die diesen Schriften zugrundeliegenden Forschungen unter anderem und vor allem Musik- und Performing Arts-Festivals, um die komplexen sozialen Prozesse in Bezug zur Fragestellung zu untersuchen und aufzuzeigen, wie Diversität verhandelt wird. Der Fokus auf die Musiksparte bedeutet, dass Modi der künstlerischen Vielfaltsgenerierung im Hinblick auf die kuratorischen Bedingungen und Konzepten von (Musik)-Performances im Vergleich zu weiteren Sparten untersucht werden. Die Frage ist dabei, wie und warum kulturelle Vielfalt oder eine postkoloniale Perspektive in solchen Projekten sich kuratorisch im Musik- und Performance-Bereich ausdrückt, präsentiert beziehungsweise ausgewählt wird, und ob dies anders als in anderen Sparten geschieht. Leitende Fragen sind bei der Untersuchung: Ist das Konzert an einem Abend des Performing Arts-Festivals eher *nur* unterhaltendes Beiwerk nach der *eigentlichen intellektuellen* Auseinandersetzung mit einem bestimmten Thema während der Theatervorstellung oder Podiumsdiskussionen tagsüber? Wird bei einem Musikfestival über die Darstellung der neuesten Entwicklungen in einem bestimmten Musikstil hinaus angestrebt, ein übergreifendes Thema kuratorisch zu bearbeiten? Gibt es Szenen oder Spezifika globaler Festivals? Handelt es sich um eine geschlossene kleine Szene, weil immer die gleichen Künstler*innen zu den jeweiligen Festivals weltweit eingeladen werden? Existieren hierbei Unterschiede beispielsweise zwischen Festivals in den USA und in Europa? Alle hier vorliegenden Schriften widmen sich in unterschiedlichen Ausprägungen diesen Fragestellungen und dem Zusammenspiel von Diskursen, Praktiken und Strukturen von Diversität. Dabei sind Schwerpunktsetzungen festzustellen: Dem Thema Dekonstruktion von Alterität wird in Bezug auf die ethnologischen und soziologischen Disziplinen im Beitrag „Dekonstruktion des ‚Anderen'" nachgegangen (Nr. 1). Die Perspektive der Transkulturalität bezogen auf den Musik(bildungs)bereich wird im zweiten Beitrag zu „Transcultural Music Studies" diskutiert. Diversität und ihre symbolischen Verhandlungen aus kultursemiotischer Sicht werden im Beitrag Nr. 3 „Symbolische Räume kultureller Diversität" dargestellt. Die

---

[27] Musikland Niedersachsen gGmbH (2012) (Hrsg.). Musik an allen Orten. Festivals im Musikland Niedersachsen 2012. Hannover, hier S. 11.

Ebene der Performanz von Diversität wird im vierten Beitrag „Kulturelle Diversität in den Künsten" und die Ebene der Repräsentation von Diversität im fünften Artikel „The ‚West' vs. The ‚Rest'" verhandelt, in beiden Fällen bezogen auf Performing Arts-Festivals. Ebenfalls eine machtkritische Herangehensweise gegenüber Politik(en) eines Festivals, in diesem Fall bezogen auf ein Festival der Straßenkünste mit Fokus auf den Musikbereich, unternimmt der sechste Beitrag „Listening to the Street". Den Verhandlungen von Diversität und Alterität sind drei Beiträge gewidmet: Nr. 7 „Epistemologies" mit Fokus auf die Kulturwissenschaften, Nr. 8 „How to Curate Diversity and Otherness" wieder bezogen auf Performing Arts-Festivals und Nr. 9 „Decolonizing Otherness" mit einem Schwerpunkt auf der Dekonstruktion und Dekolonialisierung von Alterität. Der zehnte und letzte Beitrag „Curatorial Practices of the Global" greift den Fokus auf Dekolonialisierung von kuratorischen Praktiken im Bereich der visuellen Künste auf.

Meine Forschungsschwerpunkte bearbeite ich mit sowohl qualitativ-empirischen[28], ethnografischen[29] als auch diskursanalytischen[30] Methoden. Digitale Ansätze und Methoden der eHumanities sind integrale Bestandteile des methodologischen Repertoires. Für die Datenerhebung wird hauptsächlich mit Methoden der Qualitativen Sozialforschung gearbeitet, um der Fragestellung mit Informationen direkt aus dem Feld zu begegnen. Auch beziehen die Mixed-Methods-Forschungsdesigns der in Ko-Autor*innenschaft verfassten Beiträge weitere (qualitative und quantitative sowie künstlerische) Forschungsmethoden mit ein wie unter anderem Soundscape Analyse, Publikumsbefragung und Visuelle sowie Online-Ethnografie. Die Datenanalyse schließlich baut auf einer Kombination aus Diskursanalyse im Sinne von Foucault und Inhaltsanalyse im Sinne von Mayring und Flick auf. Der gesamte qualitative Forschungsprozess verläuft dabei in Anlehnung an die „Grounded Theory"[31] zyklisch.

Wenn über den Kontakt mit den ausgewählten Festivals geeignete Interviewpartner*innen (Kurator*innen, Organisator*innen und Künstler*innen) gefunden sind, beginnt die

---

[28] Flick, U. (Ed.) (2018): The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Data Collection. Los Angeles u. a.; Czarniawska, B. (2014): Social Science Research. From Field to Desk. Los Angeles u. a.
[29] Clifford, J. & Marcus, G. M. (Eds.) (1986): Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. Berkeley u. a.; Nettl, B. (2015): The Study of Ethnomusicology: Thirty-three Discussions: Urbana; Geertz, C. (2017): The Interpretation of Cultures: Selected Essays. New York.
[30] Foucault, Michel (2017). Die Ordnung des Diskurses. Frankfurt am Main.
[31] Strauss, Anselm L. (1998). Grundlagen qualitativer Sozialforschung. München, S. 29ff.

Datenerhebung auf den Festivals oder in den ausgewählten Kulturorganisationen durch Teilstrukturierte Interviews und Teilnehmende Beobachtung[32]. Um das aus dem Interview gewonnene Textmaterial interpretieren zu können, wird der Ursprungstext durch theoretische Kategorisierung reduziert und dabei strukturiert.[33]

Die Diskursanalyse wird angewendet, wenn ein Dispositiv, ein Ensemble von Aussagen über kulturelle Diversität im Sinne von Foucault aufzufinden ist, beispielsweise in medialen Äußerungen und Pressemitteilungen. Eine solche Diskursanalyse bezieht den jeweiligen „Ort des legitimen Sprechens", das heißt auch den institutionellen Rahmen des Diskurses und dessen Grenzen mit ein, durch die bestimmt ist, was (nicht) gesagt werden darf oder muss.[34] Die qualitativ erhobenen Daten fließen ebenfalls in die Diskursanalyse ein, so dass durch die Triangulation[35] der Instrumente Diskursanalyse, Teilnehmende Beobachtung und Inhaltsanalyse der Experteninterviews eine Validität der Ergebnisse nach anerkannten Regeln der Qualitativen Sozialforschung erreicht wird.[36]

1.3   Verortung: (Inter-)Disziplinäre Einordnung

Epistemologisch verorte ich mich in einer Verbindung von Kultursoziologie[37], Soziologie der Kultur[38] und (Musik-)Ethnologie[39] mit Perspektiven der reflexiven Migrations-[40] und

---

[32] Hauser-Schäublin, Brigitta (2003). Teilnehmende Beobachtung. In: Beer, Bettina (Hrsg.): Methoden und Techniken der Feldforschung. Berlin, S. 33-54.

[33] Flick, Uwe (2010). Qualitative Sozialforschung. Eine Einführung. Reinbek bei Hamburg, S. 388.

[34] Foucault, Michel (2001). Die Ordnung des Diskurses. Frankfurt am Main.

[35] Flick, Uwe (1995). Triangulation. In: Flick, Uwe/ Von Kardorff, Ernst/ Keupp, Heiner/ Von Rosenstil, Lutz/ Wolff, Stephan (Hrsg.): Handbuch Qualitative Sozialforschung. Grundlagen, Konzepte, Methoden und Anwendungen. Kapitel 8.2. Weinheim, S. 432-434.

[36] Steinke, Ines (1999). Kriterien qualitativer Forschung. Ansätze zur Bewertung qualitativ-empirischer Sozialforschung. Weinheim & München.

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

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

[39] Stokes, M. (Ed.) (1994). Ethnicity, Identity and Music: The Musical Construction of Place. Oxford: Berg; Bohlman, P. V. (2002). 'The place of displacement: Polish musics at home and beyond', in European meetings in ethnomusicology, ed. Romanian Society for Ethnomusicology, pp. 166–178; Kovačič, M. & Hofman, A. (Eds.) (2019): Music, Migration and Minorities: Perspectives and Reflections. Musicological Annual. Vol. 2; Gratzer, W. & Grosch, N. (Eds.) (2018): Musik und Migration. Waxmann.

[40] Bojadžijev, M. (2018). Migration und Integration: Zur Genealogie des zentralen Dispositivs in der Migrationsgesellschaft. Migration und soziale Arbeit, 40 (1), 54–61; 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; Karakayali, S. (2016). Für

Diversitätsforschung[41] und mit interdisziplinären kulturwissenschaftlichen[42] Bezügen vor allem zu den Postcolonial[43], den Gender & Queer[44], den Mobility[45] Studies, den poststrukturalistischen[46] Theorien sowie der Stadt- und Raumforschung[47]. Bei den Untersuchungen von transkulturellen[48] Prozessen liegt der Fokus auf „Europa"[49] und „Deutschland" verstanden nicht als geografische Entitäten, sondern als soziokulturelle Bezüge für postmigrantische[50] Narrative und Praktiken, die sowohl der In- als auch der Exklusion

einen New Deal der Migration. Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik: Monatszeitschrift, 61 (3), 13–16; Reuter, J. & Mecheril, P. (Eds.), 2015: Schlüsselwerke der Migrationsforschung. Pionierstudien und Referenztheorien. Wiesbaden: VS Springer Verlag.

[41] Sweers, B. & Ross, S. (Eds.) (2020): Cultural Mapping and Musical Diversity. Equinox Publishing Ltd.; Reyes-Schramm, A. & Hemetek, U. (Eds.) (2007): Cultural diversity in the urban area: Explorations in urban ethnomusicology. Institute of Folk Music Research and Ethnomusicology; Clausen, B. et al. (Eds.) (2009): Music in Motion: Diversity in Dialogue in Europe. transcript; Khālid, A. & Mohammed, L.: Performing Cultural diversity; Critiquing Postcolonialism. Tetouan 2010; Ahmed, S. (2012). On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life. Duke University Press.

[42] Bhabha, Homi K. (2000): Die Verortung der Kultur. Tübingen.

[43] Reuter, J. & Villa, P. I. (Eds.) (2009): Postkoloniale Soziologie. Empirische Befunde, theoretische Anschlüsse, politische Interventionen. Bielefeld: transcript; Reuter, J. & Karentzos, A. (Eds.) (2012): Schlüsselwerke der Postcolonial Studies. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag; Mbembe, A. J. (2001). On the Postcolony . University of California Press.

[44] Gaunt, Kyra D. (2015). 'YouTube, Twerking, & You: Context Collapse and the Handheld Co-Presence of Black Girls and Miley Cyrus'. Journal of Popular Music Studies 27 (3), pp. 244-273; Hawkins, S. (Ed.) (2017): The Routledge Research Companion to Popular Music and Gender. Routledge; Fast, S. & Jennex, C. (Eds.) (2019): Popular music and the politics of hope: queer and feminist interventions. Routledge.

[45] Do Mar Castro Varela, M. (2018). Grenzen dekonstruieren – Mobilität imaginieren. In M. Bleuler & A. Moser (Eds.), ent/grenzen, pp. 23–34. Transcript; 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.

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

[47] Lipsitz, G. (1994). Dangerous Crossroads: Popular Music, Postmodernism and the Poetics of Place. London: Verso; 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; Lefebvre, Henri (1968): Le droit à la ville. Anthropos-anthropologie. Ed. Economica, Paris.

[48] Abu-Er-Rub, L., Brosius, C., & Meurer, S. (Eds.). (2019). Engaging transculturality: Concepts, key terms, case studies. Routledge; Langenohl, A., Poole, R. J., & Weinberg, M. (Eds.). (2015). Basis-Scripte: Band 3. Transkulturalität: Klassische Texte. Transcript; Lavorano, S., Mehnert, C., & Rau, A. (Eds.). (2016). Edition Kulturwissenschaft: vol. 97. Grenzen der Überschreitung: Kontroversen um Transkultur, Transgender und Transspecies. transcript.

[49] Albrecht, M. (2020). Europas südliche Ränder: Interdisziplinäre Perspektiven auf Asymmetrien, Hierarchien und Postkolonialismus-Verlierer. Edition Kulturwissenschaft. Transcript; 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.

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

dienen und auf globale, lokale wie auch glokale[51] soziale Ungleichheiten[52] und Verflechtungen[53] hinweisen. Meine Arbeiten konturieren damit postkolonial[54] und sozialwissenschaftlich orientierte Kulturwissenschaften. Im Mittelpunkt meines Forschungsinteresses stehen Fragestellungen zu musikalischer Praxis („musicking"[55]) und Kulturvermittlung[56] in urbanen[57] und migrationsbedingten[58] Zusammenhängen sowie zu damit verbundenen Identitätspolitik(en)[59]. Meine Arbeit basiert auf der Analyse von Feldern künstlerischer Produktion, sozialer Organisation[60] und sozialen Beziehungen im Rahmen von gesellschaftlichen Diskursen[61] und den hier verhandelten Konventionen[62]. Durch die

[51] Robertson, R. (2003). Globalisation or glocalisation? In R. Robertson & K. E. White (Eds.), Globalization: Critical concepts in sociology (pp. 31–51). Routledge; Guilbault, J. (2011): On Redefining the ‚Local' Trough World Music, in Popular Music, ed. C. Rojek (Los Angeles, Calif.: SAGE) pp. 137–146 ; Stokes, M. 2008-08-31T07:00:00Z. On Musical Cosmopolitanism; M'Baya, B. (2013): Crossing Traditions: American Popular Music in Local and Global Contexts. Scarecrow Press.

[52] Berkers, P. & Schaap, J. (Eds.) (2018): Gender Inequality in Metal Music Production. Emerald; Solga, H., Powell, J. J. W., & Berger, P. A. (Eds.). (2009). Soziale Ungleichheit: Klassische Texte zur Sozialstrukturanalyse. Campus Verlag; Weiß, A. (2017). Soziologie globaler Ungleichheiten. Suhrkamp; Winker, G., & Degele, N. (2009). Intersektionalität: Zur Analyse sozialer Ungleichheiten. Sozialtheorie. transcript.

[53] Gould, E. H. (2007). Entangled Histories, Entangled Worlds: The English-Speaking Atlantic as a Spanish Periphery. The American Historical Review, 112 (3), 764–786; Werner, M., & Zimmermann, B. (2006). Beyond Comparison: Histoire Croisée and the Challenge of Reflexivity. History and Theory, 45 (1), 30–50.

[54] Ismaiel-Wendt, J. (2011): tracks 'n' treks. Populäre Musik und Postkoloniale Analyse. Münster; Bhambra, G. K. (2007). Rethinking modernity: Postcolonialism and the sociological imagination. Palgrave.

[55] Small, C. (1998): Musicking – the Meanings of Performing and Listening. Middeltown.

[56] 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; Krüger, S. (2013). Undoing anthenticity as a discursive construct: A critical pedagogy of ethnomusicology and "world music". In B. Alge & O. Krämer (Eds.), Berliner Schriften: Band 116. Beyond borders: Welt – Musik – Pädagogik: Musikpädagogik und Ethnomusikologie im Diskurs (pp. 93–113), Wißner.

[57] Nettl, B. (Ed.) (1978): Eight Urban Musical Cultures: Tradition and Change. University of Illinois Press; Reyes-Schramm, A. (1979): Ethnic Music, the Urban Area, and Ethnomusicology, Sociologus 29, no. 1: 1–21.; Hall, T. D. (2014): Countercultural Space Does Not Persist: Christiana and the Role of Music, in: S. Whiteley & J. Sklower (Eds.): Countercultures and Popular Music, Ashgate Publishing, pp. 205-222; Reyes, A. (2012): Ethnomusicology's Road from the Primitive to the Cosmopolitan: Some Methodological Implications, in Musik Als Agens Urbaner Lebenswelten. Musiksoziologische, Musikethnologische und Organologische Perspektiven, ed. S. Klotz and H. Loos (Leipzig: Schröder) pp. 3–14.

[58] Krueger, S. & Trandafoiu, R. (2013) (Eds.) The Globalization of Musics in Transit: Music Migration and Tourism. Routledge; Peres da Silva, G., & Hondros, K. (Eds.). (2019). Music practices across borders: (e)valuating space, diversity and exchange. Transcript; Sardinha, J., & Campos, R. (Eds.). (2016). Transglobal sounds: Music, youth and migration. Bloomsbury Academic; Reyes-Schramm, A. (1999): Songs of the caged, songs of the free: music and the Vietnamese refugee experience. Philadelphia: Temple Univ. Press.

[59] Frith, S. (1983): Sound Effects: Youth, Leisure, and the Politics of Rock. London; Cloonan, M. & Garofalo, R. (2009): Policing Pop. Philadelphia; Altenburg, D. & R. Bayreuther (eds.) (2012). Musik und Kulturelle Identität: [Bericht über den XIII. Internationalen Kongress der Gesellschaft für Musikforschung, Weimar 2004]. Kassel: Bärenreiter; Bharucha, R. (2001). The politics of cultural practice: Thinking through theatre in an age of globalization. Oxford Univ. Press; Barber-Kersovan, A. (ed.) (2011). West meets East: Musik im interkulturellen Dialog. Frankfurt a. M.: Lang.

[60] Langley, A., & Tsukas, C. K. (Eds.). (2017). The SAGE handbook of process organization studies. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

[61] Terkessidis, M.: (2017): Nach der Flucht: Neue Ideen für die Einwanderungsgesellschaft. Ditzingen.

[62] Becker, H. S. (1963). Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance (Social Theory). London: Free Press of

Offenlegung, Dekonstruktion[63] und Dekolonialisierung[64] von persistierenden Zuschreibungsmechanismen[65], Normierungen, ungleichen Machtstrukturen und sozioökonomischen Beziehungen profiliere ich kritische soziologische Kulturwissenschaften, die der Anerkennung heutiger gesellschaftlicher postmigrantischer Realitäten in globalisierten[66] Kontexten Rechnung tragen.

In Anlehnung an einen umfassenden Migrationsbegriff wie der von Clifford[67] sowie Römhild und Bojadžijev[68] wird dabei Migration im Sinne von Mobilität nicht als Forschungsgegenstand, sondern als Voraussetzung für heutige Gesellschaften und dadurch auch für globale Kulturprojekte angesehen. Unter dem Fokus „postmigrantisches Europa" wird dabei der Blick auf gesellschaftliche Prozesse unter heutigen Globalisierungsbedingungen gewendet, die erstmalig von der Prämisse ausgehen, dass Migrationsprozesse keine neuen Phänomene sind, sondern seit Langem dynamisch verstandene Kulturen hervorbringen und beeinflussen, und demnach die Voraussetzung für kulturelle Praktiken darstellen. Dies sollte als *Normalität* für politische Maßnahmen, gesellschaftliche Debatten und eben auch für Forschungen anerkannt werden, um nicht die weit verbreitete Dichotomie von „Wir/Mehrheitsgesellschaft" versus „die Anderen/die Migrant*innen/Minderheiten" weiter zu festigen. In einer post-

---

Glencoe; Diaz-Bone, R. (Ed.) (2011), Soziologie der Konventionen: Grundlagen einer pragmatischen Anthropologie (Theorie und Gesellschaft, Vol. 73). Campus.

[63] Binas-Preisendörfer, S. (2008). Musik – eine Weltsprache? Befunde und Vorschläge zur Dekonstruktion eines Mythos. In E. Schwind & O. Senn (Eds.), Musik - Wahrnehmung – Sprache. (163-173). Chronos; Alisch, S., Binas-Preisendörfer, S., & Jauk, W. (Eds.). (2018). Darüber hinaus … Populäre Musik und Überschreitung(en): 2. Iaspm D-A-CH Konferenz/Graz 2016. BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität.

[64] Tuzcu, P. (2017): 'Ich bin eine Kanackin': decolonizing popfeminism- transcultural perspectives on Lady Bitch Ray. Transcript; Bhambra, G. K., Gebrial, D., & Nişancıoğlu, K. (Eds.). (2018). Decolonising the university. Pluto Press; Gutiérrez Rodriguez, E. (2016). Decolonizing Postcolonial Rhetoric. In E. Gutiérrez Rodriguez, M. Boatcă, & S. Costa (Eds.), Global connections. Decolonizing European sociology: Transdisciplinary approaches (49-67); 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; Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a Metaphor. Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1 (1), 1–40.

[65] Said, E. W. (1995). Orientalism: Western conceptions of the orient. Penguin history. Penguin Books; Binas-Preisendörfer, S. (2012). Mozart, Sting und Marsimoto: Zur Bedeutung klanglicher Repräsentationen des ‚Orients' in ‚westlicher' Musik, in ed. S. Binas-Preisendörfer and M. Unseld Transkulturalität und Musikvermittlung. Möglichkeiten und Herausforderungen in Forschung, Kulturpolitik und musikpädagogischer Praxis, (Frankfurt a.M. et al.: P. Lang) pp. 21–41; Hofman, A. (2010): Maintaining the Distance, Othering the Subaltern: Rethinking Ethnomusicologists' Engagement in Advocacy and Social Justice, in Applied Ethnomusicology: Historical and Contemporary Approaches, eds. Klisala Harison, Elizabeth Mackinlay and Svanibor Pettan (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishers), pp. 22–35.

[66] Stokes, M. (2004): Music and the Global Order. Annual Review of Anthropology, Vol. 33. pp. 47-72; Varriale, S. (2016): Globalization, Music and Cultures of Distinction: The Rise of Pop Music Criticism in Italy; Wetzel, R. D. (2012): The Globalization of Music in History. London & New York.

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

[68] 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.

migrantischen Analyseperspektive wird sich dabei vor allem mit den „Konflikten, Identitätsbildungsprozessen, sozialen und politischen Transformationen auseinandergesetzt, die nach erfolgter Migration und nach der Anerkennung, ein Migrationsland geworden zu sein, einsetzen."[69]

Weiterhin fokussieren die vorliegenden Schriften vor allem auf den kulturellen Praktiken, die einen Bezug zu *Europa* aufweisen als soziokulturelles Konstrukt für eben solche postmigrantischen Narrative und Praktiken, die sowohl der In- als auch der Exklusion dienen. Auch wenn damit *Europa* nicht zuvorderst als geografische Entität verstanden wird, werden kulturelle Praktiken untersucht, die *in Europa* stattfinden und verhandelt werden beziehungsweise von europäischen Organisationen getragen werden, und die auf globale, lokale wie auch glokale soziale Ungleichheiten und Verflechtungen hinweisen.

Mit globalen Künsten werden vor allem die kulturellen Felder zusammengefasst, die mit *Diversität* auf die eine oder andere Art und Weise umgehen, die also beispielsweise auf musikalische Praktiken von so genannten „nicht-westlichen" Musiker*innen oder „Musiker*innen mit Migrationshintergrund oder Fluchtgeschichte" fokussiert sind.

In Bezug zum postmigrantischen Migrationsbegriff und zum Begriff des Globalen ist der diesen Ausführungen zugrundeliegender Kulturbegriff weit gefasst, denn er bezieht sich nicht nur auf künstlerische Praktiken, sondern ebenfalls auf alltagskulturelle Praktiken.[70] Doch auch wenn der Fokus auf künstlerischen Praktiken vorrangig aus den Bereichen Musik und Performing Arts liegt und ein weiter Kulturbegriff verfolgt wird, ist immer Teil dieser Forschungen, die im jeweils untersuchten Feld wirkenden Kulturbegriffe zu eruieren, ihre epistemologische Historizität aufzudecken und zu untersuchen, durch welche Prozesse welche Praktiken in welchen Zusammenhängen von wem als kulturell oder künstlerisch definiert und anerkannt werden.

Sowohl das Grundthema „Kulturelle Diversität als kuratorisches Konzept" als auch die Grundbegriffe wie Diversität, Migration, Transkulturalität beziehungsweise Interkulturalität oder kulturelle Praxis und kulturelle Identität berühren mehrere wissenschaftliche Disziplinen, lassen sich jedoch am Besten in die Methodik und die theoretische Ausrichtung der Fachrichtung Kultursoziologie einbetten. An der Leuphana Universität Lüneburg ist das Fach

[69] Foroutan, N. (2016). Postmigrantische Gesellschaften. In H. U. Brinkmann & M. Sauer (Eds.), Einwanderungsgesellschaft Deutschland: Entwicklung und Stand der Integration (pp. 227–254). Springer VS. Hier S. 232.
[70] Williams, Raymond (1989). Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy, Socialism. London Verso.

Kultursoziologie in die interdisziplinären Kulturwissenschaften integriert, so dass hier die interdisziplinären Brückenschläge Programm sind. Im Folgenden werden die Schnittpunkte dieses Ansatzes mit weiteren wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen dargelegt und der Stand der Forschung in diesen Bereichen zu Beginn des Forschungsprojekts erläutert, in den sich die vorliegenden Schriften einordnen und durch die beschriebene interdisziplinäre Herangehensweise die kulturwissenschaftliche Diversitätsforschung weiter profilieren.

Um die migrationsbedingte gesellschaftliche Komplexität (kulturelle Vielfalt) zu beschreiben und zu analysieren, bieten wissenschaftliche Theorien seit Langem verschiedene Modelle: Ökonomische, ethnologische und soziologische Globalisierungstheorien setzen den Fokus eher auf makrosoziale Zusammenhänge, während in der Psychologie, den Kommunikationswissenschaften und der Philosophie dagegen der Fokus auf dem Individuum liegt. In allen Fällen wird dargestellt, wie sich ein Individuum oder eine Gruppe von anderen Individuen oder Gruppen abgrenzt; es geht um Identität und Alterität in einem Ganzen, der Gesellschaftsform, um Ego und Alter, um Differenz, um Pluralität und Diversität, um nur einige wenige Schlagworte zu nennen. *Interkulturell* und *multikulturell* sind dabei nur zwei der Adjektive beziehungsweise Konzepte, mit denen das Zusammenleben von Menschen unterschiedlicher Herkunft beschrieben wird. In den letzten 40 Jahren werden vor allem in den Kulturtheorien verstärkt Differenzziehungsprozesse dekonstruiert, der wissenschaftliche Blick auf ein Ganzes, das aus abgrenzbaren Entitäten besteht, in Frage gestellt, und ambivalente und paradoxe Blickwinkel anerkannt. In den Kulturwissenschaften ist ferner der Begriff der Transkulturalität zum Theorieparadigma geworden, um den kritisierten Defiziten früherer theoretischer Konzepte wie zum Beispiel, dass Kulturen als statisch beschrieben werden, zu begegnen.

Mit Themen wie Globalisierung, Kosmopolitismus, Migration, Verschiedenheit und Vielfalt, Räumen kultureller Diversitätsinszenierung sowie kultureller Identität beschäftigen sich in den Sozial- und Kulturwissenschaften vornehmlich die soziologisch orientierte Migrations-forschung, die Kulturanthropologie beziehungsweise die Europäische Ethnologie sowie die Postkolonialen Studien und die (transnationale) Stadtforschung. Künstlerische Produktion, kuratorische Praxis und musikalische Performanz sind Themen in den Performance Studies sowie in der Musikwissenschaft und Musikethnologie. Im Folgenden werden verschiedene Herangehensweisen an den weiten Forschungsgegenstand *kulturelle Diversität* aus den unterschiedlichen Disziplinen vorgestellt.

In der Globalisierungsforschung, häufig in soziologischer Perspektive, sind als Schwerpunktthemen vor allem „kulturelle Identität"[71] und „Kosmopolitismus"[72] interessant. Begriffe wie global-lokal (beziehungsweise die Verbindung aus beiden: glokal), Entwicklung oder Differenzen prägen die kulturwissenschaftliche Debatte zur Globalisierung.[73] Die Migrationsforschung in der Ethnologie und Soziologie beschäftigt sich mit den Strukturen, Bedingungen, Folgen und Räumen globaler und regionaler Migration. Die Migrationsforschung in Deutschland hat eine lange weit zurückreichende, etablierte und auch institutionalisierte Wissenschaft zu verzeichnen. So existiert an der Universität Osnabrück seit dem Jahr 1991 das Institut für Migrationsforschung und Interkulturelle Studien (IMIS), das Forschungen zu Migration und interkulturellen Fragen intensiviert und koordiniert, die fachliche und weitere Öffentlichkeit informiert, sowie Handlungsempfehlungen erarbeitet.[74]

Die kulturelle Situation von Migrant*innen ist ebenfalls ein weit beschriebenes Forschungsfeld in Deutschland. Der Fokus von Migrationsstudien war anfänglich auf regionale und nationale Entwicklungen beschränkt. So konzentriert sich frühere Migrationsliteratur häufig auf Vorher-Nachher-Analysen und versucht, Assimiliations- und Akkulturations-Prozesse aufzudecken. Der Ethnologe Martin Sökefeld sieht dabei eine Tendenz zur Vergegenständlichung von Einwanderer*innen in der Wissenschaft und Politik. Sie würden als Fremde angesehen, deren Fremdheit kulturell bestimmt sei. Sökefelds These ist, dass die Integration von Einwanderer*innen an dieser Zuschreibung von Fremdheit scheitert, und dass diese Zuschreibung mit dem Konzept *Kultur* arbeitet.[75]

Neuere Migrationsforschungen führen ähnliche Kritikpunkte auf und wenden den Blick auf transnationale oder diasporische Formationen.[76] Weitere Forschungen über Kultur in der

---

[71] Boris Groys (2008). Europe and Its Others. In: Art Power, The MIT Press, Cambridge, S. 173–182; Altenburg, Detlef & Bayreuther, Rainer (2012) (Hrsg.). Musik und kulturelle Identität. 3 Bände. Kassel Bärenreiter.

[72] Eriksen, Thomas Hylland: (2007). The cartoon controversy and the possiblity of cosmopolitanism. http://folk.uio.no/geirthe/Cosmopolitanism.pdf [12.9.2013]; Stokes, Martin (2007). On Musical Cosmopolitanism. The Macalester International Roundtable 2007. Paper 3. http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/intlrdtable/3 [25.9.2020].

[73] Eriksen, Thomas Hylland (2005). How can the global be local? Islam, the West and the globalisation of identity politics. In: Hemer, Oscar & Tufte, Thomas (Hrsg.).: Media and Glocal Change. Rethiniking Communication for Development. Buenos Aires, S. 25-40; Eriksen, Thomas Hylland (2003) (Hrsg.). Globalisation: Studies in Anthropology. London Pluto.

[74] Oltmer, Jochen (2002) (Hrsg.): Migrationsforschung und interkulturelle Studien: zehn Jahre IMIS. Osnabrück.

[75] Sökefeld, Martin (2004). Das Paradigma kultureller Differenz: Zur Forschung und Diskussion über Migranten aus der Türkei in Deutschland. Bielefeld Transcript, S. 10.

[76] Welz, Gisela (2004). Multiple Modernities. The Transnationalisation of Cultures. In: Research Group Transnationalism Working Paper Number 3. http://publikationen.ub.uni-frankfurt.de/opus4/frontdoor/index/index/docId/1720 [15.09.2020].

Diaspora rücken bevorzugt die kulturellen Ambivalenzen einer Rückkehr ins Herkunftsland, Subalternität in der *Gastgesellschaft* oder die Bildung transnationaler Allianzen wie die der Nordafrikaner*innen in Frankreich[77] in den Mittelpunkt der Forschung. So fordert beispielsweise Wolf-Dietrich Bukow, nicht länger von Migration sondern von Mobilität zu sprechen, um sämtliche transnationale Bewegungen zu erfassen.[78] „Migrancy" umfasst bei Adeleida Reyes Schramm die Gesamtsituation, die aus Migrationsprozessen hervorgeht, einschließlich emotionalen, psychologischen und kreativen Verhaltens.[79] Philip V. Bohlman und Carol Silverman untersuchen, wie die „reisende Kultur" in neuen Kontexten marginalisiert und mit Etiketten belegt, geregelt und erhalten wird.[80]

Neueste Strömungen der Migrationsforschung fordern über dieses Paradigma des Transnationalismus hinaus, nicht länger auf die Erforschung von Migrant*innen oder migrantischer Räume beschränkt zu bleiben und damit Migration nicht länger „am Rand scheinbar stabiler national-staatlicher Gesellschaften"[81] zu positionieren, sondern vielmehr „Migration selbst zu einem paradigmatischen Fokus auf die laufenden Prozesse des gesellschaftlichen, politischen, sozialen, ökonomischen und kulturellen Wandels sowie die Transformation von Staatlichkeit"[82] zu erheben. James Clifford prägte schon 1992 mit seinem Begriff „travelling culture" die Sichtweise, „migrancy" als paradigmatische postmoderne Kondition zu sehen.[83] Wie das vorliegende Forschungsprojekt anstrebt, diesen Anspruch zu erfüllen, wurde weiter oben dargelegt.

Auch im Bereich „Musik und Migration" gibt es einschlägige Studien über beispielsweise die Musik von Geflüchteten oder Musik in der Diaspora.[84] So beschäftigen sich vor allem

---

[77] Gross, Joan & McMurray, David & Swedenburg, Ted (1994). Arab Noise and Ramadan Nights: Rai, Rap, and Franco-Maghrebi Identity. In: Diaspora 3, Nr. 1, S. 3-39.

[78] Bukow, Wolf-Dietrich auf einer Podiumsdiskussion der Konferenz „Migration und Kultur" im Juni 2011 an der Alpen-Adria-Universität Klagenfurt, Österreich

[79] Reyes Schramm, Adeleida (1999). Songs Of The Caged, Songs Of The Free: Music and the Vietnamese Refugee Experience. Philadelphia, S. 206.

[80] Bohlman, Philip V. & Radano, Ronald (2000) (Hrsg.): Music and the Racial Imagination. Chicago; Silverman, Carol (2012). Romani routes: cultural politics and Balkan music in diaspora. New York.

[81] 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.

[82] Ibid.

[83] Clifford, James (1997). Routes: travel and translation in the late twentieth century. Cambridge, Mass.

[84] Allen, Ray & Wilcken, Lois (1998) (Hrsg): Island Sounds in the Global City. Caribbean Popular Music and Identity in New York. New York; Bohlman, Philip V. (2002). The place of displacement: Polish musics at home and beyond. In: Romanian Society for Ethnomusicology (Hrsg.): European meetings in ethnomusicology. Vol. 9, Bucharest, S. 166-178; Hemetek, Ursula (2001). Music of Minorities Between Exclusion and Ethnoboom. Intercultural Encounter in Austria. In: the world of music. Vol. 43, Nr. 2-3, S. 39-52; Hirshberg, Jehoash (1990). Radical Discplacement, Post Migration Conditions and Traditional Music. In: the world of music. Vol. 32, Nr. 3,

Autor*innen in der Musikethnologie mit der Situation von Migrant*innen. Diese Ansätze konzentrieren sich auf Konzepte wie *race*, Diaspora, Globalisierung, musikalische Identitätskonstruktionsprozesse oder urbane Subkulturen.[85] So hat Mark Slobin[86] die Theorien der Globalisierung von Arjun Appadurai auf die Musikethnologie übertragen und Musik als Möglichkeit der Umformung von Identitäten bezeichnet. Weiterhin zeigt sich der Einfluss postkolonialer Theorien darin, dass beispielsweise George Lipsitz das *Black Atlantic* Konzept von *race* der britischen Cultural Studies von Paul Gilroy in die Musikethnologie übernommen hat, um Musik als globalisierte Form von Subversion zu betrachten.[87]

In den Postkolonialen Studien ist Migration eines der Hauptthemen. In typischen Einwanderungsländern wie England (Commonwealth), den USA oder anderen ehemaligen Kolonialmächten beschäftigt man sich schon lange mit den Kulturen der Einwander*innen. Postkoloniale Theorien haben weitgehend aufgezeigt, wie die erste Einwanderer*innengeneration als Menschen *zwischen den Kulturen* ein *Dazwischen* konstruiert oder häufig Elemente der Ursprungskultur verwendet. Diese Elemente werden durch ihre Verwendung verändert und verändern gleichzeitig wiederum ihren Ursprung und die weiteren involvierten Gesellschaften mit.[88]

Vor allem Postkoloniale Theoretiker*innen wie Edward Said, Homi K. Bhabha, Gayatri C. Spivak und auch Denker*innen der Cultural Studies des *Birmingham Center of Cultural Studies* wie Stuart Hall oder Paul Gilroy weisen auf das *Othering* hin, mit dem in der Wissenschaft, Kunst und Politik im *Westen* ein stereotypes *Anderes* konstruiert wurde. Verstärkt zu Zeiten des Kolonialismus verfestigten sich beispielsweise Bilder des *Orients*, des *Schwarzen* oder der *Frauen*, die mit Unterdrückung einhergingen beziehungsweise als Rechtfertigung dafür dienten. Im letzten Jahrhundert entwickelten sich nicht nur Befreiungsbewegungen wie der

---

S. 68-89; Leante, Laura (2004). Shaping Diasporic Sounds: Identity as Meaning in Bhangra. In: the world of music. Vol. 46, Nr. 1, S. 109-32; Monson, Ingrid T. (1990). Forced Migration, Asymmetrical Power Relations and African-American Music: Reformulation of Cultural Meaning and Musical Form. In: the world of music. Vol. 32, Nr. 3, S. 22-47; Reyes Schramm, Adelaida (1990). Music and the Refugee Experience. In: the world of music. Vol. 32, Nr. 3, S. 3-21; Zheng, Su de San (1990). Music and Migration: Chinese American Traditional Music in New York City. In: the world of music. Vol. 32, Nr. 3, S. 48-67.

[85] Reily, Suzel Ana (1997). Macunaímas music: national identity and ethnomusicological research in Brazil. In: Ethnicity, identity and music, S. 71-96; Baumann, Gerd (1998). Contesting culture: discourses of identity in multi-ethnic London. Cambridge; Bohlman, Philip V. (2004). The music of European nationalism: cultural identity and modern history. Santa Barbara.

[86] Slobin, Mark (1993). Subcultural sounds: micromusics of the West. Hanover.

[87] Lipsitz, George (1994). Dangerous crossroads: popular music, postmodernism and the poetics of place. London.

[88] Ha, Kien Nghi (2004). Ethnizität und Migration reloaded: kulturelle Identität, Differenz und Hybridität im postkolonialen Diskurs. Berlin.

Feminismus, die Kämpfe für Unabhängigkeit von den Kolonialmächten und die Schwarzen Bürgerrechtsbewegungen, sondern ebenso wurde das dichotome Denken der Moderne an sich in Frage gestellt und dekonstruiert.

Mit dem Forschungsfeld *kulturelle Diversität* beschäftigen sich ferner vor allem die Kulturanthropologie und die Ethnologie, bei letztgenannter vorrangig die Städteforschung sowie historisch arbeitende Kulturwissenschaften. Wie erwähnt widmen sich vor allem die angloamerikanischen Performance Studies[89] mit künstlerischer (Diskurs-)Produktion, kuratorischer Praxis und musikalischer Performanz.

Zusammenfassend lässt sich über die oben erwähnten aktuelleren Studien zu Migration und Kultur beziehungsweise Musik sagen, dass es durchaus wichtige Anknüpfungspunkte gibt wie die Betrachtung von transnationaler Mobilität von Künstler*innen, der Einfluss von postkolonialen Perspektiven auf die Forschung oder die Spartenvermischung in den Künsten, welche auf Performing Arts-Festivals die vorherrschende Programmierung ist. Allerdings gehen die vorliegenden Schriften insbesondere aus zwei Gründen über diese Forschungsansätze hinaus: Erstens aufgrund ihrer interdisziplinären Herangehensweise einer postkolonial und soziologisch orientierten kulturwissenschaftlichen Perspektive und zweitens aufgrund des gleichzeitigen Fokus auf Ambivalenzen und Widersprüche sowie auf soziale Ungleichheiten, Standardisierungen und Konflikte, die dem transkulturellen Ansatz der vorliegenden Schriften Rechnung tragen. Damit lassen sich die vorliegenden Schriften zwar in die entsprechenden Cultural Turns[90] (postcolonial, interpretative etc.) einordnen, führen diese jedoch teilweise weiter und zeigen neue Verbindungslinien zwischen bislang und oft weiterhin als disziplinär abgegrenzt gedachten Feldern auf.

---

[89] Townsend, Melanie (2003). (Hrsg.): Beyond the box: diverging curatorial practices. Banff; Thomas, Catherine (2002) (Hrsg.): The edge of everything: reflections on curatorial practice. Banff; O'Neill, Paul (2012). The culture of curating and the curating of culture(s). Cambridge, MA; Birringer, Johannes (2000). Performance on the edge: transformations of culture. London; Rugg, Judith & Sedgwick, Michèle (2007) (Hrsg.): Issues in curating contemporary art and performance. Bristol; Bial, Henry (2007) (Hrsg.): The performance studies reader. Abingdon; Taylor, Diana & Villegas, Juan (1994) (Hrsg.). Negotiating performance: gender, sexuality, and theatricality in Latin/o. London; Goodman, Lizbeth & de Gay, Jane (2000) (Hrsg.). The Routledge reader in politics and performance. London; Lind, Maria (2012) (Hrsg.). Performing the curatorial: within and beyond art. Berlin.

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

2 Zusammenfassung & Einordnung kumulative Habilitationsschriften

2.1 Dekonstruktion des „Anderen" in Ethnologie und Soziologie. Ein Plädoyer für eine postmigrantische Perspektive

Im ersten Beitrag „Dekonstruktion des ‚Anderen' in Ethnologie und Soziologie. Ein Plädoyer für eine postmigrantische Perspektive" wird die Eurozentrismuskritik der Soziologie mit dem Einfluss von postkolonialen Theorien auf die Ethnologie in Beziehung gesetzt. Die Ethnologie – gewachsen als historische Disziplin des „Fremdverstehens" – setzt sich ab den 1950er Jahren unter dem Stichwort „Repräsentationskrise" mit dem Dilemma auseinander, ob ein *Fremdverstehen* und *wahre* oder *objektive* Aussagen über den *Anderen* überhaupt möglich sind. Der Ethnologie wurde vor allem aus postkolonialen Theoriepositionen heraus vorgeworfen, Handlanger des Kolonialismus zu sein, indem die *Anderen* aus *Westlicher* Sicht eingeteilt, beschrieben, interpretiert und damit normalisiert wurden. Ähnlich lautet die Eurozentrismuskritik an der Soziologie.

In den Gegenständen der beiden Disziplinen sind viele Überschneidungen zu finden: Ethnologen forschen längst *vor der eigenen Haustür*, und die ehemals *fremden Völker und Kulturen* als Gebiete der Ethnologie gehören nicht zuletzt in Zeiten der Globalisierung und weltweiter Mobilität von Personen und Kulturformen zum Forschungsrepertoire der Soziologie. Mittlerweile ähneln sich beide Disziplinen in ihren Perspektiven, Gegenständen, Methoden und Theorien so weit, dass es schwerfällt, fernab der Verteidigung von Lehrstühlen wirkliche Unterschiede festzustellen. Der Beitrag zeigt anhand der so genannten Migrationsforschung in beiden Disziplinen auf, wie sich die Perspektiven vom *Anderen* gewandelt haben: vom *Fremden* über die eurozentrismuskritische und postkoloniale Position des Transnationalismus bis hin zur Dekonstruktion des wissenschaftlichen Blickwinkels auf Migration. Diese Darstellung zeigt, wie eine postmigrantische Perspektive, die plurale Gesellschaften als Normalfall setzt, eine Antwort bieten kann auf die Frage, was nach der postkolonialen und eurozentrismuskritischen Dekonstruktion kommen kann.

Der Beitrag ist nach einem doppelten Begutachtungsprozess im Jahre 2015 im Schwerpunktheft zum Thema „Eurozentrismus der Soziologie?" (Gastherausgeber: Jörn Knobloch) in der Zeitschrift „Kultursoziologie" beim Postdamer Wissenschaftsverlag WeltTrends erschienen.

2.2   Transcultural Music Studies

Defensive bis hin zu aggressiven Einstellungen zur Definition und Verteidigung des *Eigenen* und des *Fremden* sowie unbewusste Vorannahmen bestimmen nicht nur individuelles Verhalten, sondern ebenso schulische Curricula und Lehrinhalte der universitären Musiklehrkräfteausbildung. Musikalische Praktiken von Migrant*innen werden in Öffentlichkeit und (Musik-)Schulen häufig als *traditionelle exotische Musik* oder als *Musik fremder Länder* dargestellt. Die Dekonstruktion solcher Zuschreibungsprozesse und etablierter politischer und pädagogischer Konzepte liegt einer transkulturellen Perspektive in Musikwissenschaft und Musikpädagogik zugrunde. Der zweite Beitrag „Transcultural Music Studies" adressiert verschiedene persistierende Zuschreibungen und Vorannahmen, die häufig musikpädagogischer und musikwissenschaftlicher Lehre und Ausbildung zugrunde liegen und erkundet Möglichkeiten zur Vermeidung derselben durch die Anwendung von Transcultural Music Studies.

Transcultural Music Studies streben an, den limitierten Kanon der *schönen Künste* in der Musikausbildung ohne Exotisierungen zu erweitern. Dafür werden Zuschreibungsprozesse identifiziert, analysiert und interpretiert, um zu zeigen, wie mit Musik Politik gemacht wird. Um diese Zuschreibungsprozesse in der Musikausbildung zu dekonstruieren, wird zunächst die Geschichte der so genannten „Interkulturellen Musikerziehung" am Beispiel Deutschlands skizziert. Anschließend wird die interdisziplinäre Basis der Transcultural Music Studies dargestellt. Schließlich werden Empfehlungen für die Implementierung von Transcultural Music Studies in die musikwissenschaftliche und musikpädagogische Ausbildung formuliert, um Musikwissenschaft und Musikpädagogik an die Herausforderungen heutiger postmigrantischer Gesellschaftsprozesse anzupassen.

Der Beitrag erschien auf Einladung der Herausgeber*innen Julio Mendívil, Kerstin Klenke und Michael Fuhr in der Festschrift „Diggin' Up Music: Musikethnologie als Baustelle" in 2021 im Olms Verlag Hildesheim und Universitätsverlag Hildesheim.

2.3 Symbolische Räume kultureller Diversität: Verhandlungen, Grenzen und Überschreitungen in den performativen Künsten

Im dritten Beitrag „Symbolische Räume kultureller Diversität: Verhandlungen, Grenzen und Überschreitungen in den performativen Künsten" wird am Beispiel von globalen Performing Arts-Festivals die Eurozentrismuskritik der Kulturwissenschaften mit dem Einfluss von postkolonialen Theorien auf transkulturelle Theorien in Beziehung gesetzt. Es wird den Fragen nachgegangen, ob in der EU stattfindende Festivals der Performing Arts die allseits herrschende Norm bestimmen, und wie Räume kultureller Diversität inszeniert beziehungsweise dargestellt werden. Anhand der kuratorischen Strategien auf diesen Festivals werden einerseits die zugrundeliegenden Mechanismen der Programmgestaltung und andererseits die hier ausgedrückten verschiedenen Semantiken von Diversität beleuchtet. Dabei geht es in der Tradition der kulturwissenschaftlichen Eurozentrismuskritik unter anderem darum, wer auf welcher Basis die Macht erhält, ein bestimmtes Verständnis von kultureller Diversität darzustellen.

Der Beitrag versucht, eine Antwort auf die Frage zu finden, ob und wie es möglich ist, kulturelle Diversität in den verschiedenen Kunstsparten zu kuratieren, ohne zu exotisieren beziehungsweise ohne zu paternalisieren. Es wird gezeigt, dass derzeit vor allem zwei *Strömungen* existieren, wie kulturelle Diversität in künstlerischen Projekten kuratiert wird: Auf der einen Seite werden in interkultureller Strategie verschiedene, als abgrenzbar gedachte, nationalbezogene Kunstformen präsentiert, der tolerante Austausch propagiert und das Kennenlernen *fremder Kulturen* gefeiert. Thematisch liegt unter anderem der Fokus auf *migrantischen Kunstformen* oder Migrationsgeschichten. Auch wird hier häufig als multikulturelle Strategie die kulturelle Teilhabe unterrepräsentierter Bevölkerungsgruppen, in diesem Falle die von Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund – und neuerdings von Geflüchteten – gefordert und dadurch kulturelle Diversität mit nationaler beziehungsweise ethnischer Heterogenität gleichgesetzt. Solche Ansätze werden schnell – vor allem seitens kulturwissenschaftlich informierter Studien – als exotisierend, paternalisierend oder als Abgrenzungsmechanismen zementierend kritisiert.

Dem gegenüber stehen transkulturelle, postmigrantische, kosmopolite oder postkoloniale kuratorische Strategien, die neo-kolonialistische oder eurozentristische Strukturen der Repräsentation zurückweisen, die Dichotomie von *Europa versus den Rest* versuchen aufzubrechen, oder intendieren, die postmigrantische Diversität als Normalität zu etablieren.

Hier liegt der thematische Fokus explizit nicht auf der geografischen Herkunft der Künstler*innen, sondern vielmehr auf der Verflechtungsgeschichte spezieller Kunstformen, auf aktuellen Entwicklungen in den zeitgenössischen Künsten oder beispielsweise auf einem ortlosen „Dritten Raum" der Hybridität (Homi K. Bhabha), womit einem dynamischen, dekonstruktivistischen Kulturbegriff Rechnung getragen wird.

Um diese Entwicklungen aufzuzeigen, wird in diesem Beitrag zunächst in kultursemiotischer Perspektive erläutert, wie semantische Zuordnungen in und durch Musik und Performing Arts entstehen und bestimmte Konnotationen evozieren können. Zeichentheoretische, pragmatische und ästhetische Theorien werden diskutiert und schließlich in Ernst Cassirers Bedeutungstheorie *Philosophie der Symbolischen Formen* eingeführt. Damit können die performativen Künste als bedeutungsgebendes, also symbolisches Tun theoretisiert werden, bei dem Bedeutung durch das individuelle Handeln entsteht. Warum es trotzdem zu relativ konstanten Konventionen dabei kommt, deren Gebrauch und Verständnis erlernt werden kann, wird durch die Verbindung von Jan Mukařovskýs pragmatischer Kunstsemantik und Ernst Cassirers Kulturphilosophie mit Howard S. Beckers soziologischen Art World-Ansatz erreicht, so dass auch das gesamte gesellschaftliche Umfeld als strukturierender Raum für Symbole in einem komplexen Zusammenspiel Anerkennung findet.

Der Beitrag stellt anhand dieser interdisziplinären semiotischen Perspektiven einige kuratorische Praktiken aus den Performing Arts vor und diskutiert abschließend, dass dadurch in der globalen Performing Arts-Festival-Szene *Zwischenräume* konstruiert werden, welche ihrerseits einem permanenten Wandel unterliegen.

Der Artikel erschien 2018 nach einem doppelten Begutachtungsprozess in der Open Access Zeitschrift „Schriften zur Kultur- und Mediensemiotik Online" des Virtuellen Zentrums für kultursemiotische Forschung (vzkf) in der Themenausgabe „Raumsemiotik: Räume – Grenzen – Identitäten", herausgegeben von Martin Nies.

2.4 Kulturelle Diversität in den Künsten zwischen Tradition und Zeitgenossenschaft

Seit circa drei Jahrzehnten werden vermehrt globale Kunstwelten und ihre historischen Verortungen wissenschaftlich verhandelt. In dieser Debattenlandschaft scheinen zwei Perspektiven einander gegenüberzustehen: Auf der einen Seite wird versucht, meist aus

postkolonialer Theorie heraus, die binären Zuschreibungsmechanismen der Moderne aufzulösen, und auf Traditionen fokussierte Blickwinkel kritisch zu hinterfragen. Auf der anderen Seite sind nostalgische Strömungen zu beobachten, die – auch aus postkolonialer Perspektive – auf neokoloniale Herrschaftsstrukturen mit Versuchen der Wiederbelebung einer *authentischen* Kulturpraxis reagieren. In beiden Fällen wird eine größtmögliche kulturelle Diversität angestrebt. Der Beitrag „Kulturelle Diversität in den Künsten zwischen Tradition und Zeitgenossenschaft" diskutiert daher die Frage, welche Bedeutungskonturen dem Begriff der Diversität in beiden Fällen innewohnen, wenn einerseits vergangene Gesellschaftsepochen grundlegend dekonstruiert werden und andererseits die Basis für die Begriffsverwendung darstellen.

Am Beispiel der Kunstwelten der Bildenden Kunst und der Performing Arts wird diese Fragestellung untersucht und damit gezeigt, wie kulturelle Diversität hinsichtlich von Gesellschafts- beziehungsweise Kunstepochen (de-)konstruiert wird. Dies bedeutet, dass verschiedene Diversitätskonzepte hinsichtlich ihrer aktuellen Verankerung in traditionellen und zeitgenössischen Kunst- und Kulturepochen betrachtet werden. Konkret behandelt dieser Beitrag die Frage, ob es sich bei transkulturellen Kunstpraktiken um ein traditionelles oder ein zeitgenössisches Phänomen handelt.

Es wird deutlich gemacht, wie zugewiesene Differenzziehungen von interkulturell = traditionell verhaftet versus transkulturell = zeitgenössisch vor allem *Westliche* Zeitvorstellungen in den Künsten prägen und die Sichtweise auf ein von Traditionen entkoppeltes *zeitgenössisches* kulturelles Handeln forcieren, welches außereuropäischen Künstler*innen abgesprochen wird. Diese Ergebnisse werden anhand Howard S. Beckers Theorie der Konventionalisierung, die von Gatekeepern kontrolliert wird, gestützt. Abschließend wird die Dichotomie von Tradition und Zeitgenossenschaft als eben genuin *modernes*, teilweise neo-koloniales Konzept hinterfragt und weitergeführt, indem verschiedene Konzepte wie das der *Histoire croisée* von Michael Werner und Bénédicte Zimmermann und die *Double critique* von Abdelkebir Khatibi vorgeschlagen werden, um sich der Komplexität globaler Kunstwelten zu nähern.

Der Beitrag erschien nach einem Begutachtungsprozess 2018 in dem von Lutz Hieber herausgegebenen kunstsoziologischen Band „Gesellschaftsepochen und ihre Kunstwelten" bei Springer VS in der Reihe „Kunst und Gesellschaft".

2.5 „The West" vs. „The Rest"? Festival Curators as Gatekeepers for Sociocultural Diversity

Der Beitrag „'The West' vs. 'The Rest'? Festival Curators as Gatekeepers for Sociocultural Diversity" analysiert, wie Diversität in den performativen Künsten durch Konventionen standardisiert wird. Dafür werden die verschiedenen Konzepte von Diversität in den Blick genommen, entlang derer renommierte globale Musik- und Performing Arts-Festival kuratiert werden. Der Fokus liegt dabei vor allem auf als *nicht-Westlich* erachtete Performances und auf der Figur der*s Kurators*in, die sowohl als Kulturvermittler*in (cultural intermediary) als auch als Gatekeeper verstanden wird und der*m eine spezielle Rolle in der Definition soziokultureller Konventionen zukommt. Im Sinne des eingangs dargelegten Verständnisses des „curatorials" werden kuratorische Strategien als diskursive soziale Praktiken angesehen, die Identitäten, Symbole und Beziehungen (de-)konstruieren. Diese bilden ein komplexes Feld miteinander verwobener Praktiken, Personen und Institutionen, in dem dominante Ideologien, Terminologien, Gewohnheiten etc. (re-)produziert werden. Der Beitrag stellt die Frage, ob und inwiefern Kurator*innen von Festivals, die innerhalb Europas stattfinden, die Art und Weise normieren, wie Diversität verstanden wird und wie Diversität in den Künsten inszeniert wird. In der Tradition der Eurozentrismuskritik wird diskutiert, wer auf welcher Basis die Macht zu nutzen vermag, Diversität zu definieren. Dabei wird erläutert, wie globale Performing Arts-Festival organisiert und kuratiert werden in Bezug darauf, welche Kulturkonzepte und welche sozialen Konventionen Anwendung finden und dadurch verfestigt werden.

Der Beitrag zeigt, dass eurozentristische und *Westlich*-zentristische ästhetische Kanonisierungen und organisationale Netzwerkbeziehungen die Produktion der immer gleichen Gruppen in der Festivalszene ergeben. Dies könnte zur Interpretation führen, dass eine versteckte Machthierarchie vom *Westen* gegenüber dem *Rest* existierte. Es wird jedoch argumentiert, dass diese reduktivistische Sichtweise nicht ausreicht, sondern vielmehr weitaus komplexere Bedingungen diese Prozesse beeinflussen. Abschließend wird empfohlen, dass internationales Kulturmanagement und globale kuratorische Strategien sich an die heutigen postmigrantischen sozialen Prozesse anpassen sollten. Dafür wird dargelegt, inwiefern eine transkulturelle Sichtweise helfen kann, eurozentristische Praktiken und Zuschreibungen zurückzuweisen sowie die herrschenden Konventionen zu verändern, ohne dabei Konflikte und soziale Ungleichheiten auszublenden.

Als eingeladenes Gründungsmitglied des internationalen Forschungsnetzwerks „Brokering Intercultural Exchange: Interrogating the Role of Arts and Cultural Management" bin ich Autorin dieses doppelt begutachteten Beitrags „'The West' vs. 'The Rest'? Festival Curators as Gatekeepers for Sociocultural Diversity" in der 2020 bei Palgrave McMillan erschienenen Abschlusspublikation des Netzwerks „Managing Culture: Exchange in a Global World" (herausgegeben von den beiden Principal Investigators des Netzwerks Victoria Durrer und Raphaela Henze). Eine kürzere Fassung dieser Publikation wurde 2019 mit dem *Best Early Career Research Paper Award in Sociology of Culture of the European Sociological Association* ausgezeichnet.

2.6 Listening to the Street – Urban Sounds in Hamburg-Altona between the „Right to the City" and the „Creativity *Dispositif*"

Der sechste Beitrag „Listening to the Street – Urban Sounds in Hamburg-Altona between the ‚Right to the City' and the ‚Creativity *Dispositif*'" untersucht die komplexen Beziehungen zwischen Musik und Städten. Unter Anlehnung an Andreas Reckwitz' Diskussion des „Kreativitätsdispositivs", nach dem es zu einem sozialen Regime für jedermann*frau wurde, kreativ zu sein und nach Originalität und Singularität zu streben, untersucht der Artikel im Speziellen wie, wo und warum spezifische urbane Räume durch Musik, spezifische Sounds oder kreative Praktiken wie beispielsweise Straßenmusik kreiert werden. Nach Reckwitz kann diese soziale Ästhetisierung vor allem in Städten beobachtet werden, beispielsweise auch in neoliberalen Diskursen des Stadtmarketings und der „Creative City". Straßenmusik und andere kreative Praktiken im öffentlichen, urbanen Raum scheinen ebenfalls dieser Forderung nach Ästhetisierung zu entsprechen. Allerdings gelten sie auch häufig gleichzeitig als Widerstandspraktiken gegenüber neoliberalen Diskursen, die sich beispielsweise an Henri Lefebvres „Recht auf Stadt" anlehnen.

Der Beitrag analysiert dieses ambivalente und teils widersprüchliche Bild anhand einer empirischen Studie der musikalischen Praktiken beim STAMP-Festival für internationale Straßenkünste in Hamburg-Altona. Dabei werden sowohl Makro-Strukturen wie die Stadtpolitiken und Gentrifizierungsprozesse als auch Mikro-Praktiken der Kreativität in den Blick genommen. Anhand eines Mixed-Methods-Forschungsdesigns, bestehend aus

Ethnografie, Umfragen, qualitativen Interviews und Soundscape Analyse, untersucht die Studie verschiedene Facetten urbaner Sounds aus soziologischer Perspektive, um die Forschungsfrage zu beantworten, ob das STAMP-Festival und die dort untersuchten musikalischen Praktiken eher dem Kreativitätsdispositiv entsprechen oder eher der Strategie bezüglich des „Rechts auf Stadt" zugute kommen.

Zusammenfassend kann diese Frage nicht klar beantwortet werden. Es wird gezeigt, dass das Festival durchaus Gentrifizierungsprozesse und die Ästhetisierung der Stadt im Sinne des Kreativitätsdispositivs bestärkt, sowohl durch die zum Ausdruck kommenden Stadtpolitiken als auch durch die kreativen Praktiken der Teilnehmenden sowie durch den Festivalsound selbst, wodurch ein spezifischer kreativer urbaner Raum produziert wird. Allerdings zeigt sich die Kulturalisierung urbanen Raums nicht auf allen analysierten Ebenen, wenn Lefebvrische widersprüchliche Räume zu erkennen sind. Der urbane Raum wird vielmehr durch komplexe Prozesse immer wieder aufs Neue verhandelt, so dass das STAMP-Festival die Möglichkeit hätte, das „Recht auf Stadt" zu fördern.

Im Rahmen eines Forschungsseminars im Sommersemester 2019 führte ich mit den Studierenden die genannten empirischen Forschungen beim STAMP-Festival für Straßenkünste in Hamburg durch. Die Ergebnisse flossen in diesen für das Themenheft „Listening to the Urbanocene. People – Sounds – Cities" des internationalen Open Access Journals *AVANT: Trends in Interdisciplinary Studies* doppelt-blind begutachteten Artikel mit ein, den ich im *colloborative writing process* mit insgesamt zehn Studierenden abschloss.

2.7   Epistemologies of Diversity and Otherness

Der siebte Beitrag „Epistemologies of Diversity and Otherness" befasst sich ebenfalls mit Prozessen der Standardisierung und Kanonisierung, in diesem Fall bezogen auf kulturwissenschaftliche Studien zu Diversität und Alterität im Allgemeinen und auf soziologische Kulturforschungen zum selben Thema im Speziellen. Der Beitrag zeigt, wie sich zwei kulturwissenschaftliche Narrative erkennen lassen, die epistemologisch mächtig wirken: intersektionale Diversität und Alterität sowie transkulturelle (im englischen Text als cross-cultural übersetzt, um die in dieser Habilitation verwendete transkulturelle Perspektive davon abzugrenzen) Diversität und Alterität. Studien, die die Perspektive intersektionaler Diversität

verfolgen, verstehen Diversität meist als überlappende soziale Zugehörigkeiten, die dazu tendieren (sollen), soziale Inklusion zu fördern. Intersektionale Alterität hingegen betont sich überkreuzende soziokulturelle Differenzziehungen, um ausgrenzende Funktionen zu erfüllen. Im Gegensatz dazu wird transkulturelle Diversität in Studien behandelt, die ambivalenten kulturellen Symbolen Bedeutungen zuschreiben. Transkulturelle Alterität schließlich definiert die Prozesse, die soziokulturelle Differenzen zu destabilisieren und Grenzziehungen aufzulösen versuchen.

Diese kulturwissenschaftlichen Narrative werden dabei als machtvolle strukturierende Episteme verstanden, innerhalb derer auch die vorliegenden Schriften entstanden sind. Um jedoch die akademische Debatte hinsichtlich solcher und weiterer normierender Tendenzen kritisch zu hinterfragen und emanzipatorische Ansätze (neu) zu denken, schlägt der Beitrag – und das gesamte Buch, in dem dieser und die Beiträge 2.8 und 2.9 erscheinen – eine transkulturelle Perspektive in den kulturwissenschaftlichen Forschungen zu Diversität und Alterität vor. Dies soll explizit nicht dazu dienen, lediglich ein neues *transkulturelles* Narrativ zu standardisieren. Vielmehr werden dadurch zugrundeliegende ungleiche Machtbeziehungen im Sinne der postkolonialen Kritik offen gelegt und damit dekolonialisiert sowie Dichotomien im Denken dekonstruiert, indem möglichst viele verschiedene Perspektiven und Standpunkte mit einbezogen werden.

Dieser und zwei weitere von mir verfassten Beiträge erschienen 2021 in Open Access bei DeGruyter in dem von mir und Giulia Pelillo-Hestermeyer (Heidelberg) herausgegebenen doppelt begutachteten Band „Diversity and Otherness. Transcultural Insights into Norms, Practices, Negotiations".

2.8   How to Curate Diversity and Otherness in Global Performance Art

Mein zweiter Beitrag im selben Band und achter Beitrag für die Habilitationsschrift „How to Curate Diversity and Otherness in Gobal Performance Art (Essay together with an Interview with Claude Jansen)" widmet sich ähnlich wie der vorangegangene den beiden Narrativen von Diversität und Alterität (intersektionale und transkulturelle) und ihrer Anwendung in Feldern globaler performativer Künste. Unter den Fragestellungen, ob und inwiefern diese Felder dekolonialisiert werden können, und wie Diversität und Alterität kuratiert werden können

ohne lediglich eine neue hegemoniale Norm zu essentialisieren, diskutiert der Beitrag verschiedene Ansätze aus sowohl akademischer Literatur sowie aus Interviews, die ich im Feld durchgeführt habe. Der Essay beruht vor allem auf einem Interview zur Fragestellung, das ich mit Claude Jansen durchgeführt habe, die als Forscherin, Dramaturgin und Kuratorin im Bereich globaler Tanz tätig ist. Auch wenn der Fokus wie bei den weiteren vorliegenden Schriften hauptsächlich auf den performativen Künsten inklusive Musik liegt, zeigt die Diskussion, dass ähnliche Bedingungen und Praktiken auch in anderen Kunstformen wie Literatur oder visueller Kunst vorherrschen.

Zunächst werden strukturelle Bedingungen in den Blick genommen, welche die in globalen performativen Künsten repräsentierte Diversität und Alterität beeinflussen. Hier fokussieren Politiken darauf, gleichwertigen Zugang zu Ressourcen für alle Beteiligten zu ermöglichen, um ungleiche Ökonomie- und Machtbeziehungen auf globaler Ebene zu bekämpfen. Die diskutierten Beispiele zeigen jedoch, dass diese und weitere Politiken häufig gleichzeitig ein- und ausgrenzende Folgen haben.

Anschließend wende ich den Blick darauf, wie durch transkulturelle künstlerische Praktiken Diversität und Alterität inszeniert werden und dabei angestrebt wird, Zwischenräume zu eröffnen und Abgrenzungsmechanismen zu hinterfragen. Doch auch hier zeigt sich, wie diese transkulturellen künstlerischen und kuratorischen Ansätze einerseits dazu beitragen, Zwischenräume zu öffnen und Normierungen von Diversität und Alterität zu dekonstruieren, jedoch andererseits häufig gleichzeitig Zwischenräume auch erst durch eben diese Praktiken wieder geschlossen werden sowie Diversität und Alterität standardisiert werden. Abschließend wird unter Bezugnahme auf aktuelle dekoloniale kuratorische Ansätze, die sowohl Solidarität und Komplizenschaft als auch Konflikte und Brüche betonen, empfohlen, Diversität und Alterität im Sinne des transkulturellen Ansatzes des gesamten Bandes als transkulturelle Diversität und Alterität zu verstehen. Dies bedeutet, dass Diversität und Alterität nicht a priori definiert werden, sondern für jeden Ansatz wieder aufs Neue verhandelt werden. Dieser Weg zeigt auf, dass unter Einbezug pluralistischer Stimmen und dem Aushandeln sowie einer möglichst vorurteilsfreien Reflexion von Konflikten in diesen Prozessen die kuratorische Praxis in globalen performativen Künste dekolonialisiert werden könnte.

2.9 Decolonizing Otherness through a Transcultural Lens: Conclusion

Mein dritter Beitrag in diesem Band und neunter Beitrag für die Habilitationsschrift „Decolonizing Otherness through a Transcultural Lens: Conclusion" stellt das zusammenfassende Fazit des Buches dar. Da die Einleitung von Giulia Pelillo-Hestermeyer die Beiträge des Bandes vor allem hinsichtlich *Diversität* reflektiert, schließt das Fazit mit Fokus auf *Alterität* beziehungsweise auf *Differenzen*, mit denen Alterität hergestellt wird, diese thematische Klammer ebenfalls aus transkultureller Perspektive.

Der Beitrag fasst die Hauptthesen des Buches wie folgt zusammen und ordnet alle Beiträge in ihrem Bezug zu *Alterität* beziehungsweise *Differenzen* ein: Die Standardisierungen, Praktiken und Verhandlungen von Diversität, die für verschiedene gesellschaftliche Kontexte und Zeiten sowie aus verschiedenen kulturwissenschaftlichen Zugängen aus konstruktivistischer Sicht diskutiert wurden, gehen mit der Konstruktion, Rekonstruktion und Dekonstruktion von Alterität in höchst kontingenten Prozessen einher. Damit kann gezeigt werden, dass der Fokus auf der Konstruktion und gleichzeitigen Dekonstruktion von Differenzen im Mittelpunkt kulturwissenschaftlicher Studien zu Diversität und Alterität steht, ob nun Differenzen dabei stabilisiert oder destabilisiert gedacht werden. Alle Kapitel im Buch verfolgen diese differenz-theoretische (de-)konstruktivistische Perspektive, wobei einige Kapitel die Standardisierungsprozesse von Diversität stärker in den Blick nehmen und andere sich vor allem auf Zuschreibungsprozesse von Alterität konzentrieren.

Anschließend wird das Konzept der *Differenz* näher beleuchtet und aus sozial- und geisteswissenschaftlicher Sicht diskutiert, um eine weitere durch alle Beiträge im Buch laufende Perspektive zusammenzufassen: Alle Kapitel diskutieren Diversität und Alterität in prozessualer und situationaler Sicht, das heißt wie Diversität und Alterität in verschiedenen Kontexten praktiziert werden. Damit wird der Dynamik jeglicher kultureller Praktiken und Formen Rechnung getragen und anerkannt, dass die Konstruktion von Differenzen sowohl zu ihren Standardisierungen als auch zu ihren Dekonstruktionen führen kann. Die Dynamik zwischen diesen beiden Diskussions- bzw. Reflexionsweisen erzeugt ein Spannungsfeld, welches mit dem transkulturellen Ansatz dieses Buches adressiert wird, und welches andauernden Neu-Verhandlungen unterliegt. Wenn bei diesen transkulturellen Verhandlungsprozessen vor allem ungleiche Machtrelationen und Lösungsstrategien zur Herausforderung etablierter Normen im sozialen Leben fokussiert werden, ist in diesem Band von dekolonialisierenden Praktiken die Rede, die einem gleichheits-theoretischen Impetus

folgen. Dabei wird vor allem gefragt, welche Re-, De- oder Konstruktionen von Diversität und Alterität dazu beitragen, ungleiche Machtrelationen in sozialen Lebenswelten und diskursiven Kontexten zu stärken, herauszufordern oder sogar aufzulösen.

Abschließend wird das Feld der Kulturwissenschaften und seine disziplinären Normierungen und Standardisierungen in den Blick genommen und die Notwendigkeit der Dekolonialisierung dieses Feldes unterstrichen, um etablierte disziplinäre Abgrenzungen zu überwinden. Das Buch und auch diese Habilitation sollen einen Beitrag leisten, die aktuelle kulturwissenschaftliche Forschung zu Diversität und Alterität zu dekolonialisieren und damit zu *transkulturalisieren*.

2.10 Curatorial Practices of the „Global": Toward a Decolonial Turn in Museums in Berlin and Hamburg?

Der zehnte und letzte Beitrag der vorliegenden Habilitationsschrift „Curatorial Practices of the 'Global': Toward a Decolonial Turn in Museums in Berlin and Hamburg?" nimmt den dekolonialen Ansatz des vorangehenden Beitrags auf und bezieht ihn auf das Feld der visuellen Künste. Unter der Frage, wer die Entscheidungsmacht hat zu definieren, was zum Kanon globaler zeitgenössischer Künste gehört und was ausgegrenzt wird, wurde untersucht, wie verschiedene Ansätze des *Globalen* im internationalen Kunstmuseum Martin Gropius Bau in Berlin und im ehemaligen Völkerkundemuseum MARKK in Hamburg kuratiert werden. Denn dekoloniale Ästhetik, postkoloniales Denken und Provenienzforschung zu musealen Objekten führten vor allem in letzter Zeit zu mehr Legitimitätsdruck von Museen in Deutschland und zu Debatten über ihre eurozentristische Perspektiven, über ihre Verortung, über die Unterscheidung zwischen Objekt und Kunstwerk sowie über die Reproduktion kolonialen Denkens. Obwohl diesbezüglich eine selbstkritische Wende zu erkennen ist, wird nicht klar, ob diese Prozesse dazu beitragen, die Kunstorganisationen selbst zu dekolonialisieren und damit auch strukturelle Veränderungen anzustoßen.

Darauf bezogen werden die Möglichkeiten, Einschränkungen und Anwendungen von akademischen Konzepten wie „anti-rassistische" oder „postkoloniale Kuration" diskutiert und ihr Zusammenhang zu Konzepten der „New Museology" dargelegt. Anhand von Textanalyse, räumlichen Mapping, (historischer und visueller) Online-Ethnografie, einem qualitativen Expert*innen-Interview, Teilnehmender Beobachtung, Ausstellungsanalyse sowie einer

strukturierten Publikumsbefragung untersucht die Studie sowohl die Ebene der Kuration, als auch die Ebenen der Ausstellungsinhalte und die Sicht der Rezipient*innen, um aufzudecken, welche Stimmen und Handlungsmuster in welcher Art und Weise Sichtbarkeit erlangen oder exkludiert werden.

Diese Studie belegt sowohl Ansätze einer dekolonialen Wende in der kuratorischen Praxis als auch die Notwendigkeit zu weiteren Wandlungsprozessen in diesem Zusammenhang. Um eine dekoloniale kuratorische Praxis zu erreichen, sollten beispielsweise die visuellen Repräsentationsstrategien im Museum hinsichtlich unterrepräsentierter Künstler*innen und Kunstformen weiter ausgeglichen werden und die Publikumsbeteiligung weiter gestärkt werden. Auch über den Museumskontext hinaus erscheint eine dekoloniale Wende in visueller Kultur nicht nur notwendig, sondern auch erreichbar.

Im Wintersemester 2019/2020 lehrte ich in einem Forschungsseminar zu kuratorischen Praktiken des *Globalen* in den visuellen Künsten. Wir führten Mixed-Methods Forschungen unter anderem zum MARKK Hamburg, zum Martin-Gropius-Bau Berlin sowie zum urbanen Raum rund um das Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe Hamburg unter der Fragestellung des „decolonial turns" im Museum durch. Die Ergebnisse dieser Forschungen stellten die Studierenden im Januar 2020 auf der ACMC students' conference in Groningen, Niederlande vor. Der gemeinsam mit den zehn Studierenden in einem *colloborative writing process* verfassten englischsprachigen Artikel zum gleichen Thema erschien 2020 nach einem doppelt-blinden Begutachtungsprozess im Themenheft „Museum – Politics – Management" des internationalen Journals of Cultural Management and Cultural Policy und wurde mit dem „Best Research Article Award 2020 of the Journal of Cultural Management and Cultural Policy" ausgezeichnet.

3   Kumulative Habilitationsschriften

3.1   2015. Dekonstruktion des „Anderen" in Ethnologie und Soziologie. Ein Plädoyer für eine postmigrantische Perspektive

KULTUR
SOZIOLOGIE

THEMA

EUROZENTRISMUS DER SOZIOLOGIE?

Luhmanns Überwindung

Grenzen der Zivilgesellschaft

Postkoloniale Betrachtungen

Forum

Die Geschichte der Kulturwissenschaft

Aufsätze & Besprechungen

2/15

Dekonstruktionen des „Anderen" in Ethnologie und Soziologie

Ein Plädoyer für eine postmigrantische Perspektive

Lisa Gaupp

Migrationsforschung, Eurozentrismus, Transnationalismus

Ethnologie und Soziologie ähneln sich mittlerweile in ihren Perspektiven, Methoden und Theorien so weit, dass es außer bei der Verteidigung von Lehrstühlen schwer fällt, wirkliche Unterschiede festzustellen. Je nach Standort werden beide Disziplinen ein Mal den Sozialwissenschaften, ein anderes Mal den Geistes- und/oder Kulturwissenschaften zugeordnet. Ebenfalls lassen sich in den Gegenständen der beiden Disziplinen viele Überschneidungen finden: Ethnologen forschen längst „vor der eigenen Haustür", und die ehemals „fremden Völker und Kulturen" als Hoheitsgebiete der Ethnologie gehören nicht zuletzt in Zeiten der Globalisierung und weltweiter Mobilität von Personen und Kulturformen zum Forschungsrepertoire der Soziologie.[1] Nach wie vor geht es jedoch um „Fremdverstehen", das nicht zuletzt methodologische Implikationen aufwirft, mit denen sich die Qualitative Sozialforschung und vor allem die Ethnografie auseinandersetzen. Die theoretisch-moralischen Kritikpunkte ähneln sich auch hier wieder und sind mit der folgenden Frage zusammenzufassen: Wie lassen sich Daten legitimieren, die ohnehin subjektiv sind, aber zuvorderst der Crux unterliegen, auf der Basis von Machtbeziehungen gewonnen worden zu sein?

In der Ethnologie bzw. Kulturanthropologie oder auch Völkerkunde – seit ihrer Entstehung um 1770 als Teilgebiet der historischen Wissenschaftsdisziplinen gewachsen als Disziplin des „Fremdverstehens" – wird ab den 1950er-Jahren unter dem Stichwort „Repräsentationskrise" das Dilemma diskutiert, ob ein „Fremdverstehen" und „wahre" oder objektive Aussagen über den „Anderen" überhaupt möglich sind. Vor allem in den postkolonialen Theorien wird der Vorwurf geäußert, dass die Ethnologie kolonialistisch agieren würde, indem die „Anderen" aus „westlicher" Sicht eingeteilt, beschrieben, interpretiert und damit normalisiert werden. Ähnlich lautet die Eurozentrismuskritik an der

Soziologie. Auch hier sind einige der theoretischen Wurzeln dieser Kritik vor allem in den postkolonialen Studien oder in den poststrukturalistischen Theorien zu finden.

Die Migrations- bzw. Ethnizitäts- oder auch Diversitätsforschung als jüngeres Forschungsgebiet beider Disziplinen spiegelt ebenfalls diese Fragestellung wider, denn die Frage lautet auch hier, wer und auf welcher Basis die Macht erhält, „über" Migrantinnen und Migranten zu sprechen. Um die Entwicklung dieser Frage zu erläutern und aktuelle Antwortstrategien vorzustellen, wird im Folgenden die Entwicklung der Migrationsforschung ohne disziplinäre Unterscheidung dargestellt, da die jeweiligen Positionen sowohl soziologischer, kulturanthropologischer/ethnologischer oder postkolonialer/literaturwissenschaftlicher etc. Provenienz sind. Anschließend wird dargestellt, inwiefern die jüngsten Entwicklungen in der Migrationsforschung eine Dekonstruktion der eigenen Perspektive vorschlagen und es wird argumentiert, welche Möglichkeiten für Soziologie und Ethnologie durch das Aufdecken von Alteritätszuschreibungen in einer postmigrantischen Sichtweise entstehen.

Migrationsforschung: die „Anderen"

Die Migrationsforschung in Deutschland hat sich zu einer etablierten und institutionalisierten Wissenschaft entwickelt, die sich mit den Strukturen, Bedingungen, Folgen und Räumen globaler und regionaler Migration auseinandersetzt. Betrachtet man die wissenschaftliche Literatur, die sich mit der Migrationsgeschichte Deutschlands befasst, fällt auf, dass sich in der Mehrheit der Texte in den ersten Sätzen statistische Zahlen über den demografischen Wandel in Deutschland lesen lassen, die zwei Entwicklungen illustrieren: Zum einen werden wir immer älter, zum anderen wird der Bevölkerungsanteil der Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund bis zum Jahr 2050 auf 50 Prozent steigen.[2] Ein weiterer häufig genannter Eingangssatz ist die Feststellung, dass sich Deutschland seit der Reform des Staatsbürgerschaftsrechts im Jahre 2000 als Einwanderungsland versteht, was diverse Schlussfolgerungen zulässt. Eine Vielzahl von Studien jüngeren Datums vor allem aus kulturpolitischen Zusammenhängen untersucht das Kulturnutzungsverhalten von Migrantinnen und Migranten in Deutschland.[3]

Der Fokus von Migrationsstudien ist anfänglich eher auf regionale und nationale Entwicklungen beschränkt. So konzentriert sich die frühere

Migrationsliteratur häufig auf Vorher-Nachher-Analysen und versucht, Assimiliations- und Akkulturationsprozesse aufzudecken. Einwanderer werden dabei häufig „vergegenständlicht" und ihre „Fremdheit" wird kulturalisiert.[4] Flankiert wird dies durch die Forderungen der Politik und Öffentlichkeit nach der Assimilation der „Gastarbeiter".

Seit den 1970er-Jahren ist jedoch ein Perspektivenwandel in Richtung eines Integrationsparadigmas zu erkennen, trotz der fortgeführten Zuschreibung von Fremdheit und der Dichotomisierung in „wir" und die „Anderen": Es „[...] kann behauptet werden, dass die fundamentale Grunddifferenz des (europäischen) Kulturdiskurses die Etablierung des Unterschieds zwischen Eigenem und Fremden ist."[5] Nach Sökefeld lässt sich diese Dichotomisierung in der Wissenschaft vorrangig anhand der Figur des „Zwischen-zwei-Kulturen-lebens" für Migrantinnen und Migranten der zweiten Generation erkennen. Seltener wird über erfolgreiche Migrantinnen und Migranten berichtet, da das Forschungsinteresse eher auf Ethnizität oder soziale Probleme der Migrantinnen und Migranten abzielt.[6] Doch auch in den wenigen positiven Darstellungen[7] werden Zuschreibungen bis hin zu Stereotypen verfestigt. Vielfach wird Ethnizität mit Kultur gleichgesetzt.

Der Migrationsforschung geht es u. a. darum, alteritäre Identitäten zu beschreiben und zu verstehen, d. h. sie sucht nach der theoretischen Fassbarkeit des „Fremdverstehens". Die Ethnologie sieht sich vor allem für das vergleichende „Fremdverstehen" von „fremden, anderen, d. h. außereuropäischen Völkern" zuständig.[8]

Demzufolge lassen sich in der Migrationsforschung drei Paradigmen im Umgang mit der Erforschung von Ethnizität ausmachen: die der Primordialisten, die der Situationalisten und die der Dekonstruktivisten. Die Primordialisten gehen bis in die 1960er-Jahre davon aus, dass Ethnizität bzw. Kultur statisch und vererbbar sei, wobei die Ethnie für Volk steht. In den 1920er- und 1930er-Jahren vertritt bspw. die Soziologie der Chicagoer Schule diese primordiale Perspektive, die ethnische Gruppen und ihre unausweichliche Kultur als natürliche, homogene, statische, authentische und primordiale Einheiten ansieht. Solche Theorien sind aber auch mit rassistischen Überlegenheitsfantasien verknüpft, weshalb sie aus der wissenschaftlichen Literatur weitgehend verschwunden sind. Dementsprechend wichtig sind die anderen beiden Paradigmen, die im Folgenden eingehender vorgestellt werden.

Transnationalismus

Der Kulturanthropologe Franz Boas bringt einen ethischen Kulturrelativismus in die Ethnologie, der Kulturen oder Ethnien zwar als gleichwertig, aber weiterhin als homogen beschreibt. Claude Lévi-Strauss anerkennt ab den 1950er-Jahren kulturelle Vermischungen, die jedoch ebenfalls auf kulturellen Einzelteilen beruhen. Schließlich ist es Clifford Geertz zuzuschreiben, Kulturen als Quelle von sozialem Verhalten anstelle von zusammengesetzten, homogenen Einzelteilen anzusehen.[9] Weiterhin sind James Clifford und Ulf Hannerz zu nennen, die Kultur als global vernetzte Gemeinschaftsressource („common pool of global culture") betrachten.[10]

Fredrik Barth gilt als der Autor, der die Veränderlichkeit ethnischer Zugehörigkeit einführt, und Ethnizität als dynamischen, produktiven Prozess setzt, bei dem Grenzziehungen als Bedingung für die Konstruktion von Ethnizität fungieren.[11] Diese Begriffsbildung der Situationalisten ist bis heute in der Ethnologie, in den Sozialwissenschaften oder in Migrationsstudien allgemein die Standarddefinition von Ethnizität. Demnach ist Ethnizität ein emotionales Zugehörigkeitsgefühl, das als Ideologie sozial konstruiert wird. Inklusionsmechanismen beinhalten die Konstruktion von Traditionen; Exklusionsmechanismen unterstreichen die Differenzen nach außen.

Neuere Arbeiten problematisieren verstärkt diese Verfestigung von Differenzen und die damit verbundene Essentialisierung von kulturellen Stereotypen.[12] Angelehnt an Samuel Huntingtons *Kampf der Kulturen*[13] geht diese Sichtweise häufig davon aus, dass Konflikte durch kulturelle Unterschiede entstehen, welche die unausweichliche Folge von Migration seien. Jüngere Migrationsforschungen kritisieren dies, indem sie sich auf transnationale oder diasporische Formationen beziehen.[14] Dieser sogenannte Transnationalismus ist vorrangig der Richtung der Situationalisten zuzuordnen und intendiert, unter dem Stichwort „Mobilität" (und nicht unter dem Stichwort „Migration") sämtliche transnationale Bewegungen zu erfassen.

Neueste Strömungen der Migrationsforschung versuchen, diesen Blickwinkel des Transnationalismus zu erweitern, beispielsweise um die Gesamtsituation von *migrancy*[15], die Migration nicht als Forschungsgegenstand sondern als Voraussetzung für heutige Gesellschaften versteht[16]

und die Migrationsstudien insgesamt dezentrieren[17]. An die Stelle von Migration soll nun die kulturelle Komplexität[18], *ethnoscapes*[19], Kosmopolitanismus[20] oder das gesellschaftliche Zusammenleben (*conviviality*[21]) als Forschungsgegenstände treten. Boris Nieswand und Heike Drotbohm nennen diese Entwicklungen einer „allgemeine[n] gewachsene[n] Skepsis gegenüber dominanten Kultur- und Gesellschaftsbildern"[22] die reflexive Wende in der Migrationsforschung.

Repräsentationskrise und Dekonstruktion von Migration

Diese Richtung von Ethnizitäts- und Migrationstheorien möchte Ethnizität und Migration als symbolische Inklusions- und Exklusionskonstruktionen „dekonstruieren" und ethnische bzw. kulturelle Zuweisungen auflösen. Solche Forschungen lassen sich vor allem poststrukturalistischen und postkolonialen Studien zuordnen. Allerdings hielt die postkoloniale Perspektive erst kürzlich Einzug in die deutschsprachige Diskussion, wodurch der spezifische Blick von Minderheiten ins Zentrum der wissenschaftlichen Reflexion rückt, neue offene Denkräume entstehen und systemische Grenzen als durchlässig gedacht werden.

Seit der Mitte des 20. Jahrhunderts ist die Frage der Fremdrepräsentation ein zugrundeliegendes Dilemma in der Ethnologie. Die Skepsis, inwiefern ein „Fremdverstehen" und „wahre" oder objektive Aussagen über den „Anderen" überhaupt möglich sind, wird als „Repräsentationskrise der Ethnologie" bezeichnet, die etwa ab der Mitte der 1980er-Jahre verstärkt diskutiert wird. Kultur gilt für die Autoren dieser Writing-Culture-Debatte nicht mehr nur als Repräsentation, sondern als Erfindung, „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."[23] Mit dieser Auffassung, dass Ethnografie Fiktion sei, wendet sich die Ethnologie dem „Anderen" in uns, in „unseren westlichen" Gesellschaften und der damit verbundenen Konstruktion eines „Selbst" zu.

Der philosophische Poststrukturalismus mit einigen seiner prominentesten Vertreter, Jean-François Lyotard (Postmoderne), Jaques Derrida (Dekonstruktion), Gilles Deleuze und Félix Guattari (Rhizom)[24] sowie Michel Foucault (Diskursanalyse), legt den Grundstein für eine ebenfalls

selbstreflexive Soziologie, welche durch die „Abgrenzung von gewohnten Reflexionsweisen, etablierten Darstellungsformen, traditionellen Diskurspraktiken"[25] den Einfluss der Ethnologie auf die Soziologie offenbart, da diese epistemologische Wende die soeben beschriebene Skepsis umfasst, welche vor allem in Bereichen der Kultursoziologie diskutiert wird.[26] Insbesondere im Hinblick auf das empirisch-methodische Dilemma der unmöglichen Objektivität in der Datengewinnung und Dateninterpretation, das durch diese Selbstreflexion aufkommt, bietet die ethnologische Debatte Anknüpfungspunkte für eine poststrukturalistisch fundierte Soziologie, die sich nunmehr unter Anwendung eines konstruktivistischen Kulturbegriffs vor allem durch die Kritik am Logozentrismus und die radikale Dezentrierung des modernen Subjektbegriffs[27] bzw. dem Negieren eines Zentrums verstärkt der „Differenz" zuwendet. Es zeigt sich, „daß dieser ‚Kulturalisierung' der soziologischen Theorie eine ‚Soziologisierung' der ethnologischen Theorie entspricht. Während erstere nun verstärkt die soziale Welt und somit auch die eigenen Konzepte als kulturelle Konstruktionen wahrnimmt, wird in letzterer durch wissenssoziologisch inspirierte Betrachtungsweisen der Blick auf die sozialen Kontexte der Wissensproduktion, auf Macht- und Herrschaftsverhältnisse gelenkt."[28]

Antworten auf diese Fragestellungen versucht auch die Interkulturelle Philosophie zu bieten, indem ein „ortloses" Gespräch die Ortlosigkeit des Denkens unterstreichen soll.[29] Theoretiker der postkolonialen Studien dekonstruieren ebenfalls die „westliche" hegemoniale Konstruktion des „Anderen" und die topografischen Zuweisungen von Kultur. So zeigt Edward W. Said, dass bei der Herstellung eines Textes jedweder Art immer Vorstellungen und Wissen vorausgesetzt werden und der Autor seinerseits auch wieder in Umstände eingebettet ist, die eine objektive Wahrheit ohnehin ausschließen.[30]

In den letzten 20 Jahren wird daher verstärkt versucht, Essenzialisierungen zu vermeiden und eurozentristische Paradigmen zu überwinden, nicht zuletzt, um theoretische Modelle zu entwickeln, die der existierenden kulturellen Komplexität genüge tun. Grenzziehungen werden nun problematisiert und Modelle der Grenzüberschreitung, der Transkulturalität[31], der Kreolisierung[32], Diaspora[33] oder *super-diversity*[34] und der Hybridität[35] favorisiert. Diese Begriffe besitzen jeweils unterschiedliche Ausrichtungen, jedoch ist ihnen gemein, dass sie essenzialistische Paradigmen wie Nation, Ethnizität oder Gender zu problematisieren und aufzulösen versuchen. Die Intersektionalitätsforschung thematisiert

bspw. die Verknüpfung von mehrfach (diskriminierenden) Identitätszuweisungen.[36] Kultur gilt als dynamischer Prozess, der pluralistische und ambivalente Identitäten zulässt.

Um diese Komplexität nicht in ein Nebeneinander von Teilkulturen abgleiten zu lassen, werden Abgrenzungen auf verschiedene Weisen hinterfragt. Die zugrundeliegende Denkfigur dieser Richtung von Migrationsforschung ist das von dem poststrukturalistischen Philosophen Derrida begründete Konzept der Dekonstruktion. Der Begriff der Differenz fungiert dabei als beschreibende Kategorie für die kognitive Unklarheit, die bei der Theoretisierung von sozialer oder kultureller Komplexität entstehen kann.

„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."[37]

Postmigrantische Hybridität

Postkoloniale Theorien bedienen sich des Analyseinstruments des Dekonstruktivismus, um aufzuzeigen, wie in migratorischen Räumen der Globalisierung „Zwischenräume" konstruiert werden, die ihrerseits einem permanenten Wandel unterliegen. Damit sind postkoloniale Theorien eine poststrukturalistische Antwort auf die postmodernen Diversitätstheorien, deren zwar pluralisierte, jedoch weiterhin auf Differenzen basierende Ausrichtung enttarnt wird. „So wird jeder scheinbar strenge und irreduzible Gegensatz [...] für ‚theoretische Fiktion' erklärt."[38]

Auch die wissenschaftliche Perspektive selbst wird durch postkoloniale Autoren wie Edward Said, Homi K. Bhabha, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak und Denkern der Cultural Studies des Birmingham Centers for Contemporary Cultural Studies wie Stuart Hall oder Paul Gilroy eines *Otherings* überführt, durch das ein stereotypes „Anderes" konstruiert wird. Das auf einfachen Binaritäten basierende Denken der Moderne wird zurückgewiesen.[39] So schlägt Spivak aufgrund der Unmöglichkeit, als Subalterner am Diskurs teilhaben zu können, vor, diese subalterne Erfahrung als

„unerreichbare Leere/Ausdruckslosigkeit/Verständnislosigkeit (blankness)" zu erhalten, um dadurch die Grenzen des „westlichen" Wissenschaftssystems offenzulegen.[40] Als weitere postkoloniale Autoren, die Alternativen für die „westliche" Wissenschaftsperspektive auf Migration anbieten, sind etwa Gilroy und Bhabha zu nennen. Gilroys Figur des *Black Atlantic* nutzt den Atlantik als geschichtswissenschaftliche Analyseeinheit, um transkulturelle und transnationale kulturelle Formationen in den Blick zu nehmen. Dabei steht der Atlantik für das Dazwischen, für ein Netzwerk zwischen dem Lokalen und dem Globalen, das die Dichotomie von „Nation versus Diaspora" transzendiert.[41]

Bhabhas Konzept des „Dritten Raums" geht ebenfalls über einfache Binaritäten hinaus, indem sich das Subjekt als ein „Weder-Noch" in diesem Raum der „Hybridität" konstruieren kann und damit alle Erwartungen enttäuscht. Hybridität bei Bhabha bedeutet nichtbenennbare Zwischenräume, in denen Zuschreibungen und Bedeutungen an Eindeutigkeit und Determinismen verlieren.

„Eben jener Dritte Raum konstituiert, obwohl ‚in sich' nicht repräsentierbar, die diskursiven Bedingungen der Äußerung, die dafür sorgen, daß die Bedeutung und die Symbole von Kultur nicht von allem Anfang an einheitlich und festgelegt sind und daß selbst ein und dieselben Zeichen neu belegt, übersetzt, rehistorisiert und gelesen werden können."[42]

Bhabha bietet weiterhin die Möglichkeit einer subversiven Widerstandspraxis, wenn dominante Symbole durch Mimikry umgedeutet werden. „In dieser Wiederholung und gleichzeitigen Entstellung dominanter Diskurse entsteht eine subversive Differenz, in der hegemoniale Zeichen und Bedeutungen umgedeutet, verunreinigt, hybridisiert werden."[43]

Um eine Perspektive der Hybridität nach Bhabha auf die gegenwärtige Migrationsforschung anzuwenden, liegt es nahe, die Anwendbarkeit seiner Theorie auf den deutschsprachigen Kontext zu prüfen. Ebenso stellt sich die Frage, was an die Stelle von dekonstruierten Zuschreibungen treten kann. Zur Beantwortung der letzteren Frage bietet Derrida eine Möglichkeit: „An die Stelle von System, Zentrum und Struktur tritt im Dekonstruktivismus der Begriff des ‚Spiels', das Derrida als ‚Abwesenheit eines Zentrums' bestimmt. [...] Unsere ‚Identität' ist so eine plurale Identität; sie ist keine zentrierte Struktur, sondern ein Ort des Spiels verschiedener Bilder des Selbst ohne festen Grund und ohne festes Zentrum."[44]

Dies bedeutet für die Migrationsforschung, die Technik des Dekonstruktivismus auf das jeweilige Forschungsfeld anzuwenden und jegliche Zuschreibungen, Identitätstheorien, diskursive Vorannahmen etc. „gegen den Strich"[45] zu lesen.

Um den deutschsprachigen Kontext zu berücksichtigen[46], wird an dieser Stelle die „postmigrantische" Perspektive vorgeschlagen, die die Möglichkeit bietet, Migration nicht als einen abgeschlossenen Vorgang oder als Forschungsfeld zu betrachten, sondern wie weiter oben beschrieben als Voraussetzung für heutige Gesellschaften. „Dabei geht es um kulturelle Überschneidungen, Grenz- und Zwischenräume, um Kreuzungen und simultane Zugehörigkeiten."[47] Um dennoch anzuerkennen, dass heutige Gesellschaften wesentlich auf Migrationsgeschehen beruhen, verbleibt das „Migrantische" in dem Begriff. Das Postmigrantische, das die plurale Gesellschaft als Normalfall setzt, ist dabei nicht als festgeschriebener Zustand, sondern als Prozess der dynamischen Hybridität zu verstehen. Damit werden eurozentristische Vorannahmen bei postmigrantisch ausgerichteten soziologischen Studien zurückgewiesen, wenn anstelle des ehemaligen Zentrum-Peripherie-Modells dezentrierte und praxeologische Analysen im Mittelpunkt stehen.

Eine solche postmigrantische Perspektive bietet der Migrationsforschung die Möglichkeit, durch Aufdeckung, Zurückweisung oder Mimikryumdeutung von Alteritätszuschreibungen eine Dekonstruktion der eigenen eurozentrischen Wissenschaftspraktiken vorzunehmen und in einem „Spiel" des Durchquerens Dritter Räume von Hybridität neue und auch widersprüchliche Sichtweisen auf Kultur, Ethnizität, Identität und Migration zuzulassen.

Literatur

Appadurai, Arjun (1996): Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globality. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

Appiah, Anthony Kwame (2009): Der Kosmopolit – Philosophie des Weltbürgertums. Beck, München.

Arnault, Karel (2012): Super-diversity: elements of an emerging perspective. In: Language and Superdiversites II Diversities. Vol. 14, (2), S. 1–16.

Baquero Torres, Patricia (2004): Geschlecht und Kultur im erziehungs-wissenschaftlichen Migrationsdiskurs am Beispiel der Interkulturellen Pädagogik und Sozialpädagogik. In: Sökefeld, Martin (Hrsg.) (2004): Jenseits des Paradigmas kultureller Differenz. Neue Perspektiven auf Einwanderer aus der Türkei. transcript, Bielefeld, S. 53–71.

Barth, Fredrik (1969): Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference. Universitetsforl Bergen u. a.

Bhabha, Homi K. (2000): Die Verortung der Kultur. Stauffenburg, Tübingen.

Bormann, Regina (2001): Raum, Zeit, Identität. Sozialtheoretische Verortungen kultureller Prozesse. Leske+Budrich, Opladen (Forschung Soziologie 115).

Çaḡlar, Ayşe C. (2001): Stigmatisierende Metaphern und die Transnationalisierung sozialer Räume in Berlin. In: Gesemann, Frank (Hrsg.): Migration und Integration in Berlin. Wissenschaftliche Analysen und politische Perspektiven. Leske+Budrich Opladen, S. 333–348.

Cerci, Meral (2008): Kulturelle Vielfalt: erforschen, erleben, verstehen. Ergebnisse einer repräsentativen Pilotstudie. In: Kulturpolitische Mitteilungen, 123/IV, S. 61–64.

Clifford, James (1986): Introduction: Partial Truths. In: Clifford, James / Marcus G. E. (Hrsg.): Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. University of California Press, Berkeley u. a., S. 1–26.

Clifford, James (1992): Traveling Culture. In: Grossberg, Lawrence / Nelson, C. / Treichler, P. (Hrsg.): Cultural Studies. Routledge, London. S. 96–116.

Clifford, James (2006): Diasporas. In: James, Paul (Hrsg.): Transnational Conflict. 4. Band. Globalization and violence. SAGE, London, S. 227–263.

Degele, Nina / Winker, G. (2007): Intersektionalität als Mehrebenenanalyse. In: Universität Freiburg, 11.8.2014; http://www.soziologie.uni-freiburg.de/personen/degele/dokumente-publikationen/intersektionalitaet-mehrebenen.pdf.

Deleuze, Gilles / Guatarri, Félix (1992): Tausend Plateaus. Kapitalismus und Schizophrenie II. Merve, Berlin.

Derrida, Jaques (2004): Die différance. Ausgewählte Texte. Reclam, Stuttgart.

Do Mar Castro Varela, María (2015): Koloniale Wissensproduktionen. Edward Saids „interpretative Wachsamkeit" als Ausgangspunkt einer kritischen Migrationsforschung. In: Reuter, Julia / Mecheril, Paul (Hrsg.): Schlüsselwerke der Migrationsforschung. Pionierstudien und Referenztheorien. VS Springer, Wiesbaden (Interkulturelle Studien), S. 307–322.

Eriksen, Thomas Hylland (2010): Complexity in social and cultural integration – some analytical dimensions. In: Anthropology of migration and multiculturalism. S. 97–111.

Feldmann, Doris / Schülting, Sabine (2001): Gegen-den-Strich-Lesen. In: Nünning, Ansgar (Hrsg.): Metzler Lexikon Kulturtheorie. Ansätze – Personen – Grundbegriffe. Metzler, Stuttgart / Weimar, S. 215.

Fischer, Hans (2003): Ethnologie als wissenschaftliche Disziplin. In: Fischer, Hans / Beer, Bettina (Hrsg.): Ethnologie. Einführung und Überblick. Reimer, Berlin, S. 13–32.

Gilroy, Paul (1993): The Black Atlantic. Modernity and Double Consciousness. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

Glick-Schiller, Nina / Faist, T. (Hrsg.) (2010): Migration, development, and transnationalization – a critical stance. Berghahn Books, New York u. a.

Ha, Kien Nghi (2005): Hype um Hybridität. Kultureller Differenzkonsum und postmoderne Verwertungstechniken im Spätkapitalismus. transcript, Bielefeld.

Ha, Kien Nghi (2010): Unrein und vermischt. Postkoloniale Grenzgänge durch die Kulturgeschichte der Hybridität und der kolonialen „Rassenbastarde". transcript, Bielefeld.

Hannerz, Ulf (1992): Cultural Complexity. Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning. Columbia University Press, New York.

Hannerz, Ulf (1996): Transnational connections: culture, people, places. Routledge, New York u. a.

Heil, Tilmann (2012): Fragile convivialities – everyday living together in two stateless but diverse regions, Catalonia and Casamance. Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity, Göttingen.

Hirschauer, Stefan (2010): Die Exotisierung des Eigenen. Kultursoziologie in ethnografischer Einstellung. In: Wohlrab-Sahr, Monika (Hrsg.): Kultursoziologie. Paradigmen – Methoden – Fragestellungen. VS Springer, Wiesbaden, S. 207–226.

Hoerder, Dirk / Hébert, Yvonne / Schmitt, Irina (Hrsg.) (2005): Negotiating Transcultural Lives. Belongings and Social Capital among Youth in Comparative Perspective. V-&-R-Unipress, Göttingen.

Hühn, Melanie et al. (Hrsg.) (2010): Transkulturalität, Transnationalität, Transstaatlichkeit, Translokalität. Theoretische und empirische Begriffsbestimmungen. LIT, Berlin.

Huntington, Samuel P. (1996): Kampf der Kulturen. Die Neugestaltung der Weltpolitik im 21. Jahrhundert. Europa-Verlag, München / Wien.

Immel, Oliver / Hütig, Andreas (2004): Symbol, Existenz, Lebenswelt. Kulturphilosophische Konzepte und ihre Relevanz für den Interkulturalitätsdiskurs. In: Gerlach, Hans-Martin / Hütig, A. / Immel, O. (Hrsg.): Symbol, Existenz, Lebenswelt. Kulturphilosophische Zugänge zur Interkulturalität. Lang, Frankfurt am Main, S. 9–20.

Johler, Reinhard / Matter, M. / Zinn-Thomas, S. (Hrsg.) (2011): Mobilitäten – Europa in Bewegung als Herausforderung kulturanalytischer Forschung. Waxmann, Münster / New York.

Keuchel, Susanne / Zentrum für Kulturforschung (Hrsg.) (2012): Das InterKulturBarometer – Migration als Einflussfaktor auf Kunst und Kultur. ARCult-Media Köln.

Mall, Ram Adhar (1993): Philosophische Grundlagen der Interkulturalität. Rodopi, Amsterdam u. a.

Moore-Gilbert, Bart (2000): Postcolonial Theory. Contexts, Practices, Politics. Verso, London / New York.

Moosmüller, Alois (Hrsg.) (2002): Interkulturelle Kommunikation in der Diaspora – die kulturelle Gestaltung von Lebens- und Arbeitswelten in der Fremde. Waxmann, Münster u. a.

Müller, Gesine / Ueckmann, N. (Hrsg.) (2013): Kreolisierung revisited. Debatten um ein weltweites Kulturkonzept. transcript, Bielefeld.

Münker, Stefan / Roesler, Alexander (2000): Poststrukturalismus. J. B. Metzler, Stuttgart / Weimar.

Nieswand, Boris (2013): Theorising transnational migration – the status paradox of migration. Routledge, New York u. a.

Nieswand, Boris / Drotbohm, H. (2014): Einleitung: Die reflexive Wende in der Migrationsforschung. In: Dies. (Hrsg.): Kultur, Gesellschaft, Migration. Die reflexive Wende in der Migrationsforschung. VS Springer, Wiesbaden, S. 1–37.

Reyes-Schramm, Adelaida (1999): Songs of the caged, songs of the free – music and the Vietnamese refugee experience. Temple University Press, Philadelphia.

Ruther, Carolin (2013): Verkörperte Differenz (er)leben – Kulturwissenschaftliche Perspektiven zum Alltag und zur Lebenswelt von Prothesenträgern in Deutschland (Arbeitstitel). Promotionsprojekt an der Universität Augsburg, unveröffentlicht.

Said, Edward (1979): Orientalism. Vintage Books, New York.

Sandkühler, Hans Jörg / Lim, H.-B. (Hrsg.) (2004): Transculturality – Epistemology, Ethics and Politics. Lang, Frankfurt am Main.

Schulze-Engler, Frank (2006): Von ‚Inter' zu ‚Trans': Gesellschaftliche, kulturelle und literarische Übergänge. In: Antor, Heinz (Hrsg.): Inter- und Transkulturelle Studien. Theoretische Grundlagen und interdisziplinäre Praxis. Winter, Heidelberg, S. 41–53.

Sökefeld, Martin (Hrsg.) (2004): Jenseits des Paradigmas kultureller Differenz. Neue Perspektiven auf Einwanderer aus der Türkei. transcript, Bielefeld.

Sontag, Katrin (2013): Migration of the highly qualified. (Arbeitstitel). Promotionsprojekt an der Universität Basel, unveröffentlicht.

Statisches Bundesamt: Fachserie 1, Reihe 2.2., Migration in Deutschland 2010. In: Statistisches Bundesamt, 8.11.2011; http://www.destatis.de.

Transit Migration Forschungsgruppe (Hrsg.) (2007): Turbulente Ränder. Neue Perspektiven auf Migration an den Grenzen Europas. transcript, Bielefeld.

Türkmen, Ceren (2008): Migration und Regulierung. Westfälisches Dampfboot, Münster.

Vertovec, Steven (2007): Super-diversity and its implication. In: Ethnic and Racial Studies. Vol. 29, Nr. 6, S. 1024–1054.

Welsch, Wolfgang (1997): Transkulturalität: Zur veränderten Verfassung heutiger Kulturen. In: Schneider, Irmela / Thompson, C. W. (Hrsg.): Hybridkultur: Medien, Netze, Künste. Wienand, Köln, S. 67–90.

Yıldız, Erol (2013): Postmigrantische Verortungspraktiken: Ethnische Mythen irritieren. In: Mecheril, Paul et al. (Hrsg.): Migrationsforschung als Kritik? Spielräume kritischer Migrationsforschung. VS Springer, Wiesbaden, S. 139–156.

Zapf, Hubert (2001a): Dekonstruktion. In: Nünning, Ansgar (Hrsg.): Metzler Lexikon Kulturtheorie. Ansätze – Personen – Grundbegriffe. Metzler, Stuttgart / Weimar, S. 101.

Zapf, Hubert (2001b): Dekonstruktivismus. In: Nünning, Ansgar (Hrsg.): Metzler Lexikon Kulturtheorie. Ansätze – Personen – Grundbegriffe. Metzler, Stuttgart / Weimar, S. 103 f.

---

1   Vgl. u. a. Bormann, Regina (2001): Raum, Zeit, Identität. Sozialtheoretische Verortungen kultureller Prozesse. Leske+Budrich, Opladen (Forschung Soziologie 115).

2   Vgl. Statisches Bundesamt: Fachserie 1, Reihe 2.2., Migration in Deutschland 2010. In: Statistisches Bundesamt, 8.11.2011; http://www.destatis.de, S. 7.

3   Vgl. u. a. Moosmüller, Alois (Hrsg.) (2002): Interkulturelle Kommunikation in der Diaspora – die kulturelle Gestaltung von Lebens- und Arbeitswelten in der Fremde. Waxmann, Münster u. a.; Keuchel, Susanne / Zentrum für Kulturforschung (Hrsg.) (2012): Das InterKulturBarometer – Migration als Einflussfaktor auf Kunst und Kultur. ARCult-Media Köln; Cerci, Meral (2008): Kulturelle Vielfalt: erforschen, erleben, verstehen. Ergebnisse einer repräsentativen Pilotstudie. In: Kulturpolitische Mitteilungen, 123/IV, S. 61–64.

4   Vgl. Sökefeld, Martin (Hrsg.) (2004): Jenseits des Paradigmas kultureller Differenz. Neue Perspektiven auf Einwanderer aus der Türkei. transcript, Bielefeld.

5   Baquero Torres, Patricia (2004): Geschlecht und Kultur im erziehungswissenschaftlichen Migrationsdiskurs am Beispiel der Interkulturellen Pädagogik und Sozialpädagogik. In: Ebd., S. 60.

6   Vgl. Sökefeld 2004.

7   Vgl. Sontag, Katrin (2013): Migration of the highly qualified. (Arbeitstitel). Promotionsprojekt an der Universität Basel, unveröffentlicht.

8   Vgl. Fischer, Hans (2003): Ethnologie als wissenschaftliche Disziplin. In: Fischer, Hans / Beer, Bettina (Hrsg.): Ethnologie. Einführung und Überblick. Reimer, Berlin, S. 15.

9   Vgl. Immel, Oliver / Hütig, Andreas (2004): Symbol, Existenz, Lebenswelt. Kulturphiloso-

phische Konzepte und ihre Relevanz für den Interkulturalitätsdiskurs. In: Gerlach, Hans-Martin / Hütig, A. / Immel, O. (Hrsg.): Symbol, Existenz, Lebenswelt. Kulturphilosophische Zugänge zur Interkulturalität. Lang, Frankfurt am Main, S. 9 ff.

10 Vgl. Schulze-Engler, Frank (2006): Von ,Inter' zu ,Trans': Gesellschaftliche, kulturelle und literarische Übergänge. In: Antor, Heinz (Hrsg.): Inter- und Transkulturelle Studien. Theoretische Grundlagen und interdisziplinäre Praxis. Winter, Heidelberg, S. 41–53; Hannerz, Ulf (1992): Cultural Complexity. Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning. Columbia University Press, New York.

11 Vgl. Barth, Fredrik (1969): Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Culture Difference. Universitetsforl Bergen u. a.

12 Vgl. u. a.: Çağlar, Ayşe C. (2001): Stigmatisierende Metaphern und die Transnationalisierung sozialer Räume in Berlin. In: Gesemann, Frank (Hrsg.): Migration und Integration in Berlin. Wissenschaftliche Analysen und politische Perspektiven. Leske+Budrich, Opladen, S. 333–348.

13 Vgl. Huntington, Samuel P. (1996): Kampf der Kulturen. Die Neugestaltung der Weltpolitik im 21. Jahrhundert. Europa-Verlag, München / Wien.

14 Vgl. u. a. Glick-Schiller, Nina / Faist, T. (Hrsg.): (2010) Migration, development, and transnationalization – a critical stance. Berghahn Books, New York u. a.

15 Vgl. Reyes-Schramm, Adelaida (1999): Songs of the caged, songs of the free – music and the Vietnamese refugee experience. Temple University Press, Philadelphia, S. 206.

16 Clifford, James (1992): Traveling Culture. In: Grossberg, Lawrence / Nelson, C. / Treichler, P. (Hrsg.): Cultural Studies. Routledge, London, S. 96–116; Transit Migration Forschungsgruppe (Hrsg.) (2007): Turbulente Ränder. Neue Perspektiven auf Migration an den Grenzen Europas. transcript, Bielefeld.

17 Vgl. Nieswand, Boris (2013): Theorising transnational migration – the status paradox of migration. Routledge, New York u. a.

18 Vgl. Eriksen, Thomas Hylland (2010): Complexity in social and cultural integration – some analytical dimensions. In: Anthropology of migration and multiculturalism, S. 97–111.

19 Vgl. Appadurai, Arjun (1996): Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globality. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

20 Vgl. Appiah, Anthony Kwame (2009): Der Kosmopolit – Philosophie des Weltbürgertums. Beck, München.

21 Vgl. Heil, Tilmann (2012): Fragile convivialities – everyday living together in two stateless but diverse regions, Catalonia and Casamance. Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity, Göttingen.

22 Nieswand, Boris / Drotbohm, H. (2014): Einleitung: Die reflexive Wende in der Migrationsforschung. In: Dies. (Hrsg.): Kultur, Gesellschaft, Migration. Die reflexive Wende in der Migrationsforschung. VS Springer, Wiesbaden, S. 5.

23 Clifford, James (1986): Introduction: Partial Truths. In: Clifford, James / Marcus, G. E. (Hrsg.): Writing Culture. The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography. University of California Press, Berkeley u. a., S. 2.

24 Vgl. Deleuze, Gilles / Guatarri, Félix (1992): Tausend Plateaus. Kapitalismus und Schizophrenie II. Merve, Berlin.

25 Münker, Stefan / Roesler, Alexander (2000): Poststrukturalismus. Verlag J. B. Metzler, Stuttgart / Weimar, S. X.

26 Vgl. u. a. Hirschauer, Stefan (2010): Die Exotisierung des Eigenen. Kultursoziologie in ethnografischer Einstellung. In: Wohlrab-Sahr, Monika (Hrsg.): Kultursoziologie. Paradigmen – Methoden – Fragestellungen. VS Springer, Wiesbaden, S. 207–226.

27 Vgl. Münker / Roesler 2000.

28 Bormann 2001, S. 23 f.

29 Vgl. Mall, Ram Adhar (1993): Philosophische Grundlagen der Interkulturalität. Rodopi, Amsterdam u. a.

30 Vgl. Said, Edward (1979): Orientalism. Vintage Books, New York.

31 Vgl. u. a. Welsch, Wolfgang (1997): Transkulturalität: Zur veränderten Verfassung heutiger Kulturen. In: Schneider, Irmela / Thompson, C. W. (Hrsg.): Hybridkultur: Medien, Netze, Künste. Wienand, Köln, S. 67–90; Sandkühler, Hans Jörg / Lim, H.-B. (Hrsg.) (2004): Transculturality – Epistemology, Ethics and Politics. Lang, Frankfurt am Main; Hoerder, Dirk / Hébert, Yvonne / Schmitt, Irina (Hrsg.) (2005): Negotiating Transcultural Lives. Belongings and Social Capital among Youth in Comparative Perspective. V-&-R-Unipress, Göttingen; Ha, Kien Nghi (2010): Unrein und vermischt. Postkoloniale Grenzgänge durch die Kulturgeschichte der Hybridität und der kolonialen „Rassenbastarde". transcript, Bielefeld; Hühn, Melanie / Lerp, D. / Petzold, K. / Stock, M. (Hrsg.): (2010) Transkulturalität, Transnationalität, Transstaatlichkeit, Translokalität. Theoretische und empirische Begriffsbestimmungen. LIT, Berlin.

32 Vgl. Hannerz, Ulf (1996): Transnational connections: culture, people, places. Routledge, New York u. a.; Müller, Gesine / Ueckmann, N. (Hrsg.) (2013): Kreolisierung revisited. Debatten um ein weltweites Kulturkonzept. transcript, Bielefeld.

33 Vgl. Clifford, James (2006): Diasporas. In: James, Paul (Hrsg.): Transnational Conflict. 4. Band. Globalization and violence. SAGE, London, S. 227–263.

34 Vgl. Vertovec, Steven (2007): Super-diversity and its implication. In: Ethnic and Racial Studies. Vol. 29, Nr. 6, S. 1024–1054; Arnault, Karel (2012): Super-diversity: elements of an emerging perspective. In: Language and Superdiversites II Diversities. Vol. 14, (2), S. 1–16; Johler, Reinhard / Matter, M. / Zinn-Thomas, S. (Hrsg.) (2011): Mobilitäten – Europa in Bewegung als Herausforderung kulturanalytischer Forschung. Waxmann, Münster / New York.

35 Vgl. Ha, Kien Nghi (2005): Hype um Hybridität. Kultureller Differenzkonsum und postmoderne Verwertungstechniken im Spätkapitalismus. transcript, Bielefeld.

36 Vgl. u. a.: Degele, Nina / Winker, G. (2007): Intersektionalität als Mehrebenenanalyse. In: Universität Freiburg, 11.8.2014; http://www.soziologie.uni-freiburg.de/personen/degele/dokumente-publikationen/intersektionalitaet-mehrebenen.pdf; Ruther, Carolin (2013): Verkörperte Differenz (er)leben – Kulturwissenschaftliche Perspektiven zum Alltag und zur Lebenswelt von Prothesenträgern in Deutschland (Arbeitstitel). Promotionsprojekt an der Universität Augsburg, unveröffentlicht.

37 Zapf, Hubert (2001a): Dekonstruktion. In: Nünning, Ansgar (Hrsg.): Metzler Lexikon Kulturtheorie. Ansätze – Personen – Grundbegriffe. Metzler, Stuttgart / Weimar, S. 101.

38 Derrida, Jaques (2004): Die différance. Ausgewählte Texte. Reclam, Stuttgart, S. 135.

39 Vgl. u. a. Do Mar Castro Varela, María (2015): Koloniale Wissensproduktionen. Edward Saids „interpretative Wachsamkeit" als Ausgangspunkt einer kritischen Migrationsforschung. In: Reuter, Julia / Mecheril, Paul (Hrsg.): Schlüsselwerke der Migrationsforschung. Pionierstudien und Referenztheorien. VS Springer, Wiesbaden (Interkulturelle Studien), S. 307–322.

40 Vgl. Moore-Gilbert, Bart (2000): Postcolonial Theory. Contexts, Practices, Politics. Verso, London / New York. Hier Kapitel 3: Gayatri Spivak: the deconstructive twist.

41 Vgl. Gilroy, Paul (1993): The Black Atlantic. Modernity and Double Consciousness. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.

42 Bhabha, Homi K. (2000): Die Verortung der Kultur. Stauffenburg, Tübingen, S. 57.

43 Ha 2005, S. 87.

44 Zapf, Hubert (2001b): Dekonstruktivismus. In: Nünning 2001, S. 103 f.

45 Vgl. Feldmann, Doris / Schülting, Sabine (2001): Gegen-den-Strich-Lesen. In: Ebd., S. 215.

46 Vgl. Türkmen, Ceren (2008): Migration und Regulierung. Westfälisches Dampfboot, Münster.

47 Yıldız, Erol (2013): Postmigrantische Verortungspraktiken: Ethnische Mythen irritieren. In: Mecheril, Paul et al. (Hrsg.): Migrationsforschung als Kritik? Spielräume kritischer Migrationsforschung. VS Springer, Wiesbaden, S. 144.

Zur Autorin

Dr. des. Lisa Gaupp, wissenschaftliche Mitarbeiterin am Institut für Soziologie und Kulturorganisation der Leuphana Universität Lüneburg

Diggin' Up Music
Musikethnologie als Baustelle

Festschrift für Raimund Vogels
zum 65. Geburtstag

Diggin' Up Music
Musikethnologie als Baustelle

herausgegeben von
Michael Fuhr, Kerstin Klenke und Julio Mendívil

Diggin' Up Music
Musikethnologie als Baustelle

Festschrift für Raimund Vogels zum 65. Geburtstag

herausgegeben von
Michael Fuhr, Kerstin Klenke und Julio Mendívil

UV

Universitätsverlag Hildesheim
Hildesheim

O

Georg Olms Verlag
Hildesheim · Zürich · New York

Inhaltsverzeichnis

Spatenstich

I   **Graben und Ausheben –
Feldforschung und Ethnographie**

Richtfest

Angaben zu den Autor*innen

III

Mischen und Verteilen

Kulturelle Identität und Musikalische Diversität

Transcultural Music Studies

Lisa Gaupp

Introduction

At a music association meeting in late 2008, a colleague reported that the dean of the music education department at her university, having heard her proposal to have at least one mandatory ethnomusicological course in the master's program, replied that this would not be necessary, as Germany did not have any colonies. Not only is this statement false in itself – the German Empire's colonies until the First World War covered an area which made it the fourth largest colonial territory in the world after Britain, France and Russia – but the dean's reply also shows, in an extreme way, how some common attitudes prevail in music education in Germany. Unconscious bias combined with defensive yet assertive attitudes regarding what is "one's own" seem to govern not only individual behaviour but also the curricula and contents of (university) music education itself, in Germany as well as in other societies.

More generally, questions regarding immigration and culture are still highly relevant in German society, as can be seen in how, for example, the term "integration" is discussed in political and public discussions. These questions have become more pressing since the so-called "refugee crisis" in Europe in 2015. While there are discourses trying to build up a more positive image of the place of refugees in a "welcoming culture", segregating tendencies still present cultural differences as conflictual, leading to violent assaults on refugee homes.

These developments and discussions are not limited to Germany. Questions regarding cultural differences are not only important because of such obviously discriminatory tendencies, but also because of everyday labelling processes portraying immigrants through ethnic or national stereotypes. Externally visible characteristics such as gender, clothing style or skin colour can evoke mental images leading to national or ethnic ascriptions. These othering processes include clichés and exoticisms and may culminate in criminalisation (Sökefeld 2004).

Music practices by immigrants in the public sphere and in music school curricula are often considered "traditional exotic music" or "music of foreign countries". In addition, conclusions are often drawn between a pupil's ethnic background and the music practices s*he favours. "In Germany, you are made a Turk!" (Barth 2013, 50). These unconscious biases are also present in the contexts of music(ological) education and teacher training, where

"world music" or "music of foreign countries" are taught at universities and subsequently at schools. Borders can also mean differences between "classical music" and "pop music", between "social work" and "cultural work", between different generations or between different pedagogies. But are all hip-hoppers in Germany really immigrants?

This paper addresses some of the continuing biases underlying music(ological) education and training and explores possibilities to avoid them through the application of a transcultural perspective. Deconstructing established political and educational concepts and othering processes is at the core of a transcultural perspective in (ethno)musicology and music education, revealing how music serves politics. These efforts are crucial – especially in music education and consequently in music teacher training – because of the high identificatory potential of music.

In this paper, this approach will be referred to as transcultural music studies. It constitutes an approach that should be applied in various areas of the cultural study of music (education). This paper not only lays open such continuing othering processes and unequal power relations, taking so-called "intercultural music education" in Germany as an example, but also draws on similar reflexive and deconstructivist approaches which have gained considerable influence in other areas in the study of culture. These different lines of thought will be brought together with approaches from the field of (ethno)musicology, (queer) popular music studies and music education that follow comparable transcultural perspectives, such as ethnomusicology as a *Kulturwissenschaft* (Gesellschaft für Musikforschung, n. d.). Although transcultural music studies have a similar approach to such a culturally oriented ethnomusicology, in this paper, these two approaches are distinguished in order to mainstream a transcultural perspective that is broader than ethnomusicology's approach to the study of culture.

What does transcultural music studies mean exactly? A transcultural perspective

> 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, standardised or practiced. (Gaupp 2020)

In contrast to concepts such as "global music studies", a transcultural perspective does not take the "globe" as a standard of comparison but rather focuses on multi-perspectivity, entanglements, ambivalences and cultural complexities. It does so for two reasons: Firstly, seemingly universal concepts such as "global" are often only associated with societal "developments" in the *West* and discount the majority of the world (Gabbert 2010), blanking out all "entangled histories" (Randeria 2002), including, for instance, decolonial feminist-queer southern epistemologies and new subjectivities (Gutiérrez Rodriguez 2016). Secondly, the transcultural approach followed in this paper criticises the sometimes utopian notions that are connected to concepts such as "global"[1] and instead takes conflictual articulations into consideration (Gaupp and Pelillo-Hestermeyer 2020; see also Abu-Er-Rub et al. 2019).

Theoretically, transcultural music studies take a praxeological and constructivist perspective that sees music as a dynamic socio-cultural practice of both routinised and contingent symbolic production. Musical identities and practices therefore do not simply exist; they are produced. When people act and talk, when they act musically, they construct their relation to the world and their identity every time anew (Gaupp 2016). Christopher Small's (1998) term "musicking" includes this meaning of music as any musical activity from composing, performing, listening to streamed music, chanting at football matches, to singing in the shower. Small demonstrates how musicking serves as a ritual to explore and celebrate social identities.

To apply such a praxeological and constructivist perspective to deconstruct othering mechanisms in music (education), it will first be necessary to outline the history of so-called intercultural music education, using Germany as an illustrative example, before examining the interdisciplinary epistemological basis of transcultural music studies, and finally discussing some ideas for implementing transcultural music studies in musicological (teacher) training in higher education. Implementing these ideas means renewing the curricula of musicology and music education so that it accounts for ongoing social processes characterised by processes of globalisation, migration, digitisation, etc. Even though the praxeological and constructivist approach of this paper accounts for society's and culture's dynamics and the impossibility of a "pure origin" of any cultural practice, demarcations are inherently implied in cultural practices serving identity formation pro-

---

1   Wolfgang Welsch's understanding of "transculturality" also constitutes a more utopian approach to a world without differences.

cesses. For instance, any music scene needs these b/ordering processes as musical taste is expressed through such demarcations etc.

However, when such othering processes are expression of unequal power hierarchies, discrimination and violent conflicts, there is an obvious need to focus on transcultural, counter-hegemonic and decolonial practices as well as on ambivalent and contradictory spaces. The transcultural approach to music, culture and society also encompasses an understanding of society as postmigrant (Foroutan 2010) and takes both an intersectional as well as a cross-cultural approach to cultural (musical) diversity and otherness (Gaupp 2020). Diversity and otherness are thereby constantly (re-/de-)constructed, negotiated and expressed in and through musical practices in a tense process that oscillates between standardisations and deconstructions.

Thus, transcultural music studies consider two intertwined levels: first, a focus on content, on musical practices themselves and on the call to diversify the canon in music(ological) training. And, second, an epistemological approach that follows a transcultural perspective that takes into account the conflictual negotiations implied in these practices.

In addition to these two goals, heterogeneity must be seen as the leading principle of an individualistic and inclusive education, also in music teacher training. Such diversity mainstreaming would improve the structural and legal opportunities for participation as well as lower social barriers. However, transcultural music studies go beyond a demand for intersectionality in its goal of enabling every pupil to experience musical diversity, and thereby changes of perspectives and border crossings within an interactional setting.

Although there is some valuable but fragmented academic research on this topic, the complex relationships between music and the transcultural perspective have not yet been studied comprehensively. This paper aims to close this gap and establish transcultural music studies as a new, vibrant field of research with a high discursive and transdisciplinary potential.

Intercultural Music Education

In the following, the history of German music education to integrate pupils with non-German national backgrounds is outlined as a typical example of how cultural differences are approached. In Germany, the integration of "music practices by immigrants" into the school curricula, called "intercultural music education", has a long tradition and has been influenced by

cultural, immigration and educational policies. A brief outline will serve to introduce how interculturality and music in schools have been approached in Germany.

When in the 1960s and 1970s the so-called "foreign guest workers", who were recruited in the 1950s to rebuild Germany's economy after the war, did not return to their home countries, many of their children went to German schools. At first, children with little or no knowledge of German were placed in special-needs schools to give them individual support (Kemmelmeyer and Probst 1983). When pupils with a migration background first enrolled in general schools in the 1960s, efforts were made to develop integrative educational concepts. For example, in 1964 federal state ministers of education (KMK) passed a resolution that promoted teaching in the mother tongues of pupils from immigrant families, as well as in German. Thirty years later, the KMK called for an "unbiased dialogue on cultural values and interests" (Sekretariat der Ständigen Konferenz 1996, 2). In the following years, several other resolutions and measures were passed, focusing on the problems and deficits of "foreign pupils" (Sliwka 2012, 272). As a rule, these pupils were taken as a homogeneous group with the single identifying characteristic that they were "not German".

In 2007 "Intercultural Education" was made part of the inter- and multi-disciplinary subject of "Global Learning" in school curricula.

> Global learning sees itself as education's answer to globalising processes. [...] This means, for example, the capability to act with regard to global processes and to take global structures into account while taking decisions. [...] In this context, cosmopolitanism and self-reflection are important terms. (Schneeweiß 2013, 45)

In 2013, the 1996 KMK resolution was revised using terms and concepts common at that time (Sekretariat der Ständigen Konferenz 2013). Cultural diversity was now seen as a positive value emphasising just, fair and equal opportunities for participation for every pupil. Othering processes will be ended when "attention can be drawn to different orientations, values and thinking patterns without reducing children and youngsters to these and without labelling them with specific ascribed characteristics" (Sekretariat der Ständigen Konferenz 2013, 8).

In general, intercultural music education in Germany shares similar understandings with intercultural education. In the 1970s, music education was marginalised as part of so-called "foreigners' education" or "assimila-

tion education" (Nieke 1986, quoted in Merkt 1993), even when children with a migration background were visiting general schools. The term foreigners' education "would never be used today anymore, but back then it was abbreviated like that" (personal communication, with representative of the Hamburg Ministry of Culture on intercultural policies, 13 March 2008).

In the 1980s, so-called "intercultural music education" was introduced to the schools (Klebe 1983) in an attempt to address both German and pupils with a migration background equally by focusing on a relativistic approach to the so-called "home cultures" of immigrant children, with Turkish music cultures in particular now included in school education (Merkt 1993). What was intended to foster the integration of immigrant children, often led to further exoticisation and othering processes. A majority of schools however did not focus on intercultural music education, as in the 1980s music teachers were still "preoccupied by making the transition from a focus on art music to pop music education" (Stroh 2011a, 57).

In 1993, Irmgard Merkt introduced a seven-step programme for intercultural music education in order to promote the "understanding" of unknown musical practices: beginning with an empirical study of music cultures of the world, the search for common interfaces, making music together, intercultural comparison, discussing song texts, listening first to well-known and then less well-known music pieces and a pupils' concert. "People should feel they are producers of their own culture, knowing in detail about its cultural sources and traditions" (Merkt 1993). In addition, it was acknowledged that a musical piece cannot be looked at apart from its cultural practice (Merkt 2001). The problematic aspects of this approach were the false equivalency between one's culture and one's national background, compounded by intercultural comparisons of musical practices biased by one's own musical socialisation.

This deeper understanding of a foreign music culture was to be achieved by first comparing music cultures and then making music together following a "one-world approach". This pedagogical approach was developed by Stroh as an attempt to create an intercultural music practice based on Merkt's "cultural interface approach" (Stroh 2005, 191). However, once again the seemingly relativistic comparison of all music cultures of "one world" still sets the (kn)*own* as the standard and looks at *other* music cultures from a biased perspective while homogenising both sides. The KMK referred to this approach in its educational guidelines in the year 1996:

> Instruction in music and art offers a nonverbal level to approach the known as well as the unknown, to perceive different experiences, interpretations, and forms of expressions, to gain different insights and to cope with the tensions involved in these processes. (Sekretariat der Ständigen Konferenz 1996, 11)

Stroh's response to the critique that "understanding" an unknown musical practice is subject to the limits of Eurocentric patterns of perception was to extend Merkt's cultural interface approach by reperforming music's situational function in a staged interpretation. However, he too falls into the "exoticization trap" when he assumes he is producing an unbiased re-enactment of an "authentic" music practice. Stroh even states that a staged interpretation "is often closer to the original than some concerts of an 'authentic' music group flown into Germany" (Stroh 2005, 192).

These problematic othering processes are why more recent interpretations of intercultural music education call for the production of music by the pupils themselves (Merkt 2001, 7) and for seeing the process of "understanding music" as a process of communication rather than interpretation (Schormann 1996). In the 1990s, Reinhard C. Böhle advanced a pedagogical concept in line with the discussion on multiculturalism, with cultures conceived of as separate homogeneous entities that can be unambiguously assigned to a particular ethnic or national group. Whereas in interculturalism these "container cultures" interact with each other, in multiculturalism these cultural entities are conceived of as existing side by side in mutual toleration or even harmony (Gaupp 2016). Böhle's approach looked at the musical practices from the "home countries of the immigrants" as subcultures, a concept which had previously been neglected in music education. This led to, for example, hip-hop and reggae being included in music education at schools.[2] Böhle argued that

> not only pupils with a migration background, but also German pupils take part in different subcultures. Common (sub-)culturally oriented music education would fulfil all the requirements of intercultural music education. (quoted in Stroh 2011a, 59)

---

2   In the USA, the educational concept of including "music practices by immigrants" is also called multicultural music education, although it only focuses on the ethnic or national background of musicians.

This approach still conceives of cultures as separate homogeneous entities that can be brought together, but it is less narrowly limited to "immigrant music".

Inspired by Böhle, Stroh developed an approach to a "multicultural music education" at the beginning of the 2000s that had the goals of achieving "musical multicultural competence" and a "concrete knowledge of immigration cultures" (Stroh 2011b, 60 ff.), thus narrowing Böhle's concept to "immigration cultures" again. The fact that neither Böhle's nor Stroh's approach had much of an impact is attributed by Stroh to German immigration policies and the public opinion linked to them since the middle of the 2000s. The study and practice of music cultures were merely intended to serve the political mantra of integration (Stroh 2011a, 62).

When Germany ratified the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions in 2007, music education tried to fulfil its objectives by, for example, founding a working group on music education and ethnomusicology within the German Musicological Association, which organises regular conferences on intercultural or transcultural music education. In 2010, this working group published guidelines for extending the curricula and promoting artistic production in transcultural contexts (Arbeitsgruppe Musikpädagogik und Musikethnologie 2010), again with little impact on how music education was being conducted at schools.

In 2011, two more conferences on transcultural music education took place in Germany. In Oldenburg, a symposium focused on the question "which potentials, but also which borders or difficulties arise in teaching music when one tries to describe and develop it from the conceptual perspective of transculturality" (Arenhövel et al. 2012, 11). In Rostock in the same year the conference also focused on the possibilities of teaching music from a transcultural perspective (Alge and Krämer 2013). Both conferences and their publications are examples of how transcultural music education is no longer focused on the study of the "foreign" music cultures of immigrants, but instead on music education as a space for experiences where "foreign cultures" are not merely copied but where transcultural starting points for making connections are offered. Here one can see important elements in transcultural music studies in the field of music teacher training as will be discussed below.

Another thread for a transcultural music education is found in the adaptation of "global learning" to the field of music: Music as a "social and cultural practice [fulfils] an important role in the creation and transformation

of social communities" (Vogels et al. 2015, 203 f.). Pupils should learn how to reflect upon the consequences of Eurocentrism for musical practice and go beyond the established Eurocentric canon in school curricula.

However, even though these recent approaches in music teacher training correspond to transcultural music studies, they have had little impact on music education in schools. Othering processes are still prominent in music schoolbooks. For example, the songbook *Papageno* in elementary schools has a separate and comparably small selection of songs "from all over the world" that serve to emphasise the dichotomy between *us* and *them*. It features, for example, the Jamaican children's song "Brown Girl in the Ring" with a line that goes "She looks like a sugar in the plum" (Brandt and Mansberg 2007) accompanied by a racialist image of a Black girl.[3] "Music practices other than one's *own*" are still commonly treated as something different and exotic in German schools, highlighting the need to overcome such divisive representations by applying a transcultural perspective. In the following, the epistemological foundations for transcultural concepts are sketched in order to show how a transcultural approach could radically change music education and higher education music teacher training.

Epistemological Approaches to Transcultural Studies

In anthropology, questioning the colonial past leads to the ethical dilemma of whether or not a researcher is legitimised to make statements about the research subject, not to mention a general scepticism about the positivistic claim of objectivity. Since the so-called "writing culture debate" (see below), the humanities and cultural studies have acknowledged the importance of reflection upon one's own position and the deconstruction of othering mechanisms. Postcolonial and queer studies have taken up critical and self-reflexive epistemological approaches in their contribution to the discussion on transculturality. Transcultural music studies draw on these two fields, postcolonial and queer studies, together with ethnomusicological and anthropological concepts, as will be sketched in the following.

What Bachmann-Medick (2016) calls the "reflexive turn" in the study of culture can be seen as an epistemological equivalency to the political strug-

---

3   In the Swiss version of *Papageno*, a photo of a Black girl on a bike with training wheels equally evokes stereotypical and racialist images.

gles in the period of decolonisation. Decolonial power struggles have many parallels to other social movements such as anti-racist, feminist and queer struggles. Decolonisation is used here to mean any struggle against unequal power relations, whether directly being grounded in the colonial era or not. Though many colonies in Latin America acquired their political independence in the 19th century, calls for *cultural*, and especially epistemological, decolonisation first became prominent in the mid-20th century when many colonies in Africa finally gained their independence. It was not until the posthumous publication of Bronislaw Malinowski's shockingly racist field diaries in 1967 that the debate in anthropology critiqued its colonialist premises and addressed the question how to represent the other and encompass

> 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 – within anthropology and beyond. (Bachmann-Medick, 2016, 103)

This discussion was buttressed by the development by French poststructuralist theorists of critical approaches to textual interpretation (Derrida 2004) and to power in knowledge and discourse (Foucault 1978). Another important stream of thought in the forming of transcultural thinking is postcolonial (and later also gender and queer) critique, which spread mainly from British cultural studies in the 1970s to other disciplines in the study of culture from the 1980s onwards. Postcolonial critique rethinks cultural forms based on colonial or imperialist suppression and representation by deconstructing the dichotomous thinking of modernity, problematising the representation of the *other* (Said 1995), and laying open power relations (Hall 1994). Critical concepts in this critique include "third spaces of hybridity" (Bhabha 1994), the "black Atlantic" (Gilroy 1993) and "a Europe otherwise" (Boatcă 2010).

In the 1970–80s, a further reflexive turn, "crisis of representation", in anthropology led to the so-called "writing culture debate" (Clifford and Marcus 1986). Culture and ethnographic description were no longer seen as a single representation, but as a highly constructivist "true fiction" that always omits something. Clifford and Marcus criticised power relations and the "established, yet problematic, principle of dichotomous difference" between the "West and the rest" (Bachmann-Medick 2016, 105; Hall 1994).

For Graham Huggan (2006), postcolonial studies started this "transcultural turn", a field of hybrid cultural concepts subsumed under the term

"transculturality", including the hybridisation of cultures, a blurring of cultural borders and life in spaces of (post-)migrancy. Culture could no longer be regarded as static and definable but instead it was dynamic, pluralistic and ambivalent (Abu-Er-Rub et al. 2019).

The term transculturality has a long history in Latin American studies. Cuban anthropologist Fernando Ortiz (1983 [1947]) already used the term *transculturación* in his book *Contrapunteo Cubano del Tabaco y el Azúcar* in the 1940s to describe *mestizaje* or the movement of one culture into another without influencing each other. The term was used in Spanish-speaking countries from the 1960s onwards to describe linguistic processes of hybridisation (Ángel Rama) and a literary theory of heterogeneity (Antonio Cornejo Polar). From the 1980s onwards, it was increasingly used in the Anglo-Saxon countries (Alexander A. Ervin, Mary Louise Pratt, Néstor García Canclini), often influenced by postcolonial theory. In the 1990s, transculturality was introduced into the humanities in German-speaking countries by the philosopher Wolfgang Welsch (2005). His understanding of the term opposes the essentialisation and exoticisation – still present in today's music curricula and teaching materials – by focusing on transitions, interlinking, in-between spaces and transgressing boundaries. Welsch's theory takes cultures as hybrid per se and authenticity as always staged. Especially youth and music culture are transcultural.

However, his approach portrays cultures as if they had been traditionally homogeneous and only today have become hybridised. Moreover, in keeping with the critique of transculturality itself as a hegemonic Eurocentric concept, Welsch is now criticised for imposing a "thought pattern of the West as 'naturalized diversity'" and taking "contemporary" to mean modern *Western* societies (Lavorano 2016, 151). However, Welsch also points out valuable possibilities for a political application of the concept. When ethnic singularities are used to serve divisive tendencies, they can be countered by the use of commonalities, interrelations and overlaps that allow connections and interactions to take place. In this pragmatic approach – extended by the acceptance of necessary (conflictual) negotiations in these processes – I see a point of reference for transcultural music studies.

The "transcultural turn" is also found in the field of music, with a longer history of critique of concepts such as "world music" as Eurocentric (Guilbault 1997). Simon Frith summarises the problematic aspects of the term world music in that while it sounds "like an inclusive term it is, in practice, systematically exclusive" (Frith 2007, 307). The term and related musical

practices often reinforce structural inequalities between the "Western" and the "non-Western" world (Goodwin and Gore 2011).

A number of other recent approaches in the field of music show similarities to transcultural music studies. A "decolonial turn"[4] is also found in (ethno)musicology (Sardo 2018) and other academic music-related disciplines, involving seeing music practices as border-crossings (Peres da Silva and Hondros 2019; Kim and Riva 2014) and calling for greater visibility for underrepresented musical communities (Beyer and Burkhalter 2012). Other authors from different fields of music studies such as queer popular music studies apply similar approaches (Fast and Jennex 2019; Barz and Cheng 2020). Thus, the quest is not only to apply a similar transcultural perspective to music practices and deconstruct dichotomies in thinking, but also to decolonise musical fields of practice by revealing power hierarchies and creating greater visibility for underrepresented artists, also on a global scale.[5]

Transcultural Music Studies in (Higher) Education

Instead of reinforcing dichotomous differences and structural inequalities and attempting to represent a "transcultural research object", transcultural music studies seek to reveal ascriptions and othering processes through a transcultural praxeological perspective. Borders, national cultural concepts and ethnicisations are deconstructed and replaced by a focus on entanglements, conflictual negotiations and in-between spaces. Transcultural mu-

---

4   A first indication for this are several academic conferences devoted to the topic of "decolonising music": "Sound/Music/Decoloniality" at Maynooth University (March 2020), "Decolonising of Knowledges" at University of Music and Performing Arts Vienna (May 2019), "Decolonizing Europe through Music Scholarship?" at the International Congress of the German Musicological Society (September 2020, now October 2021) and "Decolonizing Strategies in Ethnomusicology, Teaching, and Performance: Perspectives from the U. S. Southwest and Latin America" at the 2018 Conference of the Society for Ethnomusicology in Albuquerque, NM, USA. In addition, in musical practice decolonial projects are being organised, such as the Festival Decolonial de Rap (https://www.barrasmaningarretadas.com).

5   An example of this would be the web space NORIENT, which seeks to act as "an advocate for music scenes from Bolivia to Ghana to Pakistan – and for a world beyond Eurocentrism, exoticism and discrimination" (https://www.startnext.com/en/norient).

sic studies are based on a discourse of the humanities and cultural studies that follows the poststructuralist deconstruction of public understandings of culture, immigration, inequality and identity. Stereotypical representations of ethnicity and nationality, which continue to prevail in musicology and music education, can be met with transcultural strategies originating among others from the writing culture debate. In addition, postcolonial and poststructuralist perspectives can offer a fruitful analysis of neo-colonial, imperialistic or racist and exoticising traces in, for example, popular music (Beyer and Burkhalter 2012). Such a focus on ambivalent and contingent identities as well as on conflictual articulations and negotiation processes that oscillate between standardising and deconstructing ascribed labels would allow music practices to be studied from a transcultural perspective.

Transcultural music studies apply theoretical concepts, perspectives and figures such as the "black Atlantic" or the "third space" as a reinterpretation of ascribed identities. Transcultural music studies are motived by the guiding principle that the cultural representation of the *other* as well as of one's *own* identity are characterised in colonial discourse and beyond by a fundamental ambiguity. The task of postcolonial analysis is therefore to lay open these polysemous conditions of representation (Reckwitz 2008, 99 f.).

Furthermore, transcultural music studies strive to diversify the restricted canon of the fine arts in music training by including, for example, experimental, every-day, contemporary and so-called "non-European" musical practices into the curricula. This also involves the deconstruction of borders between persistent and segregating musical practices, such as the confrontation between so-called popular and classical music. With regard to the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Diversity of Cultural Expressions,[6] the goal of transcultural music studies is to protect and promote musical diversity. The UNESCO Convention sees cultural diversity as a means to worldwide peace:

> Cultural diversity, flourishing within a framework of democracy, tolerance, social justice and mutual respect between peoples and cultures, is indispensable for peace and security at the local, national and international levels. (UNESCO 2013)

---

6   Cultural expressions for UNESCO encompass, among other things, music practices. However, J. P. Singh criticises UNESCO's cultural policies as protectionist for privileging national identity constructions (2019).

The task to secure peace remains one of the most challenging facing societies today. Cultural diversity and thus the overarching goal of peace require overcoming othering mechanisms.

In this paper it is argued that this is also a task for (higher) music education. In contrast to the general handling of this topic in school curricula, teaching materials and so-called "intercultural music festivals", transcultural music studies do not focus on the "musics of foreign cultures", but instead try to deconstruct those "self-and-other" dichotomies that are closely connected to terms and concepts such as "world music". Transcultural music studies assume a transcultural perspective on social processes and music practices, with critical reflection upon individual patterns of perception and the deconstruction of unconscious biases.

Transcultural music studies can serve as the theoretical and methodological tool to bring about a non-Eurocentric, postcolonial and transcultural approach in musicology. It can diversify the limited canon of the fine arts in music training as well as its theoretical perspectives. But transcultural music studies neither compare music cultures with each other, nor do they focus only on "non-European", "traditional" or "non-Western" musical expressions, let alone is it only targeted at pupils with an immigration background or at heterogeneous school classes.

Music teacher training and musicology should instead be based on the theories discussed above, so that they can critically reflect on their own position and acknowledge different concepts of culture, self-understanding and identity construction as dynamic processes that cannot be fixed. At best, this leads to a new understanding of the term "diversity". Diversity is not to be understood as many different homogeneous cultural forms existing side by side, but instead as ambivalent, contradictory, border-crossing, dynamic, transcultural processes that rule out exoticizing othering mechanisms and allow "third spaces" to develop. In educational settings, students and pupils can learn how to change perspectives and self-reflect on their own biases, especially in contexts where the construction of mono-cultural identities is reinforced. These theoretical reflections should be carefully crafted in policies and curricula that do not separate *own* from *other* but instead focus on their joint interaction.

Structural recommendations for the implementation of transcultural music studies include laying the foundations to extend school curricula by musical practices that have been so far marginalised, but without presenting them as "ethnic" or "exotic" music cultures. This could involve inviting exter-

nal artists and experts on different musical styles into schools to perform this music with the pupils and together construct new musical practices. Existing connections between seemingly opposing musical practices can thus be revealed and used productively. This calls for an extension of music teacher training on all levels to include a diverse musical landscape. The problem is not that there are no professional musicians and experts on these issues in Germany, but that they are not included in the official educational system.

These recommendations do not mean that everything has been "bad" until now nor that transcultural music studies can solve all difficulties in music education, much less in society. A transcultural perspective is always focused on conflictual notions, racist tendencies and social inequalities; it would be naïve to think of it as a utopian vision. But, especially with regard to political and public discussions about inclusion, participation, immigration and diversity, transcultural music studies can offer a valid starting point to re-align musicology and music education to the transcultural realities of today's post-migrant societies. Since transcultural diversity is an integral part of the life-worlds of young people in Germany (Gaupp 2016), music(ological) education should promote border-crossing.

References

Abu-Er-Rub, Laila, Christiane Brosius, and Sebastian Meurer, eds. 2019. *Engaging Transculturality: Concepts, Key Terms, Case Studies*. London: Routledge.

Alge, Barbara, and Oliver Krämer eds. 2013. *Beyond borders: Welt – Musik – Pädagogik: Musikpädagogik und Ethnomusikologie im Diskurs*. Berliner Schriften Band 116. Augsburg: Wißner.

Arbeitsgruppe Musikpädagogik und Musikethnologie. 2010. "Orientierungskatalog zur Förderung kultureller Diversität in Lehre und Forschung in den Bereichen Musikpädagogik, Musikethnologie und soziale Kulturarbeit an Hochschulen." *Musikforum* 8, no. 1: 26 f.

Arenhövel, Sophie, Susanne Binas-Preisendörfer und Melanie Unseld. 2012. "Editorial." In *Transkulturalität und Musikvermittlung: Möglichkeiten Und Herausforderungen in Forschung, Kulturpolitik und Musikpädagogischer Praxis*. Musik und Gesellschaft Bd. 33, hrsg. v. Susanne Binas-Preisendörfer, Melanie Unseld, and Sophie Arenhövel, 7–17. Pieterlen/Bern: Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften.

Bachmann-Medick, Doris. 2016. *Cultural Turns: New Orientations in the Study of Culture*. De Gruyter textbook. Translated by Adam Blauhut. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter. https://dx.doi.org/10.1515/9783110402988.

Barth, Dorothee. 2013. "'In Deutschland wirst Du zum Türken gemacht!': Oder: 'Die ich rief, die Geister, werd ich nun nicht los.'" *Diskussion Musikpädagogik* 57: 50–57.

Barz, Gregory F., and William Cheng, eds. 2020. *Queering the Field: Sounding Out Ethnomusicology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Beyer, Theresa, and Thomas Burkhalter, eds. 2012. *Out of the Absurdity of Life: Globale Musik; Norient* 012. Deitingen: Traversion.

Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.

Boatcă, Manuela. 2010. "Multiple Europes and the Politics of Difference Within." In *The Study of Europe,* edited by Hauke Brunkhorst and Gerd Grözinger, 51–66. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft.

Böhle, Reinhard C., ed. 1996. *Aspekte und Formen interkultureller Musikerziehung: Beiträge vom 2. Symposium zur Interkulturellen Ästhetischen Erziehung an der Hochschule der Künste Berlin*. Frankfurt: IKO Verl. für Interkulturelle Kommunikation.

Brandt, Susanne, and Heidi von Mansberg, eds. 2007. *Papageno: 100 Lieder zum Singen, Spielen, Tanzen, Malen und Basteln in der Grundschule*. Berlin, Marschacht: Lugert / Cornelsen.

Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus, eds. 1986. *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Derrida, Jacques. 2004. *Die différance: Ausgewählte Texte*. Universal-Bibliothek Nr. 18338. Stuttgart: Philipp Reclam jun.

Fast, Susan, and Craig Jennex, eds. 2019. *Popular Music and the Politics of Hope: Queer and Feminist Interventions*. New York and London: Routledge.

Foroutan, Naika. 2010. "Neue Deutsche, Postmigranten und Bindungs-Identitäten. Wer gehört zum neuen Deutschland?" *Aus Politik und Zeitgeschichte* 46–47: 9–15.

Foucault, Michel. 1978. *Dispositive der Macht: Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit*. With the assistance of F. Ewald. Berlin: Merve.

Frith, Simon. 2007. *Taking Popular Music Seriously: Selected Essays*. Ashgate Contemporary Thinkers on Critical Musicology. Aldershot: Ashgate.

Gabbert, Wolfgang. 2010. "Das Eigene und das Fremde im 'globalen Dorf' – Perspektiven einer kritischen Soziologie der Globalisierung." In *Postkoloniale Soziologie: Empirische Befunde, theoretische Anschlüsse, politische Intervention*. Postcolonial studies Band 2, hrsg. v. Julia Reuter and Paula-Irene Villa, 159–79. Bielefeld: transcript.

Gaupp, Lisa, and Giulia Pelillo-Hestermeyer, eds. 2020. *Diversity and Otherness: Transcultural Insights into Norms, Practices, Negotiations*. Berlin, Boston, und Beijing: De Gruyter.

Gaupp, Lisa. 2016. *Die exotisierte Stadt: Kulturpolitik und Musikvermittlung im postmigrantischen Prozess*. Studies in Music 1. Hildesheim: Olms. http://hildok.bsz-bw.de/frontdoor/index/index/docId/547.

———. 2020. "Epistemologies of Diversity and Otherness." In *Diversity and Otherness: Transcultural Insights into Norms, Practices, Negotiations*, edited by Lisa Gaupp and Giulia Pelillo-Hestermeyer, 13–61. Berlin, Boston, und Beijing: De Gruyter.

Gesellschaft für Musikforschung. n. d. "Musikethnologie und Vergleichende Musikwissenschaft." Accessed July 26, 2020. https://www.musikforschung.de/index.php/en/field-units/musikethnologie-und-vergleichende-musikwissenschaft.

Gilroy, Paul. 1993. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. London: VERSO.

Goodwin, Andrew, and Joe Gore. 2011. "World Beat and the Cultural Imperialism Debate." In *Popular Music. I History and Theoretical Traditions*. SAGE benchmarks in culture and society, edited by Chris Rojek, 159–73. Los Angeles and Calif: SAGE.

Guilbault, Jocelyne. 1997. "Interpreting World Music: A Challenge in Theory and Practice." *Popular Music* 16, no. 1: 31–44.

Gutiérrez Rodriguez, Encarnación. 2016. "Decolonizing Postcolonial Rhetoric." In *Decolonizing European Sociology: Transdisciplinary Approaches*, edited by Encarnación Gutiérrez Rodriguez, Manuela Boatcă, and Sérgio Costa, 49–67. London: Routledge.

Hall, Stuart. 1994. "The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power." In *The Formations of Modernity: (Introduction to Sociology)*, edited by Stuart Hall and Bram Gieben, 275–331. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Huggan, Graham. 2006. "Derailing the 'Trans'? Postcolonial Studies and the Negative Effects of Speed." In *Inter- und Transkulturelle Studien: Theoretische Grundlagen und Interdisziplinäre Praxis*, edited by Heinz Antor, 55–61. Heidelberg: Winter.

Kemmelmeyer, Karl-Jürgen und Werner Probst. 1983. *Modellversuch des Verbandes Deutscher Musikschulen Projekt: "Instrumentalspiel mit Behinderten und von Behinderung Bedrohten – Kooperation zwischen Musikschule und Schule"*. Bonn-Bad Godesberg. 1979–81. Bericht der wiss. Begleitung. Bonn: Verband deutscher Musikschulen.

Kim, Jin-Ah, and Nepomuk Riva eds. 2014. *Entgrenzte Welt? Musik und Kulturtransfer*. Berlin: Ries & Erler.

Klebe, Dorit. 1983. *Türkische Volksmusik*. (Arbeitspapiere). Berlin: Pädagogisches Zentrum.

Lavorano, Stephanie. 2016. "Transkultureller Rassismus: Zum Diversitätsbegriff bei Wolfgang Welsch und Immanuel Kant." In *Grenzen der Überschreitung: Kontroversen um Transkultur, Transgender und Transspecies*, hrsg. v. Stephanie Lavorano, Carolin Mehnert und Ariane Rau, 149–62. Bielefeld: transcript.

Malinowski, Bronislaw. 1967. *A Diary in the Strict Sense of the Term*. 1. ed. Translated by Norbert Guterman. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Merkt, Irmgard. 1993. "Interkulturelle Musikerziehung." *Musik und Unterricht* 9. Accessed August 31, 2014. http://www.interkulturelle-musikerziehung.de.

———. 2001. "Ausländer- und Einwanderungspolitik." *Musik in der Schule* 4: 4–7.

NORIENT. n. d. "Norient Space: The Now in Sound." Accessed December 19, 2019. https://www.startnext.com/en/norient.

Ortiz, Fernando. 1983[1947]. *Contrapunteo Cubano del Tabaco y el Azúcar*. Pensamiento cubano. La Habana: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales.

Peres da Silva, Glaucia, and Konstantin Hondros, eds. 2019. *Music Practices Across Borders: (E)Valuating Space, Diversity and Exchange*. Music and Sound Culture 35. Bielefeld: transcript.

Randeria, Shalini. 2002. "Entangled Histories of Uneven Modernities: Civil Society, Caste Solidarities and Legal Pluralism in Post-Colonial India." In *Unraveling Ties: From Social Cohesion to New Practices of Correctedness*, edited by Yehuda Elkana et al., 284–311. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus-Verlag.

Reckwitz, Andreas. 2008. *Subjekt*. Einsichten. Bielefeld: transcript.

Said, Edward W. 1995. *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*. Middlesex: Penguin Books.

Sardo, Susana. 2018. "Shared Research Practices *On* and *About* Music: Toward Decolonising Colonial Ethnomusicology." In *Making Music, Making Society*, edited by Josep Martì and Sara Revilla Gútiez, 217–238. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Schneeweiß, Verena. 2013. "Perspektivenwechsel in der Bildungsethnologie: Ansätze und Ziele Globalpolitischer Bildungsarbeit." Accessed July 09, 2014. http://epub.ub.uni-muenchen.de/16124/1/oa_16124.pdf.

Schormann, Carola. 1996. "Aspekte und Formen didaktischen Handelns: Musikdidaktik und außereuropäische Musik: Der interkulturelle Imperativ." In *Aspekte und Formen interkultureller Musikerziehung: Beiträge vom 2. Symposium zur Interkulturellen Ästhetischen Erziehung an der Hochschule der Künste Berlin*, hrsg. v. Reinhard C. Böhle, 12–22. Frankfurt: IKO Verl. für Interkulturelle Kommunikation.

Sekretariat der Ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland. 1996. "Interkulturelle Bildung und Erziehung in der Schule: Beschluss Der Kultusministerkonferenz vom 25.10.1996." Accessed July 31, 2020. https://www.globaleslernen.de/sites/default/files/files/link-elements/interkulturelles_20lernen_20in_20der_20schule_2c_201996.pdf.

———. 2013. "Interkulturelle Bildung und Erziehung in der Schule: Beschluss der Kultusministerkonferenz vom 25.10.1996 I. D. F. V. 5.12.2013." Accessed July 31, 2020. https://www.kmk.org/fileadmin/veroeffentlichungen_beschluesse/1996/1996_10_25-Interkulturelle-Bildung.pdf.

Singh, J. P. 2019. "Culture and International Development: Towards an Interdisciplinary Methodology." A study commissioned by the British Council. Accessed February 28, 2020. https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/final_manuscript_cultureintldev.pdf

Sliwka, Anne. 2012. "Soziale Ungleichheit, Diversity, Inklusion." In *Handbuch Kulturelle Bildung*, hrsg. v. Hildegard Bockhorst, Vanessa-Isabelle Reinwand und Wolfgang Zacharias, 269–73. München: kopaed.

Small, Christopher. 1998. *Musicking: The Meanings of Performing and Listening*. Middletown: Wesleyan University Press.

Sökefeld, Martin. 2004. "Das Paradigma Kultureller Differenz: Zur Forschung und Diskussion über Migranten aus der Türkei in Deutschland." In *Jenseits Des Paradigmas Kultureller Differenz: Neue Perspektiven Auf Einwanderer aus der Türkei*, hrsg. v. Martin Sökefeld, 9–33. Bielefeld: transcript.

Stroh, Wolfgang M. 2005. "Musik der einen Welt." In *Musik-Didaktik: Praxishandbuch für die Sekundarstufe I und II*, edited by Werner Jank, 185–93. Berlin: Cornelsen Scriptor.

———. 2011a. "Der erweiterte Schnittstellenansatz." Interkulturelle-Musikerziehung. Accessed October 15, 2020. http://www.interkulturelle-musikerziehung.de/texte/stroh2009.pdf.

———. 2011b. "Gibt es noch eine 'visionäre' interkulturelle Musikerziehung?" In *Musik – Pädagogisch – Gedacht: Reflexionen, Forschungs- und Praxisfelder,* hrsg. v. Martin D. Loritz, Andreas Becker, Daniel M. Eberhard, Clemens M. Schlegel und Martin Fogt, 54–67. Augsburg: Wißner. http://www.interkulturelle-musikerziehung.de/texte/stroh2011a.pdf.

UNESCO. 2013. "Basic Texts of the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions." Accessed September 02, 2016. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002253/225383E.pdf.

Vogels, Raimund, Ekkehard Mascher und Bernd Clausen. 2015. "Fach Musik." In *Orientierungsrahmen für den Lernbereich Globale Entwicklung: Im Rahmen einer Bildung für Nachhaltige Entwicklung*, hrsg. v. Ständige Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, 203–23. Accessed July 31, 2020. http://globfair.be-fair.eu/files/orientation_framework_final_2015-07-21.pdf.

Welsch, Wolfgang. 2005. „Auf dem Weg zu Transkulturellen Gesellschaften." In *Differenzen anders denken: Bausteine zu einer Kulturtheorie der Transdifferenz*, hrsg. v. Lars Allolio-Näcke, Britta Kalscheuer, and Arne Manzeschke, 314–41. Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus Verlag.

Raumsemiotik

Räume - Grenzen - Identitäten

Martin Nies (Hg.)

Raumsemiotik

Räume – Grenzen – Identitäten

Martin Nies (Hg.)

vzkf www.kultursemiotik.com

Virtuelles Zentrum für kultursemiotische Forschung
Schriften zur Kultur- und Mediensemiotik

Inhalt

Symbolische Räume kultureller Diversität

Verhandlungen, Grenzen und Überschreitungen in den performativen Künsten

Lisa Gaupp

Nationale oder kosmopolitische Künste?

Dieser Beitrag beschäftigt sich mit der Frage, wie kulturelle Diversität in den performativen Künsten kuratiert wird. Dieser Frage zugrunde liegt die Annahme, dass derzeit vor allem zwei gegensätzliche ‚Strömungen' existieren, wie kulturelle Diversität in künstlerischen Projekten kuratiert wird. Grace Brockington stellt diese beiden exemplarisch am Disput zwischen Selwyn Image und Lewis F. Day dar: Auf der einen Seite werden in interkultureller Manier verschiedene, als abgrenzbar gedachte, nationalbezogene Kunstformen präsentiert, der tolerante Austausch propagiert und das Kennenlernen ‚fremder Kulturen' gefeiert. Thematisch liegt u.a. der Fokus auf ‚migrantischen Kunstformen' oder Migrationsgeschichten. Auch wird hier häufig als multikulturelle Strategie die kulturelle Teilhabe unterrepräsentierter Bevölkerungsgruppen, in diesem Falle die von Menschen mit Migrationshintergrund – und neuerdings von Geflüchteten – gefordert und dadurch kulturelle Diversität mit nationaler/ethnischer Heterogenität gleichgesetzt. Bei Brockington stehen diese Ansätze, von Selwyn Image zum Ausdruck gebracht, für eine lokale bzw. nationale Verankerung der Künste:

> Selwyn Image (1849-1930) argues vehemently that national traditions in art should be nurtured and, more pragmatically, that cosmopolitan art is an illusion. Art, he contends, is particular. Far from being a universal language, it is locally produced and historically conditioned, the individual expression of an artist or – and here he stretches his point – of a nation. […] He concedes that some elements of a national tradition may be translated, but points out that translation can never be perfect.[1]

---

[1] Grace Brockington, „Introduction: Internationalism and the Arts." In: Grace Brockington (Hg.), *Internationalism and the Arts in Britain and Europe at the* Fin de Siècle. Bern 2009, S. 1.

Solche Ansätze werden schnell – vor allem seitens kulturwissenschaftlich informierter Studien – als exotisierend, paternalisierend oder als Abgrenzungsmechanismen zementierend kritisiert.

Dem gegenüber stehen transkulturelle, postmigrantische, kosmopolite oder postkoloniale kuratorische Strategien, die neokolonialistische oder eurozentristische Strukturen der Repräsentation zurückweisen, die Dichotomie von ‚Europa versus den Rest' bzw. ‚der Westen gegen den Rest' aufzubrechen versuchen, oder intendieren, die postmigrantische Diversität als Normalität zu etablieren. Hier liegt der thematische Fokus explizit nicht auf der geografischen Herkunft der Künstler,[2] sondern vielmehr auf der Verflechtungsgeschichte spezieller Kunstformen, auf aktuellen Entwicklungen in den zeitgenössischen Künsten oder auch auf einem ortlosen *Third Space* der Hybridität (Homi K. Bhabha), womit einem dynamischen, dekonstruktivistischen Kulturbegriff Rechnung getragen wird. Die Künste gelten hier also als kosmopolitisch, bei Brockington durch Lewis Forman Days wie folgt formuliert:

> There is, he insists, no dichotomy between self-expression and a shared language, national tradition and cosmopolitan aspiration, the stay-at-home and the traveller. The cosmopolitan artist can be individual, steeped in his native tradition and fond of his own fireside. […] Simultaneously, he can be a „citizen of the world“, trained to compare various national traditions and „open to impressions from all around, and far beyond the country where he was born.“ National traditions are innate but not homogeneous and do not need to be „coddled.“ The English are a „mixed lot,“ a hybrid race, practicing a hybrid art.[3]

In beiden Fällen werden semantische Felder für kulturelle Diversität in unterschiedlicher Weise besetzt. Es geht um Fragen des ‚Eigenen' und des ‚Fremden', um Identität und Alterität sowie um Zugehörigkeiten und Zuschreibungen.

Auch wenn aktuell, zumindest in den Kulturwissenschaften, sich nicht mehr die Frage nach einer Nationalkultur stellt, sondern sich vielmehr dynamische Kulturbegriffe durchgesetzt haben, wird in diesem Beitrag untersucht, ob und inwiefern sich dieser ‚alte' Disput in der aktuellen kuratorischen Praxis von internationalen PerformingArts-Festival zeigt, wenn es um die Frage geht, wie kulturelle Diversität inszeniert wird.

Beiden genannten Positionen liegt ferner die Annahme zugrunde, dass die Künste oder künstlerische Praxis Bedeutungen evozieren, die in irgend einer Art und Weise entschlüsselt werden können, sei es, dass ‚lokale bzw. nationale Traditionen' Symbole darstellen, auf die künstlerische Konstrukte rekurrieren, oder

---

[2] Um eine gendersensible Sprache anzustreben, werden in diesem Beitrag, wenn möglich, geschlechterneutrale Sammelbegriffe wie *Teilnehmende* genutzt. Um den Lesefluss nicht zu stören, werden darüber hinaus männliche Personenbezeichnungen verwendet. In diesem Fall sind alle Geschlechter damit gemeint.

[3] Ebd., S. 2.

sei es, dass ‚kosmopolitische Kunst' bestimmte Konnotationen hervorrufen kann, die sie erst zu ‚kosmopolitischer Kunst' werden lässt.

Symbolische Formen

Zeichentheoretische Modelle der performativen Künste

Doch um diese Fragestellung zu beantworten, ist vorab zu klären, wie Bedeutung entsteht, insbesondere wie Bedeutung in den performativen Künsten entsteht. Musik beispielsweise besteht aus Tönen, die als solche keine weiterreichende Bedeutung tragen und erst im musikalischen Kontext ‚bedeuten'. Die Situation ist ähnlich wie bei der Sprache, bei der Bedeutung durch das Zusammenspiel von Silben zu Wörtern und Sätzen entsteht. Während Sprache primär eine diskursive Bedeutung trägt, handelt es sich bei Musik primär um eine ästhetische Bedeutung. Die mechanische Übertragung sprachphilosophischer Methoden auf musikalische Phänomene bedarf in jedem Fall einer kritischen Würdigung der Vorgehensweise. Doch was ist diese ästhetische Bedeutung? Bedeutung, und damit die ästhetische Bedeutung von Musik, kann in der Rolle eines Zeichens begründet sein.

Die Wissenschaftler der Musiksemiotik stellen sich die Frage, ob Musik als Zeichen zu verstehen ist. Wenn dies zuträfe, stellt sich weiterhin die Frage, wofür dieses Zeichen steht, auf was es hinweist. Schon bei Platon gibt es die triadische Grundstruktur der Zeichentheorie, in der ein materielles Zeichen, das für eine immaterielle Idee steht, von jemandem als Bedeutung dieser Idee wahrgenommen wird. Bedeutungen sind also Bewusstseinsphänomene. Zeichen sind immer bedeutungstragende Zeichen, da es nichts gibt, was wir wahrnehmen können und keine Bedeutung hätte, denn sonst wüssten wir nicht, worum es sich handelt. Nach dem Musiksemiotiker Peter Faltin ist diese Prämisse einerseits unzulänglich, die in der Art eines semantischen Naturalismus ein Zeichen mit seiner Bedeutung gleichsetzt und dadurch postuliert, dass asemantische Musik keine Bedeutung habe. In dieser Denkrichtung würde als Lösung die Musik lediglich zum Superzeichen deklariert, die auf sich selbst verweist und sich selbst genüge, eine Art *l'art pour l'art*. Andererseits sieht Faltin auch eine pragmatische Sichtweise als nicht ausreichend, die durch einen semiotischen Konventionalismus begründet davon ausgeht, dass sich musikalische Bedeutung ausschließlich durch arbiträren Gebrauch entwickeln würde.[4] Doch worauf gründet die Bedeutung der Musik, wenn nicht durch ihren Bezug auf äußere Entitäten oder durch ihren funktionalen Gebrauch?

Die herkömmliche Definition eines Zeichens, das für etwas anderes, das Denotat, steht, darauf verweist oder etwas anderes abbildet, wird auch in der Musikgeschichte in verschiedener Weise für musikalische Zeichen postuliert. So sehen

---

[4] Vgl. Peter Faltin, „Musikalische Bedeutung. Grenzen und Möglichkeiten einer semiotischen Ästhetik." In: Institute of Musicology-Zagreb Academy of Music (Hg.), *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music.* Vol. IX, Nr. 1. Zagreb 1978, S. 10 ff.

die Pythagoreer in der materialistischen Tradition der Antike Musik als Zeichen für die Zahlenverhältnisse in der Welt. Die pythagoreische Welt und ihr Fortgang ist durch Zahlenverhältnisse geregelt gesehen, und die Musik, „die letztlich auf physikalischen Gesetzmäßigkeiten der Schwingungsvorgänge beruht, [gibt] diese Zahlenverhältnisse wieder".[5] Hier sind die Töne keine ästhetischen Phänomene, sondern klingende Zahlenverhältnisse, in denen sich die Harmonie und die Ordnung der Welt abbilden. Die physikalischen Gesetze der Tonsysteme, nämlich die Entsprechung der musikalischen Intervalle zu der Obertonreihe einer idealen Saite, stehen als Zeichen für die Urprinzipien der Ordnung der Polis. Aber auch hier handelt es sich um eine ideelle Entität, da Zahlenverhältnisse, genau wie Ideen bei Platon, nicht gegenständlich sind.

Ebenfalls während der Antike entwickelt sich die Lehre vom Ethos als Basis für die Erklärung des Sinnes von Musik. Diese Lehre geht davon aus, dass durch Musik bestimmte ethische Haltungen dargestellt und im Hörer bewirkt werden sollen. Die Bedeutungen der Musik hängen jeweils von ihren physikalischen Merkmalen wir Tonart, Tonlage, Rhythmus oder Instrument ab. So schreibt Platon der dorischen Tonart die Wirkung zu, kriegerische Männer erziehen zu können, wohingegen die lydische oder die ionische Tonart für „schlaff, weichlich und ‚für Trinkgelage geeignet'" angesehen wird.[6]

Seit der Renaissance und vor allem im Barock ist die Ethoslehre zur Basis für die Affektentheorie geworden. Musik hat die Aufgabe, bestimmte Affekte darzustellen und deren festgelegte Bedeutungen durch rhetorische Figuren wie bestimmte Intervall- und Rhythmusfolgen zu vermitteln. In der europäischen Kunstmusik werden zu dieser Zeit die rhetorischen Figuren konventionalisiert. So sollen beispielsweise Intervalle mit einem Ganzton wie die große Terz Freude ausdrücken, ein zur Quarte fallender Bass steht in dieser Zeit für einen schmerzlichen Affekt oder für eine dramatische Textstelle. Die Affektenlehre des 18. Jahrhunderts sieht Musik als Sprache der Gefühle und ist vor allem am musikalischen Ausdruck orientiert.

> The framework of the Affektenlehre founded a common understanding of the meaning deposited in music, a meaning which it was thus possible to communicate through interpretation.[7]

In der Ästhetik des Sturm und Drang, als dessen Vertreter zum Beispiel Christian Friedrich Daniel Schubart oder Johann Gottfried von Herder zu nennen sind, wird die Bedeutung von Musik im authentischen Ausdruck der persönlichen Gefühle des Künstlers gesehen. Musik wird zum Zeichen des Inneren. Sie steht für die Gefühle des Komponisten. Damit findet der Wandel vom Darstellungsprinzip der Affektenästhetik zum Ausdrucksprinzip der psychologisierenden Gefühlsästhetik

---

[5] Peter Faltin, *Bedeutung ästhetischer Zeichen. Musik und Sprache.* Aachen 1985, S. 2.
[6] Ebd., S. 11.
[7] Otto M. Christensen, „Interpretation and meaning in music. In: Eero Tarasti (Hg.), *Musical Signification. Essays in the Semiotic Theory and Analysis of Music.* Berlin/New York 1995, S. 87.

statt. Im 19. Jahrhundert wird das psychische Subjekt zum ausschließlichen Bedeutungsgeber der romantischen Künste.

Das autonome ästhetische Zeichen und die Wende zur Pragmatik

Unter den Vertretern der Autonomieästhetik im 19. und der formalen und strukturalistischen Ästhetiken im 20. Jahrhundert finden sich Gegner der Gefühlsästhetik. Eduard Hanslick und Roman Jakobson vertreten die Auffassung, dass die ästhetische Bedeutung der tönende Vorgang selbst, also seine Form ist, und nicht mit dem Inhalt gleichzusetzen ist. Die ästhetische Kategorie ‚Form – Inhalt' hat ihren Ursprung bei beispielsweise Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph Schelling oder Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel im deutschen Idealismus. Bei Hegel ist der Inhalt durch den Geist bestimmt und nicht durch einen bezeichneten Gegenstand. Der Inhalt ist in der Musik ein geistiges Phänomen, eine Substanz, die in einer Tonfolge erscheint.

Hanslick legt als Verfechter der Autonomieästhetik dar, dass die Musik auf nichts Bestimmtes verweist, aber der musikalische Inhalt eine Idee der Formierung ist. Außermusikalische Vorlagen sind nicht das Ziel von Musik, sondern eher ein Mittel, durch das musikalische Ideen verständlich werden. Denn auch wer beispielsweise das Drama, das die Vorlage zu einem Musikstück bildet, nicht kennt, kann der Musik folgen, die unabhängig davon existiert. Musik teilt keine fremden Bedeutungen mit, die eine intendierte kommunizierte Wirkung im Empfänger auslösen sollen, sondern sie artikuliert einen spezifischen musikalischen Gedanken. Musik kann zwar als kommunikatives Phänomen verstanden werden, da sie Bedeutung stiftet, aber es handelt sich nicht um dekodierbare Zeichen einer direkten Kommunikation zwischen Komponist und Hörer. Die spezifische Bedeutung wird vielmehr durch die aktive Tätigkeit des wahrnehmenden Subjekts entwickelt. Bei der ästhetischen Bedeutungskommunikation ist hier somit nicht vorrangig das wichtig, was der Komponist mit dem Werk ‚meint', sondern das, was das Werk als wahrgenommene ästhetische Intention für den Hörer bedeutet.

Dies ist die von Jan Mukařovský und Charles Sanders Peirce eingeleitete Wende zur Pragmatik, bei der die Bedeutung eines Zeichens nicht allein von einem Denotat abhängt. In den 20er- und 30er-Jahren des letzten Jahrhunderts wird in der russischen und tschechischen Ästhetik vor allem durch Jan Mukařovský versucht, die Semiotik mit ästhetischen Fragestellungen zu verbinden und Bedeutung von ästhetischen Zeichen nicht in einem Denotat zu suchen. Bei Mukařovský bezieht sich die ästhetische Bedeutung des autonomen Zeichens auf den Gesamtkontext gesellschaftlicher Phänomene. Die Musik ist ein autonomes Zeichen, da sie „kein ‚Träger' einer Mitteilung [ist], (so wie es die Sprache ist), sondern [sie] ist die Mitteilung selbst".[8] Hierbei meint Mukařovský mit gesellschaftli-

---

[8] Peter Faltin, „Widersprüche bei der Interpretation des Kunstwerkes als Zeichen. Drei monistische Modelle zur Erklärung der Bedeutung von Musik." In: Institute of Musicology-Zagreb Acad-

chen Phänomenen eine geistige Qualität, die auf unterschiedliche Art und Weise in der Philosophie, in der Wirtschaft, in der Politik, in der Religion, in ästhetischen Werken usw. artikuliert wird. Ein Kunstwerk ist daher ein Zeichen eines geistigen gesellschaftlichen Phänomens, indem es einen Aspekt der Kultur und Gesellschaft ausdrückt, an der der Mensch mittels ästhetischer Zeichen als ihr Produzent oder Konsument teilnimmt. Die Bedeutung eines Kunstwerks ist stets ein Produkt der Wechselwirkungen zwischen dem geistigen Material, auf das sich das ästhetische Zeichen bezieht, und dem sich konstituierenden Bewusstsein eines kollektiven Subjekts, das geschichtlich kulturell bedingt ist. An dieser Stelle ist festzuhalten, dass diese Perspektive Mukařovskýs im weitesten Sinne der eingangs dargestellten Auffassung Images entspricht, dass Kunstwerke immer lokal verankert sind. Denn hier wird davon ausgegangen, dass im Kunstwerk eine Art ‚Zeitgeist' ausgedrückt wird.

Die ästhetische Idee als geistige Bedeutungserschaffung

Das ästhetische Zeichen besitzt also *per se* keine allgemeingültige Bedeutung, sondern seine Bedeutung wird durch die geistige Tätigkeit des Subjekts hergestellt. Es gibt dadurch so viele ästhetische Zeichen wie es ästhetische Ideen gibt, was sowohl die produzierende als auch die wahrnehmende Subjektseite umfasst. Es ist somit nicht wichtig, ob vom Produzenten, Interpreten oder Rezipienten die Rede ist, sie alle können ästhetische Bedeutung in ihrem jeweiligen Kontext schaffen, wenn sie eine Performance schreiben, spielen oder hören.

Dieser pragmatische Ansatz erklärt jedoch nicht, inwiefern es, trotz arbiträrer ästhetischer Bedeutung, konstante Mechanismen bei der Bedeutungsbildung gibt. Die performativen Künste können nicht auf die semantische Ebene reduziert werden, indem postuliert wird, wenn sie nichts außerästhetisches bezeichneten, seien sie asemantisch und würden daher auch nichts bedeuten. Während des Prozesses der Bedeutungsgebung werden im menschlichen Bewusstsein Beziehungen gebildet, z.B. aus Tönen entstehen Melodien. Ein geistiger Vorgang bildet aus einzelnen Tönen ein ganzes Werk. Die Wahrnehmung ästhetischer Zeichen ist kein einfach rezipierender, sondern ein schöpferischer Vorgang der Bedeutungskonstruktion.

Die genannten Modelle werden hier erweitert, indem mit Ernst Cassirers Bedeutungstheorie gezeigt wird, inwiefern die performativen Künste als symbolische Form als bedeutungsgebendes, das heißt als symbolisches Tun zu verstehen sind. In den Schriften der ästhetischen Theorien ist meist nicht von Bedeutung der Künste die Rede, sondern eher von ihrem Inhalt, ihrem Sinn, ihrem Sinngehalt, ihrem Affekt, ihrem Ausdruck, ihrer Botschaft usw. Um begriffliche Unklarheiten zu vermeiden, werden von nun an die Begriffe *Bedeutung* und *Sinn* synonym zu dem cassirerschen Begriff des *Symbolischen* verwendet. Cassirer hat mit seiner Philosophie der symbolischen Formen das *Symbolische* zur Grundkonstan-

---

emy of Music (Hg.), *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music.* Vol. III, Nr. 2, Zagreb 1972, S. 204.

te allen menschlichen Lebens erhoben; nämlich dass wir in alles, was wir tun, was wir denken und wahrnehmen, gleichzeitig Bedeutung hineinlegen. Ähnlich der *musikalischen Idee* bei Faltin wird im *Symbolischen* der performativen Künste durch eine *geistige Energie* eine Bedeutung an ein ästhetisches Zeichen geknüpft.

Ernst Cassirer: Philosophie der symbolischen Formen

Ernst Cassirer bietet mit seiner Kulturphilosophie der symbolischen Formen ein Denksystem, anhand dessen es möglich ist, unsere Welt, unsere Kultur zu analysieren und zu verstehen. Cassirer kann als der Denker gelten, dem es gelungen ist, die neukantianische Philosophie und die strukturale Semiotik mit ethnologischen und kulturanthropologischen Ansätzen zu verbinden und sie zu seiner Philosophie der symbolischen Formen zu erweitern.

Cassirer schlägt einen dritten Weg ein, weder den Weg der Logik noch den des Psychologismus. Seine symbolischen Formen sind weder dinghaft physikalisch noch rein ideell. Es handelt sich bei ihnen um Bedeutungen und damit um reale Prozesse der Symbolformung. Damit wird das Problem der Gültigkeit der Logik auf das Problem der Gültigkeit des Zeichens ausgedehnt. Es geht darum, die Objektivität von kulturellen Zeichen, ihren ‚Wahrheitsgehalt' zu bestimmen. Aus seinem Interesse an semiotischen Fragestellungen entwickelt er schließlich in den 20er-Jahren des 20. Jahrhunderts seine *Kulturphilosophie der symbolischen Formen* (1923-1929).

Die Tatsache des Wahrnehmens selbst wird zum Ausgangspunkt. Es handelt sich hierbei jedoch nicht um eine reine Erkenntnistheorie, da diese auch nur eine mögliche Weltanschauung sei, die Theorie und Objekt voneinander trenne. An die Stelle der Erkenntnistheorie, welche danach fragt, wie es dem erkennenden Subjekt möglich ist, zu objektiv gültigen Ergebnissen zu gelangen, tritt Cassirers konstruktivistische Kulturphilosophie als symbolische Bedeutungstheorie. Er verbindet in seiner Kulturphilosophie die empirische Beschreibung einzelner Merkmale und Kennzeichen der menschlichen Kulturwerke mit einer philosophischen Reflexion über die Natur und das Wesen dieser Gegenstände:

> Die Werke der menschlichen Kultur sind die einzigen, die in sich die beiden Bedingungen vereinen, auf denen die vollkommene Erkenntnis beruht; sie haben nicht nur ein begrifflich=erdachtes, sondern ein durchaus=bestimmtes, ein individuelles und historisches Sein.[9]

Nach Cassirers Kulturphilosophie wird die Welt kreiert, indem man in alles, was man tut, in alles, was man wahrnimmt, Bedeutung hineinlegt. Die Grundfunktion des Bedeutens ist in allem vorausgesetzt, ohne Bedeutung ist keine menschliche Handlung, keine Kultur möglich. Cassirer spricht von symbolischen Formen als diese Art der Bedeutungserschaffung, als gemeinsame strukturelle Basis der un-

---

[9] Ernst Cassirer, Zur *Logik der Kulturwissenschaften: fünf Studien.* Darmstadt 1989, S. 10.

terschiedlichen Arten des Weltverstehens. Eine symbolische Form ist nach Cassirer „jede Energie des Geistes […], durch welche ein geistiger Bedeutungsgehalt an ein konkretes sinnliches Zeichen geknüpft und diesem Zeichen innerlich zugeeignet wird".[10] Es gibt keine a priori gegebene Welt, sondern eine Welt des geistigen Schaffens. Symbolisch ist demnach, was wir durch unseren Geist nach regelnden Strukturierungen erschaffen.

Eine symbolische Form ist ein geistiges Tun, das Bedeutung mit sinnlicher Erfahrung verbindet. Die Realität wird durch das Denken konstituiert und existiert nicht *a priori.* Das geistige Tun ist als Gestalten, als Schaffen von Ausdrucksformen, als ein Bilden beziehungsweise Formen, als ein sinngebendes Tun zu verstehen. Es handelt sich um die Manifestation der geistigen Grundfunktion des Bedeutens im Material des Sinnlich-Gegebenen. Das Sein ist somit nur im Tun, in der geistigen Tätigkeit des Denkens erfassbar.

Die „höchste objektive Wahrheit, die sich dem Geist erschließt, ist zuletzt die Form seines eigenen Tuns".[11] Die Wahrheitsfrage ist demnach dem Sinn und der Bedeutung untergeordnet, nur anhand einer gefestigten Bedeutung kann etwas Wahrheitscharakter erhalten. Die Wirklichkeit bildet sich durch die Kontinuität der Erfahrungen aus, die dann als geltende objektive Wahrheit verstanden wird. Schon in seinem Werk *Substanzbegriff und Funktionsbegriff* (1910) geht Cassirer davon aus, dass sich alle wissenschaftlichen Begriffe in der Anwendung auf das empirische Material bewähren müssen, also nur innerhalb einer Interaktion zwischen der wissenschaftlichen Forschung und der Empirie entstehen und sich festigen können. Durch die allgemein erfahrene Erfahrung ist somit objektive Wahrheit gegeben: „Wir bedürfen nicht der Objektivität absoluter Dinge, wohl aber der objektiven Bestimmtheit des Weges der Erfahrung selbst."[12]

Wahr sind alle Erlebnisse, die gedanklich organisiert sind. Damit erhält das Verstehen eine pragmatische Dimension: Die Wahrheit findet sich nur in der Totalität der symbolischen Formen. Die Wahrheit ist demnach nicht statisch, sondern formt sich in einem Prozess der menschlichen Schaffenskraft der Erfahrung. Die Erfahrung ist es, die es überhaupt erst ermöglicht, feste Bedeutungspunkte zu bilden:

> […] der feste Kern des ‚objektiven' Seins, im Unterschied zur Welt der
> bloßen Vorstellung oder Einbildung, hebt sich dadurch heraus, daß
> das Beharrliche gegenüber dem Fließenden, das Gleichbleibende gegenüber dem Veränderlichen, das Feste gegenüber dem Wandelbaren immer schärfer und deutlicher unterschieden wird.[13]

---

[10] Ernst Cassirer, *Wesen und Wirkung des Symbolbegriffs. Darmstadt* 1997, S. 175.

[11] Ernst Cassirer, „Die ideelle Bedeutung des Zeichens." In: Elize Bisanz (Hg.). *Kulturwissenschaft und Zeichentheorien. Zur Synthese von Theoria, Praxis und Poiesis.* Münster 2004, S. 310.

[12] Ernst Cassirer: *SF*. S. 427 f. Zit. in: Ernst Cassirer, „Philosophie der symbolischen Formen. Dritter Teil. Phänomenologie der Erkenntnis." In: Birgit Recki (Hg.). *Gesammelte Werke/Ernst Cassirer.* Hamburger Ausgabe. Band 13. Hamburg 2002, S. 553.

[13] Ernst Cassirer, *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen. Zweiter Teil. Das mythische Denken.* Darmstadt 1997, S. 41.

Wieder betont Cassirer, wie die subjektive Erfahrung zur objektiven Bedeutung werden kann. Indem jedes sinnliche Wahrnehmungserlebnis in eine objektive Gesamtstruktur der Bedeutung eingeordnet wird, schließt es automatisch Regeln und Orientierungen in sich ein und ist damit im Sinne Cassirers symbolisch.

Symbolische Prägnanz

Cassirer betont, dass kulturelle Zeichen nur anhand ihrer konkreten geistigen Ausdrucksformen zu beobachten sind. Die menschliche Wahrnehmungswelt funktioniert nach kategorialen Ordnungsmustern auf der sinnlichen Ebene der Anschauung, und die Wahrnehmungsinhalte erlangen jeweils durch die geistige Energie Bedeutung. Die geistige Kraft des Bewusstseins bildet die sinnlichen Wahrnehmungen zu einer festen Gestalt und formt so die Wirklichkeit, und die Bedeutung benötigt gleichzeitig diesen konkreten Ausdruck, um sich zu manifestieren. Es geht also nicht nur um die unterschiedlichen Weisen des Welterfassens, sondern auch um die unterschiedlichen Ausdrucksformen der menschlichen Kreativität, welche miteinander einhergehen. Die Äußerung der geistigen Energie ist nur erkennbar in dem jeweiligen sinnlichen Zeichen, durch das sie ausgedrückt wird. So muss jede sinnliche Erfahrung, jede Wahrnehmung der Welt gleichzeitig artikuliert werden, um den geistigen Bedeutungsgehalt zu ermöglichen. Es handelt sich hierbei um die symbolische Prägung einer Erfahrung. Cassirer nennt diese Einheit des Sinnlichen und des Geistigen *Symbolische Prägnanz.*

> Unter „symbolischer Prägnanz" soll also die Art verstanden werden, in der ein Wahrnehmungserlebnis, als „sinnliches" Erlebnis, zugleich einen bestimmten nicht – anschaulichen „Sinn" in sich faßt und ihn zur unmittelbaren konkreten Darstellung bringt.[14]

Es gibt keine reine Kausalität wie im Empirismus, dem zufolge das Verstehen einer Bedeutung kausal erst der Wahrnehmung von Sinnesdaten, also der Erfahrung folgt, sondern jegliches Wahrnehmungserlebnis beinhaltet gleichzeitig einen gedanklichen Sinn. Bei der symbolischen Prägnanz sind also das Sinnliche und das Geistige nicht voneinander getrennt, sondern fungieren in einer Wechselbeziehung. Dieses Wechselverhältnis von gedanklicher Form und seinem wahrnehmbaren, sinnlichen Ausdruck ist das symbolische Urphänomen allen geistigen Schaffens.

So erklärt Cassirer die ‚Existenz' von materiellen Ausdrücken des menschlichen Bewusstseins. Alle menschlichen Erfahrungen, alle sinnlichen Wahrnehmungserlebnisse werden organisiert und geprägt beziehungsweise geformt und artikuliert und erlangen dadurch einen symbolischen Gehalt, sonst ergäben sie keinen Sinn und könnten nicht wahrgenommen werden. Es geht also um die Verkörperung von Sinn innerhalb einer bestimmten Ordnungsstruktur. Alle symboli-

---

[14] Cassirer, *PsF III*, S. 231.

schen Formen sind „auf das Ziel bezogen […], die passive Welt der bloßen Eindrücke, in denen der Geist zunächst befangen scheint, zu einer Welt des reinen geistigen Ausdrucks umzubilden".[15]

Performative Künste als symbolische Form

Die wichtigsten Punkte des letzten Abschnitts lassen sich folgendermaßen zusammenfassen: Nach Cassirer wird in jedem künstlerischen Zeichen ein geistiger Gehalt zum Ausdruck gebracht. Die Symboltätigkeit des menschlichen Bewusstseins erzeugt so eine Vielfalt von geistigen Formen, die das Sein ausmachen. In jedem dieser geistigen Ausdrücke ist zugleich eine ordnende Gesamtstruktur repräsentiert, die die Bedeutung der jeweiligen Äußerung erst ermöglicht und so symbolisch prägt. Diese Erfahrungen erlangen Stabilität durch den objektiven Ausdruck in einem künstlichen Zeichen, beispielsweise einem Kunstwerk oder einem Musikstück. Die Symbolbildung des Bewusstseins ist ein dynamischer Prozess mit dem Bestreben, durch die Fixierung in künstlichen Zeichen geistige Ruhepunkte zu finden.

Bezogen auf Musik bzw. die performativen Künste wird festgehalten, dass sie keine Gefühle ausdrücken, auch wenn beim Komponieren bzw. Produzieren oder Hören bzw. Anschauen von performativen Künsten Gefühle entstehen können, sondern in ihnen werden künstlerische Ideen als Ergebnisse einer spezifisch geistigen Tätigkeit eines Individuums ausgedrückt. Töne oder Intervalle, alle musikalischen Motive, alle tänzerischen Bewegungen etc. sind im Grunde asemantisch. Sie können durch kulturelle Konventionen semantisiert werden. Aber auch ohne konventionelle Bedeutungen trägt performative Kunst Bedeutung. Man kann z.B. Musik hören und unabhängig von möglichen Aussagen genießen. Dies macht das Symbolische nach Cassirer in den performativen Künsten aus.

Durch die indirekte Kommunikation zwischen dem Produzenten und dem Rezipienten über die künstlerische Performance sind plurale Interpretationen möglich, da der Produzent und der Rezipient der Performance variieren, wobei beide den gleichen Bezugspunkt des gleichen Stückes haben. Diese Gemeinsamkeit des Produzenten, Interpreten und Rezipienten, die unterschiedliche Standpunkte einnehmen können, macht das Symbolische der performativen Künste aus. Alle bewegen sich im Rahmen der gleichen symbolischen Form. Die jeweilige Performance ist immer sogleich ein Bedeutungsträger, weil in ihr Erfahrungen des Produzenten in einer spezifischen Weise symbolisch artikuliert werden.

Diese Erfahrung macht der Produzent in seiner Umwelt, in der Gesellschaft, in der er lebt, wodurch die gesellschaftliche Dimension der Performance gegeben ist. Entsprechend enthält die (Re-)Produktion und die Rezeption von performativen Künsten eine gesellschaftsbezogene Komponente. Doch diese ist aufgrund des konstruktivistischen Charakters der Symboltheorie Cassirers im Sinne von

---

[15] Ernst Cassirer, „Der Begriff der symbolischen Form und die Systematik der symbolischen Formen." In: Elize Bisanz (Hg.), *Kulturwissenschaft und Zeichentheorien. Zur Synthese von Theoria, Praxis und Poiesis*. Münster 2004, S. 279.

Days kosmopolitischen Anspruchs geprägt. Die symbolischen Formen an sich sind durch die Grundfunktion des Symbolischen miteinander verbunden, darüber hinaus ist es allerdings nicht relevant, welche Bezüge hergestellt werden, da z.B. eine Performance nicht als Zeichen auf ein Denotat verweist. Doch wie ist es dann überhaupt möglich, Aussagen über bestimmte Kunstwelten bzw. Symbolische Formen zu treffen, wenn, wie es scheint, jegliche Grenzziehungen oder lokale Bezüge, abhanden gekommen sind? Um diese Frage zu beantworten, wird im nächsten Schritt eine soziologische Herangehensweise geprüft.

Konventionen

Konventionalisierte Bedeutungen in den performativen Künsten

Nach dem Musiksemiotiker Vladimír Karbusicky sind Musikstrukturen ästhetisch manifestierte, formal-sinnvolle Selektionen von Klangereignissen, Tonreihen- und komplexen mit Wiederholungen und Variationen, in denen semantische Enklaven erscheinen, aber nicht vorherrschen müssen. Man kann Musikstrukturen als zeichenhaft erleben, aber eine ‚richtige' Bedeutung kann nicht dekodiert werden, denn ästhetisch ist es auch sinnvoll, wenn eine andere Bedeutung in die Musik hinein projiziert wird als beispielsweise vom Komponisten intendiert. Der Rezipient kann also genauso wie der Produzent oder der Interpret die Inhalte der Musik bestimmen, gleicher Bezugspunkt für alle drei bleibt dabei das Musikstück selbst.

Diese semantische Unbestimmtheit macht laut Karbusicky die Kraft von ästhetischen Strukturen aus, indem durch die Möglichkeit vielfacher Bedeutungen der Rezipient ideell und ästhetisch herausgefordert wird und durch seine eigene aktive Bedeutungserschaffung mit dem ästhetischen Zeichen spielen kann, und die Musik unabhängig von der Aussage Bedeutung trägt.[16] Eine große aufsteigende Sexte bedeutet nämlich nicht von Grund auf *Freude*, sondern wird höchstens in der Epoche der europäischen Klassik häufig als Stilmittel hierfür eingesetzt und von Experten und geübten Hörern als solches ‚verstanden'. Aber es ist fraglich, ob jede verwendete große aufsteigende Sexte automatisch als *Freude* intendiert oder verstanden wird. Denn

> die ästhetische Idee ist nicht nur Bestandteil der Kultur, sondern ihr Produkt. In ihr werden die durch das Individuum transformierten Ideale, Normen oder Vorstellungen einer Epoche, d.h. der Zeitgeist, ästhetisch artikuliert. Da ästhetische Ideen allen Wandlungen unterworfen werden, denen eine Kultur ausgesetzt ist, sind ästhetische Zeichen, die Zeichen dieser Ideen sind, der sensible Seismograph einer Kultur.[17]

---

[16] Vgl. ebd., S. 6 f.
[17] Faltin 1985, S. 21.

Der künstlerische Sinn kann sich darüber hinaus zu Bedeutungen in Konventionen stabilisieren. So wurde beispielsweise der Ton *h* erst zu einem Leitton in der Tonart C-Dur, nachdem der Mensch die kulturelle musikalische Denkart entwickelt hatte, die den Begriff des Leittons prägt, und mit der dieser Ton in einem System als Leitton verstanden wird. Die Voraussetzung für die Entwicklung dieses (europäischen) musikalischen Systems war jedoch der musikalisch klingende Ton in seinen Beziehungen zu anderen innerhalb einer Struktur. Diese Strukturverständnisse mit ihren Bedeutungen wie *Leitton* sind eine Art ästhetischer Kode, der durch Konventionen geregelt wird. Diese Kategorien ästhetischer Wahrnehmung haben sich teilweise über Jahrhunderte hinweg entwickelt. So ist es zum Beispiel einem Komponisten oder Hörer des europäisch geprägten Hörverständnisses schwer möglich, eine Dominante als einen Ruhepunkt zu komponieren oder zu hören.

Liegt also die Bedeutung der performativen Künste allein in ihrem Gebrauch? In den performativen Künsten sind Regeln verwirklicht, die durch Gebrauch gelernt werden. Mit Hilfe dieser Regeln wird das Wahrgenommene zu ästhetisch bedeutenden Werken gestaltet. Das Bewusstsein muss daher über Regeln und Kategorien verfügen, um die einzelnen Elemente in ihren Beziehungen zueinander wahrzunehmen, sie in künstlerisch sinnvolle Beziehungen zu setzen. Die Regeln sind jedoch ebenso kulturell geprägt, d.h. sie sind dynamisch und leiten sich vom ästhetischen wandelbaren Ideal eines Kreislaufs einer Epoche ab. Hiermit gelangen wir wieder zu Images Bild der lokal verankerten Künste.

Pragmatische Kunstsemantik nach Mukařovský

Der tschechische Strukturalismus, zu dem Mukařovský als Ästhetiker gehört, entsteht als eine Reaktion gegen die spekulative Ästhetik. Er unterliegt einem strengen Antipsychologismus, da hier das Kunstwerk nicht mit dem Seelenzustand seines Schöpfers gleichgesetzt wird. Kunst ist nicht Träger einer Mitteilung, sondern die Mitteilung selbst, das ästhetische Zeichen ist autonom. Mukařovský reduziert das künstlerische Artefakt jedoch nicht auf seine reine Materialität, denn das ästhetische Zeichen weist, obwohl es autonom ist, auf eine unbestimmte Realität hin, die den „Gesamtkomplex der sogenannten sozialen Erscheinungen: z.B. Philosophie, Politik, Religion, Wirtschaft usw." umfasst.[18] Diese Gesamtheit der sozialen Erscheinungen ist das geistige Klima einer Gesellschaft, die das kollektive Bewusstsein prägt. Die ästhetischen Zeichen beziehen sich somit auf die Übereinstimmungen im kollektiven Bewusstsein, das heißt auf die Übereinstimmungen im Verhalten einer sozialen Gruppe.

Ein Kunstwerk kann nach Mukařovský weder für den Gefühlszustand des Künstlers stehen, noch auf seine Materialität reduziert werden. Das materielle Werk besitzt vielmehr die Stellung eines äußerlichen Symbols, dem

---

[18] Jan Mukařovský, *Kapitel aus der Ästhetik.* Frankfurt am Main 1970, S. 141.

> im kollektiven Bewusstsein eine bestimmte Bedeutung entspricht
> […], die durch das bestimmt wird, was die subjektiven Zustände des
> Bewusstseins, die bei den Mitgliedern einer bestimmten Gruppe
> durch das materielle Werk hervorgerufen werden, miteinander ge-
> meinsam haben.[19]

Eine Bedeutung an sich gibt es somit nicht, nur eine Bedeutung für jemanden, da
jede Wahrnehmung gleichzeitig Bedeutungskonstitution ist. Damit ist die Bedeu-
tung durch den Gebrauch bestimmt, durch ihre Funktion. Trotz individueller Un-
terschiede gibt es innerhalb definierbarer Gruppen wie beispielsweise den Besu-
chern eines Konzerts einen relativ stabilen (Teil-)Konsens im Bezug auf das
Musikstück und seine Bedeutung.

Bei der Bildung dieser Konventionen handelt es sich um einen ständigen Lern-
prozess, und es entwickeln sich neue Konventionen, wenn beispielsweise ein
neuer Stil bei den Hörern in einer bestimmten Zeit in einem bestimmten Milieu
in den Bestand der Vorstellungen eingeht. Jedes neue Werk setzt neue Konven-
tionen fest, erweitert oder spielt mit vorhandenen Konventionen. Dank der
menschlichen Vorstellungskraft sind vielfältige stilistische Konventionen möglich.
Das alltägliche Leben und die alltäglichen künstlerischen Erfahrungen tragen zur
Veränderung der Wahrnehmungsmuster und damit auch des Geschmacks bei.
Etwas Künstlerisches kann Bedeutung erlangen, wenn es im ästhetischen Be-
wusstsein der Kultur bereits Kategorien hierfür gibt. Um neue Denk- und Wahr-
nehmungskategorien zu entwickeln, kann durch Innovationen der Avantgarde
eine Erneuerung im Material eingeführt werden, die sich durch Wiederholung zu
einer Kategorie konventionalisieren kann. An dieser Stelle lassen sich Cassirers
und Mukařovskýs Ansätze mit dem Howard S. Beckers verbinden.

Art World-Ansatz nach Howard S. Becker

Danto (1964)[20] ist zuzuschreiben, den Begriff der *Artworld* als sich wandelnde
normative Institution in die Soziologie eingeführt zu haben. Howard S. Becker
greift dieses Verständnis auf und entwickelt es hinsichtlich des gesamten Feldes
der Kulturorganisation weiter. Dieses Feld umfasst nicht mehr nur das ästheti-
sche Werk mit seinem Produzenten und Rezipienten, sondern Kulturorganisation
beschreibt die (institutionalisierte) kollektive Aktivität, die Produktion und Ver-
mittlung sowie Konsumption von Kultur beinhaltet. Dafür sind komplexe Koope-
rationsprozesse der Akteure nötig, die ihrerseits Regeln bzw. Konventionen er-
fordern. „Only because artist and audience share knowledge of and experience
with the conventions invoked does the art work produce an emotional effect."[21]
Diese Konventionen lassen sich beispielsweise auch als Seh- und Hörgewohnhei-
ten für die Seite der Rezeption beschreiben. Doch auch die Gatekeeper-Akteure

---

[19] Ebd., S. 139.
[20] Arthur C. Danto, „The Artworld." In: *The Journal of Philosophy.* 1964, Nr. 61 (19), S. 571-584.
[21] Howard S. Becker., *Art Worlds.* Berkeley/Los Angeles 2008, S. 30.

wie z.B. Galeristen oder Kuratoren ‚nutzen' diesen mächtigen Konventionen wie Becker schreibt:

> Every art world uses, to organize some of the cooperation between some of its participants, conventions known to all or almost all well-socialized members of the society in which it exists.[22]

Gaupp und Kirchberg beschreiben, wie die gesamte Kulturorganisation davon geprägt ist, dass diese Konventionen entstehen. Zunächst finden Konstruktions- und Festlegungsprozesse aufgrund von Interaktionen der Akteure statt, die soziale bzw. politische und ästhetische bzw. bewertende Kriterien von Kunst festlegen. Diese Kriterien wirken unhinterfragt und normativ durch ihre Institutionalisierung. Anschließend nehmen die genannten Gatekeeper der jeweiligen *Art World* diese Kriterien auf und verhandeln in einem weiteren komplexen Prozess der Interaktion mit Produzenten und Vermittlern der Künste die symbolischen Bedeutungen als Konventionen. Gaupp und Kirchberg erklären ferner, wie Konventionen jedoch nicht starr und unveränderlich wirken, sondern dass sie dehnbar oder auch zu vernachlässigen sind, wenn die Mehrheit der Akteure damit konform geht. Bei diesen Prozessen sind vor allem Überlegungen zum Machtgewinn ausschlaggebend, wenn die Akteure versuchen, über Konformität oder Beugung der Konventionen entsprechend Status zu erlangen. Generell jedoch verändern sich die Einstellungs- und Verhaltensroutinen bzw. die Konventionen nur langsam in der jeweiligen *Art World*.[23]

Verbindet man nun die kulturphilosophische Theorie Cassirers und die pragmatische Theorie Mukařovskýs mit dem soziologischen *Art World*-Ansatz Beckers, lässt sich festhalten, dass Bedeutungen bzw. Symbole nicht in dem jeweiligen ästhetischen Material gebunden sind, sondern durch die geistige Schaffenskraft sowohl des Künstlers, des Vermittlers, als auch des Rezipienten im Akt der ästhetischen Erfahrung konstruiert werden. Weiterhin geschieht dieser Vorgang nicht in einem ‚luftleeren' Raum, sondern die Bedeutung wird durch den Gebrauch bestimmt, der durch Konventionen strukturiert wird. Dieser gesellschaftliche Gebrauch und die ihn bestimmenden Konventionen finden in einem komplexen Zusammenspiel aller Akteure der Kulturorganisation innerhalb einer *Art World* statt, die durch die in ihr konstruierten Konventionen gekennzeichnet ist.

Somit wird die Bedeutungskonstruktion und auch die Festigung oder Hinterfragung der Konventionen nicht mehr nur vom Produzenten und Rezipienten vorgenommen, sondern die Prozesse der Vermittlung der Künste sind gleichfalls beteiligt. Das Kunstwerk an sich ist in dieser Sicht zwar nicht irrelevant, da es ebenfalls als symbolische Prägnanz verstanden werden kann, es tritt jedoch in den Hintergrund, wenn stattdessen das Interaktionsverhalten der Teilnehmenden der jeweiligen *Art World* ins Zentrum des Interesses rückt. In dieser *Art*

---

[22] *Ebd.*, S. 42.

[23] Vgl. Lisa Gaupp/Volker Kirchberg, „Kuturelle Diversität in den Künsten zwischen Tradition und Zeitgenossenschaft." In: Lutz Hieber (Hg.), *Gesellschaftsepochen und ihre Kunstwelten.* Sammelband Springer VS Reihe ‚Kunst und Gesellschaft'. Wiesbaden 2017*.*

World werden somit immer wieder aufs Neue spezifische Symbolräume konstruiert, in denen Konventionen das Verhalten der Akteure weitgehend organisieren. Durch die Verschiebung der Perspektive von den Künsten, ihren Kunstwerken und Künstlern, die entweder als lokal bzw. national und begrenzt oder als kosmopolitisch und entgrenzt angesehen werden, hin zur Betrachtung einer *Art World* gelingt es, nicht grundsätzlich und allgemein Aussagen darüber treffen zu müssen, ob die Künste per se nun lokal oder kosmopolitisch sind. Diese Frage muss vielmehr für jede *Art World* empirisch erhoben und interpretiert werden und vor allem auf die gesamte Kulturorganisation bezogen werden.

Im Folgenden wird die *Art World* der transnationalen PerformingArts Festivals betrachtet, um exemplarisch aufzuzeigen, ob hier, wie eingangs in Frage gestellt, interkulturelle, nationale bzw. lokale, begrenzte Räume kultureller Diversität konstruiert werden, oder ob sämtliche solcher identitären Zuschreibungen dekonstruiert werden und vielmehr kosmopolitische, transkulturelle oder postmigrantische und entgrenzte Räume kultureller Diversität verhandelt werden.

Identitäre Zuschreibungen

In den *Art Worlds* der transnationalen PerformingArts Festivals werden verschiedene Konzeptionen von ‚Identität' und ‚Alterität' kodiert. Damit verbunden sind Konventionen, mit denen bestimmte Definitionen kultureller Diversität semantisch normiert werden. Den Kuratoren dieser Festivals kommt als Gatekeeper zwar eine machtvolle Position bei der Normierung von Diversität zu, doch handeln diese wie zuvor beschrieben entlang gesellschaftlicher oder politischer Erwartungshaltungen, um ihren Status nicht zu verlieren oder zu verbessern. Ferner interagiert die gesamte *Art World* mitsamt ihrer Produzenten, Vermittler und Rezipienten, so dass die Kuratoren nicht als alleinige Akteure das Feld kodieren.

In der transnationalen PerformingArts-Festival-*Art World* gibt es so gut wie keine Festivals, die sich als interkulturell oder national präsentieren. Die Herkunft der Künstler tritt vermeintlich in den Hintergrund, und ein kosmopolitisches, transkulturelles, entgrenztes Ideal von Diversität wird inszeniert. In diesen Festivalräumen, welche neben den örtlich und zeitlich fixierten meist mehrtägigen oder mehrwöchigen Performancereihen auch u.a. die mental, diskursiv und medial hergestellten Räume und ihre Narrative, Ideologien und Bilder umfassen, scheinen Trans-Identitäten konventionalisiert zu werden und transkulturelle Performance-Praktiken vorzuherrschen. Das Programm wird nicht nach z.B. Kontinenten der Künstler sortiert, sondern nach thematischen Gesichtspunkten gegliedert. Kulturelle Diversität wird hier semantisch als entgrenzt, transkulturell oder kosmopolitisch besetzt, auf eine Medienvielfalt in den Performances oder auf eine Kunstspartendiversität bezogen.

Doch schaut man sich beispielsweise die Programmplanungen der großen Europäischen Festivals der letzten zehn Jahre an, fällt auf, dass einige der gebuchten Gruppen und Einzelkünstler immer wieder auftauchen, und dass diese zu einer großen Mehrheit entweder aus Europa stammen oder in Europa ansässig

sind. Hierfür gibt es verschiedene Gründe wie u.a. die Förderstrukturen, die einen nationalen (öffentliche Kulturförderung der einzelnen Staaten) oder Europäischen (EU-Förderprogramme wie *Creative Europe*) Fokus besitzen.

> The biggest challenge for the arts is an increasing nationalism in all matters. Due to the financial crisis, the national funding bodies insist more and more on national production – foreign participation is of course welcome in financial terms, but there is less interest in co-financing new works by non-resident-artists.[24]

Jedoch nicht nur finanzielle Strukturen sind ausschlaggebend dafür, dass in vermeintlich kosmopolitischen Festivalräumen nationale Zuschreibungen vorgenommen werden und weitere Grenzen konstruiert werden, also die Perspektive Images durchscheint. Wie gezeigt wurde, geht es sowohl bei der Anwendung als auch bei der Beugung von Konventionen um machtpolitische Interessen, also um den Zugang zu statussichernden bzw. -produzierenden Ressourcen.

> Territoriale bzw. nationale Kriterien haben ungeachtet ihrer Zurückweisung in einem Feld mit kosmopolitischem Selbstverständnis offenbar nach wie vor Bedeutung. Künstler/innen, die nicht auf eine nordwestliche geografische Herkunft zurückblicken, sind in jedem Zentrum des Kunstfeldes nach wie vor schwach vertreten, in dem sich die Akteure mit hoher feldspezifischer symbolischer Anerkennung konzentrieren. […] aus feldtheoretischer Perspektive [gibt es hierfür] Gründe […], die nicht zuletzt in der institutionellen Struktur des sozialen Systems der Kunst zu suchen sind, d. h. in der Verteilung relevanter Ressourcen.[25]

Weiterhin werden Konventionen in diesen Räumen (re-)produziert, die kulturelle Diversität trotz des genannten „kosmopolitischen Selbstverständnisses" auf die Herkunft der Künstler beziehen. Hier werden ästhetische Kodes, die lokale ‚außereuropäische' Bezüge aufzeigen, beispielsweise als „zu langatmig für das Europäische Publikum" bezeichnet, da sie (noch) nicht in der entsprechenden *Art World* konventionalisiert worden sind. Die ästhetische Sprache wird im Sinne Images als nicht übersetzbar gesehen. Auch wenn die Kuratoren selbst beispielsweise aus Afrika oder Asien stammen und in einem Europäischen Kontext ein Festival organisieren, werden sie

> confronted with a strong Eurocentrism in the field in which works from other continents get easily labeled either as ‚outdated' in com-

---

[24] Veronika Kaup-Hasler, zitiert in: NXT.STP: Documentation 2007-2012. http://www.nxtstp.eu/files/NXTSTP_5_years.pdf (Abruf 30.5.2015).

[25] Larissa Buchholz/Ulf Wuggenig, „Kunst und Globalisierung." In: Heike Munder/Ulf Wuggenig (Hg.), *Das Kunstfeld. Eine Studie über Akteure und Institutionen der zeitgenössischen Kunst am Beispiel von Zürich, Wien, Hamburg und Paris.* Zürich 2012, S. 179.

> parison to the European development or as ‚too specific‘ to be presented next to European works without also creating access to their ‚original‘ local context. […] Even European curators who decide to focus on works from non-European regions often have to defend their program from accusations of being ‚an easy way out‘ or pure ‚exoticism‘.[26]

Grenzen/Überschreitungen

Ferner existieren ‚bewusste‘ Gründe, warum ein Festival sein Programm nationalbezogen präsentiert. Hier sind neben einer politischen Legitimierung z.B. für die Antragstellung für finanzielle Förderungen im Rahmen von ‚interkulturellen‘ Förderrichtlinien ebenfalls Gründe auf der Ebene der Vermittlung relevant. Um beispielsweise Publikum anzusprechen, das noch nicht mit den Konventionen der performativen Künste vertraut ist, werden u.a. die lokalen bzw. nationalen Hintergründe der Künstler erläutert und so ihre ästhetische Sprache mit Mitteln des Marketings und der Kulturvermittlung symbolisch als lokal verankert gerahmt. Ein anderes Beispiel zeigt, dass bevor überhaupt grenzüberschreitende Inszenierungen in den Blick genommen werden können, zunächst politische Überzeugungsarbeit geleistet werden muss, um bestehende Vorurteile und Neo-Rassismen zu entkräften.

Nichtsdestotrotz entstehen auch in solchen Kontexten transkulturelle Verhandlungsräume der Diversität, wenn beispielsweise nationale Zuschreibungen zurückgewiesen werden und ein ‚Zwischenraum‘, ein ‚Dritter Raum‘ der Hybridität konstruiert wird, in dem die Perspektive Days aufblitzt.

> Eben jener Dritte Raum konstituiert, obwohl ‚in sich‘ nicht repräsentierbar, die diskursiven Bedingungen der Äußerung, die dafür sorgen, daß die Bedeutung und die Symbole von Kultur nicht von allem Anfang an einheitlich und festgelegt sind und daß selbst ein und dieselben Zeichen neu belegt, übersetzt, rehistorisiert und gelesen werden können.[27]

Nicht zuletzt ist dies dem dynamischen Charakter von kulturellen Äußerungen geschuldet, welcher sich in unzähligen Symbolischen Formen ausdrücken lässt.

Es mag der Eindruck entstanden sein, dass nur eine transkulturelle bzw. kosmopolitische Herangehensweise und Programmplanung die ‚einzig richtige‘ für transnationale PerformingArts-Festivals sei. Doch eine solche Perspektive ist keineswegs die ‚heilsbringende Botschaft‘, nicht zuletzt aufgrund der Utopie, die häufig mit solchen Konzepten verbunden ist. Daher sollen abschließend die kon-

---

[26] Pirkko Husemann, „A Curator's Reality Check. Conditions of Curating Performing Arts." In: Beatrice von Bismarck/Jörn Schafaff/Thomas Weski (Hgg.), *Cultures of the Curatorial.* Berlin 2012, S. 276-277.
[27] Homi K. Bhabha, *Die Verortung der Kultur.* Tübingen 2000, S. 57.

fliktären Verhandlungen hervorgehoben werden, die das Konzept der Transkulturalität durchaus mit einschließt, so dass die Betrachtung von symbolischen Räumen kultureller Diversität am Beispiel von transnationalen PerformingArts-Festivals zeigen kann, wie Grenzen permanent sowohl konstruiert als auch dekonstruiert werden, dass also sowohl gemäß Images als auch gemäß Days in der Symbolischen Form der performativen Künste ‚Wahrheit' immer wieder aufs Neue symbolisch geprägt wird.

Literaturverzeichnis

Becker., Howard S. *Art Worlds.* Berkeley/Los Angeles 2008.

Bhabha, Homi K. *Die Verortung der Kultur.* Tübingen 2000.

Brockington, Grace. „Introduction: Internationalism and the Arts." In: Grace Brockington (Hg.). *Internationalism and the Arts in Britain and Europe at the* Fin de Siècle. Bern 2009, 1-24.

Buchholz, Larissa/Wuggenig, Ulf. „Kunst und Globalisierung." In: Heike Munder/Ulf Wuggenig (Hg.). *Das Kunstfeld. Eine Studie über Akteure und Institutionen der zeitgenössischen Kunst am Beispiel von Zürich, Wien, Hamburg und Paris.* Zürich 2012, 163-188.

Cassirer, Ernst. *Zur Logik der Kulturwissenschaften: fünf Studien.* Darmstadt 1989.

Cassirer, Ernst. *Wesen und Wirkung des Symbolbegriffs.* Darmstadt 1997.

Cassirer, Ernst. *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen. Zweiter Teil. Das mythische Denken.* Darmstadt 1997.

Cassirer, Ernst. „Philosophie der symbolischen Formen. Dritter Teil. Phänomenologie der Erkenntnis." In: Birgit Recki (Hg.). *Gesammelte Werke/ Ernst Cassirer.* Hamburger Ausgabe. Band 13. Hamburg 2002.

Cassirer, Ernst. „Der Begriff der symbolischen Form und die Systematik der symbolischen Formen." In: Elize Bisanz (Hg.). *Kulturwissenschaft und Zeichentheorien. Zur Synthese von Theoria, Praxis und Poiesis.* Münster 2004, 271-283.

Cassirer, Ernst. „Die ideelle Bedeutung des Zeichens." In: Elize Bisanz (Hg.). *Kulturwissenschaft und Zeichentheorien. Zur Synthese von Theoria, Praxis und Poiesis.* Münster 2004, 304-314.

Christensen, Otto M. „Interpretation and meaning in music." In: Eero Tarasti (Hg.). *Musical Signification. Essays in the Semiotic Theory and Analysis of Music.* Berlin/ New York 1995, 81-90.

Danto, Arthur C. „The Artworld." In: *The Journal of Philosophy.* 1964, Nr. 61 (19), 571-584.

Faltin, Peter. „Widersprüche bei der Interpretation des Kunstwerkes als Zeichen. Drei monistische Modelle zur Erklärung der Bedeutung von Musik." In: Institute of Musicology-Zagreb Academy of Music (Hg.). *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music.* Vol. III, Nr. 2. Zagreb 1972, 199-215.

Faltin, Peter. „Grenzen und Möglichkeiten einer semiotischen Ästhetik." In: Institute of Musicology-Zagreb Academy of Music (Hg.). *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music.* Vol. IX, Nr. 1. Zagreb 1978, 5-33.

Faltin, Peter. *Bedeutung ästhetischer Zeichen. Musik und Sprache*. Aachen 1985.

Gaupp, Lisa/Kirchberg, Volker. „Kuturelle Diversität in den Künsten zwischen Tradition und Zeitgenossenschaft." In: Lutz Hieber (Hg.). *Gesellschaftsepochen und ihre Kunstwelten.* Sammelband Springer VS Reihe ‚Kunst und Gesellschaft'. Wiesbaden 2017*.*

Husemann, Pirkko. „A Curator's Reality Check. Conditions of Curating Performing Arts." In: Beatrice von Bismarck/Jörn Schafaff/Thomas Weski (Hg.). *Cultures of the Curatorial.* Berlin 2012, 268-286.

Mukařovský, Jan. *Kapitel aus der Ästhetik.* Frankfurt am Main 1970.

Internetquellen

NXT.STP: Documentation 2007-2012. http://www.nxtstp.eu/files/NXTS

Impressum

Schriften zur Kultur- und Mediensemiotik | Online

ist zusammen mit der Printreihe *Schriften zur Kultur- und Mediensemiotik*
im Marburger Verlag Schüren eine Publikation des
VIRTUELLEN ZENTRUMS FÜR KULTURSEMIOTISCHE FORSCHUNG (VZKF)
und wird herausgegeben von Martin Nies.

SKMS | Online erscheint in Kooperation mit der Universitätsbibliothek Passau im Open Access in
Open Journal Systems und auf der Webseite www.kultursemiotik.com. Sonderbände zu bestimmten Themenschwerpunkten sind darüber hinaus auch als BOD im Verlag Schüren erhältlich.

Verantwortlich für den Inhalt der Beiträge sind die Autor*innen.

Herausgeber / Redaktion
Prof. Dr. Martin Nies
Europa-Universität Flensburg
Institut für Sprache, Literatur und Medien
Auf dem Campus 1
24943 Flensburg
Germany

Email: redaktion@kultursemiotik.com

Schriften zur Kultur- und Mediensemiotik

No. 4/2018

Kulturelle Diversität in den Künsten zwischen Tradition und Zeitgenossenschaft
Lisa Gaupp & Volker Kirchberg

Seit circa drei Jahrzehnten werden vermehrt globale Kunstwelten und ihre historischen Verortungen wissenschaftlich verhandelt. In dieser Debattenlandschaft scheinen zwei Perspektiven einander gegenüberzustehen: Auf der einen Seite wird versucht, meist aus postkolonialer Theorie heraus, die binären Zuschreibungsmechanismen der Moderne aufzulösen, und auf Traditionen fokussierte Blickwinkel kritisch zu hinterfragen. Auf der anderen Seite sind nostalgische Strömungen zu beobachten, die – auch aus postkolonialer Perspektive – auf neokoloniale Herrschaftsstrukturen mit Versuchen der Wiederbelebung einer „authentischen" Kulturpraxis reagieren. In beiden Fällen wird eine größtmögliche kulturelle Diversität angestrebt. Es stellt sich daher die Frage, welche Bedeutungskonturen dem Begriff der Diversität in beiden Fällen innewohnen, wenn einerseits vergangene Gesellschaftsepochen grundlegend dekonstruiert werden und andererseits vergangene Gesellschaftsepochen die Basis für die Begriffsverwendung darstellen. Wir wollen dies für die Kunstwelten der Bildenden Kunst und der PerformingArts darlegen.

Die partiell zirkuläre Kombination von Dekonstruktion und Restitution künstlerischer Stile ist einerseits ein poststrukturalistisches Kennzeichen heutiger Kunstwelten. Andererseits wird dabei eine lineare Epochenabfolge insbesondere in der Bildenden Kunst häufig nicht in Frage gestellt, weil trotz aller postmodernen Attitüden die Regel eines linearen Fortschritts der Bildenden Künste unausgesprochen Bestand hat. Beispielhaft dafür ist die seit den 1960er-Jahren etablierte Reihenfolge von Kunstepochen nach Danto (1964). Er führte den Begriff der „Artworld" als sich wandelnde normative Institution ein, die sich von der Imitationstheorie der objektnahen Repräsentation von Wirklichkeit in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts zunächst zur Realitätstheorie der emotional-expressiven Interpretation von Wirklichkeit und weiter zur Abwendung der Abbildung von Wirklichkeit entwickelte (Post-Impressionismus, repräsentationeller Expressionismus des Fauvismus, nicht-repräsentationeller Abstrakter Expressionismus und nicht-expressive bzw. nicht-repräsentationelle reine Abstraktion). Diese Epochenfolge setzt sich in den dann folgenden Dekaden über Erneuerungen und Repetitionen fort (u. a. Pop-Art, Fluxus, Photorealismus, Minimal Art, Concept Art und NeoExpressionismus). Jeder dieser Kunststile baut nicht nur

kritisch auf dem Vorgänger auf, sondern setzt sich über ihn hinweg, folgt also dem linearen Fortschrittsparadigma. Während Danto diese Entwicklung als spannungsvolle Sukzession von Imitation vs. Realität betrachtete, hat sich in den letzten Jahren eine neue Sukzession von tradierten oder zeitgenössischen Kunstepochen aus der Spannung von Diversität vs. Nicht-Diversität ergeben.

Dieser Beitrag beschäftigt sich deshalb mit der Frage, wie kulturelle Diversität in der kuratorischen Praxis von Kunstprojekten hinsichtlich von Gesellschafts- bzw. Kunstepochen verwendet wird. Bezogen auf das Thema dieses Bandes bedeutet dies, dass verschiedene Diversitätskonzepte hinsichtlich ihrer aktuellen Verankerung in traditionellen und zeitgenössischen Kunst- und Kulturepochen betrachtet werden. Konkret behandelt dieser Beitrag die Frage, ob es sich bei transkulturellen Kunstpraktiken um ein traditionelles oder ein zeitgenössisches Phänomen handelt.

Das Thema „kulturelle Diversität" kam im vergangenen Jahrzehnt auch unter Begrifflichkeiten wie Interkulturalität oder Transkulturalität vermehrt auf die gesamtpolitische Agenda und damit auch in die öffentliche Debattenlandschaft. Dabei wird meist automatisch Diversität als ethnische oder nationale Diversität verstanden, es geht um Fragen der Migration, des so genannten „interkulturellen Dialogs" oder des multikulturellen Zusammenlebens. Auch in globalen Kunstwelten beschäftigt man sich mit Diversität. Es geht jedoch nicht nur im Sinne eines „Diversity Managements" darum, die Ensembles, Kuratoren, Organisatoren und das Publikum zu diversifizieren und dadurch eine höhere Beteiligung von bislang im globalen Kunstbetrieb unterrepräsentierten Bevölkerungsgruppen, beziehungsweise *eine „greater visibility of work by artists with a ‚non-Western' background"* (Westen 2012, S. 78) zu erreichen, sondern auch und vor allem darum im Sinne der UNESCO-Konvention zum Schutz und zur Förderung kultureller Ausdrucksformen (Deutsche UNESCO-Kommission 2005), die dargestellten Kunstformen auf ästhetischer und kuratorischer Ebene zu diversifizieren.

Wie eingangs dargelegt, stehen hier „interkulturelle", auf Traditionen fokussierte Projekte den transkulturellen, dekonstruktivistischen Ansätzen gegenüber. Die übergreifende Gemeinsamkeit von „interkulturellen" Kunstprojekten ist die Inszenierung von kultureller Vielfalt anhand von mehr oder minder als „traditionell" und „exotisch" dargestellten Kunstformen. Dies bedeutet, dass bei interkulturellen Kunstprojekten kulturelle Diversität vorrangig auf die nationale Herkunft der Künstler_innen bezogen wird und dadurch als

unveränderlich und abgrenzbar gedacht wird. Interkulturalität und verwandte Konzepte wie der Multikulturalismus operieren mit einem traditionellen, national geprägten oder ethnozentristischen Kulturverständnis, welches sich zum Ziel setzt, andere, als ‚fremd' titulierte Kulturen anzuerkennen und zu tolerieren beziehungsweise zu schützen. Gerade dadurch tragen sie jedoch zur Erhaltung von Differenzziehungen bei. *„Such a top-down multicultural ‚rescue' programme results in a form of virtual cultural ghettoisation"* (Appignanesi 2012, S. 88). Solche Ansätze werden aufgrund des Bestrebens „kulturelle Traditionen von Minderheiten zu bewahren" als rückwärtsgewandt oder auch als statisch kritisiert, was der Dynamik jeglicher Kultur entgegenstünde (u. a. Gaupp 2016).

Bei transkulturellen Kunstprojekten treten dagegen diese und andere, vor allem aber diese nationalstaatlichen Bezüge in den Hintergrund. Stattdessen wird unter verschiedenen Thematiken oder auch „globalen Narrativen" zwar ebenfalls kulturelle Diversität inszeniert, diese jedoch als kosmopolit und innovativ oder zeitgenössisch konstruiert. Im Gegensatz zu einem „interkulturellen Kunstprojekt" behandeln „transkulturelle Kunstprojekte" topografisch entkoppelte Themen und präsentieren aktuelle beziehungsweise zeitgenössische globale Fragestellungen. Diese letztere Richtung an konstruktivistischen Diversitätskonzepten wird hier als Transkulturalität bezeichnet. Der Begriff Transkulturalität wurde von verschiedenen Autoren mit unterschiedlichen Ausprägungen diskutiert (u. a. Welsch 2005; Sandkühler 2004; Hoerder et al. 2005; Ha 2010; Hühn et al. 2010). Gemeinsam ist diesen Begriffskonnotationen die Betrachtung von Grenzüberschreitungen, Grenzverwischungen, Verflechtungen und dynamischen Konstruktionen von Identitäten. In diesem Beitrag wird neben diesen Begriffsbedeutungen lediglich die Dekonstruktion national geprägter Kulturmodelle für das Verständnis von Transkulturalität herangezogen.

Der Begriff, bei dem diese zugewiesenen Differenzziehungen von interkulturell = traditionell verhaftet versus transkulturell = zeitgenössisch am deutlichsten zutage treten, ist der von verschiedenen Musikethnologen vor allem kritisierte Begriff der „Weltmusik", der 1982 im Zuge der Gründung des ersten Weltmusikfestivals WOMAD (Worlds of Music, Arts and Dance) durch den ehemaligen Genesis-Frontman Peter Gabriel beziehungsweise im Jahre 1987 von verschiedenen Plattenfirmen für all jene Musikformen geschaffen wird, die nicht in die gängigen Marketingkategorien des „westlichen" Marktes passen und vorrangig „traditionelle, außereuropäische Musikformen" umfassen. Wissenschaftler_innen *„had used the term world*

music to replace the term non-Western music" (Rice 2000, S. 224). Diese Verwendung des Begriffs wird vor allem für seinen Eurozentrismus kritisiert, da alles, was in Europa nicht bekannt ist, dadurch als „fremd" und „anders" deklariert wird, und die weltweit verfügbare Diversität an Musikformen negiert wird (u. a. NRW Kultursekretariat 2007; Burkhalter und Beyer 2012).

Es existieren also diese Zuweisungen, die „nicht-westliche" kulturelle Diversität als traditionell deklarieren und dagegen Kulturpraktiken „aus dem Westen" einen zeitgenössischen Charakter attestieren im Bereich der Musik.

In den Bildenden Künsten sind diese Tendenzen ebenfalls zu beobachten. Insbesondere die amerikanische Kunstsoziologin Vera Zolberg hat sich ihr seit ihrem Aufenthalt in der Elfenbeinküste in den 1960er-Jahren mit der soziologischen Analyse „afrikanischer" Kunst in der westlichen Gesellschaft unter dem Vorzeichen von Diversität beschäftigt (vgl. insbesondere Zolberg 1997). Sie stellt sich die Frage, wie in einer postmodernen Welt ohne etablierte Autoritäten, die Kunst als solche zweifelfrei festlegen, „Kunstaußenseiter" wie die „afrikanische primitive Kunst" wie und von wem zur Kunst erklärt, d. h. als Bestandteil von Art Worlds deklariert wird, und wie es seitdem zu weiteren Transformationen dieser Bedeutung kommt. Die Bedeutungszuschreibung afrikanischer Kunstobjekte ist ein kontinuierlicher Prozess, der seit Anbeginn des 20. Jahrhunderts (zunächst durch Avantgardekünstler und ihre Galeristen, später auch durch andere Gatekeeper wie Museen und Kunstsammler) unverändert anhält. Der „Wert" der „primitiven afrikanischen" Kunst wurde von diesen Gatekeepern zum einen als „authentisch", zum anderen auch „romantisch" als Bestandteil einer homogenen Gemeinschaft begründet, die es in der industrialisierten Gesellschaft nicht mehr gäbe (Zolberg 1997, S. 56f) dargelegt. Die Akzeptanz afrikanischer Holzschnitzereien der 1920er- und 1930er-Jahre ging dabei einher mit der Ignorierung des als „anonym" bezeichneten Künstlers und der Zuweisung eines „kindlichen Charmes" als Wert dieser Exponate, die eher in naturgeschichtlichen und ethnologischen Kontexten ausgestellt wurden (Zolberg 1997, S. 59). Erst in den 1950er-Jahren erhielt die umfangreiche afrikanische Sammlung des Art Institute of Chicago einen voll angestellten Kurator und wurde als Kunstsammlung akzeptiert (Zolberg 1974). Bis dahin kam „afrikanische" Kunst wenn überhaupt nur „durch die Hintertür" in das Kunstmuseum, erst jetzt und durch private Förderer aus den ethnischen Randgruppen der US-amerikanischen Gesellschaft (Juden und

Katholiken, die ansonsten keinen Zugang zur WASP-Elite hatten, später auch Afro-Amerikaner) konnte sich diese Kunst „über die Vordertür" im Museum etablieren. Zolberg weist hier explizit darauf hin, dass eine transkulturelle universale ästhetische Option (eine „menschliche Ästhetik") der partikulären und interkulturellen staatlichen oder regionalen Option (eine „soziale Ästhetik") gegenüberstand. Die universale Option ermöglichte der „afrikanischen" Kunst (und seltener den Künstler_innen) jetzt zwar den besseren Zugang zu den „Insidern" der musealen Gatekeeper, ein Erfolg bei einer breiteren Öffentlichkeit war aber eher wahrscheinlich, wenn man Kunst und Künstler über die exotische „soziale Ästhetik" einer interkulturellen „Ursprünglichkeit" kommunizierte (Zolberg 1997, S. 63). Interessant ist bei der Unterscheidung zwischen „traditioneller nicht-westlicher Kultur" und „zeitgenössischer westlicher Kultur" auch die unterschiedliche Behandlung von (nicht-westlicher) afrikanischer Kunst und Künstler_innen und westlicher afroamerikanischer Kunst und Künstler_innen. Während die erste Gruppe immer noch durch westliche Gatekeeper mittels formaler Werte, zum Beispiel der „expressiven Darstellungsmacht" und der „psychologisch-ethnographischen Bedeutung", bewertet wurden, darf sich die zweite Gruppe mittlerweile aufgrund selbstgewählter Kriterien selbst bewerten (Zolberg 1997, S. 65).

Verbunden mit dieser Annahme ist eine Wertung, die – häufig aus einer postkolonialen Kritik heraus – die zugeschriebenen Attribute von Tradition oder vermeintlicher Authentizität als exotisierend o. ä. kritisieren und eine transkulturelle Sichtweise auf zeitgenössische Kulturformen präferieren, die – in dieser Sichtweise – ohne ein solches „Othering" auszukommen vermag. Denn moderne westliche Zeitvorstellungen prägen hier die Sichtweise auf ein von Traditionen entkoppeltes zeitgenössisches kulturelles Handeln, welches außereuropäischen Künstler_innen abgesprochen wird.

„*In art world discourse for most of the twentieth century […] 'contemporary' served mainly as a default for 'modern'. […] Another major theme […] begins from the recognition that periodizing generalization such as 'modernity' and 'postmodernity' were foreign to non-Western cultures*" (Smith 2008, S. 7 und 15).

Kulturelle Diversität in den Künsten wird also demnach entweder als interkulturell, traditionell sowie nicht-westlich betrachtet oder als transkulturell, zeitgenössisch und westlich deklariert. Damit verbunden sind „*both particular historical epistemologies (defining the temporal forms*

and limits of knowledge) and particular orientations towards practice, particular politics of time" (Osborne 1995, S. IX).

Im Folgenden werden einige empirische Beispiele aus den PerformingArts aufgeführt, anhand derer die institutionelle und politische Verortung von Diversität in kulturellen Räumen und deren Machtbeziehungen sowie ihre *politics of time* untersucht werden. Wie gezeigt wird, existieren nicht nur auf ökonomischer und struktureller Ebene, sondern nicht minder wirksam auf ästhetischer Ebene die genannten wertenden Setzungen in globalen Kunstwelten.

Bestimmte Strukturen im globalen Kunstbetrieb können dazu führen, dass die gleichen Künstler_innen auf mehreren Festivals eingeladen werden. Zu diesen Strukturen zählt beispielsweise, dass sich Kuratoren aus Budgetgründen zu Co-Produktions-Netzwerken zusammenschließen. Schaut man sich die Spielpläne der letzten 10 Jahre der in der internationalen PerformingArts-Szene als wichtig angesehenen Festivals an, fallen sofort einige der „Big Player" auf, die überall vertreten sind. Zurzeit sind dies beispielsweise Namen wie Forced Entertainment, SheShePop, Rimini Protokoll, Jan Lauwers & the Needcompany, Anne Teresa De Keersmaeker, the Wooster Group, Boris Charmatz, Milo Rau etc. Erst seit einigen Jahren werden verstärkt lateinamerikanische Künstler, vor allem aus Argentinien wie Mariano Pensotti gezeigt.

In Bezug auf die Bildende Kunst schreiben auch Larissa Buchholz und Ulf Wuggenig: *„Territoriale bzw. nationale Kriterien haben ungeachtet ihrer Zurückweisung in einem Feld mit kosmopolitischem Selbstverständnis offenbar nach wie vor Bedeutung. Künstler/innen, die nicht auf eine nordwestliche geografische Herkunft zurückblicken, sind in jedem Zentrum des Kunstfeldes nach wie vor schwach vertreten, in dem sich die Akteure mit hoher feldspezifischer symbolischer Anerkennung konzentrieren. […] aus feldtheoretischer Perspektive [gibt es hierfür] Gründe […], die nicht zuletzt in der institutionellen Struktur des sozialen Systems der Kunst zu suchen sind, d. h. in der Verteilung relevanter Ressourcen"* (Buchholz und Wuggenig 2012, S. 179).

Veronica Kaup-Hasler, Künstlerische Leiterin des Steirischen Herbstes in Graz, beschreibt ebenfalls eine Art nationalistische Förderphilosophie: *„The biggest challenge for the arts is an increasing nationalism in all matters. Due to the financial crisis, the national funding bodies insist more and more on national production – foreign participation is of course welcome in*

6

financial terms, but there is less interest in co-financing new works by non-resident-artists" (Kaup-Hasler 2012).

Vieles spricht also für einen recht eingeschränkten, hauptsächlich europäischen Kanon der zeitgenössischen Künste zumindest im Bereich der Künstler_innen auf diesen PerformingArts-Festivals. Die Frage, die sich vor allem in Bezug auf „kulturelle Diversität" dabei stellt, ist warum, (neben eingeschränkten Reisebudgets etc.) relativ wenige Künstler_innen aus nicht-westlichen Ländern (außer Asien) vertreten sind, abgesehen von beispielsweise arabischen Künstler_innen, die allerdings in Europa ansässig sind. Hierzu werden exemplarisch zwei Antworten von zwei Kuratoren genannt, welche „ästhetische Barrieren" tituliert werden. So äußerte sich eine Kuratorin, die dafür steht, ein antiimperiales, antikoloniales Programm zu inszenieren und vor allem außereuropäisch programmiert, dass selbst sie solche ästhetischen Barrieren anwendet, wenn sie beispielsweise eine Performance eines Künstlers aus Afrika für nicht geeignet für den jeweiligen Festivalkontext ansieht. Sie findet solche meist unbewussten Vorgänge äußerst problematisch und reflektiert sie durchaus. Ein anderer Kurator, der vor allem antikapitalistische Programme inszeniert, meinte, dass er eine „afrikanische Performance" nicht zeigen könne, da die Ästhetik viel zu langatmig für das Publikum wäre. Eine solche Darstellung unterläge schnell der „Exotisierungsfalle", wenn nicht adäquate Übersetzungsmittel begleitend inszeniert würden. Hier zeigen sich die eingangs beschriebenen Zeitvorstellungen einer in Konzepten der Moderne basierenden Trennung von traditionell versus zeitgenössisch. „Afrikanische" Ästhetik gilt hier per se als in Traditionen verwurzelt, die nichts mit den westlichen Vorstellungen zeitgenössischer Künste gemein hätten.

Auch selbst wenn die Kuratoren selbst beispielsweise aus Afrika oder Asien stammen und in einem Europäischen Kontext ein Kunstprojekt organisieren, werden sie *„confronted with a strong Eurocentrism in the field in which works from other continents get easily labeled either as ‚outdated' in comparism to the European development or as ‚too specific' to be presented next to European works without also creating access to their ‚original' local context. […] Even European curators who decide to focus on works from non-European regions often have to defend their program from accusations of being ‚an easy way out' or pure ‚exoticism'"* (Husemann 2012, S. 276f.).

Es existiert eine Vielzahl an Gründen, weshalb eine Art interkultureller und nicht transkultureller europäischer Kanon der Künste sowohl auf der Ebene der Künstler_innen als auch auf der Ebene der Ästhetik entsteht, welcher in der Opposition von traditionell = nicht-westlich versus zeitgenössisch = westlich gefangen bleibt. Einer der wichtigsten Gründe für die Mächtigkeit dieses Kanons sowohl in der Bildenden Kunst wie in den PerformingArts ist die Mächtigkeit von Konventionen auf der Kulturproduktionsseite (von der Kreation bis zur Vermittlung) und auf der Kulturkonsumptionsseite (u. a. Seh- und Hörgewohnheiten). Unter anderem sozial fest etablierte Kuratoren von Kunstausstellungen und Festivals bestimmen diese Konventionen als Gatekeeper, wie Howard S. Becker schreibt: *„Every art world uses, to organize some of the cooperation between some of its participants, conventions known to all or almost all well-socialized members of the society in which it exists"* (Becker 2008, S. 42). Da die Produktion, Distribution und Konsumption von Kunst grundsätzlich komplexe und kooperative Prozesse zwischen einer großen Zahl an Mitwirkenden beinhaltet, muss es institutionalisierte, d. h. unhinterfragte Interaktionsregeln geben. Am Anfang bedarf es dafür eines Findungs- und Festlegungsprozesses sozialer (politischer) und ästhetischer (bewertender) Kriterien von Kunst, die das Resultat austarierter Interaktionen zwischen den Akteuren sind. Diese sozial-ästhetischen Kriterien sind institutionalisiert (d. h. normativ mächtig) und latent (d. h. selbstverständlich und unhinterfragt). Die ästhetische Bedeutung eines Kulturprodukts (in diesem Fall also zum Beispiel ein Exponat „afrikanischer" Kunst in einem zeitgenössischen Kunstmuseum oder eine Performance auf einem World Music Festival) wird den wichtigsten urteilenden Kritikern und Vermittlern der Art World (den Gatekeepern in Galerien, Museen oder Festivals) zugespielt, damit diese sie in Abstimmung mit den Produzenten und/oder Vermittlern in ihrer sozialen und ästhetischen Bedeutung für die Community der Art World festlegen. Mit dieser ihrer Machtfülle der Symbol- und Wertzuweisung bestimmen diese Gatekeeper aber nicht nur ihren Einfluss – sie nehmen dabei auch wechselseitig Rücksicht auf die anderen Akteure der eigenen Art World und taxieren genau, ob eine Bedeutungszuweisung ihren eigenen Status stärken oder schwächen könnte. Eine umfassende neue Bedeutungs- und Wertzuweisung, hier im Rahmen einer *Contemporaneity*, kann als Innovation statusstärkend für den Zuweisenden sein, sie kann aber auch als so konventionsbrechend bewertet werden, dass man sich dadurch eventuell aus dem Kanon herauskatapultieren würde – und dann im Sinne des Erhalts der eigenen konventionell-

traditionellen Machtfülle autopoietischer Systeme (Luhmann 1986) lieber auf diese umfassend erneuernde Transformation verzichtet.

Die Unterscheidung in westlich = zeitgenössisch = transkulturell und nicht-westlich = traditionell = interkulturell wird hier jedoch ebenfalls angezweifelt, indem die Dichotomie von Tradition und Zeitgenossenschaft bzw. *Contemporaneity* als eben genuin modernes, teilweise neokoloniales Konzept hinterfragt und weitergeführt wird zu Richard Appignanesis Fragen *„Is there a 'beyond' contemporary?"* bzw. hin zum *„Is there a 'beyond' cultural diversity?"* (Appignanesi 2012, S. 88ff.). Denn *„the historical study of cultural forms needs to be rethought within the framework of competing philosophies and politics of time"* (Osborne 1995, S. IX).

So werden hier im Sinne des Konzepts der Histoire croisée von Michael Werner und Bénédicte Zimmermann globale Kunstwelten beleuchtet. Histoire croisée intendiert, wie auch das Konzept der Transkulturalität, *„die Begrenzungen und Zirkelschlüsse einer nationallastigen Sozialgeschichte zu überwinden"* (Werner und Zimmermann 2002, S. 608). Weiterhin sollen *„die klassischen Oppositionen von Synchronie und Diachronie, von Kulturalismus und Universalismus oder auch von Kultur und Gesellschaft"* (Werner und Zimmermann 2002, S. 617) überwunden werden. Dies soll u. a. nicht nur dadurch erreicht werden, dass Fragestellungen erst im Laufe einer Forschung entwickelt werden sollen, anstatt apriori von bestimmten Kategorien auszugehen; ebenso sollen globale Konstruktionen von Nation etc. keine Rolle spielen, sondern die Forschung sollte sich an konkreten Objekten orientieren. Dabei sollen sowohl historische Entwicklungen als miteinander verflochten angesehen werden, als auch die Beobachterperspektive des Forschenden mindestens zwei überkreuzte Blickwinkel beinhalten.

„Alle Definitionen, alle Raum- und Zeiteinteilungen erfolgen von mehreren Standpunkten aus, involvieren verschiedene Referenzsysteme, verschiedene Sprachen und Begriffstraditionen. […] [Die Histoire croisée; d. V.] fragt danach, wie ein Problemzusammenhang in verschiedenen historischen Situationen sprachlich benannt, wie er – aus jeweils spezifischen Blickwinkel – begrifflich entwickelt, wie er in der Gesellschaft angelagert und bearbeitet wurde" (Werner und Zimmermann 2002, S. 623).

Um auf die Opposition von traditionell = nicht-westlich versus zeitgenössisch = westlich zurückzukommen, werden daher eben diese Kategorien hinterfragt. Denn *„indem wir diese*

Kategorisierungsprozesse in der Gegenwart zu unserem Forschungsgegenstand machen, haben wir zugleich darüber Rechenschaft abzulegen, auf welche Weise sie unsere heutige Sichtweise beeinflussen und bis zu welchem Grad wir unsere eigenen Analysekategorien zu revidieren haben, um die adäquaten Fragen an den Gegenstand zu richten" (ibid., S. 625f).

Beispielsweise wendet sich das im Jahre 2015 auf Kampnagel in Hamburg veranstaltete postkoloniale Festival für Tanz, Theater und Diskurs „We don't contemporary" gegen die modernen Vorstellungen einer linearen Zeit, in der der „Nicht-Westen" immer hinterherzuhinken droht.

„Ziel dabei war, den Begriff des »Zeitgenössischen« als westlich-koloniale Konstruktion zu entlarven. Denn »zeitgenössisch« im Kontext einer globalisierten Kunstwelt meint in erster Line eines: dass die europäische Kunst als zeitgenössische Kunst schlechthin, einen zeitlichen Entwicklungsvorsprung gegenüber z. B. afrikanischer Kunst hat. Die ist entweder traditionell oder erst dann »zeitgenössisch«, wenn sie sich an westlichen Maßstäben orientiert. Dazu sagt Kampnagel No! Schluss mit dem Kolonialismus im Kunstbetrieb! In diesem Sinne präsentieren die Gastkuratoren eigene Visionen »zeitgenössischer« afrikanischer Kunst verschiedener Genres" (Kampnagel 2015).

Um abschließend die Fragen zu eruieren, „Is there a 'beyond' contemporary?" bzw. „Is there a 'beyond' cultural diversity?" wird das selbst-reflexive Diversitätsverständnis von dem Kurator Khālid Amīn genannt. So führt Amīn beispielsweise die postkoloniale Kritik zu einer postpostkolonialen weiter:

„Self-reflexive negotiations within the space of Moroccan theatre are not simply supplements that reproduce the myth of big narratives through simple layering; rather, they transform the conditions of the original texts, only to emerge as new and different kinds of performance texts. The European models, then, become a crossroads and a continuum of intersections, encounters, and negotiations" (Amīn 2014, S. 37).

Amīn schlägt als Gegenmodell einer westlich geprägten postkolonialen Dekonstruktion die Double critique des Marokkanischen Soziologen Abdelkebir Khatibi vor:

„Double critique calls for the rethinking of the surpremacy of the West and the subordination of the East, the Orient, the Third World, the South, or any of the other names used by the West to designate areas that lie outside of it. It also calls for rethinking the Maghreb, the home

country, and for considering it as it currently is, with all of its elements of diversity, difference, and plurality" (Amīn, S. 36f).

So fragen wir abschließend in den Worten von Khālid Amīn im Sinne der Histoire croisée: *„Do we have to consider hybridity as the ultimate and inexorable condition of all postcolonial subjectivities? Or shall we think of it as a road map leading to alternative exchanges?"* (Amīn, Laamiri 2010, S. 7). Die simplifizierenden Binaritäten von interkulturell versus transkulturell (hybrid), von westlich versus nicht-westlich oder von traditionell versus zeitgenössisch reichen demnach nicht aus, um die Komplexität globaler Kunstwelten zu erfassen, da es sich auch hier um im Kontext verwurzelte Begriffskonstruktionen handelt. Doch bieten kulturwissenschaftliche Methoden wie die Dekonstruktion, die Histoire croisée oder die Double Critique Möglichkeiten der Annäherung an kuratorische Praktiken der Diversität in den Künsten.

Literaturverzeichnis

Amīn, Khālid und Laamiri, Mohammed (Hrsg.). 2010. Performing cultural diversity; Critiquing postcolonialism. Tetouan: Université Abdelmalek Essaâdi, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Research Group of Performance Studies (Series: Conferences and colloquia).

Amīn, K. 2014. Postcolonial Modernity. Theatre in Morocco and the Interweaving Loop. In The politics of interweaving performance cultures. Beyond postcolonialism, hrsg. E. Fischer-Lichte et al., 25–41. Oxford, UK: Routledge Advances in Theatre and Performance Studies.

Appignanesi, R. 2012. Thoughts on Cultural Diversity, Contemporaneity and Globalisation. In Changing Perspectives. Dealing with Globalisation in the Presentation and Collection of Contemporary Art, hrsg. M. ter Horst, 86-90. Amsterdam: KIT Publishers.

Becker, Howard S. 2008. Art Worlds. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Buchholz, L. und Wuggenig, U. 2012. Kunst und Globalisierung. In Das Kunstfeld. Eine Studie über Akteure und Institutionen der zeitgenössischen Kunst am Beispiel von Zürich, Wien, Hamburg und Paris, hrsg. H. Munder und U. Wuggenig, 163-188. Zürich: JRP/Ringier.

Burkhalter, Thomas und Beyer, Theresa (Hrsg.). 2012. Out of the Absurdity of Life – Globale Musik. Solothurn: Norient 012.

Danto, Arthur C. 1964. The Artworld. The Journal of Philosophy 61 (19): 571-584.

Deutsche UNESCO-Kommission. 2005. Konvention über den Schutz und die Förderung der Vielfalt kultureller Ausdrucksformen. http://www.unesco.de/infothek/dokumente/uebereinkommen/konvention-kulturelle-vielfalt.html. Zugegriffen am 30. Dezember 2016.

Gaupp, Lisa. 2016. Die exotisierte Stadt – Kulturpolitik und Musikvermittlung im postmigrantischen Prozess. Hildesheim: Universitätsverlag Hildesheim/Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag (Center for World Music - Studies in Music; Bd. 1). Open Access Download: https://hildok.bsz-bw.de/frontdoor/index/index/docId/547

Ha, Kien Nghi. 2010. Unrein und vermischt. Postkoloniale Grenzgänge durch die Kulturgeschichte der Hybridität und der kolonialen «Rassenbastarde». Bielefeld: Transcript.

Hoerder, D. et al. (Hrsg.). 2005. Negotiating Transcultural Lives. Belongings and Social Capital among Youth in Comparative Perspective. Göttingen: University of Toronto Press.

Hühn, M. et al. (Hrsg.). 2010. Transkulturalität, Transnationalität, Transstaatlichkeit, Translokalität. Theoretische und empirische Begriffsbestimmungen. Berlin: LIT Verlag.

Husemann, P. 2012. A Curator's Reality Check. Conditions of Curating Performing Arts. In Cultures of the Curatorial, hrsg. B. von Bismarck et al, 268-286. Berlin: Sternberg Press.

Kampnagel. 2015. Festival We Don't' Contemporary. http://www.kampnagel.de/we-dont-contemporary/. Zugegriffen 4. November 2015.

Kaup-Hasler, V. 2012. Zitiert in NXT.STP: Documentation 2007-2012. http://www.nxtstp.eu/files/NXTSTP_5_years.pdf. Zugegriffen am 30. Mai 2015.

Luhmann, N. 1986. Das Kunstwerk und die Selbstreproduktion der Kunst. In Stil. Geschichten und Funktionen eines kulturwissenschaftlichen Diskurselements, hrsg. H. U. Gumbrecht und K. L. Pfeiffer, 620-672. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

NRW Kultursekretariat (Hrsg.). 2007. Weltmusik - ein Missverständnis? Dokumentation des Symposions vom 13. Mai 2006. Essen: PACT Zollverein.

Osborne, Peter. 1995. The Politics of Time. Modernity and Avant-Garde. London/New York: Verso.

Rice, T. 2000. World Music in Europe. In The Garland Encyclopedia of World Music. Volume 8. Europe, hrsg. T. Rice et al, 224–230. New York/London: Routledge.

Sandkühler, Hans Jörg und Lim, Hong-Bin (Hrsg.). 2004. Transculturality – Epistemology, Ethics and Politics. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Smith, T. 2008. Introduction: The Contemporaneity Question. In Antinomies of Art and Culture. Modernity, Postmodernity, Contemporaneity, hrsg. T. Smith et al., 1-22. Durham/London: Duke University Press.

Welsch, W. 2005. Auf dem Weg zu transkulturellen Gesellschaften. In Differenzen anders denken. Bausteine zu einer Kulturtheorie der Transdifferenz, hrsg. L. Allolio-Näcke et al., 314-341. Frankfurt am Main/New York: Campus.

Werner, Michael und Zimmermann, Bénédicte. 2002. Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung. Der Ansatz der "Histoire croisée" und die Herausforderung des Transnationalen. Geschichte und Gesellschaft. Zeitschrift für historische Sozialwissenschaft 28: 607-636.

Westen, M. 2012. How Many Nations are Inside You? On Cultural Diversity, Global Art and Art Museums. In Changing Perspectives. Dealing with Globalisation in the Presentation and Collection of Contemporary Art, hrsg. M. ter Horst, 76-85. Amsterdam: KIT Publishers.

Zolberg, Vera L. 1974. The Art Institute of Chicago: The Sociology of a Cultural Organization. Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago.

Zolberg, V. L. 1997. African legacies. American Realities: Art and Artists on the Edge. In Outsider art: contesting boundaries in contemporary culture, hrsg. V. L. Zolberg und J. M. Cherbo, 53-70. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

The 'West' versus 'the Rest'?

Festival Curators as Gatekeepers for Socio-Cultural Diversity

Lisa Gaupp

Abstract:

Gaupp analyzes how socio-cultural diversity is being standardized through conventions at renowned international performing arts festivals where a variety of performances from art genres such as contemporary theatre, dance, music, or visual arts are presented. Socio-cultural diversity refers preferentially to artists and audiences with different socio-cultural backgrounds and different art forms. The focus is on the figure of the 'festival curator', understood both as a cultural broker, cultural intermediary as well as a gatekeeper who is embedded in a complex field of 'the curatorial'. As postcolonial critique, it is shown how this curatorial is deeply influenced by power relations, conventions, as well as network structures and processes. In arts management in general and in curatorial practices more specifically a transcultural perspective on diversity may provide a way to decolonize international arts management a bit more.

Introduction

This chapter analyses how socio-cultural diversity is standardized through conventions in the performing arts. It examines how socio-cultural diversity is curated at renowned international performing arts festivals. As used here, socio-cultural diversity refers chiefly to artists and audiences with different socio-cultural backgrounds and to different art forms and aesthetic expressions. These festivals present a variety of performances, with art forms ranging from contemporary theatre, dance, music, to visual arts and many others. Generally, such festivals take place annually or bi-annually and are funded mainly by public or other third-party funding bodies. These are international festivals featuring artists from all over the world. In this contribution the focus is on so-called 'non-European' or non-'Western' performances and on the figure of the festival curator, understood as cultural broker, cultural intermediary as well as cultural gatekeeper. This chapter considers whether or not curators of festivals taking place in Europe or the 'West' define and normalize what is considered to be

diversity and how it is programmed in the arts. In the tradition of Eurocentric and postcolonial critique, the issues of who, and on which grounds, holds the power to define conventions in the art world of the performing arts are discussed. The case studies presented serve as a basis to ask how, in general, international performing arts festivals are curated or managed and which socio-cultural conventions are applied, and through that application, which conventions are reinforced.

In international art worlds, 'diversity is almost considered to be a value in and of itself' (Peres da Silva & Hondros, 2019). At the international performing arts festivals analysed in this case study, attempts to achieve diversity are based on diversifying the audience as well as achieving a 'greater visibility of work by artists with a "non-Western" background' (Westen, 2012, p. 78). Different worldviews and challenging perspectives are welcomed or even explicitly the goal of festival organizers. Diversity is most often understood as diversity in the national or ethnic origins of the performing artists. Diversity can also be about addressing and involving audiences with, in an intersectional perspective, different social identity markers such as gender, ethnicity, race, or sexual orientation. Some festivals also strive for greater linguistic diversity by translating performances and marketing material. Still others want to diversify by introducing art forms into their programs that are new to the region (Gaupp, 2019). However, it will be shown that the conventions defining the boundaries of socio-cultural diversity at these festivals are mostly oriented toward the norm that art should be different, but not too different.

Most festivals communicate that the national origin of their artists is unimportant, that their mission is to present the best artists, and art, regardless of national origin or any other affinity to a geographical location. But this image, essentially a marketing device, will be questioned by discussing how specific social processes and organizational structures seem to nevertheless lead to a 'Western-centric' canon at these performing arts festivals.

In its analysis of the organizational structures and processes of these festivals, this chapter queries whether the public presentation of these festivals is aligned with the practices acted out at these festivals or whether there are segregational tendencies dividing European or 'Western'-based festivals, curators, artists and art forms from 'the rest', understood as an epistemological object constructed in opposition to an

imaginary 'West' (Said, 1991). Through analysing the institutionalizing practices of the socio-cultural conventions that influence how diversity is displayed, the chapter explores what role festival curators play when it comes to normalizing diversity and how other gatekeeping processes determine which groups will be produced at the festivals.

It seems that, on the one hand, there is a strongly Eurocentric or 'Western'-centric canon with regard to what kind of aesthetic forms are being curated. On the other, and on the level of formal organization, there seem to exist both normative ideological definitions of diversity as well as conventions of diversity based on the global circulation of financial capital. It will be shown whether these assumptions of how diversity is curated prove to be true and which organizational processes form the basis of these developments.

The gatekeeping and other power relations involved in the setting up of festival programmes will be analysed. How diversity is defined in the curatorial practice at performing arts festivals is deeply dependent upon the cultural and social capital, tastes, dispositions, beliefs and perceptions of individual curators, who are understood as cultural intermediaries (Bourdieu, 1984). But it is not the curators alone who define diversity but rather the complex processes and structures surrounding curatorial practices. As such, in this chapter, both the curator and the curatorial strategies of the festivals are analysed.

It is not possible to determine whether a festival is curated in a Eurocentric perspective or is situated in imaginary spaces seemingly outside Europe. What can be determined is that art worlds construct diverse spaces of globalization, transcultural spaces in-between, and that are themselves in a constantly changing mode. The perspective of 'Europe or the West versus the rest' falls short. Speaking with Derrida, 'every seemingly strong and irreducible opposition is declared a "theoretical fiction"' (2004, p. 135).

For example one of the curators turns to the postcolonial concept of *double critique,* advanced by the Moroccan sociologist Abdelkebir Khatibi, to develop a view that could be called transcultural diversity:

> Double critique calls for the rethinking of the supremacy of the West
> and the subordination of the East, the Orient, the Third World, the

> South, or any of the other names used by the West to designate areas
>
> that lie outside of it. It also calls for rethinking the Maghreb, the home
>
> country, and for considering it as it currently is, with all of its elements
>
> of diversity, difference, and plurality. (Amīn, 2014, p. 36f)

So it is not enough to criticize neo-colonial power hierarchies in the art world of performing arts festivals. We must also look at how socio-cultural norms, or conventions, come into being and especially how they can be changed. The 'West' and the 'rest' should not be put into a static dichotomy. Neither should diversity be understood as a mere plurality of differences, as if there were no conflict involved in the cross-cultural contacts taking place at these festivals. Moreover, the curator Khālid Amīn questions: 'Do we have to consider hybridity as the ultimate and inexorable condition of all postcolonial subjectivities? Or shall we think of it as a road map leading to alternative exchanges?' (Amīn & Laamiri, 2010, p. 7). In this sense it will be argued that while it is still necessary to lay open and question the continuing biases underlying curating processes at international performing arts festivals, it is also important to demonstrate that diversity is not something definable. It can lead to processes of transcultural diversity that allow for the development of dynamic spaces-in-between in which critique and conflicts are major driving forces.

The conclusion is that arts management in general and curatorial practices in particular must respond to the realities of today's post-migrant social processes. Likewise, it will be important to examine how a transcultural perspective provides an alternative view of curatorial practices and arts management. This view entails the rejection of Eurocentric or 'Western'-centric assumptions and a focus on decentred postcolonial analysis, instead of the conventional model of core, semi-periphery and periphery countries (Wallerstein 1990).

Curatorial practice at international performing arts festivals

Curators embody a special role in arts management. And the same is true for the curators' organizational field of performing arts festivals in the context of international art production. Curators are important gatekeepers for upcoming artists if they are to be produced on an international level. The festivals they curate form an art world in Howard S. Becker's sense. Drawing on the philosopher Arthur C. Danto, who

understands an artworld as something institutionalized by conventions constructed in arts organizations (1964), Becker extends this conventionalist and institutionalist view by introducing the network relations of art worlds. For Becker, art is not the product of a single artist but rather a collective action of a cooperative network (2008).

Festivals, as one of the most common organizational structures in the art world of performing arts, can thus be seen as a social practice, as 'a temporally unfolding and spatially dispersed nexus of doings and sayings' (Schatzki, 1996, p. 89). Through the analysis of the social practices at festivals one can find out a lot about how people interact, communicate, socialize etc. when participating in performances. As such, festivals provide a space for identity construction: 'The contemporary festival ... becomes a potential site for representing, encountering, incorporating and researching aspects of cultural difference' (Bennett et al., 2014, p. 1).

Festivals offer a valuable insight into questions such as whether 'the festivals express our zeitgeist' (Willnauer, 2012, p. 11). Thus, festivals have become a key influence on artistic cultural life. Like other art forms, performing arts have been increasingly staged in economic contexts, leading to a discussion of the 'festivalization of culture' (Bennett et al., 2014). Many of today's arts festivals have been founded in the last 30 years, a trend reinforced by funding bodies, public authorities and cultural institutions, which show a tendency to focus on annual or bi-annual festival series or the like, mainly due to funding structures that depend on annual budgets for a single festival edition. With a festival, a cultural organization can often attract more visitors in a short period than with single events throughout the year and can therefore raise more interest in their programme and mission.

This chapter focuses on performing arts festivals with cultural, national and artistic diversity as part of their mission statement. This means that these festivals present themselves as featuring artists from around the world with diverse cultural backgrounds and programmes devoted to multiple art forms and the crossing of art genre boundaries. Performing arts at these festivals do not only encompass shows in music, drama, and dance, but also include contemporary performances such as site-specific shows, installations with performances, discursive programs such as panel discussions on the topics of the respective festival, and so on. Similar to approaches

in contemporary music, performing arts question what theatre, dance or music should be and tend to develop new approaches to art production.

> Historically, performance art has been a medium that challenges and transgresses boundaries between disciplines and genders, between private and public, between everyday life and art, and that follows no rules. In the process, it has energized and affected other disciplines – architecture as event, theater as image, photography as performance. (Fischer-Lichte & Roselt, 2001, p. 241)

With this approach to questioning enduring concepts of more 'traditional' art forms, performing arts are very much a suitable research field for analysing how different approaches to diversity in the arts are enacted.

The curator's role is clearly one of the most urgent ones to be discussed when analyzing the field of arts management. The professional field of the curator has become one of the most desired jobs in these globalized times as, since about the 1970s, the boundaries between curator and artist have become blurred. 'The bearer of an artistic "skills set" replaces the exclusive figure of the original artist' (Reckwitz, 2012, p. 115). With their responsibility for selecting and setting new trends, curators act, and sometimes live, like internationally successful DJs, flexibilized global nomads and social networkers (Timm, 2011). Curators therefore carry symbolic capital in the art field as embodying the 'entrepreneurial self'.

> The potential of curating on the one hand is based in its strong interconnections with artistic practice both historically as well as regarding status, and on the other hand because it connects – as an organization, social networking, contextual association, motivation, facilitating and interpreting practice – social and self-technologies that meet the current demands of economical management. (von Bismarck, 2003, p. 83).

Curators no longer focus solely on visual arts, but mix genres and work outside the art field or rather aestheticize every part of social life in the paradigm of the 'creativity dispositif' (Reckwitz, 2012), where it 'seems closer to a basic requirement that everyone develop curatorial skills, or at least curate their own profile' (Beyes, 2018, p. 112f). This diversity in the approach to curating is reflected in a diversity of labels within

the art field comparable to the artistic directors, programmers or bookers found in the field of popular music. Since 2009, the founding of new curatorial study programmes at universities in Berlin, Frankfurt, Leipzig, Zurich, London, New York or Hamburg testify to the 'curatorial turn' (O'Neill, 2012) in a globalized art field.

Rather than examining the curating of a festival, 'the technical modality of making art go public' (Lind, 2012, p. 11), 'the curatorial' is studied as a complex 'field of overlapping and intertwining activities, tasks, and roles that formerly were divided and more clearly attributed to different professions, institutions, and disciplines' (von Bismarck et al., 2012, p. 8). Curatorial strategies are seen as a social practice that construct and deconstruct identities, symbols and relations in the performing arts. In other words, the curatorial is understood as a complex field in arts management of different intermingling practices, multiplex network relations, persons and institutions where dominant ideologies, terminologies, habits etc. are produced and reproduced, but where the curator also embodies a special role when it comes to defining (social) conventions in the respective field. Related to Pierre Bourdieu's understanding of a field, the curatorial has 'social and political implications' (von Bismarck, 2012, p. 37) where curators and other field participants define and redefine the rules and by doing so 'create differences, deviances, and frictions with the existing conditions' (von Bismarck, 2012, p. 37). Bourdieu's cultural intermediaries are also embedded in a complex field of organizations that influence ideas of taste channelled by the cultural intermediary.

Another interpretation of the curatorial is found in Michel Foucault's concept of the 'dispositif' (1978). The curatorial, so to speak, not only includes specific artistic programming decisions taken by an artistic director or curator, but it also takes into account all the different and complex, intertangled sets of institutional, political, economic, architectural, and social conditions influencing these processes.

At the same time, the organizational structures of the festivals enable and limit curatorial strategies. By studying the curatorial strategies employed in these festivals, one is able to detect certain meanings of diversity construction, and analyse the gatekeeping processes and power relations that form the base of every curatorial decision. What is revealed is how the conventions of fostering diversity at performing arts festivals are influenced by the complex field of the curatorial. In the following, the

7

figure of the curator and the concept of the curatorial are both understood as meaning that every curator is influenced by the complex conditions surrounding their work and the curatorial is intermeshed with power relations.

Curators as gatekeepers

We will now explore the power of conventions in order to demonstrate the complexity of relations in the curatorial and the art world of international performing art festivals. The curatorial practice employed within such festivals is analyzed both with regard to their formal organizational structures (Reed, 1992) as well as the organizational processes underlying every curatorial strategy (Beyes, 2007 and 2016; Langley & Tsukas, 2017; Helin et al., 2014). The first perspective looks at festivals as formal organizations with their (financial) infrastructure, policies etc. whereas the latter perspective allows a 'deeper' look at 'circulating scripts' (Latour, 2013, p. 50), such as the conventions involved in the curatorial.

The more important festivals are for the cultural landscape, and so for the field of arts and cultural management, the more significant the figure of the curator is. Even though there are about 'a few thousand curators worldwide' who belong to the art world of international performing arts festivals, there are only 'about 20 persons in Germany' (curator interview 10-6-2017). These few curators, seen internationally, act as both gatekeepers and brokers. These are key terms in the analysis of power relations in networks (Burt, 2004). Gatekeepers are seen as having a crucial position in granting or denying access to a network. For instance, a curator can decide which upcoming artist is going to be produced at their festival, and so gain admittance to the international festival network, and which artist will not.

Becker (2008, p. 93ff) also sees a gatekeeper's role in the distribution of art as someone who enacts power while controlling access to valuable resources. In social network analysis, by contrast, a gatekeeper is a type of broker. So a curator acts as a broker by arranging contact between an artist and another gatekeeper or someone similar. Brokers plan and act on the basis of power decisions (Burt, 1992). Power is established and de-established by assigning differences, by controlling and sanctioning deviance. This can lead to standardization and thereby to the institutionalization of diversity. 'In music practice, the position of the broker is called,

amongst others, the multiplier' (Dollereder, 2018, p. 60). Information is multiplied by the broker in communicating to other network members. Also, information from outside the network or from other networks is communicated by the broker. The broker can thereby fill so-called 'structural holes' (Burt, 1992), gaps in social relations between network members. Curators, for example, rely on their colleagues' advice to find 'new' artists. But the broker only bridges structural holes in their own interest, thus acting as a gatekeeper in Howard Becker's sense for weaker network members dependent on the broker's decisions if they are to be admitted to the network.

Power is key to social network theory in that it encompasses 'the ability of the brokerage to concurrently understand different levels of networks and to think in the context of multiplex network structures' (Dollereder, 2018, p. 167). 'Multiplex' is used here to describe 'layered relations'. In the curatorial brokerage takes place on different levels, for example, by providing access to artist networks, connections to funding organizations, entry to political networks etc. This means that in the international network of performing arts festivals some curators have stronger positions than others; depending on their ability to use network structures on multiplex levels, they can enact more power than others. One can either zoom in to a microlevel on the relations of the broker and their relations to other curators or artists or zoom out to a macrolevel and focus on the position of the broker in the art world or the network of performing arts festivals.

Curators are also described as cultural intermediaries (Bourdieu, 1984), as taste makers who define what is legitimate and illegitimate art. Cultural intermediaries 'construct value by mediating how goods (or services, practices, people) are perceived and engaged with by others. … Cultural intermediaries are defined by their professional expertise in taste and value within specific cultural fields' (Matthews & Smith Maguire, 2014, p. 2). So cultural intermediaries, drawing from their personal habitus, which includes cultural capital and subjective dispositions, can assign cultural legitimacy to an art form or an artist but they can equally exclude art forms or artists by constructing them as illegitimate (Bourdieu, 1984). Cultural intermediaries also work as 'power brokers' between, or rather bridging, the spheres of production and consumption, thus filtering information and products from the area of artists to the area of their audiences (Featherstone, 2007).

Brokerage involves how the relations between the single actors are constructed on a qualitative level and can take place on many different levels. 'A social network is a network of meanings' (White, 1992, p. 65f), and these meanings are stabilized by conventions. As Howard S. Becker puts it: 'Every art world uses, to organize some of the cooperation between some of its participants, conventions known to all or almost all well-socialized members of the society in which it exists' (Becker, 2008, p. 42). Becker describes how the entire art organization is influenced by the development and impact of these conventions. At first, processes of construction take place in the interactions of the stakeholders who define the social, political, aesthetic and evaluating criteria of art. These criteria are often unquestioned and have normative effects through their institutionalization. In a second step the gatekeepers of an art world take up these criteria and together with the producers and mediators of the arts negotiate, in another complex interactive process, their symbolic meanings as conventions. These conventions are not static though; they can be changed or discarded with the agreement of a majority of participants in the art world. Depending on what promises a better outcome for the stakeholder, social status, and with it power, can be achieved or increased both by adjusting and by flexing the established conventions. But most often in an art world conventions only change very slowly (Gaupp & Kirchberg, 2017).

Following a French strand of sociology, conventions are not understood as fixed standards or traditions but rather serve as a socioculturally based logic of action that 'enables the participants to coordinate themselves actively in situations characterized by conditions of uncertainty in order to realize a common intention. Conventions serve participants in situations as a collective interpretative frame for the evaluation of appropriateness and the value of actions, persons, objects and conditions' (Diaz-Bone, 2011, p. 23).

How does innovation happen in the art world? In other words, how can conventions be changed? Becker calls innovators in the art world mavericks, people who are able to bend the conventions but who still have to be part of the art world by following the organizational rules. 'Mavericks violate the conventions of art world practice, but they do so selectively and in fact abide by most of them' (Becker, 2008, p. 242f.). Only if the change introduced by a maverick also 'develops an adequate organizational support

system' (Becker, 2008, p. 242f.) will the change last and survive and thereby succeed in establishing new conventions.

Deviance, which itself is dynamic and flexible, occurs when someone does not follow the normative conventions, rules or values followed by the majority of an art world, or some part thereof. If we are interested in nonconformity to conventions, we must also pay attention to the processes that first led to establishing the conformity rule. Bending or breaking rules also implies that someone has had the social power to define and impose these rules in the first place. The curators and others involved in gatekeeping and brokering information in the art world of performing arts have set the conventions of how to act in this art world, penalizing at the same time nonconforming, deviant artists. Deviance here is generally sanctioned by not being granted entrance into the network.

In the classic sociological theory of deviance, Durkheim (1973) defines it as nonconformity to generally accepted norms. However, he also examines how deviance brings about innovation. Apart from this functionalist theory, other sociological explanations can be taken into account to understand deviant behaviour and to draw a thin line between deviance and innovation. For example, subculture theories see deviant behaviour as something that, while it does not conform to the majority's values, can be perfectly accepted in a subcultural frame with different norms and values (Raithel, 2002). As the term 'subculture' implies a normative understanding of 'one culture dominating another', again drawing from Becker's symbolic interactionist approach in *Outsiders* (1963) labelling theory can offer a valuable understanding of deviance in art worlds. It is the people with more power who are able to label another person (or art form) as too different, not fitting in, deviant etc. So it is not the artist or the art form itself that is deviant but instead the interactionist process of labelling an art form or the reactions of the more powerful gatekeeper towards the art form or the artist. The question is who defines the conventions and what are their interests and intentions.

As such, politics and domination are at the centre of these practices. The establishment of standards and norms of deviancy can lead to an intrinsic artistic censorship. In order to be able to participate in the art worlds of performing arts, artists must adapt to established conventions. This is not to say that different productions are explicitly

forbidden, only that their artists would be less likely to succeed in having their work produced. Following Pierre Bourdieu, acquiring a certain habitus is essential to joining the respective field (1984). This means that to gain acceptance or higher status in the field, artists unconsciously conform to a certain behaviour – including lifestyle, clothing, speech, and taste – to display the social status of the artist.

Methodology

This chapter deals with how conventions in the curation of performing arts festivals develop and examines the interdependencies among diversity, the performing arts, and the curatorial. This is done by combining performance, cultural, organizational and postcolonial studies with sociological theories and methodological approaches. The arguments are based on an empirical qualitative study in the field of international performing arts festivals conducted from 2014 until 2018. On the whole, 26 qualitative expert interviews were conducted with 22 curators and dramaturges of 13 festivals based mainly in Europe, West Asia and North Africa. In addition, four artists and representatives of five more cultural organizations active in the field of music and performing arts were interviewed. These data are backed by the analysis of seven public discussions, lectures and published interviews of curators from these festivals as well as press publications of the festivals. The notions of diversity discussed earlier are then used as a grid for analysis of this data corpus. Most of these festivals and events were attended for one or several days of participant observation. In one festival the author participated in a production as a singer in the choir. In this chapter, two of these festivals are used as exemplary cases to highlight the following findings.

Network relations

While it may seem that festivals taking place in Europe are dominated by artists from European countries and that this representation of how diversity should be staged has become the norm, it cannot be stated that it is always and only 'European or Western festivals versus the rest'. There are far more complex network processes at work, which are again influenced by multiple power structures and broker positions as well as funding structures, language and cultural policies, and festivals mission statements.

But these processes also generate synergetic effects and opportunities for upcoming artists and smaller festivals, as will be shown in this section.

One of the main structural influences on these organizations is the number of in-house productions and co-productions in comparison to presentations of guest performances. In essence these approaches differ as in-house productions and co-productions typically involve a specific show being developed in cooperation with a specific curatorial while guest performances generally consist of existing works with no intended link to the specific festival. Most curators who took part in this study indicated a preference for co-producing over presenting guest performances, as 'in-house productions in particular incorporate the nimbus of commitment and aesthetic vision as only they are the "product" of a single festival' (Elfert, 2009, p. 127). Curators normally work with 'their' artists over the course of several years to develop a new production. If in the talks with the artists an idea seems to be very interesting, but due to budgeting or scheduling constraints it cannot be produced in the following festival editions or if the idea does not fit into the upcoming festival programme, the production may be postponed to a later date.

But very often such in-house productions are too expensive to be produced by a single festival organization. This is one of the most important reasons for the development of festival networks, which co-produce one or several works in order to share production costs by showing the same production at the cooperating festivals. One result of this strategy is that there are fewer performing arts groups and fewer productions in the festival calendar. On the one hand, 'co-productions are … promotionally effective as they unite renowned partners … save costs compared to many in-house productions and [through the collaboration with partners from different countries] attract funds from companies and private foundations more easily' (Elfert, 2009, p. 127). On the other hand, this can lead to festivals losing their individuality and their unique selling position. A canonized performance landscape takes shape, with the same groups being produced at a majority of these festivals and a corresponding loss in diversity of cultural expression.

But the majority of this study's interview partners acknowledge the positive aspects of such cooperation. From 2007 until 2017 eight European festivals of performing arts united in the network *Nxt.Stp* and received funding from the European Commission

totalling of 2.5 million euros. This development gives upcoming artists the opportunity to be produced on a European level without having to conduct lengthy production negotiations. This network encompasses many of the major festivals in Europe: *kunstenfestivaldesarts* (Brussels, Belgium), *Alkantara Festival* (Lisbon, Portugal), *Baltoscandal festival* (Rakvere, Estonia), *Göteborgs Dans & Teater Festival* (Goteborg, Denmark), *De Internationale Keuze van de Rotterdamse Schouwburg* (Rotterdam, Netherlands), *steirischer herbst* (Graz, Austria), *Théâtre national de Bordeaux en Aquitaine* (Bordeaux, France) and, in the second funding period, *Noorderzon Performing Arts Festival* (Groningen, Netherlands). Associated festivals that did not receive EU funding but participated in the network meetings were *Dense Bamako Danse* (Bamako, Mali), *On Marche* (Marrakesh, Morocco), *Kyoto Experiment* (Kyoto, Japan) und the *Panorama Festival* (Rio de Janeiro, Brasil) (https://www.nxtstp.eu/). The substantial funding from the EU, in addition to their existing festival budgets, means that a large part of the art world of performing arts in Europe is joined in an institutionalized network.

The funding scheme reveals a deeply Eurocentric bias. Not only had the non-European festival representatives to pay for their own travels to network meetings, they also had no influence in deciding which artists were produced. Such a network seems to be a closed circle, inevitably facilitating a European canon of performing arts. But this is relativized because *Nxt.stp* is not the only the network these festivals participate in. It is more accurate to say that curators come together in a number of non-institutionalized networking groups, joining one for a period time because a specific theme is attractive and then in the following season finding other partners. 'There are always new alliances emerging. The curator discovers new, fresh, and unknown groups, and not by chance. Constellations form, ideas arise, which are meaningful for some time, and then the group splits up again and reunites in a different form' (Maß, cited in Elfert 2009, p. 336). So, new network contexts are continually established, which in turn strengthens the position of the respective curator as a broker.

Another curator states that 'in the past [the 1990s] it was like this: five partners united and showed a production one after the other. Nowadays, networks are not closed circles any more but instead are open for no matter how many partners. … I build up a new network for every new project' (Deuflhard, cited in Elfert 2009, p. 340). In social

network analysis one would say rather that the network is expanded by each new project as the former network partners still have strong ties to the curator due to the trust they built up in the former project (Kadushin, 2012). This approach was widely recognised by other curators in this study. As such, there are several strategies in the curatorial that not only depend on funding schemes and financing issues but also on several other influences, such as following a specific theme.

For instance, the *kunstenfestivaldesarts* in Brussels is seen as the trendsetter in the art world of international performing arts festivals. Curators from festivals around the world, given sufficient travel funds (curator interview, 5-28-2015), attend to see what is being staged. The curator of the *kunstenfestivaldesarts* has a very strong and central position as a broker in the festival network and his ideas as to which artists are upcoming are highly valued by the other and weaker network members. One aspect of the *kunstenfestivaldesarts*'s strong broker position is its relations to networks of artists, allowing it to more easily book those they are interested in or to convince them to produce a work for the festival. Other curators with equally strong broker positions are not influenced by the *kunstenfestivaldesarts*'s choices; on the contrary, they go there to find out which groups they should not curate themselves so that they can differentiate their own festivals from the *'kunsten'*.

In addition to the conventionalising of festival curatorial practices through networking practices, the gatekeeping and brokering processes of the curatorial as well as the financial resources of the respective festivals, the ambition or mission of a curatorial also contributes to how much and what notions of diversity are being practiced at these festivals. For instance, the goal of the festival *theaterformen* in Hanover/Brunswick, Germany is to show new, often emerging, productions and as the curator disposes over sufficient travel funds she is able to personally learn about new productions all over the world. The goal of the curator of the *D-CAF festival* in Cairo, Egypt, is to stage mainly established artists 'from the West' for Egyptian audiences, as the majority of his festival audience does not have the possibility to travel and see those productions otherwise. In order to make contact with these groups, the curator travels only to the big European festivals staging these artists. The festival *Performing Tangier* in Morocco in turn is not free to develop its own programme with artists from outside Morocco as it is dependent on institutional and financial relationships, for example with

the *Institut Français.* This leads to curatorial strategies that are influenced by this and other European organizations, resulting in a programme dominated by Moroccan acts. Then again the artistic curator of the *KunstFestSpiele Herrenhausen* in Hanover, Germany, is first interested in the artistic idea, and only then in questions of how to finance its production. Similarly, the approach of the *kunstenfestivalsdesarts* in Brussels focuses on the artists and understands the festival as an experimental field for both established and emerging artists. Although this involves the possibility failure, artists are allowed to experiment with the new and unusual, leading in turn to more artistic diversity and the bending or even breaking of art world conventions.

So even though these institutionalized networks are open to new members and sometimes provide valuable opportunities for unknown artists to be produced on a wider international scale, there is nevertheless a national focus in this process.

> The biggest challenge for the arts is an increasing nationalism in all matters. Due to the financial crisis, the national funding bodies insist more and more on national production – foreign participation is of course welcome in financial terms, but there is less interest in co-financing new works by non-resident artists. (Kaup-Hasler, 2012)

So again, as can be seen in some of the examples, brokerage and gatekeeping depends heavily on who is funding the festival. One might assume the bigger the budget of a festival, the greater the diversity of the artists in its programme. However, this view falls short as the festival mission also has to be taken into account. Regarding linguistic diversity as one possible expression of cultural diversity, it is not always the festivals with the biggest or the most 'independent' budget that also translates the greatest number of productions. For example, the *kunstenfestivaldesarts* takes place in Brussels, where language policy dictates that a production in French is only translated into Flemish and vice versa, but not into English. This may serve the goal of civil rights and non-discrimination in Belgium, but again it excludes international audiences, immigrants and artists unable to speak French or Flemish.

Socio-cultural conventions

A review of the programmes of the most important performing arts festivals over the last ten years reveals the same groups and artists, and they are mainly from 'Western'

countries or at least based in the 'West'. Some of these big players are *Forced Entertainment, SheShePop, Rimini Protokoll, Jan Lauwers & the Needcompany, Anne Teresa De Keersmaeker, the Wooster Group, Boris Charmatz, Milo Rau*. Although, for some years now, there seems to be a focus on artists from Latin America, especially from Argentina, such as *Mariano Pensotti*. This is evidence then of a mainly 'Western' canon, at least concerning the artists. The reasons for this, besides the structural reasons outlined above, are influences that can be called 'aesthetic barriers', which hinder non-European works from being presented at these festivals. If, for example, there are non-European curators presenting programmes in Europe, they are

> confronted with a strong Eurocentrism in the field in which works from other continents get easily labelled either as 'outdated' in comparison to the European development or as 'too specific' to be presented next to European works without also creating access to their 'original' local context. … Even European curators who decide to focus on works from non-European regions often have to defend their program from accusations of being 'an easy way out' or pure 'exoticism'. (Husemann, 2012, p. 276f)

Such generalizations have to be critically examined. First of all, to the extent a statement equates the country of origin of an artist or curator with their artistic practice it also exoticizes ethnicity and race. And of course there is no such thing as 'non-European art', as any artist can practice any art form, wherever its traditions might be rooted in the world, including Europe. In addition, art itself is not static but instead it is constantly changing; every art form is a dynamic transcultural practice with no pure topographic origin (Gaupp, 2016). This equating of an art form with a country of origin is wide spread though. Johannes Ismaiel-Wendt calls these othering processes in music practices 'topophilia' (Ismaiel-Wendt, 2011). But even when in the curatorial this attribution is not made, and the curator only considers the art form itself, aesthetic barriers come into play when the art form does not comply with the established standards and norms of the (European) art world.

In the art world of international performing arts festivals the conventions that define how diversity is staged and perceived are strongly oriented toward the norm that national origin is irrelevant and a festival should be a space of inclusion with the

greatest possible diversity of art forms and artists. Different worldviews and challenging art forms are things to be striven for. But when it comes to valuing differences curators tend to only include productions that are different enough to fulfil the demand for the unfamiliar but that are not too different from the known. Art must still fit into the circulating organizational scripts.

A curator stated in an interview that he would not programme an 'African' artist whose aesthetics would be too 'boring' for the audience, as it would need a long explanation (curator interview, 3-13-2017). For the same festival a European artist was chosen as a focus artist by the curator. This was an artist who displayed scenes on stage, involving her vagina and her own blood, intended to shock the audience. It was a show that was both celebrated (Schlagenwerth, 2015) and condemned (Luzina, 2015) by the critics. In fact, many people in her audience left her shows.

This bending of moral conventions was acceptable to this curator as these shows took place in an organizational network of established conventions in the 'Western'-centric art world of performing arts. In Europe the critique of for example religious norms using shocking theatrical means has a longer tradition, as can be seen in the development of the so-called in-yer-face theatre in the 1990s in the UK (Sierz, 2001; Case, 1990). Thus, audiences and critics familiar with the socio-cultural conventions established in this art world and are able to celebrate the focus artist.

But why is the focus artist considered an innovator in one case, while in the other the 'African' artist is excluded for not fitting into the programme? The curator argued that the audience of this festival would be too unfamiliar with this aesthetic language from 'Africa' to be able to understand the conventions in this field. The curator went on to say that other cultural organizations, such as *Mousonturm* in Frankfurt, could show such artists, as they have – for at least 20 to 30 years – by first educating their audiences to appreciate an art form they may be unfamiliar with. This example shows how conventions in the art world of performing arts serve as an interpretative framework that ultimately decide what is appropriate and what is not. The actions of the curator, understood as a cultural intermediary in Bourdieu's sense, reveal how conventions are not simply routinized procedures but rather formed and legitimized by taste. After all, a cultural intermediary is often striving to legitimate the 'not-yet-legitimate' (Bourdieu 1984, p. 326). In this case a feminist critique of religion can be

18

produced, even though it employs drastic theatrical means, but the production of an art form thought to be unfamiliar to an audience is declared to be too deviant from this norm and excluded. So again, the aesthetic language of the European focus artist of this festival receives the organizational support of the festival curator, whose taste then serves to bend moral and cultural conventions whereas the 'African' artist is declared a deviant outsider to this Eurocentric art world, his art form illegitimate, and so is prevented from entering the performing arts network. The curator's work as a taste maker reconfirms his own cultural capital and thus his position as cultural intermediary. He reproduces and legitimizes social stratification through notions of taste (Bourdieu 1984).

Another issue that needs to be addressed in this context is the diktat in contemporary art worlds to produce something innovative or creative (Reckwitz, 2012). 'Innovation always implies deviance from or the changing of the ruling norm, of a cultural predominance' (Büscher-Ulbrich et al., 2013, p. 9). In the art world of contemporary performing arts, innovations can be introduced if they are supported by the organizational system of the curatorial and if they still work with the known conventions, even while bending or breaking them. If an innovation does not refer to any standards within this art world – no matter if this reference involves conforming to or breaking the rules – it is highly unlikely to be included into a festival programme.

> Thereby, the ignoring or undermining of cultural conventions is, at least in the field of formal-aesthetic conventions, mostly unproblematic and does not at all undo the convention. In contrast to the 'violation' of social codes and norms, the unconventionality of innovations of artistic forms and fictional contents is generally not sanctioned negatively as long as the change in perception does not lead to radical practice. (Büscher-Ulbrich et al., 2013, p. 11)

Only a person with a strong broker position is able to introduce something more or less unknown into this art world. This means that it takes the social relations of a gatekeeper, like at the *Mousonturm* in Frankfurt, to introduce a cultural innovation, in the sense of an unknown aesthetic convention, into an art world. But if there is no social relationship, then it is nearly impossible to bridge such a structural hole and the cultural innovation is unlikely to be established. So if an 'African' artist practices an art form outside of the art world of international performing arts festivals in Europe, this

practice will not change the conventions and aesthetic expectations in this art world. Only if this art form is being brokered by a cultural intermediary is it possible for it to be accepted for programming. Again, curators in their embodied roles as gatekeepers, power brokers or cultural intermediaries are able to change the conventions and norms of the art world. So if there is to be innovation in 'Western'-centric art worlds, it is exactly these curators who need to be even more self-reflective about the underlying biases that inform every process in the curatorial.

One might think that digitalization would make it easier for artists from outside an art world to enter by promoting their work through online channels such as video platforms, but the position of curators as cultural intermediaries remains largely unaffected for three reasons. Firstly, curators simply do not look for new artists online but instead depend on their own experiences or personal relations to other curators or trusted experts in the field. They do not have the time to watch all the videos sent to them by unknown artists. Normally, a curator only becomes aware of an artist if they have already been recommended by a trusted broker (curator interview, 2015-05-26). Secondly, even in the face of the decentralizing potential of digitalization, topographic space remains important, as cultural intermediaries and other helping hands are still regionally clustered (Hracs, 2013). And thirdly, an artist's symbolic capital depends on their personal relationships to cultural intermediaries in the field (Lizé, 2016).

But perhaps even more urgent is the question of what happens to critical or subversive art forms when they become an innovation in the art world they were once opposed to (Chiapello & Boltanksi, 2007). It is indeed possible to change or at least expand the prevailing convention of 'different enough-but not too different' in the curatorial of performing arts festivals through conflict and critique, questioning the established concepts of diversity and imagining alternative point of views and alternative exchanges. 'When dissidence, critique and subversion have become the motor of modernization for those conditions they once wanted to undermine, eliminate or at least denounce, the relation between norm and deviance has been reversed' (von Osten, 2003, p. 7).

In the conclusion, the possibilities of a transcultural curatorial in the field of arts management will be discussed in order to show that it is not either/or but both/and, that it is not a fixed dichotomy of Eurocentric or 'Western'-centric curators versus non-

European or non-'Western' artists and art forms, that it is not Europe or the 'West' versus 'the rest' but rather a transcultural way of inclusion that involves critique as a major driving force. 'The moment of innovation is constituted here as a conflictual permeation that initiates processes of hybridization' (Büscher-Ulbrich et al., 2013, p. 17). Transcultural in this sense focuses on the processes of interweaving and interconnectedness of different art forms artists and curatorials by acknowledging that these processes contain conflicts that have be carried out.

Conclusion

I think that arts management needs to adapt to the realities of today's post-migrant social processes (Gaupp, 2016) and it should and could provide a space where these alternative processes take place. A transcultural perspective on diversity can lead to an alternative perspective in arts management, one that rather than focusing on segregating differences, engages in processes of interconnectedness. Diversity understood from a transcultural perspective means that differences are not reduced to national or ethnic differences, but are seen for what they are, a manifold and muli-layered intersectionality in each individual. These differences are not categorically ascribed to artists or art forms. The curator anticipating that the 'African' artist would be too 'boring' for their audiences should rather focus on the commonalities between the 'African' artist and the audience and build a bridge to the more established conventions in this art world.

A transcultural curatorial also legitimizes conflict as part of engaging with new art forms. So the feared unfamiliarity of an 'African' art form or even the unconscious biased conventions within the curatorial could become topics in the art world with a view to creating new meeting places for the performing arts. Transcultural diversity in this sense does not mean that social inequalities or discrimination processes are ignored, but rather that they are at the core of a transcultural diversity-sensitive approach. In this context, diversity is not a given entity but rather a condition for life in today's societies. 'Thereby, it is a matter of cultural overlaps, border spaces and spaces-in-between, of crossings and simultanious affiliations' (Yıldız, 2013, p. 144).

A case of how transcultural diversity – which I experienced myself – can be practiced is worth discussing in detail. It offers an insight into how difficulties arising from different

aesthetic, organizational, and performance ideologies can be handled with transcultural sensitivity in the production and curatorial process. In 2017 Lemi Ponifasio – the internationally renowned Samoan and New Zealand director, artist, dancer, designer and choreographer – was staging a performance at the festival *Theater der Welt* in Hamburg, Germany. It was a huge project, four years in the planning, and was to take place in the *Kakaospeicher* in Hamburg's harbor*,* an enormous warehouse dating from the colonial era for the storage of cacao. In the initial concept, ten performers from Ponifasio's ensemble MAU would take part in the performance. Conceived of as a community project it would also feature some fifty young students from Hamburg's *HipHop Academy* and a 400-person amateur choir made up of volunteers from Hamburg (amongst them myself). The choir would sing part of a composition by Murray Schafer with twelve choirs, twelve chamber quartets and sound effects. The production was conceived of as a transcultural performance bridging diverse cultural understandings, backgrounds and aesthetics by bringing together people from diverse backgrounds. It would challenge our worldviews by representing the wars and violence faced by children all over the world. The performance would also challenge our conventional understandings of theater and theatrical space by being staged in a huge non-bourgeois hall.

This original concept was revised, for different reasons during the production process, and the choir was now asked to improvise with Schafer's material and perform a walking choreography. This was a major change for the amateur singers in the choir, who were used to the conventions in 'classical church choirs', which involved working with choral scores. In the major rehearsal three days before the premiere all the performers came together for the first time and performed the whole piece together. Lemi Ponifasio approved, but two days later before the last dress rehearsal, which was already open to the public, and half an hour before going on stage, the concept was radically revised again as the choir was told not to sing at all, but to perform an altered walking choreography instead. In this situation, different aesthetics, ideologies of performing, and cultural expressions (classical choir against theatre cultures) clashed and many members of the choir left, very angry at having invested much time into rehearsing a singing piece that was not to be performed. The whole project was in danger of failing.

22

Those who stayed however experienced a transcultural situation in which everybody distanced themselves from habituated conventions, changed perspectives and were able to create a – to me – wonderful performance. It was a community-building process based on transcultural diversity, in which a show was produced for the premiere, and the following three performances, which involved the choir singing most of the rehearesed music in the improvisation concept and again a new walking choreography. This change was only brought about after the curators had a long talk with Lemi Ponifasio, in the process of which they persuaded him to let transcultural diversity practices to take place. This process did not try to bracket out the organizational difficulties and clashing worldviews at the core of the disagreement; on the contrary they were openly discussed. Transcultural diversity did not mean an absence of conflict or its resolution but a change in perspectives, brought about by a curatorial brokering between the director, his ensemble, the choir and the audience.

This case study shows that 'the curatorial embodies a central role as here, hierarchies, exclusions and disciplinary measures are illustrated clearly as the expectations and competencies of all involved parties intersect in particular. Thereby curatorial actions can contribute significantly to the resolution or shifting of the existing power relations between the persons involved in the art field – as for example between artists, gallerists, curators, critics and researchers' (von Bismarck, 2003, p. 84).

To sum up, the chapter discussed how different concepts of diversity are practiced out in the curatorial of performing arts festivals. As postcolonial critique or *double critique*, it was shown how this curatorial is deeply influenced by power relations, conventions, network structures and network processes as well as other organizational issues. These power hierarchies are unlikely to change in the near future as the majority of performing arts festivals are financed by 'Western'-centric funding bodies and organised by established curators able to strongly influence the conventions governing this art world. This makes it all the more imperative for research into how cross-cultural cooperation can be made fruitful for all parties involved, whether artist, festival organizer, audience and curator. In a transcultural perspective, it will be crucial to lay open, critique and question the structures, conventions and processes in the curatorial of the art world of performing arts festivals in particular and in arts management in

general in order to decolonize international arts management a bit more and achieve something resembling a true diversity.

References

Amīn, K. (2014). 'Postcolonial Modernity: Theatre in Morocco and the Interweaving Loop'. in E. Fischer-Lichte, T. Jost, S. I. Jain (eds.). *The politics of interweaving performance cultures: Beyond postcolonialism.* New York, London: Routledge.

Amīn, K. & M. Laamiri (2010). *Performing cultural diversity: Critiquing postcolonialism*, 1st ed. Tetouan: Université Abdelmalek Essaâdi, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Research Group pf Performance Studies.

Becker, H. S. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance.* London: Free Press of Glencoe.

Becker, H. S. (2008). *Art worlds.* Berkeley, London, Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Bennett, A., J. Taylor & I. Woodward (eds.) (2014). *The festivalization of culture.* Surrey, Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Beyes, T. (2007). 'Organisationstheorien von Agamben bis Žižek. Auf dem Basar der Organization Studies' in Eberle, T. et al. (ed.). *Fokus Organisation. Sozialwissenschaftliche Perspektiven und Analysen.* Konstanz: UVK.

Beyes, T. (2016) 'Art, aesthetics and organization' in B. Czarniawska (ed.) *A research agenda for management and organization studies.* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.

Beyes, T. (2018). 'Curating' in T. Beyes, J. Metelmann (eds.) *The Creativity Complex: A Companion to Contemporary Culture.* Bielefeld: Transcript.

Bismarck, B. v. (2003). 'Kuratorisches Handeln. Immaterielle Arbeit zwischen Kunst und Managementmodellen' in M. v. Osten (ed.) *Norm der Abweichung.* Vienna, New York: Springer.

Bismarck, B. v. (2012). 'Curating/Curatorial: A Conversation between Irit Rogoff and Beatrice von Bismarck' in B. v. Bismarck, J. Schafaff, T. Weski (eds.) *Cultures of the curatorial.* Berlin: Sternberg.

Boltanski, L. & È. Chiapello (2007). *The new spirit of capitalism*, 1st ed. London, New York: Verso.

Bourdieu, P. (1984). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Burt, R. (2004). 'Structural Holes and Good Ideas', *American Journal of Sociology,* 110, 2, 349–399.

Burt, R. S. (1992). *Structural holes: The social structure of competition.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Büscher-Ulbrich, D., S. Kadenbach & M. Kindermann (2013).'Einleitung. 'The More Things Change' in D. Büscher-Ulbrich, S. Kadenbach, M. Kindermann (eds.) *Innovation - Konvention. Transdisziplinäre Beiträge zu einem kulturellen Spannungsfeld.* Bielefeld: Transcript.

Case, S.-E. (1990). *Performing feminisms: Feminist critical theory and theatre.* Baltimore: John Hopkins University Pres).

Danto, A. C. (1964). 'The Artworld', *The Journal of Philosophy,* 61, 19, 571–584.

Derrida, J. (2004). *Die différance. Ausgewählte Texte.* Stuttgart: Reclam.

Diaz-Bone, R. (2011). 'Einführung in die Soziologie der Konventionen' in R. Diaz-Bone (ed.) *Soziologie der Konventionen. Grundlagen einer pragmatischen Anthropologie.* Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Dollereder, L. (2018). *Netzwerkbildung im Musiksektor von Niedersachsen. Funktionsweisen und Mechanismen Sozialer Formationen.* Lüneburg: Leuphana University of Lüneburg.

Durkheim, É. (1973). *Moral education: A study in the theory and application of the sociology of education*, 1st ed. New York NY u.a.: Free Press.

Elfert, J. (2009). *Theaterfestivals. Geschichte und Kritik eines kulturellen Organisationsmodells.* Bielefeld: Transcript.

Featherstone, M. (2007). *Consumer Culture and Postmodernism (Theory, culture & society).* London

et al: Sage Publications.

Fischer-Lichte, E. & J. Roselt (2001). 'Attraktion des Augenblicks - Aufführung, Performance, performativ und Performativität als theaterwissenschaftliche Begriffe', *Theorien des Performativen,* 10, 1, 237–253.

Foucault, M. (1978). *Dispositive der Macht. Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit*. Berlin: Merve.

Gaupp, L. (2016). *Die exotisierte Stadt. Kulturpolitik und Musikvermittlung im postmigrantischen Prozess.* Hildesheim: Olms.

Gaupp, L. (2019). 'Epistemologies of Diversity' in L. Gaupp, G. Pelillo-Hestermeyer (eds.) *Diversity and Otherness between Standardization and Life-Worlds. A Transcultural Approach.* Berlin, Boston, Peking: DeGruyter, *forthcoming.*

Gaupp, L. & V. Kirchberg (2017). 'Kulturelle Diversität in den Künsten zwischen Tradition und Zeitgenossenschaft' in L. Hieber (ed.) *Gesellschaftsepochen und ihre Kunstwelten.* Wiesbaden: VS Springer.

Helin, J., T. Hernes, D. Hjorth & R. Holt (2014). *The Oxford handbook of process philosophy and organization studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hracs, B. J. (2013). 'Cultural Intermediaries in the Digital Age: The Case of Independent Musicians and Managers in Toronto', *Regional Studies,* 49, 3, 461–475.

Husemann, P. (2012). 'A Curator's Reality Check: Conditions of Curating Performing Arts' in B. v. Bismarck, J. Schafaff, T. Weski (eds.) *Cultures of the curatorial.* Berlin: Sternberg.

Ismaiel-Wendt, J. (2011). *Tracks'n'treks. Populäre Musik und postkoloniale Analyse*, 1st ed. Münster: Unrast.

Kadushin, C. (2012). *Understanding social networks: Theories, concepts, and findings.* New York: Oxford Univ. Press.

Kaup-Hasler, V. (2012). *NXT.STP. Documentation 2007-2012,* http://www.nxtstp.eu/files/NXTSTP_5_years.pdf, accessed 21 January 2019.

Langley, A. and C. K. Tsukas (eds.) (2017). *The SAGE handbook of process organization studies.* Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, Washington DC, Melbourne: SAGE reference.

Latour, B. (2013). 'What's the story?' Organizing as a mode of existence' in D. Robichaud, F. Cooren (eds.) *Organization and Organizing: Materiality, Agency and Discourse.* London: Routledge.

Lind, M. (2012). 'Performing the Curatorial: An Introduction' in M. Lind (ed.) *Performing the curatorial: Within and beyond art.* Berlin: Sternberg Press.

Lizé, W. (2016). 'Artistic work intermediaries as value producers: Agents, managers, tourneurs and the acquisition of symbolic capital in popular music', *Poetics,* 59, 35–49.

Luzina, S. (2015-07-02). *Angélica Liddell bei 'Foreign Affairs'. Die Bühnenmesse der Porno-Queen,*https://www.tagesspiegel.de/kultur/angelica-liddell-bei-foreign-affairs-die-buehnenmesse-der-porno-queen/11997268.html, date accessed 21 January 2019.

NXTSTP *NXTSTP. A network of European performing arts festivals,* https://www.nxtstp.eu, accessed 21 January 2019.

O'Neill, P. (2012). *The culture of curating and the curating of culture(s).* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Osten, M. v. (2003). 'Einleitung' in M. v. Osten (ed.) *Norm der Abweichung.* Vienna, New York: Springer.

Peres da Silva, Glaucia & K. Hondros (eds.) (2019). *Music Practices Across Borders. (E)Valuating Space, Diversity and Exchange.* Bielefeld: Transcript.

Raithel, J. (2002). 'Ethnisch-kulturelle Konfliktpotenziale unter Jugendlichen im (groß)städtischen Raum. Ein Vergleich zwischen deutschen und türkischen Jugendlichen', *Soziale Probleme,* 13, 1, 54–79.

Reckwitz, A. (2012). *Die Erfindung der Kreativität. Zum Prozess gesellschaftlicher Ästhetisierung.* Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Reed, M. I. (1992). *The sociology of organizations: Themes, perspectives and prospects*, 1st ed. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Rogoff, I. & B. v. Bismarck (2012). 'Curating/Curatorial: A Conversation between Irit Rogoff and Beatrice von Bismarck'. in B. v. Bismarck, J. Schafaff, T. Weski (eds.) *Cultures of the curatorial.* Berlin: Sternberg.

Said, E. W. (1991). *Orientalism.* London: Penguin.

Schatzki, T. R. (1996). *Social practices: A Wittgensteinian approach to human activity and the social.* Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schlagenwerth, M. (2015-06-29). *Angelíca Liddell. Schreiben ist meine Rache,*https://www.berliner-zeitung.de/kultur/angel%C3%ADca-liddell--schreiben-ist-meine-rache--1299316, date accessed 21 January 2019.

Sierks, A. (2001). *in-yer-face Theatre: British Drama Today.* London: Faber and Faber.

Smith Maguire, J. & J. Matthews (2014). 'Introduction: Thinking with Cultural Intermediaries' in J. Smith Maguire, J. Matthews (eds.) *The cultural intermediaries reader.* Los Angeles, Calif: Sage.

Timm, T. (5 May 2011). *Die Macht der Geschmacksverstärker,*http://www.zeit.de/2011/19/Kunst-Kuratoren, date accessed 06 December 2012.

Wallerstein, I. (1990). 'Culture as the ideological Battleground of the Modern World-System' in M. Featherstone (ed.) *Global culture. Nationalism, globalization, and modernity.* London, Newbury Park, New Delhi: Sage Publications.

Westen, M. (2012). 'How Many Nations are Inside You? On Cultural Diversity, Global Art and Art Museums' in M. t. Horst, G. Schwartz (eds.) *Changing perspectives: Dealing with globalisation in the presentation and collection of contemporary art.* Amsterdam: KIT.

White, H. C. (1992). *Identity and control: A structural theory of social action.* Princeton NJ: Princeton Univ. Press.

Willnauer, F. (2006). 'Musikfestspiele und Festivals' in Deutscher Musikrat (ed.) *Musik Almanach 2007 ╱08. Daten und Fakten zum Musikleben in Deutschland.* Regensburg: .Conbrio.

Yıldız, E. (2013). 'Postmigrantische Verortungspraktiken. Ethnische Mythen irritieren' in P. Mecheril (ed.) *Migrationsforschung als Kritik? Spielräume kritischer Migrationsforschung.* Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

OPEN ACCESS

Listening to the Street – Urban Sounds in Hamburg-Altona between the "Right to the City" and the "Creativity Dispositif"

Lisa Gaupp[*], **Nikolas Bielefeldt**, **Joanna Dill**, **Rufus Giesel**, **Kathleen Göttsche**, **Zoe Hasse**, **Simon Laumayer**, **Leona Lenßen**, **Julia Mai**, **Anna Rüpcke** and **Louis Rummler**
Leuphana University of Lueneburg, Germany
[*]**corresponding author** *gaupp@leuphana.de*

Abstract

This study examines the complex relationship between music and cities. More specifically, it explores how, when and why distinct urban atmospheres and unique urban spaces are created through music, specific sounds or creative social practices such as busking. As Andreas Reckwitz has shown, it has become a social regime in accordance to the creativity *dispositif* to act creatively and to strive for originality and uniqueness. Busking and other creative expressions in public sphere seem to satisfy this demand, but at the same time, they also tend to symbolise practices of resistance against neo-liberal discourses. According to Reckwitz, this social aestheticisation can be observed especially in cities, for example, in neo-liberal discourses such as city marketing. To examine this ambivalent if not contradictory divide, this empirical study focuses on STAMP, an international street arts festival in Hamburg, Germany, and especially, on related music practices. It considers macrostructures, such as city policies, organisational and spatial politics of gentrification and micro-practices of creativity expressed in symbolic interactions or practices of participation, following specific sociocultural conventions. Using a mixed method research design including ethnography, surveys, qualitative interviews and soundscape analysis, this study explores the many different facets of urban sounds in the streets of Hamburg-Altona from different sociological perspectives. By considering not only different perspectives, such as those of the organisers of the festival, the city, local residents, audiences or musicians as well as cultural policies but also the sound of the festival, this study aims to answer the question whether such urban musical practices are at odds with or contribute to what Reckwitz refers to as "creativity *dispositif*" and related processes of gentrification or whether they can be related to what Henri Lefebvre has described as the "right to the city".

Keywords: creativity dispositif; sound; intrinsic logic of a city; right to the city; culturalization; gentrification; Hamburg; street arts; live performing arts; festival

1. Urban Sounds in Hamburg-Altona: Introduction

Music contributes to the creation of distinct urban spaces, and, conversely, cities may become associated with a certain kind of sound. Studies examining the complex relationship between music and cities acknowledge the importance of the urban in the production, dissemination and consumption of music and, in turn, of space or the city for music practices. How, when and why music or sounds become intertwined with cities is, however, a very complex phenomenon that needs further study. Researchers agree (Barber-Kersovan et al., 2021) that spatial, economic, political, social or cultural conditions of cities affect musical practices, but it is not clear which of these have to be urban and to what extent. In other words, the question is which elements of music appear exactly as they are just because they are situated in a specific urban space? There is a variety of practices, symbols and structures that are commonly recognised as urban. These include, for example, city policies developed and applied to regulate music practices or to improve living conditions within city limits. A wide range of social interactions also only take place in urban environments. Economic hubs and networks likewise depend on urban infrastructures.

While the connection between these examples and the urban seems obvious enough, the relationship between music and the city in general and creative musical practices is more complex, especially when it comes to the creation of sounds and music unique to a given city or practices such as busking. Andreas Reckwitz's book *The Invention of Creativity* (2017 [2012])[1] demonstrates how it has become a social regime in accordance with the creativity *dispositif*[2] to act creatively and to strive for originality and uniqueness (p. 3). This social aestheticisation can be observed in cities, for example, in neo-liberal discourses such as city marketing and urban planning policies (Florida, 2003). Music can be a means to revive neighbourhoods, to create a distinct, perhaps even unique city image based on musical diversity or to promote social cohesion in community projects. The implementation of this political agenda often results in, to give but two examples, the festivalisation and stricter regulation of busking practices. In contrast, a wide range of musical practices, strategies, networks and initiatives have emerged in response to the neo-liberal reorganisation of urban spaces. Some of these have, for example, promoted the democratic "right to the city" (Lefebvre, 1968). Busking and other creative street arts practices have been interpreted as signs of resistance.

Music in particular and creativity in general, then, can have very different functions in urban spaces, perhaps several at the same time. To unpack some of these complexities, ambiguities and contradictions, this empirical study analyses the international street arts festival STAMP in Hamburg, Germany and related musical practices. STAMP, which takes place on a weekend in June and is part of the annual cultural festival altonale in Hamburg's district of Altona, provides a platform for street artists who "relate to the space and humans in their surroundings" (STAMP, 2019). It is not clear whether STAMP contributes to the aestheticisation of the city-

---

[1] There is a vast body of academic literature devoted to the topic of creativity, often in reference to Reckwitz (see for instance Henning, Schultheis & Thomä, 2019 or Beyes & Metelmann, 2018).

[2] Reckwitz thereby refers to Michel Foucault's term "dispositif" understood as a heterogeneous ensemble of discursive and non-discursive elements which function as a symbolic order regulating what is (scientifically) acceptable (or true) and what is not (or false) (Foucault, 1978, p. 124).

scape in Hamburg-Altona and whether it contributes as a festivity to processes of gentrification, a major problem in this area. The term gentrification[3] is used for a process in which a diverse and, in many instances, working-class district is transformed by the influx of artists and creative individuals who are drawn to the area due to its distinct character and low rents (Naegler, 2012, p. 38). These are often followed by investors and companies, whose arrival results in higher living costs, which, in turn, forces original inhabitants to move to cheaper areas.

The process of gentrification can also be observed in the case of Hamburg-Altona, and it represents a development affecting visitors and residents in particular in the short and in the long run. To understand the impact of STAMP on this district in this respect and to examine how creative cities emerge, this study considers, on the one hand, macrostructures such as city policies or organisational and spatial politics of gentrification and, on the other hand, micro-practices of creativity, which are expressed in symbolic interactions or practices of participation following specific sociocultural conventions. Using a mixed method research design including ethnography, surveys, qualitative interviews and soundscape analysis, this study considers whether musical practices such as busking, which have often been deemed to be "outside of the system" and utilised in a fight for the "right to the city", are at odds with or contribute to the creativity *dispositif* at this festival, which is both a community project as well as a city policy.

To answer this question, this study analyses perspectives such as those of the organisers and other people involved (local residents, audiences, artists), city and municipal policies affecting the festival and the sound of the festival. More specifically, it aims to answer the following questions: To what extent are the goals of the festival affected by and aligned with city policies? What part does the festival play in debates on and processes of gentrification? How is daily life of the residents affected by the festival? How do audiences participate in the festival? What are the reasons for musicians to perform at the festival? Is there a specific festival sound which then becomes associated with the district of Altona? What is the atmosphere at the festival and how is it created? Drawing on the insights of cultural sociology, sociology of culture and urban sociology and contextualising the questions listed above in theoretical debates about gentrification and the creativity *dispositif*, this urban music study provides new perspectives on the complex relationship between cities and music, showing that while creativity at and in the context of the festival is closely linked to processes of gentrification, some contradictory spaces and practices undermine this view on creativity.

---

[3] In contrast to this specific understanding of the concept of gentrification focused on its relations to creative practices followed in this paper, a more standard definition of the term can be found in Lees et al. as "the transformation of a working-class or vacant area of the central city into middle-class residential and/or commercial use" (Lees et al., 2008, p. xv) focusing on the class dimension in gentrification processes. Tim Butler (2007, p. 178) extends this approach "as the concept of gentrification can elucidate some of the spatially and socially specific mediations between globalisation, the emergence of global cities (and their metropolitan hinterlands), and the construction of local identities".

2. The Creativity *Dispositif* and the Right to the City: Theory

One major development in urban sociology in recent decades was the spatial turn, that is, the shift toward a greater critical consideration of "social production of space as a complex and often contradictory social process" (Bachmann-Medick, 2016, p. 214). Many approaches developed in this context have drawn on Michel Foucault's concept of "heterotopia" (Foucault, 2006) or Pierre Bourdieu's production of social space (Bourdieu, 2006). This study likewise defines urban space as produced in social practices and symbolic discourses. Here, these practices include not only musical ones, but also sound practices, for example, noise and silence.

Definitions of the urban and the city in the field of urban sociology are abundant so that they cannot be exhaustively dealt with at this point. Of course, the modifier *urban* implies research conducted in cities or a focus on urban spaces. In addition to this terminological debate, researchers have disagreed about how to conduct research on cities in general and comparative studies in particular. To be able to compare the manifold complexities between modern cities, Martina Löw, for example, presents and argues in favour of focusing on the "intrinsic logic of a city", on typical characteristics (Löw, 2010, pp. 613–616) in order to be able to reduce "the multitude of urban practices … to basic common meaning relations" (Löw, 2012, p. 303). By referring to a survey about the differences of the post-industrial structures of Manchester and Sheffield, Henri Lefebvre's interpretation of the term *oeuvre* and other semantic attempts that try to grasp the heterogeneity and complexity of modern cities, Löw points out that every city as a research object needs a different approach (Löw, 2010, pp. 613-616). Heeding Löw's call, this study uses a mixed method research design and focuses on different aspects, such as city policies to describe the "intrinsic logic" of the District of Altona.

By considering both urban and sound dimensions, this study contributes to an emerging field called urban music studies. While some researchers (e.g. Holt & Wergin, 2013) have focused on this connection before, it is the Urban Music Studies Scholars' Network (Urban Music Studies, 2019) in particular, in which the authors of this article are situated in as founding members, which has sought to understand the complex relationships between music and the city and to establish urban music studies as a distinct interdisciplinary field.

Similarly, Thorbjörg Daphne Hall, with her article "Countercultural Space Does Not Persist: Christiania and the Role of Music" (2014) brings together musicology with urban studies. Drawing on Sara Cohen's concept of a "local city sound", Hall analyses music played in the clubs, at the street market, on street corners or at free concerts. In line with this approach and by analysing soundscapes from the festival, we examine whether or not there is a local sound of Altona which could be read as a signifier for an "intrinsic logic" of this part of Hamburg.

Discussing the development of the processes of aestheticisation mentioned above with regard to urban spaces, Reckwitz speaks of the "culturalisation of cities", which, he argues, has had a major influence on political and economic programmes in cities and on urban society itself. The global phenomenon of culturally oriented cities emerged in the 1970s. It started in New York as a hybrid combination of living and working in the same space, where cities became social entities that "distribute *space* and coordinate artefacts and people within that space" (Reckwitz, 2017, p. 177). The process of aestheticising public space, similar to alternative

ideals, then became the goal of political urban planning in the 1980s: "Both the critical, counter-cultural urbanism discourse and culturally orientated urban planning have since been promoting an active culturalisation of urban space to counter the perceived alienation and standardisation of the functional city" (Reckwitz, 2017, p. 179).

Based on an initial desire to foster civil society, urban planning came to contribute to the revitalisation of symbolic qualities, i.e., to the appreciation of historical heritage, and, if necessary, to the creation of sensual-affective atmospheres of the urban. The resulting type is nowadays often referred to as "creative city" (Reckwitz, 2017, p. 180) that purposefully acts to reproduce this status (pp. 176-177). Thus, this process is mainly a state and political one and modern urban planning characteristics are important for the rise of creative cities. In the context of New Labour politics in Great Britain, for example, the "creative industries" emerged as economic prototypes of the concept at the end of the 1990s (p. 179).

This culturalisation of urban space constitutes one of the foundations of the creativity *dispositif*. In this respect, urban planning primarily involves governmental and political processes, which are commonly instigated by public officials, economic leaders or residents. In contrast, the culturalisation of cities is often incited by the presence and practices of artists and other creative individuals. This process of culturalisation is followed by one of gentrification, which, in turn, tends to marginalise groups from the culturalised milieus due to the influx of new residents and businesses (Reckwitz, 2017, pp. 186-189).

The culturalisation of a city, then, can be analysed as aesthetic socialisation of neighbourhoods on four levels (Reckwitz, 2017), which will be analysed in this empirical study: 1. subjects as creators (artists), 2. a creative public (residents, audience), 3. aesthetic objects (organisation of space through architecture, festival programming or sound) and 4. institutionalised regulations (policies). This systematisation allows us to analyse symbolic meanings of creativity, practices of culturalisation and organisational, spatial and political processes of gentrification at the same time, in order to get a full picture of the musical "intrinsic logic" of Hamburg-Altona.

After Charles Landry and Franco Bianchini have introduced the term "creative city" in 1995, Richard Florida is known for further developing this concept and expanding it with the notion of "creative class". In his book *Cities and the Creative Class* (2003), Florida deals with the questions why creative people tend to move to specific regions or areas and why some cities are more attractive to them than others. The "creative class" consists of two groups: first, the "supercreative core" of scientists, artists, designers or teachers, who create something new, for example, innovative products or optimised processes and, second, "creative professionals" including managers, lawyers or doctors, who need to think independently and find creative solutions to practical problems at work (Florida, 2003, p. 34) . In creative centres, the creative class "makes up more than 35 percent of the workforce" (p. 36). Florida points out that a highly developed economy, very good living conditions and other social aspects play a major role when choosing to relocate to a certain area. Highly educated individuals, such as the members of the creative class, are assumed to prefer lively, inclusive and diverse neighbourhoods located close to the city centres.

In 2009, Florida and Scott Jackson applied these hypotheses to spaces of "musicians and music establishments" in the USA from 1970 to 2004 (Florida & Jackson, 2009, p. 310). The results

of the study demonstrated a general concentration in certain spaces and only a "modest countertrend" (p. 318) in response to this development. These findings could be explained by the fact that large metropolitan areas translate into bigger audience and higher probability for commercial success (p. 310). In contrast, while the internet and new media allow artists to choose where they want to work which would also allow them to avoid bigger cities, the majority of the musicians in this study did move to creative cities (p. 310). As all of these aspects might also be applicable to our research field in Hamburg-Altona, we will take a more critical look than Florida at all of these processes. This means that, while we do ask about processes of culturalisation and gentrification in Hamburg-Altona, particular focus is set on the question whether there are contradictory or negatively perceived urban spaces detectable that counteract neo-liberal positive views of creative cities.

Our approach is in line with several other works that are critical of Florida's neo-liberal agenda which will now be introduced shortly in order to further explain our research interest. For example, in her article "Creative Class, Creative Industries, Creative City. Ein Musikpolitisches Paradigma" (2007), Alenka Barber-Kersovan critically examines the economic dimension of creativity and the correlation between culture, economic growth and competitive ability of creative cities. Her findings show that the creative class and creative cities do have a symbiotic relationship. Our question is whether that might be also suitable to exhaustively explain the processes in Hamburg-Altona?

But how does that refer to subcultural movements that answer to these neo-liberal developments? Lefebvre's manifesto *The Right to the City* (1968) continues to serve as a comprehensive postmodern and poststructuralist critique of state and governance structures in daily life (Ronneberger & Vogelpohl, 2014, p. 264). Lefebvre calls for better access for unprivileged populations to the city's economic, cultural and material resources, for the acknowledgment of cultural differences in the city and for more democratic participation in urban planning processes. As a study of social tensions in (urban) space, it is not only relevant for contemporary urban sociology but also for practices of resistance and countercultural movements. While Lefebvre developed his concept in the light of the Fordist cities in the late 1960s, many (countercultural) movements worldwide used this concept to resist against processes of gentrification surrounding the creative cities debate from the 1990s on. The city of Hamburg is also attached to the discourse referring to Lefebvre's right to the city in local debates about urban development (Recht auf Stadt, 2019). More specifically, processes of gentrification have sparked considerable resistance, for example, in the Gängeviertel in the Neustadt and Altstadt districts organised under the umbrella concept of the fight for the right to the city (Schäfer et al., 2010).

Hence, in order to analyse urban music practices and festivity sounds of Hamburg-Altona, we should also examine the contradictions taking place in those practices and sounds. To do so, this paper attempts to outline some contradictions in Altona in a Lefebvrian sense. Lefebvre himself specifies contradictory space as the result of the "illusion of a transparent, 'pure' and neutral space–which, though philosophical in origin, has permeated Western culture–[and which] is being dispelled only very slowly" (Lefebvre, 1974, p. 292). But are in Reckwitz's creative cities really no such contradictory spaces to find? Or are contradictory spaces and practices of resistance rather only processes of culturalisation themselves?

On these grounds this study is going to show whether or not Altona and the urban sound of the STAMP may serve as examples of constructing a contradictory space in the creativity *dispositif*. When starting our research, we expected to find a divide between neo-liberal tendencies of the creative city and opposing countercultures lived out in the festival space that fight against the takeover of public urban spaces by multi-national companies. We will, however, demonstrate, how these seemingly countercultural practices mainly also belong to the creativity *dispositif*.

The anthology *The Sound of the City: Music Industry and Subculture in Berlin*, edited by Albert Scharenberg and Ingo Bader (2005) can offer some valuable insights as it deals with the development of the music industry and subculture, as well as with the relationship between the two. For instance, Bader discusses how a "policy of enabling" is needed for the emergence of subcultures or local cultural practices as well as of a creative city. We will demonstrate later how city policies and the organisation of the STAMP festival contribute to such a connection between processes of gentrification of the "creative city" and local cultural practices.

Consequently, when thinking about these issues in urban music practices, it is important not to forget about the organisational side of it. As for Timon Beyes "the idea of purity, of aesthetically non-corrupted spheres of life, is a profoundly strange one" (Beyes, 2016, p. 122), aesthetisation can not only be found in artistic practices but also in management discourses and organisational practices (p. 116f.). Organising and managing an event such as STAMP also involves the "return to the realm of sensori-emotional experience and … a renewed interest in art and artistic practices" (p. 122). It cannot be understood in rational terms only, as it is "predicated on–and contributing to–the shaping, engineering or disruption of perception, moods and feelings" (p. 115). Emotions and sensory faculties could potentially provide rich material for analysis (p. 117). This is why we also focus on the sound itself and the sensory perceptions of the audience as well as on aesthetics of organisation besides analysing, for example, the policies connected to the festival.

3. Listening to the Street: Methods

This study used a mixed method research design to examine the relationship between urban space, live performing street arts and music at the 2019 STAMP festival. Combining different approaches, for example, analyses of spatial structures, policies and sounds or interviews with local residents, members of the audience or musicians, this design acknowledged both the complexity of the phenomenon and the "intrinsic logic" (Löw, 2012) of Hamburg-Altona. More specifically, the organisational, spatial and structural dimensions of the festival and of the City of Hamburg were analysed by conducting two semi-structured expert interviews and by means of walking ethnography. In addition, we examined the opinions of local residents in a quantitative survey and views expressed by participating audiences and artists in qualitative semi-structured interviews. (Bodily) participation of selected audiences was then explored in a videographic analysis. This combination of surveys, interviews and videography allows us to correlate all perspectives with each other. Last but not least, the construction of urban space through sound itself at the festival was best researched conducting a soundscape analysis of

selected timeframes. In the following parts, each of these methods will be further sketched and the respective research fields at the festival will be outlined.

We first looked at the structure and the organisation of the festival and how these relate to the city of Hamburg, the district as well as the cultural scene of Altona. We especially focused on the question whether or not an image transfer in the sense of Florida's creative city is detectable or if there are other synergetic effects at work that offer a better understanding of the relationships between the three organisational players: festival, district and city.

The political and organisational interactions between the city of Hamburg and the STAMP festival were analysed through semi-structured expert interviews. Two interviews were conducted with different experts regarding two different positions towards the festival. One expert was Heike Gronholz, the managing director of the altonale GmbH, which is the convenor of the STAMP festival. The other interviewee was Enrico Lautner, the head of the *Department of Social Space Management* of the District of Altona. The method of a semi-structured expert interview was chosen because it offers valuable insights about the cooperation between the city of Hamburg and the STAMP festival from two different, if not opposing, points of view.

Ethnographic research with the specific method of observation can give a deeper insight into the role that the STAMP festival plays in the developments and debates around gentrification. A street festival like STAMP seems to be the perfect place for walking ethnography. Ethnographic research consists of a data collection in the field and a coding and writing process (Charmaz & Mitchell, 2001). The observation and data collecting, in the best case, should be carried out without any presumptions and as objectively as possible, but already with a focus on the question that is being researched. While walking across the festival space we took field notes. Analysing these spontaneously written notes and setting them into the context that online research provided offered a wider understanding of the spatial structures the festival is acted out in. The mentioned online research was mainly conducted to gather more information about the political, organisational and spatial history of the festival, its socio-cultural relations within the cultural scene of Altona and Hamburg as well as its connections to gentrification processes.

We also wanted to focus on issues of spatial organisation, its relation to socio-cultural practices and gentrification processes from the residents' point of view. In order to be able to relate Reckwitz' thesis of culturalisation of cities to gentrification processes in Hamburg-Altona, a half-structured questionnaire survey was deliberately chosen. The designed questionnaire was meant to look at the opinions of the residents who are living nearby the venue of the STAMP festival.

To accumulate data quantitatively can be a challenging task, especially if the approach simultaneously points at the qualitative investigation of subconscious attitudes regarding a particular subject. In the case of this research it has been clear that it would require a sample of at least 30+ individuals[4] to provide vital information regarding the circumstance. It has been indeed

---

[4] Although this number still seems to be relatively small compared to the overall participants in the 2018 altonale of 450.000 persons (altonale, 2019), we aimed at this number of interviewees in order to triangulate the findings with the rest of the results of our mixed-methods study.

relatively difficult to generate as much data as needed. Because of the STAMP being a walking event, where visitors constantly switch between different locations, the extent of willingness to participate in the survey was low. Nevertheless, by triangulating the findings of this survey with the other methodological parts conducted in the whole study, the results provide valuable data to answer the overarching research question as well as the sub-questions.

The questionnaire was structured into 20 different questions, ranging from the simple yes/no format to scale questions (1-6). By asking 20 different questions it was further guaranteed that the respondent took time to think about his or her current situation in terms of the abovementioned topic. The questions aimed to reveal the overall mood of the residents of Altona in general, and more specifically, to examine if Reckwitz' hypotheses offer an understanding of the empirical circumstances in Hamburg-Altona.

In exploring the relationship between the city and the creativity *dispositif*, it was also important to focus on the perspectives of both artists and visitors who are not residents but rather come to Altona to visit the festival on purpose. As key questions we asked what the artists wanted to address or communicate with their performances and whether or not they have achieved this task in their view as well as in the spectators' opinion. Semi-structured qualitative interviews were chosen to pursue these questions. Through these, we were able to make sure that all relevant aspects of answering our key question were covered. At the same time, we were free to spontaneously respond to hitherto less discussed aspects as well as asking individual or situation-dependent questions. All in all, we interviewed six different artists and, for each of these artists, also one to two spectators attending the respective performance. We use the terms "artist" and "creative" for interviewees who are responsible for the performance or the event. The term "visitor" describes the spectators or participants of the performance or event we interviewed in contrast to the above mentioned group of "residents".

However, the practices of the festival participants could not be analysed sufficiently through these semi-structured interviews. That is why, for analysing the audience's behaviour during certain concerts and performances – how they participate, react and interact with it – the usage of videography seemed to be an appropriate method to work with. Videography describes the video recording of certain situations for the purpose of gaining a quantity of impressions. Moreover, one does not have to rely on memory and field notes only, but has the possibility to re-live the performances again and again (Pink, 2007). This allowed us to take notice of previously unnoticed elements in specific situations. Especially when the research interest is focused on a larger group of people in an audience, a video recording helps to concentrate on more than only a few single persons in the audience as it offers the chance to focus on different persons in every repetition during analysis.

With the question of audience participation in focus, three different performances were analysed as objects of our studies in order to include a variety of performance types: a dance competition, an acrobatic performance and a concert. Even if the analysis of these three performances only gives us an exemplary insight into the whole programme presented at the STAMP festival, we can nevertheless gather sufficient information on the noticeable behaviour of the audience during those. All the observed acts took place on Saturday afternoon.

However, we were not only interested in the spatial, political and organisational structures and processes of the festival and its connections to urban space, nor solely in the practices of the people involved. The organisation of space through sound was also of great interest to us. In order to break down this huge topic into analysable bits, we decided to focus on how the STAMP festival deals with silence. For this, it is important to focus on the method of soundscape analysis. The concept of soundscapes was developed by the composer and sound researcher Raymond Murray Schafer in 1977 (Schafer, 1994). The term "soundscape" relates to the word "landscape" and it is defined as the acoustic environment of a person at a specific time and place (Organisation Internationale de Normalisation, 2004). Before the industrial revolution, acoustic environments were largely characterised by sounds of nature. During the industrial revolution, when the levels of sound (volume and quantity) increased, soundscape research was initiated. Now, acoustic environments were mainly characterised by the sounds of machines. This also led to an increase of acoustic information (Schafer, 1994, p. 71).

As Schafer was interested in the history of soundscapes, he started to analyse the changing soundscape and its effects. Schafer proposed to categorise sounds, so he divided sounds into nature sounds, speech, working and machine sounds and music. He realised that soundscapes are composed of a synergy of sounds produced in and through space.

Schafer then set apart lo-fi (low-fidelity) from hi-fi (high-fidelity). High-fidelity, describes a soundscape where sounds are overlapping at a low level, so single sounds can be differentiated like in nature. This acoustic soundscape creates a perspective with a foreground and a background and makes it possible to listen "into the distance". Today, a natural hi-fi area is rare to find in the cities. In contrast, low-fidelity describes a soundscape that is overloaded with sounds. An example for a lo-fi soundscape could be a central station, where single acoustic signals are hard to find as they are overlapping each other. The result is a destruction of the perspective, meaning that only the nearby sounds can be heard, not those in distance. This also results in sounds turning into anti-information (Wrightson, 2000, p. 11). Anti-information is perceived as noise or not noticed at all.

For the subjective perception of space, lo-fi or hi-fi have a huge impact. Since the industrial revolution in central Europe in the 19th century, more and more areas have turned into lo-fi areas (Schafer, 1994, p. 43). Schafer revealed that there is already an atrophy in the human listening competence as an effect of these changing soundscapes. The tuning of music in hi-fi quality makes the listeners sense their environment in a lo-fi quality. Schafer instead calls for a balanced soundscape, where there is space for silence. Silence should not be seen as a vacuum that has to be filled with sound (pp. 253-259).

To answer the connected research question "is there space for silence at the STAMP festival or is silence a vacuum filled with sounds?", we chose places that seem to be calm. We picked the food area at the Platz der Republik in front of Altona´s townhall, which has the function to recharge the people's energy – so a place to calm down. Besides, the *Hummustopia* by Avi Rosenblum seemed to be an interesting place for our research as it is described as a "quiet oasis" (altonale, 2019) in the programme. As the performance *Hamonim* by Particia Carolin Mai relates to the word harmony, we were interested in how balanced the soundscape is here and whether there is also space for silence. In addition, we chose the *Poetic Dance* of Aziz

Boumediene which is inspired by *thai chi* techniques. As Boumediene uses relaxing techniques, we were interested whether or not he also plays with silence. Finally, we chose *Closetland* by the Third Hand Group as it promised to offer a "trip into alternative worlds" (altonale, 2019).

In order to record the soundscapes in representative clips for our research at those places during the festival, we used a Zoom H2n sound recorder. Listening to the recordings, we wrote down what could be heard and categorised the sounds using Schafer's categories for soundscape analysis as a tool for our analysis.

4. Structures, Organisation, Symbols, Practices and Sounds of the Urban: Results

In this section, the results generated with each of the four methodological approaches will be presented. The first of these involved two expert interviews on the relation between the City of Hamburg, the District of Altona and STAMP: one with Heike Gronholz, managing director of altonale GmbH, and one with Enrico Lautner, head of the Fachamt Sozialraummanagement, the department that manages, among other aspects, public spaces in Altona. Both interviews revealed that the cooperation between the festival and the city is beneficial to both parties involved, primarily in economic terms.

The origins of the altonale can be traced back to a past effort of the District of Altona to organise an event for all residents of Altona and those of adjacent districts. The initiators of the altonale took up this idea and created an event that now stands for all kind of artistic interventions and performances in public spaces. The altonale has evolved along with the district, usually in close collaboration with local cultural organisations as co-initiators or supporters. For this reason, the festival has been widely accepted by the people of Altona and beyond.

The STAMP festival was founded in 2010 and has taken place ever since (except for one gap year) in a 48.000m^2 area around the train station, which spatially divides Altona into two sections. The festival aims to change the rather run-down image of the district through art, to interrupt the everyday lives of inhabitants and to provide access to the festival to anyone interested, including families. It has also become an important venue for local businesses and NGOs to present their work.

The festival is primarily funded by both the District of Altona and the City of Hamburg. Both interviewees described this process as a rather smooth one. More specifically, the city provides funds to the altonale and STAMP. The latter, in turn, functions as a role model and a showcase for citizen involvement for the district and the city. A conference during STAMP, for example, attracts a specialist audience from all over the world, and the art programme includes international artists. This aspect is important for the city officials, whereas those in Altona aim to create a cultural event where people can come together regardless of their background and celebrate the diversity and vibrancy of the district and where residents can deepen their connection to the area they live in.

Despite these differences regarding the outcome and the character of the festival, STAMP and the altonale enable the city to establish partnerships with cities such as Aarhus in Denmark, and to attract a high number of tourists and other people from the region. Both events can be

easily marketed, and they help the city and the district to project an image of open-mindedness and diversity and to foster a vibrant cultural sector. For the district, it is an easy means to involve citizens, since they can contribute their ideas to the festival.

While the two festivals have an important function for the City of Hamburg in particular, they were also described as factors contributing to gentrification. While Altona attracts more and more people who want to live there, STAMP adds to the benefits of living in the district. That said, the collaboration between STAMP and the City of Hamburg and especially the District of Altona was described as a win-win situation for both parties. The festival generates money and improves the image of the district, and the city benefits because it can use the event to market Hamburg and to attract tourists.

Along with the previous insights about the festival administration and funding structures, in-teractive data collected by means of walking ethnography, the second method used for the first approach, showed that the festival mostly takes place in the pedestrian zone of Neue Große Bergstraße and in a park area. As a result, different parts of the festival, such as the venues where artists perform, can be visited while walking down the street and into the park. That way, the full festival can be experienced and thereby analysed by taking a walk.

When walking down the festival, it quickly becomes clear that the festival is not only a local one but also one which could be separated into two parts in terms of content. The first part is Neue Große Bergstraße and its direct surroundings, and the second one is the area around Platz der Republik. Both these areas seem like distinct festivals. The main difference between these two parts is the style of art that is being shown. While the area around Neue Große Bergstraße mainly displays urban art genres such as hip-hop culture, the area around Platz der Republik focuses on small performing arts venues, theatres and cabarets.

The differences sketched above are mirrored by Altona's architecture and spatial formations: The area around Neue Große Bergstraße is a rather metropolitan one with large buildings and a pedestrian shopping zone. An IKEA mall was opened in 2014 and increased property value in the entire area, a development which resulted in the closing of many local shops. That said, the area continues to be home to a high number of very cheap shopping possibilities. This area of Altona is usually frequented by diverse people displaying their cultural heritage by, for example, wearing traditional clothing styles. The same can be said regarding the audience in this part of the festival.

Apart from shows related to performing arts such as dancing, cabaret or music, there were also many professional vendors travelling from festival to festival selling products from all around the world. These included international hand-made clothing which could be labelled as "hippie chic" and products such as belts or hats. Lined with low-cost fruit and vegetable vendors, the area of Neue Große Bergstraße was filled with people who seemed interested in what was happening, and it appeared that many who had come not just for the festival. The only perfor-mance which drew a crowd, comprised most likely to a large extent of parents from the area, was a drumming group from a local school. Apart from that, people were still going shop-ping, went to the IKEA mall for lunch or even used it as a free day-care, as people at the entrance indicated.

The festival zone around the park Platz der Republik showed a different picture. The place is usually used as a recreational area by both the mostly white middle-class people from Altona's Ottensen section and the more diverse people from the area along Neue Große Bergstraße as we observed in several shorter walking ethnographies conducted prior to and after the festival. During STAMP, it seemed that this urban space was designed only for the first group of people. The people attending were mostly people from Ottensen interested in small-scale performing arts and cabaret and also guests of the altonale, the festival one block away.

Most of the artists who were part of the festival were people travelling from festival to festival to make a living. The festival also featured non-professional artists from the area, although these contributions were limited to some parts of the programme. The area featuring urban art and hip-hop events offered a variety of participatory workshops, an open dance contest and the drumming group from a local school mentioned above. In contrast, there were no options for people to participate in the area around Platz der Republik, and it seemed that most of the people in attendance were fine with this arrangement.

The results generated using walking ethnography were complemented with those of the survey questionnaire focused on the Altona residents. Almost half of the respondents indicated that they had been living in the district for less than five years. Slightly more than half of the total respondents said that the number of cultural events had increased and that the public and touristic interest in the very district had grown in recent years. Almost two thirds stated that the living costs had also increased since they have moved to Altona. Asked to describe STAMP festival and the neighbourhood in three to five words, respondents provided answers that were then assigned to two semantic fields, "creative" and "critical urban". The former one included positively imbued terms, such as "creative", "fun", "living quality" ["Lebensqualität"], "diverse", "modern", "urban", "open-minded", "alternative" and "multicultural", whereas the latter consisted of terms with negative denotations or connotations, such as "gentrification", "consumption", "density", "clash of cultures", "expensive" or "rent increase".

Responses by artists and audiences to the survey questionnaire seemed to be affected by both the kind of performance they contributed and their understanding of art. For example, acrobats seemed to be more concerned with artistic feats foregrounding the human body, whereas the theatre plays *The Invasion* and *Harmonim* or the interactive installation *Closetland* addressed controversial social and political issues. In other words, not all performances or artists were meant as critical interventions, although when they did, it seemed that audiences were able to relate. In general, all performances and installations observed were well-received by people attending the festival, and the artists, in return, also described their audiences as positive.

Although respondents differed considerably in terms of their demographic background and their personal relationship to Altona or Hamburg, artists, residents and people attending STAMP agreed that the district appears to be open, tolerant and multicultural. The events at the festival significantly affected this perception. Respondents noted that contributions, such as the so-called "oasis of peace", where free food was served to facilitate open discussion of socioeconomic and political issues, or performances, such as the one featuring aliens upending norms of public life and encouraging people to break out of their everyday-conventional behaviour, had a positive influence on the open-minded flair of the district. Discussing an event called *Hummustopia*, a visitor from Hamburg's District of Harvestehude put it,

> We make art or something like that in some way and for that you need … openness, non-conformity … free space simply. It's about what you wear or how weird you can be or how events can be …, there's a lot of liveliness left in a part of town like Altona and you need it … so if we did that in Harvestehude, sitting at such a table, it wouldn't work with strangers. (Avi Rosenblum, *Hummustopia*: Visitor 2019, p. 2)

Respondents not only described Altona as an open, lively and friendly neighbourhood but also as a space for people to come together (Patricia Mai, *Harmonim*: Visitor B 2019, p. 1). A long-time visitor stated that the festival, the altonale and the interactive installation *Closetland* in particular are means to get out of everyday-life, to take a break and "to refresh body, mind and soul" (Third Hand Group, *Closetland*: Visitor 2019, p. 2). To him, the festival has an immense, even defining significance for the district, since it has encapsulated for many years what the district is: colourful, diverse, very different and international in character. He summarised the significance of the festival for the district and its perception as follows:

> In this sense, this festival is actually an expression of the living culture of this district and … very important for Altona, because I think it's just like a business card … for Altona. Meanwhile the event became known certainly beyond Hamburg, …beyond the borders of Germany even, and therefore it became really influential, characteristic, a very important … event. (Third Hand Group, *Closetland*: Visitor 2019, p. 2)

Turning to the results of our third methodological approach, an analysis of the videos of three performances yielded very different results regarding (bodily) participation by audiences, indicating that STAMP features a wide range of possibilities for people attending to interact with artists or their work. As all analysed performances took place during daytime on a sunny day, we could not detect any differences in audience behaviour due to different performance hours or weather conditions. The first performance, a dance competition based on dynamic "African House" music, received considerable attention. Some visitors smiled and clapped along to the beat for a few seconds, while others slightly moved to the music but did not dance. When a dancer struck a pose or showed stamina, a few people in the audience applauded shortly or cheered him or her on. The audience, which consisted mostly of people between 25 to 30, seemed very interested in and focused on the stage. Only a few women began to dance during breaks; the rest of the audience did not move to the electronic music.

The second show, which featured Italian acrobats, differed from the dance competition not only in kind but also in terms of audience involvement. This acrobatic fire attracted mainly young families and some elderly people. The majority of the audience smiled and seemed to enjoy the performance, shouting along and clapping, especially in response to daring feats.

The third performance analysed was a concert by a brass band. The audience was rather diverse and included people of all ages. The atmosphere in front of the stage could be described as carefree and positive. People were laughing, dancing with children, jumping and bouncing, whistling and singing to the music or talking to each other. Other people just watched or stared at their mobile phones. The audience kept a distance of approximately four meters to the stage, and the band encouraged the people in attendance several times to come closer. Except for children and a few adults, the people did not close the gap.

The recorded sounds collected for our fourth methodological approach of soundscape analysis were categorised into nature sounds, speech, working and machine sounds and music. In the next step, hi-fi and lo-fi features were distinguished to map the soundscape and to answer the question whether there were any spaces for silence at the festival. The results indicated that there were none. Instead, there were many different and overlapping layers of sound. For example, at the food area, the most dominant sounds were made by layered voices, and in the background, there was music and also muted individual sounds, such as sneezing, coughing, tinkling bottles or clattering cooking utensils. No nature sounds or machine sounds were found. In this lo-fi soundscape, the number of voices and the volume of the ambient noise were so high that it was not possible to understand what they were talking about.

At the event *Hummustopia*, the soundscape consisted of distinct individual voices in the foreground, layered voices, squealing kids, laughter, coughing, the sound of a camera shutter, clatter of crockery and cutlery and guitar music. In Schafer's categories, there were speech (one clear voice in the foreground), working sounds (the clattering of cutlery and crockery when clearing the tables) and music (sound of a guitar). Again, no nature or machine sounds and no silence in this lo-fi soundscape were to be found.

The soundscape during the performance *Hamonim* was characterised by the sounds produced the fountains' rushing water, breathing sounds, layered voices and traffic sounds. One could classify the sounds into speech (layered voices) and machine sounds (traffic). Nature sounds, working sounds and music could not be perceived. In this lo-fi soundscape, most of the sounds overlapped, forming a dense layer.

During the performance *Poetic Dance*, the main sounds were one clear loud voice and music. The music was characterised by an intense drumbeat and a hoot in one performance and a strumming piano in another one. Layered voices, laughter and crying babies could be heard in the background. The soundscape was rich, and there were no silences. Following Schafer, the lo-fi soundscape included speech (clear loud voice, layered voices, crying babies) and music (intense drumbeat, hoot/strumming piano) but no nature, working or machine sounds. It was not possible to follow individual conversation.

At *Closetland*, the soundscape was characterised by loud drums, layered voices, a rattle, a whistle, shouting and applause. The soundscape was dominated by music (loud drums, rattle) and speech (layered voices, rejoicings). There were no working, machine or nature sounds. The sound of the drums volume was so loud that it was not even possible to understand the words of people shouting. In this lo-fi soundscape, there were no silences.

5. Gentrification, Creativity, Participation and Soundscapes in Urban Spaces: Discussion

Before answering the main research question of this study, that is, whether the practices, symbols and structures of the festival are in contrast to or complicit with what Reckwitz calls "creativity *dispositif*" and related processes of gentrification, this section will discuss the results presented above in light of the specific questions raised towards the end of the introduction. The first of these questions was whether the festival is in line with city policies and

contributes to their successful implementation. The results suggest that the cooperation between the City of Hamburg, the District of Altona, and STAMP is perceived as a successful collaboration between city government and a cultural project. The most obvious benefit for the city is the festival's actual and potential contribution to the ongoing effort to create and market a positive, supportive and open-minded image of Altona and, by implication, the City of Hamburg. The discourse on STAMP can be tapped for successful marketing and tourism strategies. This is, in turn, a major advantage for the festival, which is supported by, among others, the city. When the distinct sound of STAMP is, however, conflated with—in a marketing campaign, let us say—the sound of the larger urban entity, questions about control, power and appropriation are thrown into high relief. In this case, the music and sounds of local residents or artists might be used for ends that they might not agree with or even oppose. Simply rebranding these sounds as the ones representative of Hamburg might also not sit well with residents in both Altona and Hamburg in general.

STAMP is, as indicated by the results, of great value for urban marketing and for the development of a distinct image of Hamburg despite its origins as an event primarily for residents. This result is in line with Barber-Kersovan's ideas concerning the economic aspects of creativity. In the case of the altonale in particular, exploiting cultural practices for city marketing purposes is easy because the name of the festival echoes the one of the district. It is easy to link the festival to a very specific urban context and to create a close connection between the two.

Like most cultural organisations or events, the festival increases, as respondents indicated, the quality of life in Altona. At the same time, it also contributes to gentrification in Altona. It is not a driving force, but one of the multipliers. As noted in the theory section of this study, because culture can create valuable living spaces in urban areas, it is often used by cities to systematically revaluate urban districts. The District of Altona, for instance, asks the altonale to bring art to public spaces in places in Altona that need an image design. This might not be the main interest, but it is still a welcome side effect.

Whether STAMP contributes to this kind of revaluation of the area and, in this manner, influences a gentrification process or whether it merely strengthens the structures which are already there is an unresolved issue. To address this point, one can look at the organisational processes or, as Beyes states, at the organisational aesthetics (Beyes, 2016, p. 115f), in this case the ones of the festival.

An analysis of the data generated with ethnographic fieldwork showed that the festival consists, in fact, of two parts: the area around Neue Große Bergstraße, where the festival focuses mostly on urban and hip-hop culture, and the area around Platz der Republik, which focuses on small-scale performing arts and cabaret acts which attract very different audiences. This separation shows how STAMP seems to adjust aesthetically to a given area, to two distinct spaces. It is important to note here that the two areas are also separated geographically by the railway station; most visitors of the festival do not even get to see both parts of the festival. One could argue that this physical separation is also suggested by the aesthetics of the different spaces. Platz der Republik is a quiet, green park; hip-hop, a presumably primarily urban phenomenon, does not seem to belong here. Conversely, scheduling cabaret and other small performing arts acts in the economically distressed Neue Große Bergstraße would be, for most

members of the audience, a rather unusual decision from an aesthetic point of view. This categorisation seems to follow stereotypical assumptions of equating social stratification structures with aesthetic preferences, or as Bourdieu would put it, to put social positions in line with a certain habitus and taste (Bourdieu, 2010).

Presenting urban art and hip-hop culture in the diverse urban spaces might make sense from the organisers' perspective, as poorer populations, in line with Bourdieu, are more likely to be drawn to low threshold entertainment. This approach also seems to be reasonable given that the festival is meant to be "by the district and for the district". The same reasons seem to have played a role at the other part of the festival, where highbrow performing arts and cabaret acts attract local white middle- and upper-class audiences. In short, the different parts of the festival seem to be spatially arranged in line with aesthetic considerations.

However, the aesthetic and spatial division remains ambiguous as, on the one hand, the link between space and aesthetics is common and also true for the majority of our findings. That said, our results are not consistent, and it is possible that, for example, the spatial arrangements we observed are due to other processes. For instance, the festival area around Platz der Republik usually also attracts populations whose cultural preferences are assumed to include urban cultural practices. These people get excluded by the organisational divide of aesthetic space-making at the festival.

At first sight, this organisational decision seems to strengthen the separation of the district, a fault line which has been there before. A festival such as this is, however, not only eager to attract residents, who might be there anyway, but people from other parts of the city and tourists. When these two groups encounter the two different parts, they do not experience Altona the way residents would. The temporary spaces they enter are characterised by exoticisation and romantic transfiguration. Hip-hop and urban culture are presented in an ahistorical and depoliticised manner, and issues such as social inequality are glossed over. Instead, Altona is presented, often by artists who are not from the area, as a hip, creative district, a cool urban cultural hub. Perceived as diverse, multicultural and on the move, the area is marketed to investors, tourists, local communities and potential residents alike. What was described above as exoticisation and romantic transfiguration of the area and its people during STAMP could contribute to processes of gentrification in an area that is already being rapidly gentrified. Even if performances, then, were to invoke the right to the city, they would end up indirectly achieving the exact opposite.

To understand this contradiction in greater detail, it is also necessary to review the results regarding the daily life of residents and the effects of the festival and gentrification processes. These results can be explained with Reckwitz's argument concerning the culturalisation of the city. In urban space of Altona, both urban flows of gentrification and culturalisation can be observed. As many new residents arrive in the district, the economic, cultural and public life in Altona changes. STAMP is one of the best known cultural offers in the district and therefore greatly contributes to the culturalisation of this part of the city. As discussed above, residents described the district using terms and phrases taken from the "creative semantic field", which describes the processes of culturalisation discussed by Reckwitz, and the "critical urban semantic field", which, in turn, can be related to processes of gentrification.

These two very different semantic fields and the words contained therein are linguistic markers for interrelated urban spatial processes and, more specifically, the link between culturalisation and gentrification. What can be seen in Altona in general and during STAMP in particular is not a tension between gentrification and grassroot movements to fight for the right to the city and against gentrification, but a productive co-existence of city gentrification and city culturalisation with residents, artists, visitors, the STAMP festival, city and district policies mutually affecting one another in what Reckwitz refers to as a creativity *dispositif*. Practices of resistance such as movements for the right of the city, formerly identified as in opposition to processes and policies of gentrification, are not at odds with neoliberalism. Multicultural organisations such as altonale or STAMP might have originally been founded to support local communities and might have aimed to foster creativity in the local community as a means to strengthen citizens' rights and participation in a Lefebvrian sense. As processes of city gentrification and culturalisation become increasingly intertwined, local creative participation is no longer opposed to policies of the creative city; instead, they are at the core of these processes.

Thus, the symbols of creativity, negotiated by the residents of Hamburg-Altona and within the space of STAMP, cannot be easily separated from city developments and policies which lead to increasing gentrification of the district. These paradoxical and complex links in urban space in Hamburg-Altona can help to identify hidden neoliberal structures, which are characterised by this symbiosis not only at a symbolic level but also at the level of lived practices and socio-economic living structures.

To explain how symbols of creativity are negotiated in urban space, the results concerning the practices and motivations of artists and visitors need to be considered. As noted earlier, on the one hand, the festival reflects the culture of the district and its image; on the other hand, Altona's cultural infrastructure is the reason for the festival to emerge in the first place and for it to be accepted. Despite its international character, the artistic contributions have a connection to Altona, and they help to create the image of the district. In turn, the artistic intervention in the everyday cityscape made some visitors feel a sense of community in the neighbourhood. The strongest connection between the festival, Altona and Hamburg comes from the territorial adjacency between the festival and the district. This link was perceived positively without exception.

However, people mostly visited the festival as regular consumers of cultural events in Altona or due to personal relations with one of the artists, whereas most artists were booked and had no regular connection to the district itself. A further factor when deciding to attend the festival was the requirement that there would be no admission fee and that people of all ages would be able to enjoy harmonious coexistence together.

The primary goal of the artists during STAMP was to present their abilities and to entertain. A stronger political or socio-critical statement such as fighting for the right to the city could not be recognised during the performances and was not attempted by the artists. Above all, an aesthetic sense of art was to be conveyed to the guests. It can be said that the original goals of passing on positive feelings as well as entertaining the audience have been achieved. Again, the primary symbols negotiated at and connected to the STAMP festival were not related to a "critical urban semantic field", but they can rather be assigned to the "creative semantic field" of the creativity *dispositif*, of which the festival and Altona forms a prominent part.

These findings also correspond to the bodily participation of the audiences at the festival, which can be characterised as practices of creative and passive participation. During the dance competition, the audience was restrained and did not interact with the performers. The audience, rather than freely interacting, followed conventions and responded only to certain highlights. The audience at the acrobatic show became much more involved, also with the general atmosphere of the performance. Due to the comic elements of the show, reactions to the performance by the spectators were planned and desired for. Nevertheless, although participation was manifold and vivid, it was predictable. The audience did not do anything unexpected but again followed certain rules. The last performance, by the brass band, combined both situations. The overall atmosphere was casual, and the majority of the audience interacted with the band. There was, however, a barrier difficult to cross, resulting in an again passive participation.

Overall, the audience of the three performances did not do anything unexpected. They rather followed the sociocultural conventions of what is requested, what is within one's reach and what is disrespectful (Becker, 2008 [1982], p. 42). In line with the creativity *dispositif*, the audience displayed acceptable behaviour and was able to engage in creative practices of participation. These practices could be called creative, as they correspond to the rules of the creativity *dispositif* in Altona. Again, these do not have to be artistic practices nor do they have to follow a critical stance of resistance to neoliberal agendas. These practices solely have to follow the rules of culturalisation and show that everybody participating knows and conforms to the established conventions (Gaupp, 2020).

Finally, the practices which confirm the creativity *dispositif* in Hamburg-Altona contribute to the formation of creative urban spaces, i.e. the culturalisation of the city. Another important factor that needs to be taken into account when looking at the creative construction of space in a city is in the context of this contribution the sonic material itself, the sounds in Altona. This leads us to the question whether or not there is a specific sound atmosphere at STAMP that conveys an "intrinsic logic of the city" (Löw, 2012), asking whether or not the close symbiosis of a cultural scene of a city and the city itself affect the development of a "local city sound" (Hall, 2014). Focusing at silence as important part of sound allows us to detect this intrinsic logic in comparison to the majority of urban spaces that are dominated by soundscapes that do not offer much silence.

The collaboration between the city of Hamburg, the district of Altona and the STAMP festival may also be interpreted as a factor contributing to, in line with Hall's ideas concerning city sound, the development of a distinct sound for the district. The STAMP festival tries to reflect the cultural and musical diversity of Altona in its programme structure and with the selection of invited artists. By investing and supporting the festival, the city of Hamburg is also funding its own city sound, because it helps to promote the festival and to bring the sound to as many people as possible. By looking at the programmes of the STAMP festival over the past years, it is clear that Altona does not stand for one specific kind of music though. The sounds are rather diverse and so are the people living in Altona. Thus, the city sound of Altona is a mixture of all different kinds of genres, languages and music styles. This, in fact, is related to what Lefebvre calls the positive acknowledgment of cultural differences between urban citizens.

Nevertheless, all in all, there were no silences to be found at STAMP but rather only sound-scapes in line with the usual lo-fi soundscapes of the creative city. As a result, the information sounds usually sent became anti-information or noise (see above). Furthermore, the sound-scapes during the festival were not balanced. Music sounds, speech and traffic were the most dominant sounds to be heard in these soundscapes. At least regarding the soundscapes, there seems to be no intrinsic logic of Altona or Hamburg that includes silence as a prominent feature.

Following Schafer, to some people, silence is negatively connoted. They may associate sound with life, and silence with the absence of life, that is, death, or isolation. To come to terms with their fears, individuals may drown out silence with music or other sounds. To others, silence is, however, needed to relax and recover. Silence can heighten perception and make sounds more clearly audible (Schafer, 1994, pp. 256-259). This is why Schafer suggests an acoustic design of the soundscape as a way to improve its balance (pp. 237-252). In this suggestion we find one option of how the STAMP could contribute to a "local city sound" that characterises Altona's "intrinsic logic". Using noise-cancelling techniques, adding performances that experiment with silence or increasing the distance between venues could be options for integrating silence into the soundscape of the urban spaces of Altona. In this manner, urban space could not only be formed by sounds but by silence as well.

Changing perspectives like this could offer new ways of thinking not only about soundscapes but also about aesthetics of organisation, symbols of creativity and practices of participation in urban spaces. As such, granting access to the unprivileged, taking the diversity in the district as a chance and including the diverse populations of Altona in such participatory urban planning processes as suggested by Lefebvre will allow for more contradictory urban spaces to develop, meeting the goals of the right to the city rather than the ones of the creativity *dispositif* and its related processes of gentrification.

6. Summary: Conclusion

As shown with this empirical study of the STAMP festival in Hamburg-Altona, there is no tension between gentrification and what Reckwitz refers to as the creativity *dispositif*. Rather, the processes associated with these two terms overlap and intersect. At the organisational and structural levels, a successful relationship between festival and city policies may result in the exploitation of the cultural practices at the festival for city marketing purposes. As discussed above, this may lead to gentrification. The "culturalisation of the city" (Reckwitz, 2017) is fostered by the festival and its "organisational aesthetics" (Beyes, 2016). Hence, the "creative class" (Florida, 2003) collaborates and is complicit with the "creative city" (Barber-Kersovan, 2007). In the context of the festival, creativity is closely linked to gentrification, whether it is symbolically negotiated or expressed in practices of creative and passive participation along established sociocultural conventions of the creativity *dispositif*. Through these social practices and symbolic discourses the "intrinsic logic" (Löw, 2012) of the urban space in Hamburg-Altona is produced.

The sound of the festival itself further adds to the production of a creative urban space. Even though Altona's "local city sound" (Hall, 2014) can only very vaguely be described as a mixture of genres and styles and by the fact that there are no silences (Schafer, 1994), it is related to the symbols of creativity negotiated in the festival space. These symbols were not only summarised as "creative", that is, tied to the culturalisation of Altona, but also as "critical urban", which, in turn, can be assigned to the discourse against gentrification. Again, the symbiosis of gentrification and culturalisation becomes visible, further underlined by the regime of creative self-optimisation residents, artists and visitors alike have to follow (Reckwitz, 2017).

However, the results concerning these processes cannot be confirmed for all levels analysed. Some Lefebvrian contradictory spaces can be identified in this creativity *dispositif*. For instance, some results concerning perceptions of creativity showed that these were not always entirely positive. The festival organisers, residents, artists and visitors all mentioned problematic aspects of what was referred to here as the processes of culturalisation. Regarding the spatial organisation, not all findings fall within the clear architectural and aesthetic divide between the two parts of the festival. Social tensions in the urban space are not entirely alleviated or erased. It has become clear that the urban space of Hamburg-Altona is not "transparent" or "neutral" (Lefebvre, 1968). Instead, this urban space is constantly being produced through political structures, organisational processes, symbolic discourses, social practices and sound itself in complex negotiations. In Altona, the creativity *dispositif* is not destiny; given a different policy approach such as a "policy of enabling" (Bader, 2005), festivals such as STAMP could be public affirmations of the right to the city. In this case, creativity would be a means to counter neo-liberal developments.

References

Bachmann-Medick, D. (2016). *Cultural turns: New orientations in the study of culture*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Bader, I. (2005). Die Rolle der Subkultur für die Entwicklung der Berliner Musikindustrie. In A. Scharenberg & I. Bader (Eds.), *Der Sound der Stadt: Musikindustrie und Subkultur in Berlin* (pp. 102-119). Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Barber-Kersovan, A. (2007). Creative class, creative industries, creative city. Ein musikpolitisches Paradigma. In D. Helms & T. Phleps (Eds.). *Sound and the city: Populäre Musik im urbanen Kontext* (pp. 11-30). Bielefeld: Transcript.

Barber-Kersovan, A., Gaupp, L., Kirchberg, V., & Kuchar, R. (Eds.). (2021). *Urban music studies*. Bristol: Intellect Publishing (forthcoming).

Becker, H. S. (2008). *Art worlds*. Berkeley, London: University of California Press.

Beyes, T. (2016). Art, aesthetics and organization. In B. Czarniawska (Ed.), *A research agenda for management and organization studies* (pp. 115-125). Cheltenham, Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Beyes, T., & Metelmann, J. (Eds.). (2018). *The creativity complex: A companion to contemporary culture (Kulturen der Gesellschaft)*. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Bourdieu, P. (2010 [1979]). *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste*. London, New York: Routledge.

Bourdieu, P. (2006 [1989]). Sozialer Raum, symbolischer Raum. In J. Dünne & S. Günzel (Eds.). *Raumtheorie: Grundlagentexte aus Philosophie und Kulturwissenschaften* (pp. 354-368). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Butler, T. (2007). For gentrification? *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 39(1), 162-181. https://doi.org/10.1068/a38472

Charmaz, K., & Mitchell, R. G. (2001). Grounded theory in ethnography. In P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont, J. Lofland & L. Lofland (Eds.), *Handbook of ethnography* (pp. 160-170). Los Angeles, London: SAGE Publications.

Florida, R. (2003). Cities and the creative class. In J. Lin & C. Mele (Eds.) (2005). *The urban sociology reader* (pp. 290-301). London, New York: Routledge.

Florida, R., & Jackson, S. (2010). Sonic city: The evolving economic geography of the music industry. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 29(3), 310-321. doi: 10.1177/0739456X09354453

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

Foucault, M. (2006 [1967]). Von anderen Räumen. In J. Dünne & S. Günzel (Eds.), *Raumtheorie: Grundlagentexte aus Philosophie und Kulturwissenschaften* (pp. 317-329). Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Gaupp, L. (2020). "The West" vs. "The Rest"? Festival curators as gatekeepers for sociocultural diversity. In V. Durrer & R. Henze (Eds.), *Managing culture: Reflecting on exchange in global times* (pp. 127-153). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-24646-4

Hall, T. D. (2014). Countercultural space does not persist: Christiana and the role of music. In S. Whiteley & J. Sklower (Eds.), *Countercultures and popular music* (pp. 205-222). Farnham: Ashgate Publishing.

Henning, C., Schultheis, F., & Thomä, D. (2019). *Kreativität als Beruf - Soziologisch-philosophische Erkundungen in der Welt der Künste*. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Holt, F., & Wergin, C. (2013). *Musical performance and the changing city: Post-industrial contexts in Europe and the United States*. London, New York: Routledge.

Landry, C., & Bianchini, F. (1995). *The creative city*. London: Demos.

Lees, L., Slater, T. & Wyly, E. (2008). *Gentrification*. New York, London: Routledge.

Lefebvre, H. (1968). *Le droit à la ville*. Paris: Éditions Anthropos.

Lefebvre, H. (1974). *The production of space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Malden: Blackwell.

Löw, M. (2010). Stadt- und Raumsoziologie. In G. Kneer & M. Schroer (Ed.), *Handbuch Spezielle Soziologien* (pp. 605-622). Wiesbaden: VS Verlag.

Löw, M. (2012). The intrinsic logic of cities: towards a new theory on urbanism. *Urban Research & Practice*, 5(3), 303-315. 10.1080/17535069.2012.727545

Naegler, L. (2012). *Gentrification and resistance: cultural criminology, control and the commodification of urban protest in Hamburg.* Hamburg: LIT Verlag.

Pink, S. (2007). Walking with video. *Visual Studies*, 22(3), 240-252. 10.1080/14725860701657142

Ronneberger, K., & Vogelpohl, A. (2014). Henri Lefebvre: Die Produktion des Raumes und die Urbanisierung der Gesellschaft. In J. Oßenbrügge & A. Vogelpohl (Eds.): *Theorien in der Raum- und Stadtforschung: Einführungen* (pp. 251–270). Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Schäfer, C., König, A., & Wilson, E. (2010). *Die Stadt ist unsere Fabrik. The city is our factory.* Leipzig: Spector Books.

Schafer, R. M. (1994). *The soundscape: Our sonic environment and the tuning of the world*. Rochester: Destiny Books.

Schmid, C. (2010). *Stadt, Raum und Gesellschaft: Henri Lefebvre und die Theorie der Produktion des Raumes*. Stuttgart: Steiner.

Reckwitz, A. (2012). *Die Erfindung der Kreativität. Zum Prozess gesellschaftlicher Ästhetisierung.* Berlin: Suhrkamp Verlag.

Reckwitz, A. (2017). *The invention of creativity: modern society and the culture of the new* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Wrightson, K. (2000). An introduction to acoustic ecology. *Soundscape: the journal of acoustic ecology*, 1(1), 10-13.

Web Sources

Altonale (2019), https://www.altonale.de LJUD, *The INVASION* (2019), http://www.ljud.si/slo/?page_id=9&lang=en

Organisation Internationale de Normalisation (2004), https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:iso:12913:-1:ed-1:v1:en

Recht auf Stadt (2019), http://www.rechtaufstadt.net

STAMP (2019), https://www.altonale.de/stamp/strassenkuenste/stamp-theater/

Urban Music Studies (2019), http://www.urbanmusicstudies.org/

Sound recordings

190615-192210 Hamonim (Saturday, 15.06.2019, 19:22:40)

190615-201104 Foodarea (Saturday, 15.06.2019, 20:12:50)

190616-160124 Hummustopia (Sunday, 16.06.2019, 16:05:22)

190616-181249 Closetland (Sunday, 16.06.2019, 18:30:34)

190615-174013 Poetic Dance (Saturday, 15.06.2019, 17:40:52 & 17:49:00)

Interviews

Interview with Enrico Lautner, the head of the Department of Social Space Management of the District of Altona by Anna Rüpcke, 24 July 2019.

Interview with Heike Gronholz, the managing director of the altonale GmbH by Julia Mai and Anna Rüpcke, 12 August 2019.

Lisa Gaupp is interim professor for cultural sociology at Leuphana University of Lüneburg. She studied cultural studies (Kulturwissenschaften) and intercultural & international studies at the Universities of Lüneburg and Barcelona and holds a PhD in ethnomusicology from Hannover University of Music, Drama and Media. Her scholarly work - which has been supported by numerous grants and was awarded with several prizes - focuses on music, performance arts, migration, inequality, global interrelations, urban spaces, politics, diversity and decolonizations. Lisa has lived in the USA, Haiti, Guatemala and Spain and was executive manager of the 2009 Hannover International Violin Competition (Stiftung Niedersachsen).

Lisa Gaupp & Giulia Pelillo-Hestermeyer (Eds.)
DIVERSITY AND OTHERNESS

DE GRUYTER

Lisa Gaupp & Giulia Pelillo-Hestermeyer (Eds.)

DIVERSITY AND OTHERNESS

TRANSCULTURAL INSIGHTS INTO NORMS, PRACTICES, NEGOTIATIONS

OPEN ACCESS

Lisa Gaupp & Giulia Pelillo-Hestermeyer (Eds.)
Diversity and Otherness
Transcultural Insights into Norms, Practices, Negotiations

Lisa Gaupp & Giulia Pelillo-Hestermeyer (Eds.)

Diversity and Otherness

Transcultural Insights into Norms, Practices, Negotiations

Managing Editor: Katarzyna Michalak
Associate Editor: Francesca Corazza
Language Editor: Adam Tod Leverton

Contents

List of Contributing Authors

Giulia Pelillo-Hestermeyer
University of Heidelberg, Germany
Chapter 1, 8, 13

Lisa Gaupp
Leuphana University of Lüneburg, Germany
Chapter 2, 12, 14

Stefan Hirschauer
Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz (JGU),
Germany
Chapter 3

Kijan Espahangizi
ETH and University of Zurich, Switzerland
Chapter 4

Joseph Ciaudo
Orléans University, France
Chapter 5

Susanne Marten-Finnis
University of Portsmouth, UK
Chapter 6

Barbara Ursula Oettl
University of Regensburg / Kunstakademie Düsseldorf, Germany
Chapter 7

Dagmar Reichardt
Latvian Academy of Culture, Riga, Latvia
Chapter 9

Marta Niccolai
University College London, UK
Chapter 10

Marek Sancho Höhne
European University Viadrina, Germany
Chapter 11

Fabio Cismondi
Fusion for Energy, Rokkasho, Japan
Chapter 13

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 "Wissenschaftliche 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 comparison 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 Grenzlosigkeit 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 Sozial-wissenschaftliche 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 Sozial-forschung 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 Theorie-programms (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-kuluressenzialismus/

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.), Global-ization: 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.

Lisa Gaupp

12 How to Curate Diversity and Otherness in Global Performance Art

(Essay Together with an Interview with Claude Jansen)

Global performance art worlds are often presented as borderless and international. Through internationally active curators, their festivals and other cultural organizations, a global art market has developed which adheres to the motto of "diversity" (Peres da Silva & Hondros, 2019) for increasing inclusivity. However, at the same time, global art worlds are criticized for being "too international" (Buţ, 2017), and for standardizing an international canon which largely excludes, for example, "refugee" artists. So is diversity a "white word" (Cañas, 2017)?

The theoretical framework for this paper is formed by applying different post-colonial and transcultural perspectives to compare and criticize the application of different narratives of "diversity and otherness" in the field of global performance art.[216] This discussion will lead to an attempt to answer the research question of how diversity and otherness can be curated without labelling, paternalizing or exoticizing, i.e. by asking how curating can be decolonized, as structures and practices of neocolonialism, social inequality and exclusion persist on a global scale. This means that modes of transformation will be explored as forms of cultural expressions, which provide emancipatory views of cultural expression that are different from the hegemonic mainstream's entanglement with social inequalities.

The focus will lie on both the representation of diversity and otherness in the life-worlds of globally active performance art, music festivals and other cultural organizations, and the performativity of diversity and otherness in these fields of practice. While the former encompasses all structural conditions which influence how *intersectional diversity and otherness* are (re-)presented at festivals and other cultural organizations, the latter limits its attention to the practices and strategies of performing *cross-cultural diversity and otherness* as border-crossing. In other words, we shall take a look at how the concepts of intersectional and cross-cultural diversity and otherness are applied to the field of arts production, both in their symbolic uses in the

---

216 I have discussed the two narratives of diversity and otherness as intersectional and as cross-cultural in my other contribution in this volume as follows: Intersectional *diversity* encompasses intersecting social belongings which include, while intersectional *otherness* emphasizes these differences to exclude. Cross-cultural *diversity* describes ambiguous cultural symbols, cross-cultural *otherness* de-stabilizes differences.

politics of representation (such as striving for equal access) and with regard to how border-crossing concepts are performed, negotiated and mediated in these fields.

Intersectional approaches to diversity and otherness in global performance art typically focus on unequal economic and power relations on a global scale and on ways of how to overcome these inequalities. In this connection, I will discuss approaches for increasing inclusion through strategies of intersectional diversity, as well as how practices of intersectional otherness often increase exclusionary outcomes in the arts. The intersectional approach thereby refers to multiple intersecting types of identity, which mutually influence other markers of difference. *Cross-cultural notions of diversity and otherness* in global performance art, conversely, brings into focus how ambiguous cultural symbols of entanglement, interconnectedness and spaces in-between are negotiated, standardized and deconstructed in the field of practice.

Such an approach entails focusing on the practice of doing and undoing differences (Hirschauer in this volume), by providing a genuinely praxeological stance (Reckwitz, 2005; Schatzki, 1996; Bourdieu, 1978). Even though the part of this chapter dedicated to intersectional strategies of representation places more emphasis on structures, while cross-cultural practices of performativity rather emphasize the actions of individuals and how the un-doing of differences is performed, both approaches rely on the common assumption of performative approaches (Butler, 2013; Bharucha, 2001; Fischer-Lichte, 2004; Fischer-Lichte & Roselt, 2001; Goodman & DeGay, 2000; Bial, 2004). The acting-out of narratives cannot be analysed without reference to the structures of the surrounding conditions, such as policies, finances, economy, organizational structures, etc. The same entanglement applies to how to theorize these performative practices, which depend equally on the construction of certain symbolic meanings as well as on the structuring conditions that are involved. Narratives are performed under specific conditions (Austin, 2014). So it is not only structure and agency that need to be thought about together (Archer, 2005), but idealist and materialist stances cannot be separated (Zembylas & Niederauer, 2017).

This leads us to examine how curating is conceptualized in this chapter. Curating is a social practice embedded in a field of structures which enables as well as limits, and a social practice that combines the construction, performance and negotiation of situational meanings and their acting-out (Davida et al., 2019; Lind, 2012; Buden, 2012; Rugg & Sedgwick, 2012). So Buurman et al. write:

> To acknowledge both the structural constraints and the potentialities for agency, we suggest replacing theories of (fixed) identity with the notion of (changeable) positionality in relation to a number of intersecting and potentially shifting social affiliations (race, class, gender, age, location), … to encourage casting aside the obsession with origins for one which is in favour of a perspective of practice and what one does, from being to doing, without forgetting that the options for agency are sometimes heavily confined and policed by outright violence, not to mention subtler mechanisms of discursive, social or biopolitical control. (2018, p. 20)

With regard to methodology, this chapter is based on literature reviews. These academic studies will be complemented with my own empirical data from the field, as well as with some additional "good or bad practice examples". Empirical results which are included in this chapter are deduced from the qualitative expert interviews which I have conducted with 26 curators, dramaturges, artists and representatives of cultural organizations in globally active festivals and organizations of performance art and music in the period of 2014–2018. This chapter is largely based on an interview with Claude Jansen, an independent scholar, performer, dramaturge and curator from Hamburg. This interview served as a debate about the possibilities of decolonizing "curating performance art" on a global scale. How can dualisms and dichotomies of diversity and otherness be overcome, and how can practices of representations be transformed and set in a more contextualized relationship?

12.1 Representation of Diversity and Otherness—An Intersectional Approach

Let us begin by taking a look at the fields of practice in global performance art and see how different academic studies look at social inequalities and multiple discriminations. It will also be necessary to exemplify notions of *intersectional otherness* and note how other approaches look at social inclusion from a perspective of *intersectional diversity* in these fields of cultural production. As stated in the introduction as well as in my other contribution to this volume, narratives that guide the area of *intersectional diversity and otherness* are mostly oriented towards the assumption that fields of global cultural production are interwoven with economical and power hierarchies. Social inequalities which result from processes of social determination are emphasized and intended to be overcome. Another important orientation is often the quest not only to unveil unequal power-relations but also to achieve greater equality and inclusivity within these cultural fields through, among other things, decolonization. Thus, differences between people or larger social groups are either emphasized in order to exclude outsiders from this group, or unity based on diversity is featured in order to include people with diverse and intersecting multiple identity-markers.

> This leads us to social inequality as a further central concept of diversity in diversity studies which refers to the systematic access (or lack of access) to socially validated assets and resources, based on belonging to a social group determined by categorisations of gender, class, ethnicity or race, sexuality, religion or disability. (Jungwirth, 2019, p. 11)

When we look at the representation of diversity and otherness in globally active performing arts and music festivals and other cultural organizations, by entangling the structural conditions that influence how diversity and otherness are staged in these fields, we must consider how the terms and narratives of *intersectional diversity and*

otherness are applied. Sara Ahmed has described how in diversity-work in universities, terms stemming from earlier feminism such as "equal opportunities" or "anti-racism", which aspire to bear negative connotations by their confrontational and abundant use, have been replaced by the non-defined term of diversity "as a 'feel good' politics" (Ahmed, 2012, p. 69). "The shift from the language of equality to the language of diversity becomes linked to a shift from a confrontational to a collaborative working model, to sharing rather than enforcing values" (p. 64). For Ahmed, this use of the term has two sides. On the one hand, when diversity is used as such a "container term", the risk of obscuring inequalities (pp. 71–72) is apparent. On the other hand, the universal and plural possibilities of such a positive but non-defined term offers people the chance to fill it with their own content, and thereby "a community can take shape through the circulation of diversity. ... To speak the language of diversity is to participate in the creation of a world" (p. 81). In this light, is it possible to curate diversity and otherness in global performance art in an open-minded, non-hierarchical, postcolonial, anti-racist, transcultural and emancipated way? Even more importantly, how is this to be achieved? Is it possible to fill the concept of diversity in such a way? Does the term fulfil the promise of collaboration rather than confrontation?

The debate in global performance art is often concentrated on concepts such as participation, representation, access and inclusion (Gaupp, 2016). Questions that are raised in these contexts include, for example, how individuals can react to essentializing group identities and instead empower themselves, how cultural organizations can foster inclusivity without othering, and how institutionalized identity politics can avoid exclusion (Dobusch et al., 2020). For instance, suppose that one wants to create a more diverse audience for the audiences of art performances in Germany. The German debate particularly focuses on the participation of those citizens who have not so far been represented, especially young people and (young) immigrants, because the audience of tomorrow is not sufficiently reached by publicly funded culture. The established, publicly funded cultural institutions have therefore come under strong political pressure to prove their legitimacy. In particular after the so-called "refugee crisis" in 2015, these arguments can lead to the absurd situation, that, for example, in Berlin you can hardly find a refugee who has not been approached by at least three cultural institutions, asking if he or she wants to participate in a cultural project (Henze, 2017).

As I have shown in my PhD thesis (2016), the cultural policies concerning immigrant populations in Germany since the 1960s have mostly developed from the concepts of interculturalism, and multiculturalism. Intercultural or multicultural concepts of culture follow a traditional, nation-based concept of culture, and thereby foster differences between a homogenous "minority" and a homogenous "host society". Through this they construct and label their target group through markers of otherness, showing the mechanisms of "othering" or labelling (see also Köhl, 2001).

This is also the case in some approaches of so-called intercultural audience development (Haberkorn, 2010; Mandel, 2014). Suppose, here, that one wants to include people in art performances who have hitherto been under-represented, by designing and implementing an agenda of diversity affirmation. Even though data shows that under-representation is prevalent (Horz, 2014) and that established power hierarchies which are often dominated by male white individuals hardly change at all, such an approach for, e.g., the target group "immigrants" runs into the danger of essentializing certain identity traits over others. The target groups can, for instance, become further differentiated in an intersectional manner. It also emphasizes the divide between "us" and "them" and thus fosters exclusion rather than inclusion.

A solid body of literature analyses the underlying reasons for exclusionary practices and under-representation in the arts concerning a variety of artistic genres, such as visual arts (see below), film (Dovey, 2015) and theatre (Heeg & Hillmann, 2017). Scholarship has also previously focussed on the organizational side of implementing diversity in the arts, such as through cultural policies (Benzer, 2016; Sievers et al., 2018), audience research (Van Wel et al., 2006), community work (Pilić & Wiederhold, 2015) and education (Lutz-Sterzenbach et al., 2013; Keuchel & Kelb, 2015; Eremjan, 2016).

Many of these approaches apply postcolonial and/or poststructuralist theory to the field of interest, so again questions may be posed whether the outcome is really as it was theoretically intended—and in turn whether theory can learn from practice or is practice (Kolsteeg, 2019)—and how diversity and otherness can be curated without paternalizing and exoticizing. We will come back to these questions in the discussion.

Other examples do not obviously exhibit signs of exclusion, so the whole picture needs to be disentangled very carefully. An additional heuristic difficulty arises since diversity-sensitive and cross-cultural concepts, as well as transcultural and postcolonial theory, have become a major ingredient for many global arts organizations today (Do Mar Castro Varela & Haghighat, 2020). How, then, should we conduct theory when within a single cultural field the same concepts, such as academic postcolonial and poststructuralist critique, are being applied? Or to put the question differently: "What contribution can deconstructive readings and highly abstract conceptualizations make to the real liberation struggles from neo-colonial exploitation of the Global South?"[217] (Angermüller & Bellina, 2012, p. 34). For Johannes Angermüller and Leonie Bellina, this task can only be achieved by consequently bringing together theory and practice. Equally, Alexandra Karentzos suggests taking into account different levels that all need to be addressed simultaneously. Regarding the enforcement of a "postcolonial art history", it is not sufficient to apply postcolonial critiques to exclusionary

---

217 "Welchen Beitrag können dekonstruktive Lektüren und hochabstrakte Begriffsbildungen zu realen Befreiungskämpfen gegen neo-koloniale Ausbeutung des Globalen Südens leisten?" (Angermüller & Bellina, 2012, p. 34).

practices such as (re-)establishing hegemonies by curating certain objects as "other objects". An example of the latter is the exhibition *Primitivism in 20ᵗʰ Century Art* at the Museum of Modern Art in New York in 1984, which opposed European "masters of modernity" to the "traditional Other" (Karentzos, 2012, p. 250). Also, on an academic level, art history needs to be revised in order to deconstruct the established construction of "ethnic encoding of an artist" in academia. Thirdly, contemporary art practices which challenge these exclusionary practices of otherness in the museum, by offering a transdisciplinary view from combined art-historical, anthropological and artistic perspectives, in order to set a "transcultural polyphony" against those "linear master narratives" (p. 253), are in need of being critically re-considered. Such "postcolonial streams in contemporary art challenge art-scholars to rethink their own theory formation in a postcolonial manner"[218] (p. 249). Thus, this approach suggests simultaneously a decolonizing of practice and academia by including plural and transdisciplinary voices.

However, with such an approach, other difficulties can arise. The more people participate in, for example, curating processes, the more differentiated (political) agendas need to be negotiated in order to reach a common goal. These agendas can be more or less individual,[219] such as by adherence to a certain artistic understanding, or they can be related to group identity politics, such as wanting to increase the representation of a certain social group. For instance, in a transnational, collaborative project between German and "African" artists,

> you actually have two positions, on the one hand the diasporic, progressive one [in Germany] which wants to untangle that [Africa is not a country ... not the continent of illusions with all its fantasies] from a position that I find absolutely correct. ... But [on the other hand,] in African countries I know a lot of artists coming from a very strong political context, who speak more radically of the continent [in reference to the pan-African idea ... in order to not acknowledge the national, colonial borders].[220] (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018)

---

218 "postkoloniale Strömungen zeitgenössischer Kunst [stellen auch] eine Herausforderung für die Kunstwissenschaft dar, die eigene Theoriebildung postkolonial weiterzudenken" (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018).

219 However, the majority of the academic approaches in this area regard the cultural field (Bourdieu, 1993) or the art world (Becker, 2008) not as an individual task but rather as a social endevour. Thus, they can be related to the Sociology of Culture by also looking at the actions of individuals as stemming mainly from the social position of an individual and his or her relationships.

220 "in Referenz zur panafrikanistischen Idee, die ja vor 100 Jahren als erste, entsprechend der Verhandlungen mit den Partnerinnen und Partnern aus dem jeweiligen Land und es nach diesen Ideen gibt. Und das es eben viele meiner Co-Produktionspartnerinnen aus den Ländern sagen, dass sie die nationalen, kolonialen Grenzen nicht anerkennen und deswegen, eigentlich, aus ihrer Position, erneut von Afrika als einen Kontinent sprechen. Wobei und da haben wir schon den ersten Graben zu der Diaspora, die natürlich sehr stark auf ‚Africa is not a country', eben sehr stark, in den Schulungsprozessen der EuropäerInnen darauf verweist, dass es eben viele Länder gibt und Afrika ist nicht der Illusionskontinent, mit all den Fantasien und so. Und da geht es eigentlich schon los:

In addition, both positions are situationally even more split up. The "German side" can be influenced heterogeneously by, among other factors, funding schemes and/ or postcolonial theory, which "want to dissolve the African cliché, in Germany" by including migrant Afro-Germans into the project, "whereas the African says, your clichés are of no interest to me"[221]. Furthermore, the "African" positions "already differ very vehemently among each other between Namibia and South Africa" (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018). Likewise, "a great many positions come in"[222] (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018). Thus, such an *intersectional diversity* of voices can both offer emancipatory views and foster *intersectional otherness*, by emphasizing the differences between all perspectives.

As stated above, there are numerous examples of academic studies which analyse the power-relations in different fields of global arts, which foster exclusion rather than inclusion. A large majority of these approaches to *intersectional otherness* in global cultural production is focused on the visual arts. In particular, the debates around the establishment of the Humboldt-Forum in the centre of Berlin, as a space for the display of "the cultures of the world" (Stiftung Humboldt Forum im Berliner Schloss, n.d.; Di Blasi, 2019), the decolonizing of more traditional anthropological museums, such as the former Museum für Völkerkunde Hamburg which has been transformed into the MARKK Hamburg (https://markk-hamburg.de; Kraus & Noack, 2015), post-colonially oriented biennales such as documenta XI[223] (2002 in Kassel) and the topic of colonial and Nazi-looted art and their restitution, have sparked considerable attention in several academic disciplines within art history (Rother, 2017; Macdonald, 1996). Other authors focus on "outsider art" (Zolberg & Cherbo, 1997) from under-represented visual artists, such as "primitive African art" (Zolberg, 1997), or on the power hierarchies in the visual arts (Below & von Bismarck, 2005; Behnke et al. 2015; Buchholz & Wuggenig, 2005[224]).

---

dann hast du eigentlich zwei Positionen, nämlich zum einen die diasporische, aufklärerische, die das aufdröseln möchte, aus einer Position, die ich absolut richtig finde, einerseits. Aber wie gesagt, in den afrikanischen Ländern kenne ich sehr viele Künstlerinnen und Künstler die aus einem sehr starken politischen Zusammenhang kommen, die viel radikaler wieder von Kontinent sprechen" (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018).

221 "Wobei [diese Seite] ja das afrikanische Klischee auflösen will, in Deutschland. Während die Afrikanerin sagt, Was interessieren mich eure Klischees?" (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018).

222 "Und da kommen dann noch einmal zig Positionen rein. ... Und die unterschieden sich ja schon vehement von Namibia zu Südafrika" (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018).

223 This was curated by the first non-European curator Okwui Enwezor, who laid open the "asymmetry between curating and curated cultures" by citing Gerardo Mosquera in the documenta catalogue (Enwezor, 2002, p. 46; see Mosquera, 1994, as cited in Karentzos, 2012, p. 251).

224 The manifold relation between all kinds of art genres and power is the subject of another volume entitled "Arts and Power – Policies in and by the Arts", which I am editing, to be published in 2021 by Springer VS Gaupp et al., 2021).

Thanks to such critique, in the field of practice, new identity politics and interest groups, such as the Initiative Bündnis kritischer Kulturpraktiker_innen (https://mindthetrapberlin.wordpress.com) or the Diversity Arts Culture (http://www.diversity-arts-culture.berlin/en), have been developed. Both of these organizations host conferences and cultural events which are intended not to reproduce the mentioned exclusions. In order to protest against racist and extremist right-wing attacks on cultural organizations and artists in Germany, the association DIE VIELEN was founded in 2017 and published the declaration Wir sind Viele,[225] besides organizing a large array of events such as anti-racist lectures and discussions[226] (http://theaterder-welt2017.iti-germany.de). Elsewhere, others also criticize these exclusionary outcomes of such diversity-affirmative actions, but still see the need to follow such an agenda in the medium term, in order to change the hierarchical and neo-colonial structures of the cultural field in the long-run (https://www.kiwit.org/kultur-oeffnet-welten/kultur-oeffnet-welten.html).

One study by the global media company Pitchfork on diversity, which was concerned with the line-ups of major popular multi-genre music festivals in the US and Canada, shows that the same groups and artists tended to play at these festivals in 2017, and that these artists came mainly from European countries or at least were based in the so-called "West". (Pitchfork, n.d.) This study also showed that there is a homogeneity in the American and Canadian festival scene regarding gender balance and other diversity markers, "especially toward the top of the bill" (Bishop, 2018). These findings are no different if we take a look at the programmes of publicly funded festivals in Europe. The same groups and artists are playing at these festivals, and they are mainly artists from European countries or at least based in the so-called "West".

When it comes to these issues of representation, one also has to take into account structural conditions, such as the financing strategies of the festival producers themselves. For example, to keep costs down, festivals form networks to co-produce new productions. This practical strategy has consequences for diversity, as it contributes to having the same groups booked at a majority of these festivals in the "Western" world (Gaupp, 2020). Another very influential issue concerns visa permits, which sometimes prevent musicians from certain countries touring or travelling at all. Even if a record company manages to bring artists to Germany to record, other problems can arise when it comes to paying royalties to the musicians, since not every country has a royalty association, such as the GEMA in Germany (Record label representative, personal communication, May 3, 2018). For this reason, one could think that these networks, visa conditions and royalties would result in a closed circle of a kind of

---

225 We are Many.
226 At the end of 2019, nearly 3500 cultural organizations and persons working in the field, coming from 16 cities and regions and 15 German federal states, have signed the declaration and participated in the organization of such events.

"Western male white canon in global arts". However, in an interview I conducted with a curator, she stated that sometimes these networks are a very good way for unknown artists to become produced on an international level. After all, it only takes one of the curator gatekeepers to be convinced in order for a work to be produced. Moreover, once an artist is a part of the bigger and more established festivals, they will be more willing to feature the same artist (Gaupp, 2020).

But there is still a nationalistic focus in this process. One curator expresses this aptly when she states that—mainly due to the financial crisis—national funding bodies tend to focus on resident artists only (Kaup-Hasler, 2012). After all,

> in a field of cosmopolitan self-conception, territorial or rather national criteria still are meaningful regardless of their rejection. Artists without north-Western geographic origin are still underrepresented in the centre of the art field where actors with high field-specific symbolic recognition prevail. ... Field theory offers explanations for these facts by looking at the institutional structure of the art field, i.e. the distribution of relevant resources.[227] (Buchholz & Wuggenig, 2012, p. 179)

Fewer approaches appear to discuss how inclusion can be achieved in cultural organizations, which follow an approach of intersectional diversity and/or focus on other artistic genres besides the visual arts. For instance, Johan Kolsteeg has published some studies on the strategies of inclusivity in a Dutch theatre, and has shown that a complex process needs to take into account not only the structure of the organization itself (for instance, by implementing flexible management structures or rotating project leadership) and a carefully designed audience development strategy (by focussing on e.g. a "delta of niches"), but also to think of the cultural organization's stakeholders (by including plural collaborations with local and regional partners) as well as developing a talent development strategy (e.g. by connecting the local to the global) (Kolsteeg, 2019). Only by taking into account all of these levels (and probably more, in other contexts), by establishing Richard Sennetts' social triangle (2003) of authority, cooperation and trust, can social entrepreneurship in a cultural organization be achieved, which accounts for inclusivity as a starting point of cultural democracy (Kolsteeg, 2019).

For example, many performing art festivals organized by politically active or at least engaged organizations are trying to achieve a gender balance within their artists' roster. The Festival Theater der Welt at Kampnagel 2017 in Hamburg discussed these topics around discrimination processes (http://theaterderwelt2017.iti-germany.

---

227 "Territoriale bzw. nationale Kriterien haben ungeachtet ihrer Zurückweisung in einem Feld mit kosmopolitischem Selbstverständnis offenbar nach wie vor Bedeutung. Künstler/innen, die nicht auf eine nordwestliche geografische Herkunft zurückblicken, sind in jedem Zentrum des Kunstfeldes nach wie vor schwach vertreten, in dem sich die Akteure mit hoher feldspezifischer symbolischer Anerkennung konzentrieren. ... aus feldtheoretischer Perspektive [gibt es hierfür] Gründe ..., die nicht zuletzt in der institutionellen Struktur des sozialen Systems der Kunst zu suchen sind, d. h. in der Verteilung relevanter Ressourcen" (Buchholz & Wuggenig, 2012, p. 179).

de). Another example is taken from the music industry and is called the Keychange Initiative, which was granted 1.4 million Euro of the EU's Creative Europe funding scheme in October 2019 at the Reeperbahn festival in Hamburg. The initiative seeks to achieve a 50:50 gender balance in the industry by 2022, through activities such as supporting female artists and innovators with cross border collaborations and show-cases, engaging more festivals in the 50:50 gender balance pledge, raising awareness and stimulating debate in events and panel discussions, and establishing female role models through Ambassadors and Inspiration Awards (https://keychange.eu).

Moreover, cultural policies are also seeking to increase intersectional diversity and thereby building a more inclusive society, by following the Creative Justice Model of access, diversity, inclusion, equity (Cuyler, 2019). In this regard, J. P. Singh distinguishes between four different international discourses in cultural policies, which operate in the grey area between consensus and conflict. Accordingly, consensus can be reached on a nation-state level either through hierarchical structuring or horizontally via different actors. More conflict-oriented discourses are rather found to stem from social pressures, either by mobilizing discourses of social movements or by counter-discourses of, for example, community projects (Singh, 2019). Can these examples show the way to support intersectional diversity in the global arts and decolonize unequal power structures? We will come back to these and other possibilities to decolonizing global curating and to curating diversity instead of otherness later in the discussion.

12.2 The Performativity of Diversity and Otherness—A Cross-Cultural Approach

Let us now turn to the concepts of *cross-cultural diversity and otherness* and examine how these concepts are applied in the field of practice of performance art. To this end, we will focus on the performativity of diversity and otherness, speaking of the practices and strategies of performing diversity and otherness in a cross-cultural way. While the previous section, which was devoted to the representation of intersectional diversity and otherness in the arts, focussed chiefly on individuals or groups, this section will concentrate on the aesthetic art forms, and especially on how artistic practices are performed. These practices are presented as border-crossing and cross-cultural, which means that they are either attributed to no pure genre or origin but are rather global and/or hybrid (Davida, 2011), or that they open up possibilities of in-between-spaces and re-readings of established (b-)ordering practices.

Likewise, these performativities of diversity and otherness can also be called diversity in the arts, aesthetic diversity, or the diversity of cultural expressions, as it has been defined in (e.g.) the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions (UNESCO, 2013). According to this

convention, the central goal is to increase the visibility of global artistic diversity. Cultural diversity, in the case of the UNESCO convention, strives for no less than worldwide peace, and in the convention one can read that: "Cultural diversity, flourishing within a framework of democracy, tolerance, social justice and mutual respect between peoples and cultures, is indispensable for peace and security at the local, national and international levels" (UNESCO, 2013, p. 3). As I will show, this remains one of the most challenging tasks in global art worlds. The UNESCO convention was founded to oppose the further liberalization of the global market for cultural goods and the market domination of the USA in the 1980s. Connected to these developments are discourses around the potential of cultural expressions for social transformation (Lettau & Knoblich, 2017; Kagan 2011), as well as peace-building activities through cultural policies (UNESCO, 2013; Schneider & Gad, 2014). However, for Singh, these cultural policies led by UNESCO should be criticized as protectionist, as they and further international regulations privilege national identity constructions, which are themselves used by post-colonial interest groups in their fight for indigenous rights (Singh, 2019; Pelillo-Hestermeyer in this volume).

Another example of the contradictory outcomes of cross-cultural agendas is the National Festival for Iranian Folk Music, which I was invited to attend for the purposes of field research in 2017. This festival takes place nationwide, and is organized by the government through the Iranian Music Council. It focuses exclusively on the genre of folk music, but in practice an enormous cross-cultural diversity of instruments, folk music styles, idioms, languages, dress, etc. is found there, which in turn supports national unity based on artistic diversity.

This artistic diversity not only means a variety of aesthetic styles, but can also include intermedial diversity (i.e. the use of different artistic media within one performance; Rajewsky, 2002) or inter-art diversity (i.e. the use of different art genres or the crossing of art genres boundaries within one performance; Bharucha, 2001). As this first kind of intermedial diversity is not the precise focus of this study, we can turn directly to look at inter-art diversity instead. The focus of the empirical study which I carried out lies on the "genre" performance art in general, and specifically on music understood as any kind of sound practice in the broadest sense (Small, 2010). In addition, considering my research focus on diversity, performance art offers a highly appropriate research field, as it includes a diversity of art genres and categories:

> Historically, performance art has been a medium that challenges and violates borders between disciplines and genders, between private and public, between everyday life and art, and that follows no rules. In process, it has energised and affected other disciplines–architecture as event, theatre as image, photography as performance. (Fischer-Lichte & Roselt, 2001, p. 241)

Another, but very similar, approach focuses on the arts in general or art festivals with specific regard to this organizational format. Many curators come to biennales such as the documenta, in order to find "new" artists who are able or willing to cross artistic

genres, such as in the case of the visual video artist Wael Shawky, who produced a performance on the theatre stage at the festival Theater der Welt 2017 in Hamburg (http://theaterderwelt2017.iti-germany.de). His stage-setting is a visual piece of art in itself, which is surrounded by and embedded within music, drama and dance elements.

Nevertheless, music is still the focus of my research. For example, I have asked the curators why they would include music in their programme. There are many answers to this question. In most theatre and dance performances the musical layer is extremely prominent by default. This is why music is important to a curator I interviewed. For the purposes of staging pure music concerts, more specialized institutions in town are typically able to complete this task more successfully (Two festival curators, personal communication, May 26, 2015). Another performance art festival was founded as a music festival, and only later did it include more theatre and dance performances into its programme, still retaining a large music programme (Festival curator, personal communication, May 28, 2015). Yet another festival presents a large popular music programme at nights for "socializing" and the "enjoyment" of the audience (Festival curator, personal communication, June 17, 2015). Also in the same city, there is another performing art festival with a focus on contemporary music rather than theatre or dance performances, with the intention of not being a direct competitor of the other performance art festivals or dance festivals which are now established in town (Festival curator, personal communication, June 14, 2015).

As we can see, on the level of inter-art diversity, the practices in performance art seem to foster cross-cultural diversity, as genre barriers become dissolved, and a wide variety of artistic approaches are included in these festivals. However, when looking more closely at the differences between different kinds of genre in the eyes of curators, certain practices of cross-cultural otherness seem to be prevalent. For example, the genre of music[228] is slightly discriminated against when it is described as a "easy to consume" genre, in contrast to a "more intellectually challenging theatre performance". Of course there are many more reasons for such a curational approach, but in sum artistic genre boundaries are dissolved rather than enforced, given the cross-genre approach of performance art in general.

In performance studies a shift to "the global" can be detected, thus situating performance art within the "mobility, transnational and global turns" (see my other contribution in this volume). In other artistic genres, such a focus on "global arts" is also evident. Furthermore, there is an ongoing genre-crossing debate on translation (Apter, 2013), on migratory aesthetics (Durrant, 2007), on the (im-)possibility of defining "an African contemporary dance aesthetic" (Douglas et al., 2006) and on the

---

228 How musical genres are constructed in the first place and how genres serve to stabilise and destabilise communities is the subject of a wide corpus of sociological literature, that can be assigned mainly to the field of sociology of music. See, for example, Lena, 2019.

de-territorialisation of art (Dorn, 2004), which also belongs to the debate about cross-cultural diversity and otherness in the arts.

For instance, in literary studies, debate has recently focussed on the concept of "world literature" in light of globalization (Thomsen, 2008). Introduced by Johann Wolfgang Goethe in 1827, this term is as un-definable and contested as is, for example, "world music", which has been heavily criticized for its Eurocentric notions (Krüger, 2013; Peres da Silva, 2017). For Mads Rosendahl Thomsen, the more recent shift to the "global" highlights the point that it "will always be a world literature as seen from a particular place, even though some aspects are shared" (Rosendahl Thomsen, 2008, p. 1). He therefore looks at the processes of how certain kinds of literature become canonical on an international scale.[229] In this light, "world literature" can never be as universal as the term suggests.

It is with this in mind that Emily Apter and her colleagues focus on the "untranslatability of languages" (Cassin & Apter, 2014). Other scholars give attention to hybrid, transcultural and interweaving forms of literature (Hitzke, 2019) or seek to re-write "European Peripheries in the Postcolonial Literary Imagination" (Hauthal & Toivanen, 2021). Likewise, Ottmar Ette prefers the term "literatures of the world", which acknowledges the "vectorisation of all references"[230] (Ette, 2017, p. 59). One of the research foci of the renowned Leibniz-Zentrum für Literatur- und Kulturforschung in Berlin is also named "world literature", which demonstrates a similar critical approach that takes into account the fact that "world literature refers to the specific global conditions shaping the realm of literature and to the effects globalisation has had on literary production and its reception in a rapidly changing society" (https://www.zfl-berlin.org/world-literature.html). These approaches thus mirror the epistemological development of a cross-cultural view of the diversities and otherness of literature, by focussing on the entanglements of post-colonial writings.

Similarly, in the field of the visual arts, the notion of contemporaneity has been deconstructed (Osborne, 2013; Smith et al., 2009) and unmasked as deeply Eurocentric, on the grounds that it is often set in opposition to "non-Western" art forms, to which certain traits of traditionality are often ascribed (Dornhof et al., 2018; Horst & Schwartz, 2012). In fact, the two sides of cross-cultural diversity and cross-cultural otherness are often present in such approaches at the same time. When, for instance, the othering mechanisms which continue to prevail in art history are sought to be decolonized (Allerstorfer & Leisch-Kiesl, 2017), the movement of deconstructing hegemonic border demarcations shows the notion of cross-cultural otherness at play. When instead the focus lies more on how visual art forms and practices are themselves

---

229 This question is treated by, among others, Buţ (2017) in the field of visual arts, who shows that an international canon has developed which is "too international", excluding a wide variety of cultural expressions.

230 "Vektorisierung aller Bezüge" (Ette, 2017, p. 59).

presented as entangled and cross-cultural (Seliger, 2011), we can speak of strategies of cross-cultural diversity. This means "look[ing] at (global) art from a transcultural perspective that acknowledges the inherent transculturality of artistic practices and artefacts, [along with their] dynamic cross-cultural constellations, migrations and transformations, locations and dislocations" (Buurman et al., 2018, p. 17).

Thus, the focus of the cross-cultural entanglement is also present in visual art scholarship. However,

> in the methodical descriptions of entangled histories, what has remained unanswered is how this entanglement is constituted, who the actors are, on which levels societies, cultures etc. are entangled, and based on which subjects, objects and concepts these stories can be related. (Leeb, 2015, p. 211)

In this connection Susanne Leeb describes how "postcolonial narrations" have influenced art history. According to her, these "increasing approaches toward a transnational art historiography in the past years have made very little impact on the level of museum presentations" (Leeb, 2015, p. 214). What is at stake here is the strong connection of the concept of cross-cultural diversity with intersectional diversity, as discussed above. On the one hand, visual art forms that challenge the Eurocentric meta-narrative by including entangled, transcultural notions are increasingly presented as "entangled-global-but contextual". On the other hand, the quest to decolonize museums, to achieve a greater representation of those cross-cultural art forms and artists from the "Global South" within canonical museums, and to overcome the established divide between "fine arts" and "ethnic culture" is striven for. Museums are increasingly bound to curate "non-Western" artists and postcolonial topics, as well as to call established curatorial practices into question. For instance, the above-mentioned former Museum für Völkerkunde Hamburg (Ethnological museum) has been renamed the MARKK—Museum am Rothenbaum—Kulturen und Künste der Welt (Museum at Rothenbaum—Cultures and Arts of the World) in 2018, under the leadership of its new director, Barbara Plankensteiner, who has started an extensive reform on the aforementioned premises. Together with my co-authors I have shown in another empirical mixed-method study that, while the new self-image of the MARKK has already been implemented, the exhibitions still need further development to ensure that the content reaches visitors (Gaupp et al., 2020). We have also shown how, in the case of different museums and events, e.g. the Venice Biennale, the intended focus on postcolonial issues and the desire for greater representation of Artists of Colour for example, can indeed increase cross-cultural diversity in visual arts. However, the same intention can also lead to intersectional otherness, when only Artists of Colour are curated for those postcolonial topics, whereby they function as tokens without really challenging the structures of unequal representation and power relations.

Furthermore, in the field of music, similar approaches can be detected. The debate on deconstructing "world music" as Eurocentric (Guilbault, 1997), the quest

to conceptualize music practices as inherently border-crossing (Peres da Silva & Hondros, 2019; Sardinha & Campos, 2016; Kim & Riva, 2014) and the bid to achieve greater visibility for globally underrepresented musical expressions (Beyer & Burkhalter, 2012; Beyer et al., 2015), by focusing on a "decolonial turn" in (ethno-) musicology[231],can be related to both the practices of cross-cultural diversity and cross-cultural otherness. Again, notions of intersectional diversity and otherness are interwoven with those same practices (Alisch et al., 2018). An example of this would be the web space NORIENT, which wants to act as "an advocate for music scenes from Bolivia to Ghana to Pakistan–and for a world beyond Eurocentrism, exoticism and discrimination" (https://www.startnext.com/en/norient).

Finally, focusing on the more conspicuously genre-crossing field of performance art, similar debates have influenced the theatre sector. The academic narrative has shifted from "intercultural theatre" (Shevtsova, 2009) to "transcultural theatre" (Heeg, 2017) on the level of the theatre texts and performances, i.e. artistic practices. Intersectional otherness in turn is present in many approaches to increase representation, for instance of "immigrant theatre" (Shevtsova, 2009) and the evolvement of the "postmigrant[232] theatre" movement in Berlin (Haakh, 2015; Sharifi, 2011). In 2008, Shermin Langhoff founded the theatre space Ballhaus Naunynstraße in Berlin-Kreuzberg as a "postmigrant theatre" with the intention to avoid focus on ethnic ascriptions and to increase participation of immigrants in the art scene (http://www.ballhausnaunynstrasse.de). Since then, the concept of postmigrant theatre and Langhoff herself has gained an enhanced reputation, for instance by receiving the most highly endowed Kairos Cultural Award in 2011 (Alfred Toepfer Stiftung, n.d.) or by her appointment as artistic director of the prestigious Maxim Gorki Theatre Berlin in 2013 (Maxim Gorki Theatre Berlin, n.d.).

Another prominent approach is the concept of "Interweaving Performance Cultures" (Fischer-Lichte et al., 2014). As Fischer-Lichte writes, "[h]ere, moving within and between cultures is celebrated as a state of in-betweenness that will change

---

231 In the years 2019 and 2020, several musicological conferences focus on topics of decoloniality, for instance the research colloquium on "Sound / Music / Decoloniality" at Maynooth University in March 2020, the symposium on "Decolonising of Knowledges" at University of Music and Performing Arts Vienna in May 2019 and the symposium on "Decolonizing Europe through Music Scholarship?" at the International Congress of the German Musicological Society in September 2021 in Bonn.

232 The term "postmigrant" with regard to postmigrant society was coined by Naika Foroutan in 2012 and describes "not a finished process of migration but an analytical perspective that deals with the conflicts, processes of identity formation, and social and political transformation which have started after migration and after the recognition [of Germany] as a country of migration." "Postmigrantisch steht ... nicht für einen Prozess der beendeten Migration, sondern für eine Analyseperspektive, die sich mit den Konflikten, Identitätsbildungsprozessen, sozialen und politischen Transformationen auseinandersetzt, die nach erfolgter Migration und nach der Anerkennung, ein Migrationsland geworden zu sein, einsetzen" (Foroutan, 2016, p. 232).

spaces, disciplines, and the subject as well as her/his body in a way that exceeds what is currently imaginable" (Fischer-Lichte, 2014, p. 12). For this group of scholars, who have conceptualized performances as inherently interweaving, cross-cultural also describes a focus on the (historical) entanglements of drama. By going beyond postcolonial theory and employing concepts such as double criticism (Khatibi, 1985), Khālid Amīn and Mohammed Laamiri seek to find a different way, by asking: "Do we have to consider hybridity as the ultimate and inexorable condition of all postcolonial subjectivities? Or shall we think of it as a road map leading to alternative exchanges?" (Amīn & Laamiri, 2010, p. 7).

The utopian aspects, which are often connected with such a deconstructed meaning of diversity (or, in these cases, named interweaving cultures and hybridity) have to be critically approached. First, the critique towards concepts of cross-cultural diversity, which neglect existing social inequalities and unequal power relations by celebrating and consuming diversity, needs to be taken into account. Such inequalities will not become smaller purely through an increase in the number of interweaving performances. In addition, it needs to be clarified–especially in times when the US government, under the leadership of the President Donald Trump, presents lies as "alternative facts" (Moore, 2017) – what "alternative" means, i.e. alternative to what? (Bachmann-Medick, 2016) The positionality of all these concepts should be laid open in order not to present merely another dichotomy of "the West versus the rest" (Hall, 1994).

What can be summarized at this point is that, in all discussed artistic genres, similar debates have evolved which centre on practices which cross or are intended to cross (dichotomous) borders (genre, national/regional, ethnic, etc.) and foster spaces-in-between instead. Often these quests become entangled with notions of intersectional diversity and otherness, when not only the art practices but also the representation of artists, curators, audiences, etc. come into focus. Last but not least, such cross-cultural, border-crossing practices can at the same time construct new orders, which might be themselves declared as universal or result in other exclusionary practices again.

> Focusing on the transcultural topologies of global art thus permits the study of relational processes of circulation and exchange while also calling into question the idea of ethno-cultural locality as a nostalgic marker of authenticity as well as celebrations of multicultural plurality that disregard ongoing inequalities in capitalist and (neo-)colonial power relations. (Buurman et al., 2018, p. 18)

Thus, when we look at practices of cross-cultural diversity and otherness in the arts, the arts are either conceptualized as "global" and border-crossing or as situational, so as to require some kind of translation in order to foster inclusivity on a global scale (Apter, 2013; Dätsch, 2018; Charle et al., 2017; Klein, 2013). While the former approach relies on a concept of culture which is conceived as transcultural and dynamic per se, lacking in any pure origin (Stroh, 2005), the latter negates the fact that the arts can

function as a "global language" (Binas-Preisendörfer, 2008), which is understandable globally, though differently appropriated. It rather follows a concept of culture which sets culture as socially transmitted, internalized, situationally performed (Dorn, 2004) and understandable only to members of a specific art world (Becker, 2008) or cultural field (Bourdieu, 1993).

These two opposing regimes have been pointedly summarized by Grace Brockington in relation to a dispute between Selwyn Image and Lewis F. Day at the beginning of the 20th century (Brockington, 2009). While for Image, art is locally or nationally embedded, it is "particular. Far from being a universal language, it is locally produced and historically conditioned, the individual expression of an artist, or ... of a nation" (Brockington, 2009, p. 1). It cannot fully be translated (Gaupp, 2018). However, Brockington states how Day takes the opposite view and rather tends towards the concept of cosmopolitan artists. "National traditions are innate but not homogeneous and do not need to be 'coddled.' The English are a 'mixed lot', a hybrid race, practicing a hybrid art" (Brockington, 2009, p. 2). In this dichotomy of conceptualizing cultural expressions, both cross-cultural diversity and otherness can be detected. While the particular, situational view on the diversity of artistic expressions can be related to the narrative of cross-cultural otherness, the latter concept, which portrays the arts as hybrid and cosmopolitan, can be described as an approach to cross-cultural diversity. Nevertheless, this debate is mainly situated on the level of narratives, while in this contribution we intend to look at how these concepts are applied in the field of practice.

Here, the picture becomes even more complicated and blurred. The majority of artists whom I spoke to conceptualize their artistic practices as transcultural rather than as connected to a certain geographic region (Two artists, personal communication, May 5, 2015). Art and diversity both appear to be a dynamic process that cannot be defined in any a priori sense. Their artistic practices are characterized by crossing borders, by connecting to many people with many world-views, thus producing seemingly perfect cross-cultural practices. For instance, the art space in Berlin and founded in 2009 by Bonaventure Soh Bejeng Ndikung "S A V V Y Contemporary, situates itself at the threshold of notions and constructs of the West and non-West, in order to understand and negotiate between, and thereby deconstruct, the ideologies and connotations eminent to such constructs" (SAVVY Contemporary, p. 1). Another example in performance art which seeks to decolonize the art field and thereby increase both intersectional and cross-cultural diversity is the Migrantpolitan at Kampnagel in Hamburg, which curated by among others Anas Aboura. Kampnagel describes this as:

> a campaigning space ... where diasporic and local artists enter into a process of exchange, develop joint transcultural strategies, and test out new forms of aesthetic praxis. This micro-cosmos is a laboratory for collaboration under conditions of solidarity, where new ideas can

be developed, where cultural self-determination has a home, and where a pinch of anarchy is always part of the mix. (Kampnagel, 2019)

For some artists themselves as well as audiences and curators, these and other practices of performing cross-cultural diversity are evident. Sociological research in the arts has shown extensively how interpretation is an individual and intrinsically social matter (Abbing, 2019). This means that the interpretation of symbolic meanings which are ascribed to certain artistic expressions by the artists themselves might not necessarily perceived in the same manner by the audiences. For instance, an artist whom I interviewed described himself as cosmopolitan (Artist, personal communication, January 9, 2015), while the same artist was labelled a "typically Middle-Eastern artist" by a curator (Curator, personal communication, January 22, 2015). Marketing experts, media representatives and audience members also have different approaches in how to present and perceive this artist(ic expression) (Festival curator, personal communication, May 28, 2015). As a result, transcultural or cross-cultural art forms do not exist per se–or, any artistic practice would need to be called cross-cultural, assuming the arts' dynamic and processual character. But certainly, an artist or art form can be constructed and perceived as cross-cultural. It may rather be only that this construction has less to do with the actual artistic content than with its situational use.

This situational semantics offers two different perspectives in how to curate diversity and otherness. The first is to acknowledge that labelling is a dynamic and thus influenceable, changeable process, and certain wording and concepts can be used strategically and/or negotiated every time anew. "Performance is ... the joint execution in a (specific) situation. ... It is not to be determined and not to be understood, (the execution is only) at the moment"[233] (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018).

The second reading relates to an analysis of power inequalities in these negotiation processes. Those with more power have greater opportunities for defining the norm, and for standardizing certain interpretations over others. This leads us to the overarching question of how to decolonize the field of performance art without essentializing just another hegemonic norm. This will be discussed in the next section.

---

233 "Performance ist ... der gemeinsame Vollzug in der Situation. ... Der ist nicht zu determinieren, und der ist nicht zu verstehen, der ist im Moment" (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018).

12.3 How to Curate Diversity and Otherness—The Decolonization of Curating

As I have pointed out in my other chapter on epistemologies, the quest to decolonize is called for in several life-worlds and can be traced back to the political decolonization and liberation processes in the 1950s, which spurred the academic stream of postcolonial thinking. This stream of thinking called not only for political liberation from colonial structures but also wider cultural and epistemic decolonization. Transferred to the present day, this task continues to be relevant, as dichotomies in thinking persist. I have mentioned several de-constructivist, decolonial theoretical approaches in the study of culture, which seek to de-stabilise and re-think established ascriptions and borders. Also in today's fields of practice, decolonization appears not yet to be completely fulfilled. In this case, I have summarized as decolonization any fight for liberation from any unequal power structures, which need not necessarily be grounded in the colonial era. However, in general, unequal power structures on a global scale cannot be separated from their colonial legacies due to their entanglement with neoliberal capitalistic structures, which could only expand as such through colonialism (Dussel, 1998).

To achieve decolonization, I have also mentioned several theoretical approaches such as organizing networks (Mbembe, 2016, p. 37) or taking into account decolonial feminist-queer southern epistemologies and new subjectivities (Gutiérrez Rodriguez, 2016). In my chapter here, William Jamal Richardson's call for action, and for intervening in "physical spaces" (2018, p. 232) rather than only in debates, comes into focus. How should we decolonize the global arts in practise? While discussing this question, I also reflect upon my own positionality, as well as on what Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang call the risk of using the term decolonization as a mere metaphor (Tuck & Yang, 2012).

How can I write about issues of racism, inequality and decolonization as a White, heterosexual, privileged person from the "Global North"? Is this only appropriation, talking "about" and not "with" and/or the intention to white-wash myself from not really doing anything against inequalities and the collective guilt of colonialism? After all, knowledge production is always influenced by political interests (Richardson, 2018).

> What does it mean when the tools of a racist patriarchy are used to examine the fruits of that same patriarchy? It means that only the most narrow perimeters of change are possible and allowable. ... For the master's tool will never dismantle the master's house. (Lorde, 1984, pp. 110–114)

Audre Lorde criticizes how members of different minorities are merely used as tokens and reveals how White feminists are deeply racist.[234] She also suggests how to work against these mechanisms, by urging everyone to "reach down into that deep place of knowledge inside herself and touch that terror and loathing of any difference that lives there. See whose face it wears" (Lorde, 1984, p. 114). Lorde appears to call not only to a process of honest self-reflection, but she also incorporates another notion of diversity and otherness, one that could be called a combination of intersectional with cross-cultural otherness. For her, *differences* should be acknowledged, as by shedding difference, no real community can develop. "Difference must be not merely tolerated, but seen as a fund of necessary polarities between which our creativity can spark like a dialectic" (Lorde, 1984, p. 110). In most of the literature which is discussed in my two chapters in this book, diversity is framed positively and connected to inclusionary narratives, while otherness is rather related to processes of exclusion. Lorde, however, offers a perspective that turns these approaches around. It is exactly the intersectional difference that should be made productive for fostering inclusion, decolonizing the racist patriarchy, and recognizing "difference as a crucial strength" (Lorde, 1984, p. 111). Likewise, real cooperation can form that might meet up with the emancipatory quest that cross-cultural otherness seeks.

In other research, Rosalba Icaza and Rolando Vázquez have inquired into how the combination of intersectional with decolonial frameworks can offer an application of a perspective similar to Lorde's at the University of Amsterdam (Icaza & Vázquez, 2018). They show how positionality, relationality and transitionality can support decolonizing in the university. "Practices of positionality ..., even while teaching the canon, reveal the geopolitical location of knowledge. ... Relationality ... includes a transformation of the relationships established in the classroom and across the university" (p. 119–120), by rendering valuable differences. Last but not least, "the question of transition points towards the need for the university to actively address its own societal and ecological implications by enabling the students to bridge the epistemic border between the classroom and society" (p. 120). Thus, we see three levels of possible action for decolonizing knowledge. Always reflect upon the position of knowledge, come to view differences as strength, and not only theorize but also act. Let us see later whether this approach could help decolonize the global arts–which can be taken as forms of knowledge production (Hall, 1981).

Tuck and Yang also call for action rather than only speaking, writing and reflecting about inequalities. When decolonization is misused as no more than a metaphor, it is in danger of serving only the settlers, colonialists (and their ancestors today) as "moves to innocence" (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 3). Instead of using decolonization as a metaphor for any fight of social justice, for these scholars it should mean above all

---

234 bell hooks is another renowned scholar who addresses similar issues (hooks, 1995).

repatriating the land from the colonizers to the colonized. In this case, those involved are the settlers to the First Nation People in the USA.

> Decolonisation in the settler colonial context must involve the repatriation of land simultaneous to the recognition of how land and relations to land have always already been differently understood and enacted; that is, all of the land, and not just symbolically. This is precisely why decolonisation is necessarily unsettling, especially across lines of solidarity. (Tuck & Yang, 2012, p. 7)

Even though I would not agree to use the term exclusively with regard to the US American context, what is important in Tuck's and Yang's approach is not only their unveiling of colonial legacies and various strategies to innocence, but for them, the fact that "decolonization is not an 'and'. It is an elsewhere" (p. 36). "Opportunities for solidarity lie in what is incommensurable rather than what is common" (p. 28). Thus, first, we need a diversity of decolonization practices. Secondly, as Lorde has described it, solidary cooperation arises in the bridges which are forged between people and communities, not in the commonalities. As I have discussed in my other chapter, Bruno Latour writes to make traceable all dynamic associations (Latour, 2010). This again relates to the transcultural approach of this volume, which oscillates between the negotiations and standardizations of differences and their transcultural practices, which in turn go beyond these (b-)ordering differences.

Several authors also present suggestions of how to decolonize the arts through implementing anti-racist (Bayer & Terkessidis, 2017), decolonial (Caceres et al., 2017) or transcultural (Bhagwati, 2018; Lutz, 2018; von Osten, 2012) practices of curating. Besides the intersectional and cross-cultural strategies I have discussed for the avoidance of exclusion, fostering of representation and participation of underrepresented people and the increased visibility of minority perspectives within the arts sector, enabling reflection on hegemonic narratives and social inequalities, these curatorial approaches focus again on different aspects of joint cooperation (Sennett, 2012; Richter, 2012), polyphony (Bempeza et al., 2019), collectives (von Bismarck, 2012), social cohesion and conviviality (Heil, 2020; Espahangizi in this volume).

These partially activist debates and practical approaches emphasize both modes of solidarity and complicity as well as notions of conflict, complication and disruption (Dobusch et al., 2020). This means that any decolonial cooperation on a day-to-day level will inevitably involve conflict and disruption in order to foster new ways of doing things. "The moment of innovation is constituted here as conflictual permeation that initiates processes of hybridisation" (Büscher-Ulbrich et al., 2013, p. 17). This is what is meant by a transcultural way of inclusion, that involves critique and conflict as a major driving force.

A postcolonially oriented research agenda such as the one I propose seeks to dismantle all these different power-laden processes, by including many views through co-operation on an equal footing. This means that the terms and concepts with which we all operate in practice as well as in academia also need to be decolonized. I would

instead suggest that we consider, research, teach and curate diversity as transcultural diversity. Lorenzo Ornaghi would probably speak of "glocal diversity", a "contamination" that exercises a genuinely "glocal power" beyond domestic and international politics (Ornaghi, 2017, p. 8). By transcultural diversity, I mean to underline that diversity cannot be fixed and defined. Instead, it is constructed and reconstructed or deconstructed every time by every curator, artist, cultural administrator or manager, student, audience, researcher, etc. Just as Ernesto Laclau and Chantal Mouffe have pled against apriorism (Laclau & Mouffe, 2012), in every situation it is possible to construct a new way of thinking and acting.

> The potential of the proposed transcultural perspective on global art that takes into account not only the global (and globalising) conditions of production but also specific localities is that it allows scholars to grasp cross-cultural connections, interactions as well as marginalised forms of knowledge and agency that are otherwise often overlooked or underestimated in their critical force. (Buurman et al., 2018, p. 18)

As the Cultural capabilities model–which is based on the capabilities approach of Martha Nussbaum and Amartya Sen–aims at fostering conditions of cultural opportunity in order to co-create versions of culture, in order to extend cultural democracy, this would mean including both top-down and bottom-up approaches as well as both global and local approaches. "It is only when 'substantive freedom' is realized in relation to culture–real, concrete freedoms to choose what culture to make, as well as what culture to appreciate–that people are genuinely empowered in their cultural lives" (Wilson et al., 2017, p. 5; Nussbaum, 2011; Sen, 2001).

By developing new approaches together with different partners, the study of culture can give valuable stimuli to discover new terms, concepts, cooperation forms, funding schemes, etc. for glocal spaces, without the claim of having either global or national effect. Nevertheless, it allows for more pluralistic voices and views to be taken into account, as J.P. Singh has suggested, and for the established thinking of a hierarchy of needs to transform into thinking about networks of possibilities (Singh, 2019).

Such transcultural insights into curating diversity and otherness also entails that we cannot answer the question of how to curate diversity and otherness, as the answer will always be bound to a radical diversity of possibilities and is never able to aim at universalism. However, we can instead learn from practice by looking at examples of how to decolonize the arts in general or the global performance arts more specifically. For this approach, we have learnt that it is important to expose unequal power structures as well as to overcome dichotomies in our own individual and collective thinking. However, this needs to go a lot farther still. In the arts, dichotomies in thinking are not only present regarding (e.g.) the border drawn between "Western" and "non-Western" art and artists. Dichotomies also target the way that things are expected to be done. For instance, in the German cultural sector, results are mainly measured through financial means, success, and evaluation. Artists and audiences

are separated and performances are organized and scheduled. However, in different contexts, not even the division between different artistic genres necessarily exists. (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018) What is needed then to overcome these and other dichotomies, is to "always stay in contact. First of all to ask the person, from which position are you speaking to me? What is my position? This negotiation has to start in the first second [of meeting each other]"[235] (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018). Thus, cooperation on eye-level, decolonial curating and practices of transcultural diversity involve questioning all presuppositions and acknowledging other knowledge systems, concepts of art, practices of cultural expressions. But this must not necessarily lead to or hinder conflict. On the contrary, it is really a process of negotiations, of "situational practices, no determined categories"[236] (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018).

Some Goethe Institutes in African countries now follow an approach of putting the power into the hands of local artists and not only collaborating with them, but letting them decide what and how to curate, and how to organize the cooperation by deciding on the use of these Goethe funds. An important factor for successful cooperation is transparency about decisions, finances, concepts, etc. Everyone involved should have the opportunity to partake in every process. But the desire to "always make everything right [leads to] forgetting to just talk with the people. ... One is permanently in discourse, but actually never really in contact"[237] (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018). So the question remains, "[W]here can we meet?"[238] (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018). This is again not to be answered generally, but needs to be negotiated every time anew. Curators understood in the etymological sense of the term as "carers" should "stop working with signs and stop representing, but should work rather with presence than with absence"[239] (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018). Only in such situational practices of relations, can curating diversity and otherness as neo-colonial be overcome and can it transform practices of representation. "It is not about the structure, it is about the

---

235 "immer in Kontakt bleiben. Erst einmal die Person fragen, von welcher Position aus sprichst du mit mir? Was ist meine Position? Die Verhandlung muss in der ersten Sekunde anfangen" (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018).

236 "situative Praktiken, keine festgelegten Kategorien" (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018).

237 "immer alles richtig machen zu wollen – und dabei zu vergessen mit den Leuten eigentlich selbst zu reden. ... man ist die ganze Zeit, permanent im Diskurs und ist eigentlich nie in Kontakt" (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018).

238 "Wo können wir uns treffen?" (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018).

239 "aufhören, mit Zeichen zu arbeiten und zu repräsentieren, sondern mit der Anwesenheit, nicht in der Abwesenheit" (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018).

relation. It is about the agency"[240] (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018). Such an approach could be "the product of communication beyond space and time, beyond territorial boundaries. It questions out-dated ideas of culture, identity and community" (Burkhalter, 2012, p. 30), and can lead to a transcultural understanding of diversity and otherness as a way of decolonizing curating in global performance art.

References

Abbing, H. (2019). The Changing Social Economy of Art: Are the Arts Becoming Less Exclusive? (1st ed. 2019). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-21668-9

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

Alfred Toepfer Stiftung (n.d.). Kairos-Preis 2011: Shermin Langhoff. Retrieved November 24, 2019, from https://www.toepfer-stiftung.de/kairos-preis-2/kairos-preis-2011/

Alisch, S., Binas-Preisendörfer, S., & Jauk, W. (Eds.). (2018). Darüber hinaus … Populäre Musik und Überschreitung(en): 2. Iaspm D-A-CH Konferenz/Graz 2016. BIS-Verlag der Carl von Ossietzky Universität.

Allerstorfer, J., & Leisch-Kiesl, M. (Eds.). (2017). Linzer Beiträge zur Kunstwissenschaft und Philosophie: Band 8. "Global Art History": Transkulturelle Verortungen von Kunst und Kunstwissenschaft. transcript.

Amīn, K. (2014). Postcolonial Modernity: Theatre in Morocco and the Interweaving Loop. In E. Fischer-Lichte, T. Jost, & S. I. Jain (Eds.), Routledge Advances in Theatre and Performance Studies: Vol. 33. The politics of interweaving performance cultures: Beyond postcolonialism (pp. 25–41). Routledge.

Amīn, K., & Laamiri, M. (2010). Performing cultural diversity: Critiquing postcolonialism (1st ed). Series: Conderences and colloquia. Université Abdelmalek Essaâdi, Faculty of Letters and Humanities, Research Group of Performance Studies.

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 (Vol. 20, pp. 27–37). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-93453-2_2

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

Archer, M. S. (2005). Structure, Culture and Agency. In M. D. Jacobs & N. Weiss Hanrahan (Eds.), The Blackwell Companion to the Sociology of Culture (pp. 17–34). Blackwell Publ.

Austin, J. L. (2014). Zur Theorie der Sprechakte: = (How to do things with words) ([Nachdr.], bibliogr. erg. Ausg). Reclams Universal-Bibliothek: Nr. 9396. Reclam.

Bachmann-Medick, D. (Ed.). (2016). The trans/national study of culture: A translational perspective. De Gruyter.

Bayer, N., & Terkessidis, M. (2017). Über das Reparieren hinaus: Eine antirassistische Praxeologie des Kuratierens. In N. Bayer, B. Kazeem-Kamiński, & N. Sternfeld (Eds.), Edition Angewandte. Kuratieren als antirassistische Praxis (pp. 53–70). De Gruyter.

---

240 "Es geht nicht um die Struktur. Es geht um die Beziehung. Um die Handlungsmacht" (Jansen, personal communication, October 17, 2018).

Becker, H. S. (2008). Art worlds. University of California Press.

Behnke, C., Kastelan, C., Knoll, V., & Wuggenig, U. (Eds.). (2015). Art in the periphery of the center. Sternberg Press.

Below, I., & Bismarck, B. von (Eds.). (2005). Schriftenreihe des Ulmer Vereins, Verband für Kunst- und Kulturwissenschaften e.V: N.F., Bd. 1. Globalisierung, Hierarchisierung: Kulturelle Dominanzen in Kunst und Kunstgeschichte. Jonas-Verl.

Bempeza, S., Brunner, C., Hausladen, K., Kleesattel, I., & Sonderegger, R. (Eds.). (2019). Polyphone Ästhetik: Eine kritische Situierung. transversal texts.

Benzer, S. (Ed.). (2016). Kultur für alle: Gespräche über Verteilungsgerechtigkeit und Demokratie in Kunst und Kultur heute ([1. Auflage]). Folio Verlag.

Beyer, T., & Burkhalter, T. (Eds.). (2012). Out of the absurdity of life: Globale Musik (1. Aufl.). Traversion.

Beyer, T., Burkhalter, T., & Liechti, H. (Eds.). (2015). Seismographic sounds: Visions of a new world (1. edition). Norient.

Bhagwati, A. (2018). Of Maps, Nodes and Trajectories: Changing Topologies in Transcultural Curating. In S. Dornhof, N. Buurman, B. Hopfener, & B. Lutz (Eds.), Image: Vol. 89. Situating Global Art: Topologies - Temporalities - Trajectories (pp. 191–211). transcript.

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

Bharucha, R. (2001). The politics of cultural practice: Thinking through theatre in an age of globalization. Oxford Univ. Press.

Bial, H. (Ed.). (2004). The performance studies reader. Routledge. http://catdir.loc.gov/catdir/enhancements/fy0650/2003005708-d.html

Binas-Preisendörfer, S. (2008). Musik – eine Weltsprache? Befunde und Vorschläge zur Dekonstruktion eines Mythos. In E. Schwind & O. Senn (Eds.), Musik - Wahrnehmung - Sprache: Eine Publikation der Musikhochschule Luzern (pp. 163–173). Chronos. https://uol.de/fileadmin/user_upload/musik-medien/Medien/Susanne-Binas-Preisendoerfer_Musik-eine-Weltsprache_2008.pdf

Bishop, S. (2018, May 23). With calls for more diversity in music festivals, is Forecastle doing enough? Leo Weekly Online. https://www.leoweekly.com/2018/05/forecastle-enough

Bismarck, B. v. (2012). The Exhibition as Collective. In B. v. Bismarck, J. Schafaff, & T. Weski (Eds.), Cultures of the curatorial: [... Based on the Conference "Cultures of the Curatorial" at the Hochschule für Grafik und Buchkunst - Academy of Visual Arts Leipzig, January 22 - 24, 2010] (pp. 289–302). Sternberg Pr.

Bourdieu, P. (1978). Entwurf einer Theorie der Praxis auf der ethnologischen Grundlage der kabylischen Gesellschaft (1. Aufl.). Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, P. (1993). The field of cultural production: Essays on art and literature. European perspectives. Columbia University Press.

Brockington, G. (2009). Introduction: Internationalism and the Arts. In G. Brockington (Ed.), Cultural interactions: vol. 4. Internationalism and the arts in Britain and Europe at the fin de siècle (pp. 1–24). P. Lang.

Buchholz, L., & Wuggenig, U. (2005). Cultural Globalization Between Myth and Reality: The Case of the Contemporary Visual Arts. ART-E-FACT Strategies of Resistance (4). http://artefact.mi2.hr/_a04/lang_en/theory_buchholz_en.htm

Buchholz, L., & Wuggenig, U. (2012). Kunst und Globalisierung. In H. Munder & U. Wuggenig (Eds.), Das Kunstfeld: Eine Studie über Akteure und Institutionen der zeitgenössischen Kunst am Beispiel von Zürich, Wien, Hamburg und Paris (pp. 163–188). JRP/Ringier.

Buden, B. (2012). Towards the Heterosphere: Curator as Translator. In M. Lind (Ed.), Performing the curatorial: Within and beyond art (pp. 23–46). Sternberg Press.

Burkhalter, T. (2012). Weltmusik 2.0: Musikalische Positionen zwischen Spass- und Protestkultur. In T. Beyer & T. Burkhalter (Eds.), Out of the absurdity of life: Globale Musik (1st ed., pp. 28–47). Traversion. https://norient-beta.com/academic/weltmusik2-0/

Büscher-Ulrich, D., Kadenbach, S., & Kindermann, M. (2013). Einleitung: »The More Things Change«. In D. Büscher-Ulrich, S. Kadenbach, & M. Kindermann (Eds.), Kultur- und Medientheorie. Innovation - Konvention: Transdisziplinäre Beiträge zu einem kulturellen Spannungsfeld (pp. 7–20). transcript.

Buţ, G. (2017, August 31). Internationalisation as the (Invisible) Curated Object. European Sociological Association. 13th Conference of the European Sociological Association. (Un) Making Europe: Capitalism, Solidarities, Subjectivities, Athens.

Butler, J. (2013). Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative. Taylor and Francis.

Buurman, N., Dornhof, S., Hopfener, B., & Lutz, B. (2018). Situating Global Art: An Introduction. In S. Dornhof, N. Buurman, B. Hopfener, & B. Lutz (Eds.), Image: Vol. 89. Situating Global Art: Topologies - Temporalities - Trajectories (pp. 11–32). transcript.

Caceres, I., Mesquita, S., & Utikal, S. (2017). Anti*Colonial Fantasies/ Decolonial Strategies: A Conversation. In N. Bayer, B. Kazeem-Kamiński, & N. Sternfeld (Eds.), Edition Angewandte. Kuratieren als antirassistische Praxis (pp. 201–211). De Gruyter.

Cañas, T. (2017). Diversity is a white word: The superficial scramble for cultural diversity is not addressing the deep causes of exclusion and the power imbalance in the arts. https://www.artshub.com.au/education/news-article/opinions-and-analysis/professional-development/tania-canas/diversity-is-a-white-word-252910

Cassin, B., & Apter, E. S. (Eds.). (2014). Translation / transnation. Dictionary of untranslatables: A philosophical lexicon (S. Rendall, Trans.). Princeton University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt5hhntn https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt5hhntn

Charle, C., Lüsebrink, H. J., & Mix, Y. G. (Eds.). (2017). Deutschland und Frankreich im wissen-schaftlichen Dialog / Le dialogue scientifique franco-allemand: Volume 6. Transkulturalität nationaler Räume in Europa (18. bis 19. Jahrhundert): Übersetzungen, Kulturtransfer und Vermittlungsinstanzen = La transculturalité des espaces nationaux en Europe (XVIIIe-XIXe siècles); traductions, transferts culturels et instances de médiations (1. Auflage). V&R Unipress. https://www.vr-elibrary.de/isbn/9783847104797 https://doi.org/10.14220/9783737004794

Cuyler, A. (2019). The Role of Foundations in Achieving Creative Justice. GIA Reader, 30 (1), Article 6. https://www.giarts.org/role-foundations-achieving-creative-justice

Dätsch, C. (Ed.). (2018). Edition Kulturwissenschaft: Band 103. Kulturelle Übersetzer: Kunst und Kulturmanagement im transkulturellen Kontext. https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839434994

Davida, D. (Ed.). (2011). Fields in motion: Ethnography in the worlds of dance. Wilfrid Laurier University Press. http://lib.myilibrary.com/detail.asp?id=380988

Davida, D., Pronovost, M., Hudon, V., & Gabriels, J. (Eds.). (2019). Curating Live Arts: Global Perspectives on Theory and Practice. Berghahn Books Incorporated.

Di Blasi, J. (2019). Das Humboldt Lab: Museumsexperimente zwischen postkolonialer Revision und szenografischer Wende. transcript. https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839449202

Do Mar Castro Varela, María, & Haghighat, L. (Eds.). (2020). Double Bind postkolonial: Kritische Perspektiven auf Kunst und Kulturelle Bildung. Transcipt Verlag.

Dobusch, L., Kreissl, K., & Wacker, E. (Eds.). (2020). Diversitätsforschung: Von der Rekonstruktion zur Disruption [Special issue]. ZDfm – Zeitschrift für Diversitätsforschung und -Management, 5(1). Leverkusen-Opladen. Barbara Budrich.

Dorn, C. (2004). The Deterritorialization of Art. The Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 34(2), 141–150. https://doi.org/10.3200/JAML.34.2.141-150

Dornhof, S., Buurman, N., Hopfener, B., & Lutz, B. (Eds.). (2018). Image: v.89. Situating Global Art: Topologies - Temporalities - Trajectories (1st ed.). transcript.

Douglas, G., Sichel, A., Liadi, A. M., Noël, K., Danster, R., Cuvilas, A., & Linyekula, F. (2006). Under Fire: Defining a contemporary African dance aesthetic - can it be done? Critical Arts, 20(2), 102–115. https://doi.org/10.1080/02560040608540458

Dovey, L. (2015). Curating Africa in the Age of Film Festivals. Framing Film Festivals. Palgrave Macmillan.

Durrant, S. (Ed.). (2007). Thamyris, intersecting: Vol. 17. Essays in migratory aesthetics: Cultural practices between migration and art-making. Rodopi.

Durrer, V., & Henze, R. (Eds.). (2020). Managing Culture: Reflecting on Exchange in Global Times. Sociology of the Arts. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-24646-4

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.

Enwezor, O. (2002). Demokratie als unvollendeter Prozess: Documenta 11, Plattform 1; [dieser Band enthält alle Beiträge der Documenta 11 - Plattform 1 "Demokratie als Unvollendeter Prozess", einer Reihe von Konferenzen und Vorträgen in Wien, Akademie der Bildenden Künste, 15. März - 20. April 2001, und in Berlin, Haus der Kulturen der Welt, 9. - 30. Oktober 2001.] Hatje Cantz.

Eremjan, I. (2016). Transkulturelle Kunstvermittlung: Zum Bildungsgehalt ästhetisch-künstlerischer Praxen. Pädagogik. transcript.

Ette, O. (2017). WeltFraktale: Wege durch die Literaturen der Welt. J.B. Metzler.

Fischer-Lichte, E. (2004). Ästhetik des Performativen (Orig.-Ausg., 1. Aufl.). Edition suhrkamp: Vol. 2373. Suhrkamp.

Fischer-Lichte, E. (2014). Introduction: Interweaving performance cultures; rethinking "intercultural theatre"; toward an experience and theory of performance beyond postcolonialism. In E. Fischer-Lichte, T. Jost, & S. I. Jain (Eds.), Routledge Advances in Theatre and Performance Studies: Vol. 33. The politics of interweaving performance cultures: Beyond postcolonialism (pp. 1–21). Routledge.

Fischer-Lichte, E., & Roselt, J. (2001). Attraktion des Augenblicks: Aufführung, Performance, performativ und Performativität als theaterwissenschaftliche Begriffe. Theorien des Performativen, 237–253.

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.

Foroutan, N. (2012). Neue Deutsche, Postmigranten und Bindungs-Identitäten: Wer gehört zum neuen Deutschland? In J. Manemann & W. Schreer (Eds.), Quellen und Studien zur Geschichte und Kunst im Bistum Hildesheim: Vol. 6. Religion und Migration heute: Perspektiven - Positionen - Projekte; [Norbert Trelle, Bischof von Hildesheim, zum 70. Geburtstag] (1st ed., pp. 111–121). Schnell + Steiner.

Foroutan, N. (2016). Postmigrantische Gesellschaften. In H. U. Brinkmann & M. Sauer (Eds.), Einwanderungsgesellschaft Deutschland: Entwicklung und Stand der Integration (pp. 227–254). Springer VS.

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

Gaupp, L. (2018). Symbolische Räume kultureller Diversität: Verhandlungen, Grenzen und Überschreitungen in den performativen Künsten. In M. Nies (Ed.), Schriften zur Kultur- und Mediensemiotik Online: Vol. 4. Raumsemiotik: Räume – Grenzen – Identitäten (pp. 241–259). Virtuelles Zentrum für kultursemiotische Forschung.

Gaupp, L. (2020). The 'West' versus 'the Rest'? Festival Curators as Gatekeepers for Sociocultural Diversity. In V. Durrer & R. Henze (Eds.), Managing Culture: Reflecting on Exchange in Global Times. Sociology of the Arts. Palgrave Macmillan.

Gaupp, L., Abramjan, A., Akinay, F. M., Hilgert, K., Mulder, A. C., Schmidt, R., Schnitzler, V., Thurich, O., Tiemon, L., & Wurl, S. (2020). Curatorial practices of the "Global": Toward a Decolonial Turn in the Museum in Berlin and Hamburg? Journal of Cultural Management and Cultural Policy, Special Issue: Museum – Politics – Management. 2020(2), 107–138.

Gaupp, L., Barber-Kersovan, A., & Kirchberg, V. (Eds.). (2021). Arts and Power: Policies in and by the Arts. Serie Kunst und Gesellschaft. Springer VS.

Goodman, L., & DeGay, J. (Eds.). (2000). Performance Studies. The Routledge reader in politics and performance.

Guilbault, J. (1997). Interpreting World Music: A Challenge in Theory and Practice. Popular Music, 16(1), 31–44.

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 Taylor & Francis Group.

Haakh, N. (2015). Muslimisierte Körper auf der Bühne: Die Islamdebatte im postmigrantischen Theater. transcript.

Haberkorn, S. (2010). Neues Publikum für Kunst und Kultur gewinnen? Eine empirische Untersuchung zum Audience Development am Beispiel des Festivals der Kulturen MELEZ. VDM Verlag Dr. Müller.

Hall, S. (1981). The Whites of their Eyes: Racist Ideologies and the Media. In G. Bridges & R. Brunt (Eds.), Contributions to the Communist University of London. Silver Linings: Some strategies for the eighties (pp. 28–52). Lawrence & Wishart.

Hall, S. (1994). The West and the Rest: Discourse and Power. In S. Hall & B. Gieben (Eds.), The Formations of Modernity: (Introduction to Sociology) (pp. 275–331). Polity Press.

Hauthal, J., & Toivanen, A. L. (Eds.). (2021). European Peripheries in the Postcolonial Literary Imagination [Special issue]. Journal of Postcolonial Writing, 57. Routledge Taylor & Francis Group.

Heeg, G. (2017). Das transkulturelle Theater. Recherchen: Vol. 130. Theater der Zeit.

Heeg, G., & Hillmann, L. (Eds.). (2017). Recherchen: Vol. 134. Willkommen anderswo – sich spielend begegnen. Theater der Zeit.

Heil, T. (2020). Comparing Conviviality: Living with Difference in Casamance and Catalonia. Palgrave Macmillan.

Henze, R. (2017). Why we have to overcome paternalism in times of populism. In M. Dragićević Šešić, L. Rogač Mijatović, & N. Mihaljinac (Eds.), Cultural diplomacy: Arts, festivals and geopolitics (pp. 73–89). Culture Desk Serbia Creative Europe Desk Serbia; Faculty of Dramatic Arts in Belgrade Institute for Theatre Film Radio and Television.

Hitzke, D. (2019). Nach der Einsprachigkeit: Slavisch-deutsche Texte transkulturell. Postcolonial Perspectives on Eastern Europe: Vol. 6. Peter Lang GmbH, Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften.

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

Horst, M. t., & Schwartz, G. (Eds.). (2012). Changing perspectives: Dealing with globalisation in the presentation and collection of contemporary art. KIT.

Horz, C. (2014). Medien - Migration - Partizipation: Eine Studie am Beispiel iranischer Fernsehproduktion im Offenen Kanal. transcript.

Icaza, R., & Vázquez, R. (2018). Diversity or Decolonisation? Researching Diversity at the University of Amsterdam. In G. K. Bhambra, D. Gebrial, & K. Nişancıoğlu (Eds.), Decolonising the university (pp. 108–128). Pluto Press.

Jungwirth, I. (2019). Introduction: Gender and Diversity Studies: European Perspectives. In I. Jungwirth & C. Bauschke-Urban (Eds.), Gender and Diversity Studies: European Perspectives (pp. 9–30). Verlag Barbara Budrich.

Kagan, S. (2011). Art and Sustainability: Connecting Patterns for a Culture of Complexity. transcript. http://www.transcript-verlag.de/ts1803/ts1803.php

Kampnagel (2019). Migrantpolitan: X-Mas Party. Retrieved December 18, 2019, from https://www.kampnagel.de/en/program/migrantpolitan-x-mas-party

Karentzos, A. (2012). Postkoloniale Kunstgeschichte. Revisionen von Musealisierungen, Kanonisierungen, Repräsentationen. In J. Reuter & A. Karentzos (Eds.), Schlüsselwerke der Postcolonial Studies (Vol. 2010, pp. 249–266). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-93453-2_19

Kaup-Hasler, V. (2012). In NXTSTP (Ed.), NXT.STP: Documentation 2007-2012. http://www.nxtstp.eu/files/NXTSTP_5_years.pdf

Keuchel, S., & Kelb, V. (Eds.). (2015). Perspektivwechsel Kulturelle Bildung: v.1. Diversität in der Kulturellen Bildung. transcript.

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.

Kim, J. A., & Riva, N. (Eds.). (2014). Entgrenzte Welt? Musik und Kulturtransfer (1. Aufl.). Ries & Erler.

Klein, G. (2013). Übersetzen und Rahmen: Aufführungen in globalisierten Pop(ulär)kulturen. In D. Helms & T. Phleps (Eds.), Ware Inszenierungen: Performance, Vermarktung und Authentizität in der populären Musik (pp. 211–222). transcript.

Köhl, C. (2001). Strategien der interkulturellen Kulturarbeit. IKO - Verl. für Interkulturelle Kommunikation.

Kolsteeg, J. (2019). Inclusiviteit is de praktijk: Grand Theatre Groningen. Boekman Extra - Trends in Kunst En Cultuur (19), 1–10. https://www.boekman.nl/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/BmXtra_19_DEF-1.pdf

Kraus, M., & Noack, K. (Eds.). (2015). Edition Museum: v.16. Quo vadis, Völkerkundemuseum? Aktuelle Debatten zu ethnologischen Sammlungen in Museen und Universitäten. transcript.

Krüger, S. (2013). Undoing anthenticity as a discursive construct: A critical pedagogy of ethnomusicology and "world music". In B. Alge & O. Krämer (Eds.), Berliner Schriften: Band 116. Beyond borders: Welt – Musik – Pädagogik: Musikpädagogik und Ethnomusikologie im Diskurs (pp. 93–113). Wißner.

Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2012). Hegemonie und radikale Demokratie: Zur Dekonstruktion des Marxismus (Dt. Erstausg., 4., durchges. Aufl.). Passagen Philosophie. Passagen Verlag.

Latour, B. (2010). Eine neue Soziologie für eine neue Gesellschaft: Einführung in die Akteur-Netzwerk-Theorie (1. Aufl.). Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft: Vol. 1967. Suhrkamp.

Leeb, S. (2015). Entangled: But How? In C. Behnke, C. Kastelan, V. Knoll, & U. Wuggenig (Eds.), Art in the periphery of the center (pp. 210–219). Sternberg Press.

Lena, J. C. (2019). Entitled: Discriminating tastes and the expansion of the arts. Princeton University Press.

Lettau, M., & Knoblich, C. (2017). Foreign cultural policy in processes of transformation: Perceptions of German-Tunisian cultural exchange. ENCATC Journal of Cultural Management and Policy, 7(1). https://www.encatc.org/media/3725-7_encact-vol-7_meike-lettau-caroline-knoblich.pdf

Lind, M. (2012). Performing the Curatorial: An Introduction. In M. Lind (Ed.), Performing the curatorial: Within and beyond art (pp. 9–22). Sternberg Press.

Lorde, A. (1984). Sister outsider: Essays and speeches. The Crossing press feminist series. Crossing Press. https://collectiveliberation.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Lorde_The_Masters_Tools.pdf

Lutz-Sterzenbach, B., Schnurr, A., & Wagner, E. (Eds.). (2013). Pädagogik. Bildwelten remixed: Transkultur, Globalität, Diversity in kunstpädagogischen Feldern. transcript.

Lutz, B. (2018). Curating as Transcultural Practice: Documenta 12 and the "Migration of Form". In S. Dornhof, N. Buurman, B. Hopfener, & B. Lutz (Eds.), Image: Vol. 89. Situating Global Art: Topologies - Temporalities - Trajectories (pp. 213–230). transcript.

Macdonald, S. (Ed.). (1996). Theorizing museums: Representing identity and diversity in a changing world. Blackwell.

Mandel, B. (2014). Interkulturelles Audience Development: Zukunftsstrategien für öffentlich geförderte Kultureinrichtungen. Schriften zum Kultur- und Museumsmanagement. transcript.

Maxim Gorki Theatre Berlin (n.d.). Shermin Langhoff. Retrieved November 24, 2019, from https://www.gorki.de/de/ensemble/shermin-langhoff

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

Moore, M. (2017, January 22). Conway: Trump spokesman gave 'alternative facts'. New York Post. https://nypost.com/2017/01/22/conway-trump-spokesman-gave-alternative-facts-on-inauguration-crowd/

Mosquera, G. (1994). Some Problems in Transcultural Curating. In J. Fisher (Ed.), Global visions: Towards a new internationalism in the visual arts (1st ed., pp. 133–139). Kala Press in association with the Institute of International Visual Arts.

NORIENT (Ed.). (2020). Norient Space: The Now In Sound. https://www.startnext.com/en/norient

Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). Creating capabilities: The human development approach. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press. https://doi.org/10.4159/harvard.9780674061200

Ornaghi, L. (2017). Does Glocal Political Power Already Exist? Glocalism. Journal of Culture, Politics and Innovation (1), 1–11. https://glocalismjournal.org/does-glocal-political-power-already-exist/

Osborne, P. (2013). Global modernity and the contemporary: Two categories of the philosophy of historical time. In C. Lorenz & B. Bevernage (Eds.), Schriftenreihe der FRIAS School of History: Band 007. Breaking up Time: Negotiating the Borders between Present, Past and Future (1st ed., pp. 69–84). Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Osten, M. von. (2012). Displaying the Absent: Exhibiting Transcultural Modernism. In B. v. Bismarck, J. Schafaff, & T. Weski (Eds.), Cultures of the curatorial: [… Based on the Conference "Cultures of the Curatorial" at the Hochschule für Grafik und Buchkunst - Academy of Visual Arts Leipzig, January 22 - 24, 2010] (pp. 189–212). Sternberg Pr.

Peres da Silva, G. (2017). Weltmusik: Ein politisch umstrittener Begriff. In C. Leggewie & E. Meyer (Eds.), Global Pop: Das Buch zur Weltmusik (1st ed., pp. 9–16). J.B. Metzler Verlag.

Peres da Silva, G., & Hondros, K. (Eds.). (2019). Music and sound culture: volume 35. Music practices across borders: (e)valuating space, diversity and exchange (1. Auflage). transcript.

Pilić, I., & Wiederhold, A. (2015). Kunstpraxis in der Migrationsgesellschaft: Transkulturelle Handlungsstrategien am Beispiel der Brunnenpassage Wien = Art practices in the migration society; transcultural strategies in action at Brunnenpassage in Vienna. Vol. 48. transcript; Brunnenpassage.

Pitchfork (n.d.). Are Music Festival Lineups Getting Worse? Retrieved June 18, 2018, from https://pitchfork.com/features/festival-report/10059-are-music-festival-lineups-getting-worse/

Rajewsky, I. O. (2002). Intermedialität. UTB für Wissenschaft Medien- und Kommunikationswissenschaft: Vol. 2261. Francke.

Reckwitz, A. (2005). Kulturelle Differenzen aus praxeologischer Perspektive: Kulturelle Globalisierung jenseits von Modernisierungstheorie und Kulturessentialismus. In I. Srubar (Ed.), Kulturen vergleichen: Sozial- und kulturwissenschaftliche Grundlagen und Kontroversen (1st ed., pp. 92–111). VS Verl. für Sozialwiss.

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.

Richter, D. (2012). Artists and Curators as Authors: Competitors, Collaborators, or Teamworkers? In B. v. Bismarck, J. Schafaff, & T. Weski (Eds.), Cultures of the curatorial: [… Based on the

Conference "Cultures of the Curatorial" at the Hochschule für Grafik und Buchkunst - Academy of Visual Arts Leipzig, January 22 - 24, 2010] (pp. 229–248). Sternberg Pr.

Rosendahl Thomsen, M. (2008). Mapping World Literature: International Canonization and Transnational Literatures. Continuum Literary Studies. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Rother, L. (2017). Kunst durch Kredit: Die Berliner Museen und ihre Erwerbungen von der Dresdner Bank 1935. De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110496093

Rugg, J., & Sedgwick, M. (Eds.). (2012). Issues in curating contemporary art and performance. Intellect.

Sardinha, J., & Campos, R. (Eds.). (2016). Transglobal sounds: Music, youth and migration. Bloomsbury Academic.

SAVVY Contemporary (Ed.). SAVVY Contemporary. The Laboratory of Form-Ideas: A CONCEPT reloaded. https://savvy-contemporary.com/site/assets/files/2811/savvy_concept_2017.pdf

Schatzki, T. R. (1996). Social practices: A Wittgensteinian approach to human activity and the social. Cambridge Univ. Press.

Schneider, W., & Gad, D. (Eds.). (2014). Studien zur Kulturpolitik. Cultural Policy: Vol. 16. Good Governance for Cultural Policy: An African-European Research about Arts and Development (1st, New ed.). Peter Lang GmbH Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften. https://doi.org/10.3726/978-3-653-03932-0

Seliger, I. (2011). The aesthetics of transcultural desire: Borderline interventions in Miao Xiaochun's The last judgment in cyberspace and The last judgment in cyberspace - where will I go? In H. Belting, J. Birken, A. Buddensieg, & P. Weibel (Eds.), Global studies: Mapping contemporary art and culture (pp. 174–193). Hatje Cantz.

Sen, A. (2001). Development as freedom. Oxford University Press paperback. Univ. Press.

Sennett, R. (2003). Respect in a world of inequality (1. ed.). W. W. Norton.

Sennett, R. (2012). Together: The rituals, pleasures, and politics of cooperation. Yale University Press. http://lib.myilibrary.com/detail.asp?ID=340905

Sharifi, A. (2011). Theater für Alle? Partizipation von Postmigranten am Beispiel der Bühnen der Stadt Köln. Zugl.: Hildesheim, Univ., Diss., 2011. Studien zur Kulturpolitik: Vol. 13. Peter Lang GmbH Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften.

Shevtsova, M. (2009). Sociology of theatre and performance. Sociology, communication and performing media. QuiEdit.

Sievers, N., Dengel, S., Blumenreich, U., & Hippe, W. (Eds.). (2018). Jahrbuch für Kulturpolitik: Vol. 16. Jahrbuch für Kulturpolitik 2017/18: Welt. Kultur. Politik. - Kulturpolitik in Zeiten der Global-isierung. transcript. https://doi.org/10.14361/9783839442524

Singh, J. P. (2019). Culture and International Development: Towards an Interdisciplinary Methodology [A study commissioned by the British Council]. https://www.britishcouncil.org/sites/default/files/final_manuscript_cultureintldev.pdf

Small, C. (2010). Musicking: The meanings of performing and listening. Music/culture. Wesleyan Univ. Press.

Smith, T., Enwezor, O., & Condee, N. (Eds.). (2009). Antinomies of art and culture: Modernity, postmodernity, contemporaneity. Duke University Press.

Stiftung Humboldt Forum im Berliner Schloss (n.d.). The Humboldt Forum im Berliner Schloss. Retrieved February 27, 2020, from https://www.humboldtforum.org/en/pages/hf-en

Stroh, W. M. (2005). Musik der einen Welt. In W. Jank (Ed.), Musik-Didaktik: Praxishandbuch für die Sekundarstufe I und II (1st ed., pp. 185–193). Cornelsen Scriptor.

Tuck, E., & Yang, K. W. (2012). Decolonization is not a Metaphor. Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society, 1(1), 1–40. https://clas.osu.edu/sites/clas.osu.edu/files/Tuck%20and%20Yang%202012%20Decolonization%20is%20not%20a%20metaphor.pdf

UNESCO. (2013). Basic Texts of the 2005 Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions. http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0022/002253/225383E.pdf

Van Wel, F., Couwenbergh-Soeterboek, N., Couwenbergh, C., ter Bogt, T., & Raaijmakers, Q. (2006). Ethnicity, youth cultural participation, and cultural reproduction in the Netherlands. Poetics, 34(1), 65–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2005.06.001

Wilson, N., Gross, J., & Bull, A. (2017). Towards Cultural Democracy: Promoting Cultural Capabilities for Everyone. https://www.kcl.ac.uk/cultural/resources/reports/towards-cultural-democracy-2017-kcl.pdf

Zembylas, T., & Niederauer, M. (2017). Composing Processes and Artistic Agency: Tacit Knowledge in Composing (1st ed.). Routledge Advances in Sociology. Taylor and Francis.

Zolberg, V. L. (1997). African Legacies, American Realities: Art and Artists on the Edge. In V. L. Zolberg & J. M. Cherbo (Eds.), Cambridge cultural social studies. Outsider art: Contesting boundaries in contemporary culture (pp. 53–70). Cambridge Univ. Press.

Zolberg, V. L., & Cherbo, J. M. (Eds.). (1997). Cambridge cultural social studies. Outsider art: Contesting boundaries in contemporary culture. Cambridge Univ. Press.

Lisa Gaupp

14 Decolonizing Otherness Through a Transcultural Lens: Conclusion

14.1 Norms of Otherness: Differences

The standardizations, practices and negotiations of diversity that have been discussed across different settings and disciplinary contexts throughout this book were mainly based on the common assumption that they go hand in hand with the doing and undoing of otherness in highly contingent and constructivist processes. While the introduction placed the different chapters of this book within the field of diversity and transcultural studies by discussing how diversity can be re-thought transculturally, this concluding chapter will close the topical bracket by specifically focusing on the study of otherness from a transcultural perspective. In other words, diversity is connected to otherness in so far as it can be understood as the multiplication of differences, which might at the same time be connected to a blurring of differences. Conversely, the common goal of such constructions and deconstructions of differences is to emphasize belonging and inclusivity to a group, network or similar associational constructs. In turn, otherness can equally encompass the destabilization of differences, but also place emphasis on such border-makings while enforcing exclusionary practices. On the whole, all these different concepts of diversity and otherness lay at the very core of cultural analysis, no matter how the differences are conceptualized, from which perspective this is conducted, or whether differences are thought to serve either normalizing or deconstructing processes. This perspective on differences can thus be called a difference-theoretical approach in the study of diversity and otherness, that runs throughout the entire book.

In sum, all chapters approach *culture* in a constructivist way while focussing on "not-so-clear" constructions by taking a deconstructivist stance. So, while keeping the different foci of the articles in mind, it is important to note that the topics of diversity are always connected to the processes of (de-)construction of otherness. Nevertheless, some contributions have placed greater emphasis on the standardization of diversity (Gaupp on Epistemologies, Pelillo-Hestermeyer on Linguistic Diversity, Espahangizi, Pelillo-Hestermeyer and Cismondi, Reichardt) whereas others have focussed more on processes of Othering (Hirschauer, Höhne, Ciaudo, Oettl, Marten-Finnis, Niccolai).

Looking at the basis of "differences" in the cultural analysis of diversity and otherness, what does "difference" mean in the first place? The etymological source of the term stems from the Latin *differentia*, which can both be translated into English as *diversity* or *difference* and *distinction* (Latin Dictionary, n.d.), which again stands as a

synonym for *otherness* (Dictionary, n.d.). Hence, difference is about being different, being distinct, being non-identical. Philosophically speaking, difference can involve questions of identity. For instance, in the branch of the philosophy of language that focusses on semiotics, differences are conceptualized as necessary in order to be able to communicate at all. If one is not able to discriminate between any two issues, things, practices, etc., one would not be able to attach meaning to them and thus understand or act. Difference is thus needed for our perceptions and actions (Frege, 1990; Wittgenstein, 1977; Herder, 1772/1975; Cassirer, 1997).

In the social sciences[249] as well as in the humanities[250], the concept of differences can be traced back to the institutional foundation of these same disciplines at the end of the nineteenth century in Central Europe, as well as to other intellectual perspectives which have been developed long before this around the world, such as the thinking of Ibn Chaldūn (1332–1406) or the Vedas that were created in ancient India from 1700 B.C. The discipline of (cultural) sociology as it is nowadays institutionalized at universities and other organizations of higher education is mainly based on a founding legend that leaves out these earlier developments and, being almost exclusively Eurocentric, is traced back to the "founding fathers" of sociology, such as Émile Durkheim, Max Weber and Georg Simmel. Here, the term difference is put at the forefront, but mostly in this processual use as differentiation. Sociological differentiation theory describes mainly social change processes on different levels, which can

---

249 Cultural social sciences encompass all (interdisciplinary) approaches in the study of culture that focus on how cultural constructions are practiced, and how they have an effect (or rather how they are made effective) in society. In other words, these approaches inquire into the nature, forms, causes, processes, purposes and effects of social life, i.e. any type and degree of human relations. In today's vast disciplinary system of academic life, these approaches bear the names of, among others, cultural sociology, sociology of culture, social anthropology, ethnomusicology, cultural politics, political studies of culture, cultural history, cultural economics, communication and media studies, as well as even more interdisciplinary fields such as area studies or gender and postcolonial studies. In this volume, especially (but not exclusively) the chapters by myself (Epistemologies and How to Curate), Hirschauer, Espahangizi, Höhne and Pelillo-Hestermeyer and Cismondi can be assigned to this line of thought in the study of culture, even though the overarching theme of the book intends to make the connections between more humanities-based approaches and more social science-oriented approaches fruitful, rather than emphasizing those "old disciplinary divides".

250 Humanities-based studies of culture focus especially on how culture is transformed. Culture is thereby understood as the construction of meaning. Academic disciplines that traditionally belong to this critical perspective are e.g. linguistics and languages, literature, philosophy, visual and performing arts, cultural anthropology, and more recent fields within the scope of digital humanities. Given the disciplinary localization of the respective authors, especially the chapters by Ciaudo, Marten-Finnis, Oettl, Pellilo-Hestermeyer, Reichardt and Niccolai can be positioned in this line of thought. As I will further discuss in the last section of this conclusion however, we deeply believe in the need to overcome such disciplinary divides–which we regard as a mere matter of university policy–as most chapters in this book can be assigned both to the humanities-based as well as to the social sciences-approach. It is exactly this inter- and transdisciplinary diversity that the study of culture stands for.

be looked at by focusing on differentiations of, for example, social positions, professions, institutions etc. and the life-style changes involved. For instance, Simmel wrote at the end of the 19th century in "Über sociale Differenzierung" (1890/2016) about how every single person achieves greater individuality through the increase of social differentiations, as the individual is positioned at the crossing of a higher number of social circles through his or her development.[251] This point of view on social circles led, among others, to the development of current social network analysis (White, 2012). Durkheim also wrote, only three years after Simmel, in "Über soziale Arbeitsteilung" (1893/1996), about how the social differentiation of society goes hand in hand with economic specialization and corresponding differentiations of specialist knowledge.[252] Another prominent social theory which is based on differentiations or differences is Niklas Luhmann's system theory (Luhmann, 2018).[253]

More recent approaches in cultural social sciences often acknowledge processes of differentiations in human life too (such as "sociological difference", which describes the difference between theory and its object; Haker, 2020), as well as asking how these differentiations are constructed in the first place, how they are destabilized (see below for the section on deconstructions) and how they lead to unequal conditions (see below for the section on decolonizations, and compare e.g. Albrecht, 2020).

As we can see, processes of differentiation represent an interest for both humanities-based and social theory-based cultural analysis as well as in their interdisciplinary combinations. The differences that are thereby conceptualized are taken as constitutive and necessary for human life. In addition, it is not the fact of differences themselves that are problematized but rather the processes of normalizing certain differences and preferring them over others. This happens, for example, when the doing of otherness is given more attention than the undoing of otherness, which

---

251 A social circle means a random association of relations. A single person can be a member of different social groups and through this develops his*her personality. A society, for Simmel, then describes the social process of the crossing of social circles, i.e. individuals embedded in interactions and group relations. The number of social circles, in which an individual is embedded, also serves as an indicator for culture which is thought of as a system of coordinates. As stated, the more points of intersections exist, the higher one's individuality and personality is. Personality or subjectivity therefore describes the combination of elements of culture which becomes more specific, the more social circles lay next to each other. Individualization, for Simmel, is when an individual also occupies different relative positions within the social circles while based at a higher number of circles in the first place (Simmel, 1890/2016).

252 The division of labour thereby fulfils the function to bind people together by crystallizing social aggregates (socio-economic concentration-*Verdichtung)*. This is why Durkheim's theory is also called functionalist differentiation theory (Durkheim, 1893/1996).

253 For Luhmann, difference is mainly conceptualized according to a constructivist perspective, which describes that something only becomes distinct or distinguishable when a difference is introduced in opposition to a sameness, an identity, for example when a system is differentiated from its environment (*Umwelt*) (Luhmann, 2018).

leads to homogenized conceptualizations of social groups and unequal living conditions. Hence, if the doing and undoing of diversity is always bound to the doing and undoing of otherness, it is not the *if* but the *how* this is done that is at stake.

The processual perspective is also adopted in this volume. We do not intend to define what diversity and otherness *are*, but rather to show different examples of how they are practised in a wide variety of situations and contexts, how they are done and undone. Diversity and otherness are not given facts but are normalized, practised and negotiated, which also implies following both a constructivist approach to culture and a situational perspective on different practices in different contexts. So, we shed light on all those different cultural processes of differentiations by examining a variety of normalizations, practices and negotiations of diversity and otherness.

In other words, the cultural study of diversity and otherness in this book looks at how, in different settings, times, and relations, the tension between constructing and stabilizing differences and the deconstruction as well as destabilization of differences is worked out. On the one hand, this entails a praxeological, processual focus which acknowledges the dynamics of any cultural forms (narratives, practices, negotiations, materializations, etc.). On the other hand, it is recognized that the construction of differences can both lead to standardization and even canonization of what diversity is supposed to be or how diversity should be practised, since the same norms and standardized practices can be challenged and undermined by deconstructivist and decolonizing practices, policies and agendas. The tension between these two "sides of the coin" does not necessarily have to be acted out between a somehow more powerful elite (who sets the norms) and a less powerful subaltern group (who has to bow to these rules or try to challenge them from a grassroot level), but both the construction (the doing) and deconstruction (the undoing; see Hirschauer in this volume) of differences can take place in practices at any micro-, meso- or macro-level of society. Moreover, as research in both Kulturwissenschaften and Cultural Studies has pointed out, power asymmetries and hegemony reveal themselves in society in much more subtle ways than the mere juxtaposition of single, clearly identifiable social groups. For example, the chapters by Pelillo-Hestermeyer (Linguistic Diversity), Höhne, Pelillo-Hestermeyer and Cismondi, Marten-Finnis, Espahangizi and myself (Epistemologies; How to Curate) all describe how various institutional players normalize the application of diversity policies as well as narratives and practices of diversity and otherness. Last but not least, Oettl, Ciaudo, Niccolai and Reichardt, while also referring to macro- and meso-levels, place an emphasis on individual settings in which diversity and otherness are performed. Again, these foci are interrelated and are treated in different specifications in all chapters of this book.

In places where these processes involve asymmetries in power and/or lead to a prioritization of certain identity traits over others, we sought to shed light not only on how such representations, homogenizations and canonizations take place, but also if and how they can eventually be better addressed if not overcome. I will come back to the transcultural approach of this book later by summarizing how the doing

and undoing of otherness necessarily involves conflict and negotiations, rather than a supposedly tolerant celebration of diversity, as well as how the chapters of this volume discuss emancipatory approaches, among other ways by deconstructing dichotomous and static conceptualizations of culture and decolonizing, and thereby overcoming, inequalities and asymmetric power relations.

The first set of chapters takes a look at how, in the scholarly debate itself, the mentioned standardizations and canonizations of diversity and otherness take place and how these academic norms relate to social practices on different levels. As the transcultural approach of this book seeks to address critically the ways in which certain concepts of diversity and otherness are preferred and standardized over others, the first three chapters focused on academic terms and concepts in different settings which are connected to the field of the study of diversity and otherness and their applications and uses. In particular, my first chapter looked at the epistemologies of intersectional and cross-cultural diversity and otherness, Hirschauer approached the doing and undoing of social distinctions and Espahangizi analysed the historical contingency of different concepts of (multi)cultural diversity and social practices surrounding immigration processes in Switzerland.[254]

I showed how, in the study of culture in general, and in the sociological study of culture more specifically, two different basic narratives of diversity and otherness have been developed, normalized and canonized, which can be called first *intersectional* and second *cross-cultural* diversity and otherness. The majority of academic perspectives in the study of culture which I have discussed in this chapter approach *intersectional diversity* as intersecting social belongings, which tend to include socially, and *intersectional otherness* as emphasizing intersecting difference to fulfil exclusionary functions. Conversely, *cross-cultural diversity* is understood to assign meaning to ambiguous cultural symbols, whereas *cross-cultural otherness* is conceptualized as movements that de-stabilise differences and thus blur border-markings.

This summary of canonizing trends does not mean that it stands for any current academic debate in the study of culture whatsoever, nor that there are not many exceptions that were not mentioned at all. In addition, the analysis was itself conducted within the framework of a powerful epistemological setting (see also Brunner, 2020) in which I had to reflect on my own positionality. After all, academic approaches that seek to re-think normalizing tendencies and overcome unequal power relations in academia and beyond are also themselves part of those powerful epistemes they supposedly "fight against". As I have noted, not only are epistemes powerful in structuring symbolic orders (Foucault, 1974; Bourdieu, 1992), thereby exercising an

---

254 Concepts such as cosmopolitanism (Marten-Finnis, Ciaudo), civilization (Marten-Finnis, Ciaudo), modernity (Ciaudo) or Westernism and Orientalism (Ciaudo, Marten-Finnis, Höhne) are equally challenged, but will not be highlighted separately in order to keep this conclusion focused on the main aspects of diversity and otherness in this volume.

"epistemic violence" (Spivak, 1988), but also we have to realize that knowledge production is always entangled with political interests (Richardson, 2018).

This book itself is no exception and can of course be critically placed in the row of both epistemological streams of *intersectional and cross-cultural diversity and otherness*. However, with our transcultural approach (which itself threatens to become another one of those standardized academic concepts), this volume has sought to open the debate to re-think not only unequal power relations that exist in academia, but also to point at emancipatory approaches in scholarly and non-academic social life. I will come back to this point in the last section of this conclusion. In my chapter on Epistemologies, I also concluded with the call to "transculturalize" the study of diversity and otherness by acknowledging the two main features of postcolonial critique in the analysis of diversity and otherness through decolonizing unequal (often Eurocentric) power structures, as well as through deconstructing dichotomies in our thinking. Also, by including as many perspectives and standpoints as possible, such a transcultural approach to the study of diversity and otherness could help to "rethink a Europe Otherwise" (Boatcă, 2010).

For Stefan Hirschauer any cultural phenomenon can be conceptualized as a meaningful distinction. He focussed on those meaningful differentiations that mark (multiple) social affiliations. All these processes are extremely heterogeneous and contingent with many possible grades of intensity. This is what Hirschauer described as the doing and undoing of differences, a processual model that takes into account the relativity and diversity of contingent processes of categorizations. The study of diversity and otherness should hence ask how individuals process differences and focus on the question of why, when and how a difference becomes (ir-)relevant as differences constantly are (re-)enforced, minimized or de-differentiated. In addition, the chapter outlined several theoretical concepts regarding social distinctions, such as hybridity, social circles and intersectionality, which show how the study of differences has been standardized within the study of culture. As such, Hirschauer's approach can be called a praxeological, constructivist perspective to the contingency of social distinctions, which also deconstructs standardized established theoretical models. This stands in line with the constructivist and deconstructivist, as well as with the processual and transcultural, approach of this book.

Likewise, Kijan Espahangizi conducted a constructivist analysis of how the "interpretative frameworks" on immigration and integration in public and scholarly debate in Switzerland changed throughout the 1980s, on what historicities they were based upon, and how they related to social processes of diversification following immigration. By looking at "micro-practices of postmigrant conviviality" and how they can be related to discourses that arise in the course of these practices at the same time, Espahangizi's approach not only emphasized the need in cultural analysis to acknowledge that any cultural practice, narrative, product, etc. is historically shaped and can hence only be understood as situational, dynamic and contingent. This approach also stands as a bridge in the above-mentioned disciplinary divide between

humanities-based, interpretative approaches to culture, which consider the production of meaning, and social-theoretical ways of looking at social practices and uses of cultural "material". Here instead, the "mutually constitutive interaction between social and discursive change" was highlighted.

The chapter presented a parallel analysis of the "historical co-emergence of the concept and the object of (multi)cultural diversity" by comparing especially two projects in Swiss immigration policies and debates–the *Mitenand*-movement, a "coalition for solidarity with 'foreign workers'" and the Swiss refugee aid project–and related their histories to the public and academic discourse on diversity during the same time. The key question of the chapter, namely how "culture" could become the "key signifier with regard to immigration and integration", was answered by distinguishing the respective historicities of all practices and discourses that were analysed. In particular, two different notions of cultural diversity were detected: a traditional one that is based on regional multilingualism has served as an essential cornerstone for Swiss national identity for a long time, and a more recent one that is conceptualized around the "ethnic diversity" of immigrants in Switzerland in the course of the second half of the 20th century, which relies mostly on culturalist arguments. Again, both notions of diversity were repeatedly related to the social practices of postmigrant conviviality that took place in and around the analysed projects. Another project on the representations of diversity in Switzerland from 2015 showed that both notions of cultural diversity still have not been integrated with each other. However, Espahangizi did not conclude by highlighting only these standardizations of cultural diversity, but rather stressed their ambiguities, permanent transformations, controversies and contradictory histories, highlighting the permanent interplay of the contingent construction and deconstruction of diversity and otherness.

14.2 Transcultural Negotiations: Deconstructions

A focus on the processes of standardization as well as the destabilization of diversity and otherness is not only thoroughly assumed in these chapters, but many other cultural theories have also challenged dichotomous thinking beyond the scope of this book. Theories of modernity have been defied through these deconstructivist developments, as they are often based on dichotomous differentiations such as nature-culture, modernity-tradition, us-them etc. Following Gurminder Bhambra, theories of modernity assume that "Western" modernity developed through the Enlightenment, the French Revolution and processes of industrialization while distinguishing between stable differences. These differences are based on the assumptions of a temporal rupture between a traditional, agrarian past and a modern, industrial present, as well as on an imagined difference between Europe and the rest of the world, in which the "Western" side is put to be universal and superior (Bhambra, 2007, p. 1). Also, in more humanities-oriented fields in the study of culture, the logocentrism of

"Western" science has been criticized (Derrida, 2004), established notions of subjectivity have been questioned (Foucault, 1978) and possibilities of agency have been critically provoked (Spivak, 1988; Haraway, 2017). As I have stated in my chapter on the epistemologies of diversity and otherness, it was especially poststructuralism as well as postcolonial theory that developed different heuristic models to re-think, revise and read against the grain. Gender and queer studies and other theoretical strands, such as new materialism or ecofeminism, have complimented this vast array of approaches with other tools such as standpoint epistemologies, situated knowledges, psychoanalysis and queering perspectives.

To take the praxeological stance of this book as our departure point, the tension that arises between the above-mentioned standardizations of diversity and otherness and how, in practice, these and other norms become challenged, undermined and negotiated, is a further focal point that runs through many chapters of this book. However, these chapters put more emphasis on the tension between standardizations of diversity and otherness and various corresponding deconstructivist practices they have found in their respective fields of analysis. The chapters by Ciaudo, Marten-Finnis, Oettl, Pelillo-Hestermeyer (Linguistic Diversity), and Reichardt especially focus on how norms are established in the first place and on how irritations of the norm and challenging deconstructions sometimes blur the differences that have been constructed in different settings and intensities.

As such, a focus on these deconstructivist practices can lead to in-between spaces and ambiguous cultural symbols, and can therefore be called transcultural negotiations. As the transcultural approach of this book involves the constructions of (hegemonic) differences as well as their conflictual deconstructions at the same time, the tension between these two, which is in constant flux and is negotiated every time anew, is exactly what the transcultural practice stands for. The chapters by Niccolai, Höhne, myself (How to Curate) as well as Pelillo-Hestermeyer and Cismondi all make this tension into a subject of discussion. As they offer an analysis of unequal power relations and exemplify how the established norms are challenged in social life, they will be summarized in the next section on decolonizations. This does not entail that these latter chapters include a more detailed or even a more sophisticated transcultural approach than the former. The decision to summarize them in a section of their own was taken in order to highlight another focal point of this volume: decolonizations. Again, the constructivist and deconstructivist, processual and contingent focuses on norms, practices and negotiations of diversity and otherness from a transcultural perspective, which takes conflicts into account, are present in all chapters of this book, but only in different compositions.

Joseph Ciaudo in his chapter focused on how the rejection of "Western" clothes by a Chinese minister in the early 20th century offers insights into transcultural practices of negotiating the standardized meanings of the "West" and the "East". In this chapter, clothing is regarded not only as a tool in the fight between ruler (colonizer) and ruled (colonized), which serves as a standard to "justify European colonialism".

Clothing is also looked at concerning its social dimension, as a matter of defending and presenting one's identity, with the result that it serves perfectly as the basis for his analysis of the constructions and deconstructions of cultural differences. By looking at different texts written by the Chinese minister to the USA, Spain and Peru Wu Tinfang—a "central figure of Chinese political and intellectual life" during that time—, Ciaudo showed how Wu did not reject "Western" dress either in order to defend the "Chinese way" over the "American" one, or in order to negotiate between these two sides that are thought to oppose each other as clearly defined single cultures. Wu can rather be described as a "transculturalist", as he transcended "given cultures", explored "new horizons", navigated "through very blurry cultures" and thereby produced "a cohesive way of life that acted as a junction between different life-worlds". Ciaudo concluded that Wu's negotiation of a "transcultural modernity" with "hygiene" ("*weisheng*, living a civilized life in ethical and medical terms") as a salient aspect de-territorialises the "idea of civilization from the West", and can therefore be regarded as a transcultural negotiation which transcends static and dichotomous conceptualizations of culture in a contingent, deconstructivist and dynamic process which necessarily involves situational conflicts on individual, institutional and state-political levels.

Closely connected to the chapter by Ciaudo by its interest in the social practices surrounding (material) cultural productions, Susanne Marten-Finnis conducted an analysis of the performances of the *Ballets Russes* that took place in Paris, London and other European metropolis at the beginning of the 20th century. This analysis showed how these ballets led to the artistic upsurge called the "Russian Silver Age" at the turn of the century, which also influenced French couture and British domestic interiors through the adaptations of the Oriental themes displayed in set designs and costumes. These adaptations can therefore be seen as triggering rather than learning from integrated art forms that became popular in European Symbolism at that time. Similarly, Marten-Finnis described how the standardizations of the "Oriental Other" were constructed in the first place, and how, then, by drawing on other forms of Russian self-presentation that rely on associations beyond the established display of Russian folklore, a new Oriental theme that looked "East" and not "West" challenged and deconstructed those standardizations.

These standardizations of the "Oriental Other" were usually thought to reinforce stereotypes of outdated folklore associated with "familiar fairy-tale forests of Europe". Equally, in academic literature, the critique of Orientalism is most often linked to Edward Said's interpretation as an act of colonialism in which knowledge about the Orient serves "to subjugate the Other". Marten-Finnis questioned these standardized interpretations in her analysis of several performances of the *Ballets Russes,* as well as by linking their symbolic practices to other knowledge about the Orient that can be traced back to other practices of the ancient Silk Road, which Russian ethnographers had researched from a transcultural perspective at the end of the 19th century. These scholars and their influence on the displays in the *Ballets Russes* made it possible for

Marten-Finnis to analyse the ballets as *heterotopias* in Foucault's sense. Therefore, the performances understood as such "mythical and real counter-spaces" both provided the artists with a space to rehearse a "revamped identity" on European stages, and provoked a shift in imagining the "Oriental Other" as something familiar and desirable and no longer as unfamiliar and outdated for European audiences. Thus, the deconstructions of symbolic practices by dancers and decorateurs of the *Ballets Russes* are not only understood as PR acts to cater to the "Western" audiences, who enthusiastically perceived the performances as physical representations of an "Oriental Other", but also as negotiations of Otherness, which offer new insights in their corresponding counter-spaces when analysed from a transcultural point of view.

The chapter by Barbara Oettl approached negotiations of diversity and otherness in an even more deconstructivist way by making the performances and multi-media artworks of the artist ORLAN the subject of her discussion. ORLAN, born in 1947, not only questions standardized understandings of the body, identity, "Self" and "Other" with her radical artistic approaches from the 1960s onwards, but she also challenges the anthropocentric focus of most science on what it can mean to be human to the core. ORLAN literally changed, hybridized and multiplied her bodily identity and personality through live surgeries on her body, psychoanalysis and virtual self-hybridizations. Through intensive descriptions of many of ORLAN's "surgical performances", which took place especially at the beginning of the 1990s as well as corresponding and un-associated virtual 3D artworks, Oettl discussed how ORLAN critically examines legal and ethical issues on three distinct levels. On a juridical level, ORLAN lays open how a legal persona is normalized and expected to represent a stable identity. On a scientific transgenetic level, her "Carnal Art" shows how "we have all become cyborgs a long time ago". Finally, by breaching feminist and transgendered issues, ORLAN examined how standards of beauty are deconstructed. Instead, ORLAN depicts a transcultural, transnatural, technoscientific and posthuman condition by these crossings and transformations. Through Oettl's discussion, it became clear that standardizations of diversity and otherness, constructions of identities, the "Self" and "Other" can only be understood as interchanging, reproducing, multiplying and hybridizing, and hence as contingent processual and situational constructions. To become aware of this, Oettl concluded, is indispensable in "this world of growing in-acceptance of the 'Other'". Thus, ORLAN's transcultural approach of deconstructing established self-understandings exposes how every presupposition of stable beings only rests on constructed shaky foundations.

In her chapter on linguistic diversity, Giulia Pelillo-Hestermeyer also discussed several examples of how linguistic practices are standardized as well as negotiated and deconstructed in "mediatized public spheres". Mediatized public spheres were understood in this context as spaces in which both these standardizations of "normative attitudes towards language(s)" and counter-hegemonic practices against these normalizations are practised. By focusing on this tension between construction and deconstruction, "doing diversity" and "doing otherness", and by highlighting the

conflicts involved in these processes, the chapter outlined the transcultural approach of this volume in the field of linguistic diversity. The common static assumption of languages as "monolithic systems" was hence deconstructed by highlighting deconstructivist practices as well as the diversification processes of media and language(s) in relation to social changes, such as globalization and migration and the resulting transformation of public spheres. The chapter discussed these questions by focusing especially on two examples: first on the standardizations, institutionalizations and negotiations surrounding the discussion of English as a "global language"; and second, on how "language(s)" are represented and performed in institutional policies and politics on a European level. Pelillo-Hestermeyer concluded that, even while there are many deconstructivist practices of "multiple appropriations and re-signifying practices" that work against the "ideological frames" which are imposed, they have not yet arrived at European media-makers. However, given the ordinariness of mixing "languages" in mediatized public spheres as well as in every-day life, this might be acknowledged as the new standard in the future.

The chapter by Dagmar Reichardt took Italian fashion as another field of cultural analysis by highlighting the practices of standardizations and corresponding negotiations of diversity and otherness. Similarly to Ciaudo and Marten-Finnis, dress was understood in its material, social and discursive dimensions as a way of negotiating identities as well as promoting emancipatory transcultural approaches. By drawing equally from more humanities-based approaches in semiotics as well as from social theory, the case study of mainly Italian fashion was conducted to show fashion's potential to construct (standardize) and deconstruct at the same time. Through the examination of the fashion duo Dolce & Gabbana, Pulitzer Prize Winner Jhumpa Lahiri in her writings on fashion, the theory, history and mechanisms of the Italian fashion system in the last 70 years, and finally a specific fashion show by Karl Lagerfeld staged in 2016, Reichardt emphasized this tension between "dichotomized concepts" and "processes of interconnectedness", between homogeneity (standardization) and heterogeneity (diversification) that eventually lead to spaces that open "*in between* of countries, borders and cultures". She concluded by stressing how the inclusion of Fashion Studies within Cultural Studies and the topic of Italian fashion in Modern Italian Studies might more specifically meet the need to revert established power relations between centre and periphery. This quest to overcome unequal power relations also lies at the core of the decolonizing approach that runs through most chapters of this book in different specifications and which will be summarized more in detail in the following section.

14.3 Decolonizing Practices of Otherness

A further, but no less important, epistemological assumption regarding diversity and otherness in this book can be called equality-theoretical. Similarly to constructivist

and/or deconstructivist epistemological assumptions, theoretical emphasis on differences and/or (in-)equalities is not a matter of "either/or", but is rather accentuated in all contributions in this book, only in different specifications. The underlying question is how the doing and undoing of diversity and otherness help to strengthen, challenge or even dissolve unequal conditions in both social realms and in discursive settings. This also encompasses the quest to overcome unequal power relations (decolonization) and deconstruct dichotomies in thinking, writing and speaking, as well as the attempt to offer emancipatory, transculturally sensitive ways in other domains.

Such decolonizing practices are mostly elaborated from multiple deconstructivist and postcolonial traditions of thought and activism. They lay open invisible power relations and how these impact different cultural constructions of differences. Equally, these approaches place an emphasis on how any construction and deconstruction of diversity and otherness can never be neutral, but are rather always biased and formed by standardizing norms, entangled with processes of inclusion and exclusion, in such a way as to contribute to hierarchical power relations.

The exercise of not only unveiling these power inequalities but also developing politics that help to subvert them can therefore be viewed as a central aspect of the concept of (transcultural) decolonization. As I have shown in both my chapters, this decolonial focus on political practice can be traced back to the political liberation struggles of former colonies in the 1950s. Hierarchical power relations persist up to this day and seem to even intensify. These inequalities do not necessarily have to relate (only) to colonial structures, even though, for example, the entanglement of today's neoliberal capitalist structures with social inequalities on a global scale remains obvious (Quijano, 2000). I have nevertheless argued that decolonization can be understood not only as political and epistemological liberation from (neo-)colonial structures in social life and thought, but also encompasses "any fight for liberation from any unequal power structures".

Yet, instead of merely opposing the more hegemonic side from below and thereby reproducing and strengthening the dichotomy that unequal power relations are based upon, decolonization means the permanent (conflictual) negotiation of diversity and otherness, while constantly acknowledging as many perspectives as possible in this process, in a corresponding way to the transcultural approach we have aimed at in this volume. For instance, Boatcă describes how the "double imperial difference in Europe"[255] leads to "two types of European subalterns to the hegemonic model of power" and "multiple Europes" (Boatcă, 2010, p. 4). Because of the countless

---

255 This "double imperial difference in Europe" is understood as follows: "on the one hand, an external difference between the new capitalist core and the existing traditional empires of the Islamic and Eastern Christian faith–the Ottoman and the Tsarist one; on the other hand, an internal difference between the new and the old capitalist core, mainly England vs. Spain" (Boatcă, 2010, p. 4).

complexity of differences, it is required to highlight many different ways of decolonization (p. 5). This is again exactly what the transcultural focus of this volume entails.

As Homi K. Bhabha wrote, the complex and dynamic processes of the social articulation of differences is a constant contingent negotiation that questions normative traditions and expectations. Any political empowerment thereby relies on the possibility to pose questions from the perspective in-between. Likewise, negotiating the articulation of differences from such a transcultural perspective—by "dis-placing", "reading against the grain", "re-inscribing", "cultural border-work", "rebellious acts of cultural translation", "going beyond"[256]—can lead to "in-between (third) spaces" of "hybridity" that can serve as innovative spaces for both collaboration and antagonism (Bhabha, 1997, pp. 123–134). These hybrid cultural in-between spaces become spaces for interventions and political actions in the decolonial sense described, where it becomes possible to not only acknowledge (her*hi)stories of exploitation and inequality but also to develop strategies of resistance by creatively inventing new diversities and othernesses beyond mere dichotomies.

Thus, in close connection to the deconstructivist notion described above, and thereby blurring references and representations in or through these in-between counter-spaces, the last set of chapters by Niccolai, Höhne, Pelillo-Hestermeyer & Cismondi and myself (How to Curate) concentrate especially on how transculturally sensitive approaches to standardizations can be analysed as practices that, by manoeuvring differences, help to decolonize their respective life-worlds. The theoretical perspective on (in)equality, even when equally focusing on cultural differences as do the aforementioned chapters, implies describing a (political) tendency which seeks to overcome hegemonic normalizations of cultural differences in order to achieve, for instance, social equity in the form of fostering more inclusive theatrical practice (Niccolai), decolonizing the normative binary gender order (Höhne), curating diversity and otherness in performance arts without exoticizing or paternalizing (my chapter on How to Curate Diversity and Otherness) and establishing good practices in managing diversity in scientific environments (Pelillo-Hestermeyer and Cismondi).

In this light, Marta Niccolai's chapter on Romani on the contemporary Italian stage discussed how three Italian playwrights portrayed the discrimination of Roma people established in common stereotypes and prejudices as well as visible social injustices by offering new narratives in whose constructions Romani themselves were involved. An analysis of different plays by the playwrights Daniele Lamuraglia (Florence), Fiorenza Menni and Andrea Mochi Sismondi (Bologna), and Pino Petruzzelli (Genoa) as outcomes of personal encounters with Romani showed how such processes of interweaving challenge and deconstruct standardized views of "Romani identity".

---

256 "Gegen-den-Strich-Lesen", "Neueinschreibung kultureller Zeichen", "kulturelle Grenz-Arbeit", "aufrührerischer Akt kultureller Übersetzung", "Darüberhinausgehen", "De-plazieren" (Bhabha, 1997, pp. 123–134).

As such, these plays can be read as transcultural emancipatory practices, that help to not only decolonize theatrical practice but also to serve as political acts to counter social injustice in general. In the context of unequal relationships such as the normalized one between Roma at the margins of society and non-Roma at the centre of society, the chapter shed light on how "the question of 'voice'" becomes important in the contingent process of construction and deconstruction of diversity and otherness.

While Niccolai focused on this processual tension between standardizing and negotiating cultural differences on stage through a transcultural lens, it became obvious how the plays analysed, by "break[ing] away from standard representations", can be understood not only as deconstructing but also as decolonizing practices that make visible new ways of creating "new realities". The first example regards a trilogy by Lamuraglia in which Roma are brought on stage, so "the margin becomes visible". Furthermore, new meanings are generated by different theatrical strategies such as the reversal of established symbols, parody narrated from a Roma perspective, and the re-reading of classics. In the second example, Menni and Sismondi not only play with a diversity of languages on stage, but have alienated themselves from their usual context by staying with Romani communities in Macedonia as part of the playwriting process. These plays were interpreted as offering insights into a "transcultural process" such as an "anthropological journey", in which "what counts is one's approach toward the other". Finally, the third example of Narrative theatre by Petruzzeli also challenges the norm by de-centering it and giving the voice to the unprivileged. The chapter concluded that the transcultural approach of the three playwrights of personal exchange and deconstruction of the standard "becomes a political act of social inclusion and emancipation", and, as such, a decolonial act.

The next chapter by Marek Sancho Höhne can also be read as both focussing on standardizations and deconstructions of these, as well as providing insights into decolonial approaches to overcome social inequalities. Höhne discussed how the normative binary gender order relies on how gender is narrated and mapped and thereby standardized in public discourse and medico-legal knowledge. This "net of knowledge and power" is deeply entangled with both temporality (e.g. narrations of medical treatments for trans* people as a linear movement) and locality (e.g. "imaginations of trans* are connected to questions of national belonging"). The chapter analysed standardizations of trans lives with different examples. The first examples, which was taken from the medico-legal system in Germany, showed how trans* bodies are (psycho)pathologized and treated as "an individual problem", for whose "treatment" national belonging is required in order to have access to the healthcare system. The medico-legal system does not allow for negotiations of normative boundaries and does not take into account resisting practices that blur these norms. The second set of examples discussed different Othering processes regarding trans lives which were detectable in mainstream media contributions. Narratives on trans lives are thereby instrumentalized and serve to display an "assumed progressiveness" of Germany: such a trans* nationalism is at work, for instance, when seemingly inclusionary calls

for more "gay and queer equality" at the same time produce exclusions through the embedded racialisations of trans* discriminatory violence.

According to Höhne, in all these normalizations and negotiations of diversity and otherness regarding gender, contradictions are not spelled out nor are the realities of trans lives adequately grasped. Therefore, in the next step, different strategies of self-narrations for resisting these standardizations were highlighted, which can be called decolonial in the described sense. The life stories of several trans* people can help to understand how the normative binary gender order can be not only deconstructed, but can also help to "try to find a solution to survive all the violence" directed against them. These life stories of "resistance and adoption", of "interaction and negotiation", the chapter concluded, show how trans* people are "no[t] simple victims of oppression, but rather actors inside these negotiations". It is about the diversity of narrations and imaginations of trans lives that helps to decolonize the normative binary gender order, questions of belonging and classifications of "us" and "them".

In my chapter "How to Curate Diversity and Otherness in Gobal Performance Art", I similarly showed that such a diversity of narrations and imaginations is necessary to find different ways to decolonize the field of global performance art. In order to answer the question of how curating diversity and otherness in this field of practice could be possible without labelling or paternalizing and without essentializing "just another hegemonic norm", I discussed several approaches taken from both academic literature and interviews conducted in the field, that try to offer emancipatory views which go beyond the established "hegemonic mainstream's entanglement with social inequalities". In the main interview used, which was conducted with Claude Jansen, an independent scholar, performer, dramaturge and curator based in Hamburg, I considered the underlying question of how to decolonize the field of curating global performance art. Curating was hence understood as a social practice that is deeply embedded with structural conditions that mutually influence this practice in turn. Even though the main emphasis was put on the field of performance art, I nevertheless showed that these conditions and practices are similarly present in other art forms, such as literature, visual arts or music.

I first focused on structural conditions that enable and limit how diversity and otherness are represented in global performance art, for instance in politics, that strive for equal access. These representations of diversity and otherness focus largely on individuals and groups from an intersectional perspective and on how "unequal economic and power relations on a global scale" can be overcome. The examples I discussed show that these politics both foster "inclusionary and exclusionary outcomes in the arts" at the same time. I then discussed several cross-cultural artistic practices of performing diversity and otherness. This means that the focus was placed on how artistic practices are performed, which are conceptualized as hybrid, and which offer possibilities "for in-between spaces and re-readings of established (b-)ordering practices". I again showed how these cross-cultural agendas often have contradictory outcomes of both opening and closing in-between spaces, and of both standardizing and

deconstructing norms of diversity and otherness. While referring to how decolonizing approaches in curating practice "emphasize both modes of solidarity and complicity as well as notions of conflict, complication and disruption", I concluded with the suggestion to understand diversity and otherness in a transcultural way, meaning that it is not understood as *a priori* but negotiated every time anew. Such a transcultural understanding of diversity and otherness could pose a way to decolonize curating global performance art by taking into account "a plurality of voices" in a communicative process of negotiations that also entails the negotiation of conflicts.

Last but not least, Giulia Pelillo-Hestermeyer and Fabio Cismondi focused on similar questions but in a seemingly completely distinct field: science. Regarding methodology, this chapter had further parallels to my earlier one, as it was also based mainly on academic literature reviews in the field of diversity management and organizational studies and on one interview which was conducted with Pietro Barabaschi, a scientist who is Head of Department at Fusion for Energy and Director of the European-Japanese Broader Approach activities. By deconstructing the established norm in diversity management that mainly looked at diversity as a "sum of single identity groups", the chapter examined from a constructivist perspective how the "doing" of diversity in scientific communities can rather be understood as a "fluid category", which involves permanent negotiations of (trans)cultural exchanges.

In taking one of the sub-projects of the nuclear fusion research megaproject ITER, the European-Japanese cooperation within Broader Fusion Development as an example, the authors showed how diversity, understood as a dynamic complex of negotiations and practices, influence both processes of constructing the reactor and of developing a group project identity, which in this case particularly contributed to the success of it. This "ability of the work-team in constructively integrating differences in approaches and frameworks", or the "diversity of laboratory cultures" of the cooperating research institutes, played a significantly greater role in the overall success than merely overcoming static stereotypes of e.g. national differences. The chapter concluded with an emphasis on this "strong nexus between the socio-cultural dimensions of scientific cooperation and its outcomes" that could help to decolonize diversity management (studies), by not only deconstructing certain norms and standardizations of diversity and otherness, but also highlighting the emancipatory approach followed in the discussed project of being aware of "culture" in scientific management. As such, this chapter closed the transcultural endeavour of this volume by bridging seemingly inter- and transdisciplinary divides in practices, norms and negotiations of diversity and otherness.

14.4 The Transcultural Study of Diversity and Otherness: An Overview

To sum up, the chapters of this book discussed different intertwined processes of doing diversity and otherness from a range of processual, praxeological and constructivist

perspectives. The construction and standardization of differences are always connected to the deconstruction and negotiation of them in turn, resulting in both inclusionary and exclusionary outcomes. The situational approach of this volume entailed that a wide variety of these practices in tension between normalizations and negotiations were discussed from historical and contemporary perspectives, covering a wide range of different life-worlds and from different methodological and theoretical standpoints in the study of culture. One might be surprised not to find any explicit reference to a geographical diversity this book intended to cover. However, given the dynamic understanding of culture and thus of practices of diversity and otherness which is followed throughout the chapters, it should be obvious that any territorial or topographic representation can only be understood as another normed construction in itself. Hence, we wanted to pose the questions from the start as to how these unequal representations have been normalized, are negotiated and deconstructed and eventually can be overcome, i.e. decolonized instead. These questions were discussed in different settings and contexts, different cultural forms (narratives, politics, practices, negotiations, materializations, etc.) and at different micro-, meso- or macro-levels of society. The cultural practices conceived as life-worlds analysed in this volume range from the study of culture (myself on epistemologies), the contingency of human differentiations (Hirschauer), postmigrancy in Switzerland (Espahangizi), "Western" clothes in China (Ciaudo), *Ballet Russes* (Marten-Finnis), multi-media performance as well as bodily practices (Oettl), mediatized public spheres (Pelillo-Hestermeyer on linguistic diversity), "Italian" fashion (Reichardt), to Romani on stage in Italy (Niccolai), trans* gender narratives in Germany (Höhne), global performance art (myself on how to curate), and international scientific groups (Pelillo-Hestermeyer and Cismondi). While the majority of this book's articles took a look at contemporary life-worlds (Hirschauer, myself, Reichardt, Oettl, Pelillo-Hestermeyer, Niccolai, Höhne, Pelillo-Hestermeyer and Cismondi), Espahangizi, Marten-Finnis and Ciaudo applied a historical perspective on their respective research fields.

The wide variety of (inter- and trans-)disciplinary as well as "research field" approaches included, among others, concepts relating to cultural theory (myself on epistemologies, Hirschauer), mediatization (Pelillo-Hestermeyer on linguistic diversity), science and technology studies, feminist and cyborg studies (Oettl), gender and queer studies (Höhne, Oettl), neo-materialism (Ciaudo, Reichardt), entangled history (Espahangizi, Ciaudo, Marten-Finnis), artistic fields (myself on how to curate, Niccolai) and organizational studies (Pelillo-Hestermeyer and Cismondi).

This incomplete listing of positioning the chapters in inner-disciplinary fields within the study of culture highlighted two points in particular: firstly, the bridging of materialistic and idealistic perspectives along with the entanglement of more humanities-based approaches with more social theory-related ones; and secondly, that the cultural study of diversity and otherness needs a transcultural approach, which also takes into account its own conflicts, norms, and negotiations.

As stated above and as the contributions in this volume proved, both humanities-based and social theory-based approaches in the study of culture are no longer two opposing sides in academia, but their contextual entanglement is rather established in practice and proven fruitful without degenerating into mere theoretical eclecticism. Cultural scholars pose thematically framed questions and approach them from many points of view, in order to be able to grasp a tiny bit of cultural complexity from a constructivist stance. In this light, the old disciplinary divides should indeed be overcome, given this established constructivist and deconstructivist, i.e. transcultural practice in the study of culture. We at least deeply believe in the need to overcome such disciplinary divides, and thereby to deconstruct the field of the study of culture itself and negotiate new meanings within the field.

However, certain disciplinary norms and (b-)ordering standardizations persist in the field and remain powerful in structuring, especially in university policies and politics. Academic funding bodies such as the German DFG (*Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*, German Research Foundation) do not have a department specialized in the study of culture in the way delineated in this volume.[257] Most professorships and associated positions attached to departments, faculties or institutes, that are called cultural studies or the like in Germany, are advertised for mono-disciplinary fields. Even if they are advertised rather openly and retain an interdisciplinary focus on thematic questions or, in very few cases, are entitled "cultural studies", in the selection processes those candidates are often preferred over cultural scholars who allow the most disciplinary connections to the established mono-disciplinary department members. Another example for the force of hegemonic norms is the establishment of "trend topics", such as globalization, digitization or social cohesion (including diversity), which function as "canonizers" in the study of culture (Heinze & Jappe, 2020). There are many more examples of such hierarchical power structures but also of subverting strategies. Certainly, selection processes, university and research politics are influenced by many more issues than just these. After all, powerful epistemes and their entanglement with political interests are at work anywhere, and they are difficult to decolonize. We nevertheless hope and believe that the study of culture could be decolonized by taking a transcultural approach not only in research practice but also with regard to policies and politics that structure the field. As this book has shown, such a transcultural approach reveals the construction processes of (hegemonic) differences as well as deconstructs them at the same time. The resultant tension is in constant flux and needs to be negotiated every time anew. This book

---

257 The "Review Board (*Fachkolleg*)" responsible for cultural studies (*Kulturwissenschaft*) of the DFG is called Literary Studies. "Cultural studies" is listed as a sub field of Literary Studies together with General and Comparative Literature. Even though there is the possibility to declare a research grant application as "interdisciplinary", practice shows how reviewers are still often drawn from mono-disciplinary fields (Folk, 2020).

has offered insights into emancipatory approaches in scholarly and non-academic social life by including a diversity of narrations, standardizations, imaginations, deconstructions and negotiations, which functioned as inter- and transdisciplinary bridges over established divides. All in all, it invites to re-think norms, practices and negotiations of diversity and otherness in further ways, in order to "transculturalize" the politics in the study of culture.

References

Albrecht, M. (2020). Europas südliche Ränder: Interdisziplinäre Perspektiven auf Asymmetrien, Hierarchien und Postkolonialismus-Verlierer (1st ed.). Edition Kulturwissenschaft. transcript.

Bhabha, H. K. (1997). Verortungen der Kultur. In E. Bronfen, M. Benjamin & S. Therese (Eds.), Stauffenburg discussion: Vol. 4. Hybride Kulturen: Beiträge zur anglo-amerikanischen Multikulturalismusdebatte (pp. 123–148). Stauffenburg.

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

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

Bourdieu, P. (1992). Rede und Antwort (1st ed., Vol. 547). Edition Suhrkamp: 1547. Suhrkamp.

Brunner, C. (2020). Epistemische Gewalt: Wissen und Herrschaft in der kolonialen Moderne. Edition Politik. transcript.

Cassirer, E. (1997). Philosophie der symbolischen Formen (licensed edition). Primus-Verlag.

Derrida, J. (2004). Die différance: Ausgewählte Texte (P. Engelmann, Ed.). Universal-Bibliothek: Nr. 18338. Philipp Reclam jun.

Dictionary. (n.d.). Difference: Synonym. Retrieved February 25, 2020, from https://www.dictionary.com/browse/otherness?s=t

Durkheim, É. (1996). Über soziale Arbeitsteilung: Studie über die Organisation höherer Gesellschaften (2nd ed., Vol. 1005). Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft. Suhrkamp. (Original work published 1893)

Folk, C. (2020). Kein Selbstzweck: Kreative Forschung und Drittmittelstrategien. Forschung & Lehre (3), 202–204.

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

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

Frege, G. (1990). Schriften zur Logik und Sprachphilosophie: Aus dem Nachlass (3rd ed.). Philosophische Bibliothek: Vol. 277. Meiner.

Haker, C. (2020). Immanente Kritik soziologischer Theorie: Auf dem Weg in ein pluralistisches Paradigma. Praktiken der Subjektivierung. transcript.

Haraway, D. (2017). A cyborg manifesto: Science, technology, and socialist-feminism in the late twentieth century. In R. Latham (Ed.), Science fiction criticism: an anthology of essential writings (pp. 306–329). Bloomsbury Academic.

Heinze, T., & Jappe, A. (2020). Fundamentales Spannungsfeld: Wissenschaftliche Relevanz und Originalität. Forschung & Lehre (3), 198–200.

Herder, J. G. v. (1975). Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache. Universal-Bibliothek: 8729/30. Reclam. (Original work published Berlin 1772)

Latin Dictionary. (n.d.). Differentia. Retrieved February 25, 2020, from https://latin-dictionary.net/definition/17616/differentia-differentiae

Luhmann, N. (2018). Soziales System, Gesellschaft, Organisation (6th ed., Vol. 3). Soziologische Aufklärung. Springer VS.

Quijano, A. (2000). Coloniality of Power and Eurocentrism in Latin America. International Sociology, 15(2), 215–232. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268580900015002005

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.

Simmel, G. (2016). Über sociale Differenzierung: Soziologische und psychologische Untersuchungen (K.-M. Guth, Ed.) (1st ed.). Contumax; Hofenberg. (Original work published 1890)

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

White, H. C. (2012). Identity and Control: How Social Formations Emerge (2nd Edition). Princeton University Press. https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1r2fg1

Wittgenstein, L. (1977). Philosophische Untersuchungen (1st ed., Vol. 203). Suhrkamp-Taschenbuch Wissenschaft. Suhrkamp.

Curatorial Practices of the 'Global': Toward a Decolonial Turn in Museums in Berlin and Hamburg?

Kuratorische Praktiken des ‚Globalen': Auf dem Weg zu einer dekolonialen Wende in Museen in Berlin und Hamburg?

LISA GAUPP, ANNA ABRAMJAN, FRIDA MERVECAN AKINAY, KATHARINA HILGERT, ANNA CATHARINA MULDER, REBECCA SCHMIDT, VIVIANE SCHNITZLER, OLE THURICH, LUCAS TIEMON, SWANTJE WURL, MIRA ZIMMERMANN
Leuphana University of Lueneburg

Abstracts

Who decides what is included in the contemporary canon of 'global arts'? This empirical mixed-methods study examines how different notions of the 'global' are curated in so-called 'global' visual arts in northern Germany. Decolonial aesthetics, postcolonial thought, and the provenance of exhibition objects have challenged the legitimacy of German museums and have triggered a debate on their Eurocentric perspective, their situatedness, the differentiation between artefact and artwork, and the reproduction of colonial thinking and patterns of domination. Although a critical turn in current curatorial practice can be observed, it is not clear whether this change is the result of a genuine effort to decolonize art organizations. In this regard, the potentials, restrictions and applications of academic concepts such as "anti-racist" or "postcolonial curating" are discussed. This study found indications of a decolonial turn in a predominantly White European curatorial practice and emphasizes the need for further changes to this context.

Wer definiert den Kanon zeitgenössischer ‚globaler Künste'? Diese empirische Mixed-Methods-Studie untersucht, wie verschiedene Konzepte des ‚Globalen' in so genannten ‚globalen' visuellen Künsten in Norddeutschland kuratiert werden. Dekoloniale Ästhetiken, postkoloniales Denken und die Provenienz von Museumsobjekten haben Museen in Deutschland in einer Debatte über ihre Eurozentristischen Perspektiven, ihre Situiertheit, die Unterscheidung zwischen Kunst und Objekt und die Reproduktion kolonialen Denkens und Dominanzmustern herausgefordert, ihre Legitimität zu beweisen. Obwohl eine kritische Wende in aktuellen kuratorischen Praktiken sichtbar ist, bleibt unklar, ob dieser Wandel das Ergebnis von Dekolonialisierungsbestrebungen der Kunstorganisationen selbst darstellt. Darauf bezogen werden die Möglichkeiten, Einschränkungen und Anwendungen von akademischen Konzepten wie „anti-rassistische" oder „postkoloniale Kuration" diskutiert. Diese Studie belegt sowohl Ansätze einer dekolonialen Wende in der weitgehend Weißen kuratorischen Praxis als auch die Notwendigkeit zu weiteren Wandlungsprozessen in diesem Zusammenhang.

Keywords

Diversität / diversity, Entwicklungsprozesse / development, transformation, Gesellschaftlicher Wandel / social change, Kuratieren / curating, Museum/museum

1. The 'Global' in Visual Arts

Who decides what is included in the contemporary canon of 'global arts'? In the production of knowledge and meaning in society, the fields of visual arts and culture, with museums among their most important institutions, are important actors which represent and negotiate social conditions, assumptions, symbols, and discourses about identity. The museum is a place of knowledge creation and a public space where visitors of many kinds come together and engage with the content exhibited. How visitors first encounter and experience an exhibition contributes critically to the complex decision-making during the curatorial process prior to the opening. Both museums and individual exhibits can therefore be understood as highly sensitive constructs involving more than the vision of artists and those of curators.

Since the 1960s, the function of curators has changed dramatically from the mere caretaking of existing collections to the actual making of exhibitions. The late 1980s revealed that "there is a subtext comprising innumerable diverse, often contradictory strands [...], the subject matter of the new museology" (VERGO 2009: 3). Since then, a curator has become "an independent exhibition maker ('exhibition-auteur') who operate[s] in a broader social and cultural space, organizing large-scale exhibitions of contemporary art, and addressing a general public rather than a particular, clearly socially distinguishable art audience" (BUDEN 2012: 24). Objects in an exhibition become "elements of a narrative, forming a part of a thread of discourse which is itself one element in a more complex web of meanings" (VERGO 2009: 46) (Figure 1).

Now more than ever, works of art are positioned in a defined curatorial setting. Especially in theme-based group exhibitions, they merely represent one of many positions vis-à-vis the overarching theme of the exhibition. These themes and related questions reflect contemporary societal discourses, and many aim, as Paul O'Neill observed in his discussion of the "biennial boom," to bring the 'local' and the 'global' into a continuous dialogue with one another (O'NEILL 2007: 16).

In the second half of the 20th century, we can locate two interrelated changes brought by this curatorial turn: first, the rise of temporary group exhibitions that aim to interrogate a certain 'zeitgeist,' often using a transcultural or global perspective; and, second, the opening of the art museum to a wider public and new audiences. Boris Buden describes the latter shift as follows: "In short, it is through the relation to the general

Fig. 1: *MARKK in Transition, Hanging Vessels & Carrier, Ceiling 1st Floor, MARKK, Hamburg 2020 (Photo by Anna Catharina Mulder 2020).*

public that the curator has become an authorial one" (BUDEN 2012: 27). As a result, the relationship between the artist and the curator has become less hierarchical than it used to be.

Since curators have moved in the museum discourse, it is fruitful to question the figure of the curators themselves. According to Mieke Bal's "expository concept," culture is created by regarding the tension between the maker, the work, and the viewer as a productive relationship (BAL 1996: 4). The "expository actor" not only refers to individuals, i.e. artists or curators, but also to institutions. For Bal, these expository agents in the "first person" tell the visitor as the "second person" something about a "third person", namely the exhibition.

> The 'first person' remains invisible. The 'second person,' implicitly, has a potential 'first-person' position as a respondent; his or her response to the exposing is the primary and decisive condition for the exposing to happen at all. The 'third person,' silenced by the discursive situation, is the most important element, the only one visible. (BAL 1996: 4)

The invisibility of curators, who are largely responsible for the visibility of the artists and artworks, creates the impression of a 'neutral narrative perspective,' which, however, cannot be achieved in an exhibition. In view of this, exhibitions, which are similar to other kinds of communicative action, cannot adopt a neutral or impartial standpoint (MUTTENTHALER/WONISCH 2006: 244). For example, beliefs and values

Fig. 2: *Sandals (Pair) & Usambara Violets, Amani, 20th Century, MARKK, Hamburg 2019 (Photo by Paul Schimweg/MARKK 2019).*

of curators affect matters of both presentation (who is being addressed and how?) and selection (whose perspective and which narratives are showcased?) (Figure 2). Both of these are closely intertwined, as curators become translators and mediators (BUDEN 2012: 30).

The selection of content and other kinds of decision-making in this context, which are closely linked to issues of representation of power, are often discussed in postcolonial debates. As an institution with long traditions, the museum continues to reflect and reproduce colonial power relations. (KARENTZOS 2012: 249) The so-called 'crisis of representation' which developed in anthropology, among other fields, since the 1960s, criticized the discipline's foundation on colonial premises and posed the question of how it is possible to represent the 'Other' in a non-discriminating way. In art history, a similar stream of thought can be detected, which developed in parallel to and was influenced by poststructuralist and postcolonial theory. Not only were colonial iconographies such as 'Orientalisms' and 'Primitivisms' criticized but also, for example, the genesis of the Eurocentric canon in art museums. In relation to the developments of the above-mentioned new museology, such critics have questioned the established division between art museums (as displaying 'art') and ethnological museums (as displaying 'artifacts' taken as representatives of an 'entire culture') (MUTTENTHALER/WONISCH 2006: 36). Artists of color reject such "burden[s] of representation"

(SCHMITT- LINSENHOFF 2005: 19, 22) as being on display in an ethnically minded way that does not necessarily increase societal participation, let alone change unequal power hierarchies (KASTNER 2012: 75).

Instead, a 'global art' is nowadays favored that focuses on art's transcultural entanglements and lays open neo-colonial premises and unequal power hierarchies in the arts and art history (BUURMAN et al. 2018). These developments can be denoted as a decolonial turn in visual culture for the purposes of this paper (MODEST et al. 2019). The decolonial turn in this sense addresses all these critical approaches of postcolonial theory to museums' colonial premises that seek to decolonize the art institution by, among other things, the application of "anti-racist curating" (see below; BAYER/TERKESSIDIS 2017).

To unpack the history of power in the arts and to examine the colonial legacy of 'Western' museums as reflected in, among other aspects, curatorial decision-making, we conducted a mixed-methods study of three exhibitions in two museums in Berlin and Hamburg. By asking what is included or excluded in the exhibitions, which aspects are discussed or disregarded, and which perspectives are privileged or diminished, we focused on what is often referred to as 'non-European art' or, in postcolonial studies, 'global art.' Discussing the potential, limits, and applications of academic concepts such as "anti-racist curating," we consider whether there are any indications of a decolonial turn in this context or not.

To answer this question, we analyzed two sites while taking a look at Bal's three persons: the curator (curating institution), the visitor and the exhibition(s) themselves (BAL 1996: 4). In order to find out whether a decolonial turn can be detected in art museums and ethnological museums, we analyzed museums with regard to both of these categories which have positioned themselves as responding to the afore-mentioned postcolonial critique as well as adhering to the quests of the new museology. The first site is an internationally renowned institution for contemporary art, namely the *Martin Gropius Bau* in Berlin, in which we focus on one of its seemingly postcolonial exhibitions called *The Garden of Earthly Delights*. The second site, in Hamburg, is its former ethnological museum, *MARKK*, its 'postcolonial' reform and repositioning process and its exhibitions *Amani. On the footsteps of a colonial research station* and *Re-Interpreted*.

Even though a critical – and arguably 'decolonial' – turn in current curatorial practices can be observed, the question arises whether this reaction is a genuine effort to decolonize art institutions. Our analyses of

these two sites indicate that it is too early to speak of a proper decolonial turn in the two museums, as can be seen in the ongoing exclusion of underrepresented artists and the reproduction of colonial concepts. Anti-racist curating, however, has led to notable changes in some respects. For example, the *MARKK*'s self-understanding has shifted from a place to convey 'cultures' to a self-reflexive forum. That said, we conclude that, while this study found signs of a decolonial turn in a predominantly White European curatorial practice, the need for further changes to this context and related representations has to be emphasized.

2. Power, the 'Other', and "Anti-Racist Curating"

Firstly, we should take a look at whether and how museums enforce the discourses of the "disciplinary power" (FOUCAULT 1978: 51) of colonial legacies, in order to explain how curatorial practices discipline visitors and others involved. In addition to understanding the curator as a powerful gatekeeper suppressing certain artists by selecting and omitting (GAUPP 2020), we focus on the disciplinary power of what is included (and regarded as 'true') and what is excluded (and regarded as 'false') in the contemporary museum discourse and the self-submission to this discourse of all actors involved (MUTTENTHALER/WONISCH 2006: 20) (Figure 3).

The emergence of various branches of 'Western' science and, above all, the emergence of the 'modern' museum in the nineteenth century in response to colonization led to the division of collected objects into artistic (art museums) and objectified (ethnological museums) categories (SUHRBIER 2015: 101). For these reasons ethnological objects were not perceived as aesthetic and artistic. Instead, they became artifacts of a 'foreign culture.' Seen in this light, 'Western' art history is at its roots a history of power (MICOSSÉ-AIKINS/SHARIFI 2017: 137), which points at the legacy of 'Western' empires that includes both the institution of the museum and the objects contained in them. In short, there seems to be a lack of awareness of the "colonial unconscious" (SCHMITT-LINSENHOFF 2005: 19), i.e. a lack of reflection upon the colonial underpinnings of European art history and curatorial practice.

Although visual culture in Germany today is still deeply invested in neo-colonial power discourses, there have been several calls for decolonizing these practices. In response to decolonial aesthetics, postcolonial thought, and major debates about the provenance of exhibition objects,

Fig. 3: *Central Door Relief at MARKK-Foyer with Art Installation on the Theme "Colonial Heritage", Program "Azimut Decolonial – an Archive Performs": Three Performer Portraits of "Transnational Ensemble Hajusom", Photographed by Arne Thaysen, Hamburg 2019 (Photo by Anna Catharina Mulder 2020).*

museums in Germany have begun to examine their Eurocentric perspective, their own situatedness, the differentiation between artifact and artwork, and the reproduction of unreflective colonial thought patterns. As such, representations of otherness become increasingly questioned (MUTTENTHALER/WONISCH 2006: 22; see also GAUPP/PELILLO-HESTERMEYER 2020). In recent years, (ethnological) museums have faced questions concerning ownership and representation of (ethnological) objects in their collections (KAZEEM et al. 2009: 7f.). As such, their role in the colonial project is today under greater scrutiny.

Following the discourse-promoting contribution by John Giblin, Imma Ramos and Nikki Grout (2019), we agree that the decolonization of curatorial practices needs to be an "active, radical and potentially all-encompassing" process in which institutional decision-making processes on all levels – from "recruitment to representation, audience engagement to repatriation, acquisitions to architecture, design to labeling" (GIBLIN/RAMOS/GROUT 2019: 472) – need to be taken critically into consideration.

In addition, as our focus is set on the curatorial process of exhibitions specifically, we based our studies on Natalie Bayer and Mark Terkessidis' discussion of an anti-racist practice of curating (2017) which has also

formed the basis for our research question whether a decolonial turn has become the state of the art in 'global' visual culture. The term 'racism' is to be perceived as a societal uneven ratio, a separation between 'us' and 'them,' which functions as an apparatus or dispositif, in which practices of exclusion and processes of generating knowledge mutually define each other in a binary system (BAYER/TERKESSIDIS 2017: 58). The aim, therefore, is to overcome such societal practices.

In the context of this paper, an anti-racist curatorial practice involves the disclosure, reflection, and unlearning of one's own racisms. In the context of museum exhibitions, the active avoidance of racist longings such as the desire for others and the search for exoticism or voyeurism is fundamental to an anti-racist curatorial practice. The reflection of museological forms of representation should question the construction of the 'Own' and the 'Other,' which implicitly or explicitly conveys specific narratives on 'race' (MUTTENTHALER/WONISCH 2006: 10f.).

Curators need to interrogate all narratives and works of art in an exhibition by asking themselves the following questions: Whose story is being told? Whose perspective has been put in a privileged position? Which artworks are being shown? How have the texts been written? Are the narratives and the artworks intended to empower groups that have been underrepresented or even objectified until now? (BAYER/TERKESSIDIS 2017: 56)

For Bayer and Terkessidis, giving artists the possibility of such self-translation when exhibiting content in museums is the key of anti-racist curating. They argue for the necessity of implementing multi-perspective opinions in the curating process, rather than proceeding with a one-sided point of view of one curator or a unilateral curating team. (BAYER/TERKESSIDIS 2017: 62) A public institution such as the museum is intended to be the right place for this purpose. To examine the two sites considered here, we used the questions above to determine whether and, if so, to what extent museums and curators practice anti-racist curating, thus fulfilling the demands of a decolonial turn in 'global' visual culture in Berlin and Hamburg.

3. Analyzing Curatorial Practices

We approached these questions by applying a mixed-methods research design including textual analysis, spatial mapping, online historical and visual ethnography, a qualitative expert interview, participatory obser-

vation, exhibition analysis, and a structured audience survey. With the triangulation of these methodological approaches, it was possible to address all three levels which Bal includes for her "expository actor" without limiting the analysis to just one or two kinds of involved actors.

As noted above, we focused on two museums, each of which was envisioned as a representative for the two established categories of museums: *Martin Gropius Bau* – art museum – (and its exhibition *Garden of Earthly Delights*) and *MARKK* – ethnological museum – (and its exhibitions *Amani. On the Footsteps of a Colonial Research Station* and *Re-Interpreted*). Both museums position themselves in the described discourses on new museology and postcolonial critique. However, rather than comparing the application of postcolonial critique in the two examined museums, i.e. if and how they adhere to the decolonial turn, the study focuses on analyzing the specific characteristics of the curating process in each case. In order to be able to unpack the decolonial argument, we needed to pay attention to the question whether the practices of displaying 'Western' art in an art museum and the 'Other's' art in an ethnological museum have been revised, and, if so, how this decolonial turn has impacted the specific museum category. This also made it necessary to apply different methodologies to each museum-case, its specific settings, related recent institutional changes, and exhibitions, all of which will be explained in the following.

Founded as a museum for decorative arts in 1881, the *Gropius Bau Berlin*, "a renowned venue for modern and contemporary art in dialogue with archaeology and cultural history," (GROPIUS BAU 2020) offers international artists a forum to present their distinct perspectives on contemporary societal concerns (Figure 4). Since February 2018, the *Gropius Bau* has been led by director Stephanie Rosenthal, who aims to open "up the institution as a location for artistic creation and exchange" (GROPIUS BAU 2020) and who curated the exhibition *Garden of Earthly Delights* (July 26–December 1, 2019). This exhibition addressed global "themes as pressing as the anthropocene, seed politics, the legacies of colonialism and historical segregation" (GROPIUS BAU 2019). The exhibit featured artists from across the globe and adopted the curatorial theme of "the garden as a metaphor of the state of the world" (ibid.).

We analyzed this exhibition to evaluate whether curatorial decisions of *Garden of Earthly Delights* reflect a neo-colonial preoccupation with 'the Other,' and follow "the canonical model of [...] monographic presentation" (O'NEILL 2007: 14) or whether the decision-making for this exhibit gestures toward anti-racist curating. We also considered who had

Fig. 4: *Main Entrance, Martin Gropius Bau, Berlin 2020 (Photo by Eflin Mulder 2020).*

been invited to discuss 'the state of the world,' whose perspective had been highlighted, and how contributors have been presented.

In a first step, we analyzed the textual dimension in the texts appearing in the exhibition catalogue, in the introductory texts to each artist in the exhibition, and in texts created specifically for this exhibition from artists' statements as described in Daniel Jacobi and Marie Poli's publication on the analysis of textual documents in exhibitions (1995: 51). Our goal was to map interpretational and representational sovereignty and related power relations. In a next step, we analyzed the wording whenever the curated exhibition texts dealt with colonialism (or when they did not address this point) to understand how the *Gropius Bau* dealt with this issue.

In addition to texts, we investigated the museum's "spatial anthropology" (ROBERTS/COHEN 2015: 170, 181) by applying the methodology of mapping to ascertain whether the exhibition met the criteria for anti-racist curating discussed earlier. Specifically, we looked at the spatial dimension, encompassing the country of origin and residence of artists and the space allotted to them in the exhibition. As *Garden of Earthly*

Fig. 5: *"Zwischenraum/A Space Between", MARKK, Hamburg 2020 (Photo by Anna Catharina Mulder 2020).*

Delights seeks to bring together perspectives from all over the world, we considered whether the artists chosen truly did so.

The second site we investigated was the former *Museum für Völkerkunde Hamburg* (Ethnological Museum Hamburg), which was founded in 1867 by Tilenius and which was reconceptualized and renamed to *MARKK* (*Museum at the Rothenbaum. World Cultures and Arts*) in 2018 (Figure 5). Its new director, Barbara Plankensteiner, has changed the museum in terms of both structure and content since 2017 (MARKK 2019), possibly with the aim of adhering to the decolonial turn in ethnological museums. Three dimensions of these changes at the *MARKK* were examined: the new concept and vision compared to the old concept, the implementation of this vision as reflected in activities or exhibitions, and the response of visitors to these changes.

To investigate the extent to which the *MARKK* has changed since 2018 compared to its former ethnological orientation, its website was analyzed using an online historical and visual ethnography. With the help of a historical website archive called *Wayback Machine*, it was possible to compare the current website with its three previous versions by applying a qualitative content analysis. To learn more about *MARKK*'s perspective on their concept and the new website, we conducted a qualitative expert interview with a representative of the museum's adminis-

tration. An analysis of several in-house publications by *MARKK* supplemented the data basis.

In addition to tracking the changes at the *MARKK*, we analyzed how the new vision was implemented in an exhibition, *Amani. On the footsteps of a colonial research station* (September 20, 2019–April 26, 2020[1]). *Amani* dealt with the history of the Organic Agricultural Institute Amani in the Usambara Highlands in present-day Tanzania. The institute was founded in 1902 and was a German showcase project where agriculture and forestry, tropical diseases, and the flora and fauna of the rainforest were studied, first by European and later by Tanzanian scientists (PLANKENSTEINER 2019: 9). The curators of the exhibition attempted to portray the ambivalent remains of German colonial discourse and the presence of colonial and post-colonial stories. Next to the exhibition analysis, we analyzed a guided tour with the curator as well as two discussions about nature reserves and famous researchers, which were part of the exhibitions supplementary program. Using participatory observation, we sought to replicate and analyze the visitor experience, including related social interactions such as those between staff members and visitors, to understand the effects of curatorial decision-making. Observations were recorded in field notes and then collected in a spreadsheet.

In addition, we also examined the exhibition's 'objects' on display. Here, we analyzed how the museum deals with the distinction between art and artifact (MUTTENTHALER/WONISCH 2006: 46ff) by comparing the aesthetics of displaying two 'works' by contemporary artists in *Amani* with the exclusive display of ethnological 'objects' in the same as well as in another exhibition called *Re-Interpreted* (October 1–November 6, 2019). The aesthetic analysis in *Amani* was supplemented by an analysis of statements by curators, representatives of the museum, and the artists themselves regarding their artistic practices in the exhibition *Amani*. In turn, the second exhibition, *Re-Interpreted*, developed by a team of curators, did not include any artworks by contemporary artists but only ethnological objects, that were partly framed as aesthetic or artistic. To analyze the 'objects' on display in both exhibitions, we identified the people involved and focused on the exhibition's topic, on what is being seen, how 'objects' are arranged, whether music can be heard, and what is written in the exhibition catalogue as well as on panels in the

1   The museum had to close March 14, 2020, due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

exhibition as suggested in Angela Jannelli's and Thomas Hammacher's guide to exhibition analysis (2008: 7).

Last but not least, we analyzed visitors' responses to the exhibition using a reception analysis with an emphasis being paid to the recent changes, especially with regard to the reappraisal of the museum's colonial history and the visitors' willingness to engage with the exhibition's content in the context of anti-racist curation. To this end, we conducted nine face-to-face interviews in the museum. Transcripts were analyzed through qualitative content analysis (MAYRING 2015).

4. Whose Narratives are Curated?

4.1 Narratives and Spaces at Martin Gropius Bau

Our analysis of the texts and spatial conditions for Garden of Earthly Delights at Martin Gropius Bau Berlin concerning our research questions of who had been invited, whose perspective had been highlighted and how contributors had been presented showed that several quests of anti-racist curating have been achieved. However, certain gaps between the curatorial narrative and the artists' statements, as well as a strong dominance of invited 'Western'-based artists and some unfortunate curatorial decisions regarding how and where certain pieces of work were placed in the museum and in the exhibition's map, could be detected.

For instance, some works on display dealt very critically with topics of colonialism, such as the site-specific work Lawn I (2019) by Lungiswa Gqunta. This work consisted of a grid of broken Coca Cola bottles placed upside down in the middle of one of the exhibition rooms. Filled with ink, water, and petrol, the glass was colored in a bluish green (Figure 6). To Gqunta, Lawn I was a meditation on the garden on two levels. First, it was a reflection of historical circumstances, specifically the colonial occupation as well as the Apartheid regime, which transformed the garden into a status symbol and a marker of segregation. Second, in the interview sequence printed in the exhibition catalogue, Gqunta argued that her work was a metaphor for "the continuation of colonial fuckery" that continued to this day (GQUNTA 2019: 295). However, the room where Gqunta's work was on display was not easily accessible and was therefore placed in a non-privileged position by the curators. 'Her' room was restricted to a maximum of ten visitors at once for security reasons connected to the installation's composition from broken glass fragments.

Fig. 6: *Installation view, Lungiswa Gqunta's "Lawn I", Exhibition: Garden of Earthly Delights, Martin Gropius Bau, Berlin 2019 (Photo by Katharina Hilgert 2019).*

Fig. 7: *Installation view, Libby Harward's "Ngali Ngariba, We talk", Exhibition: Garden of Earthly Delights, Martin Gropius Bau, Berlin 2019 (Photo by Katharina Hilgert 2019).*

This led to a constant queue in the preceding room. Many visitors hence chose to skip these two rooms.

The issue of colonialism also featured prominently in other contributions, including those by Australian artist Libby Harward. Harward's mixed-media installation Ngali Ngariba (We talk) (2019) examined the aftermaths of colonialism in South-East Queensland with regard to the botanic landscape (HARWARD/HARWARD-NALDER 2019: 286) (Figure 7).

However, it was decided to exclude certain vocabulary from the exhibition text. The curators referred to indigenous cultures as "First Nation cultures," which in English-speaking discourse is one of the applicable terms to use. In the German exhibition text, "Ur-Einwohner*innen" was used, a term that has historically been associated with colonialization and empire. Similar lexical choices could also be noticed in the exhibition text and catalogue. Here, colonial vocabulary was reproduced when addressing colonizers as "Europäische Entdecker*innen" ("European discoverers"). However, the critique which this wording entails was said to be "exposed by Harward as being a fiction" in the exhibition panel text itself.

Looking at the questions of who had been invited and how they had been presented, the participants were predominantly composed of artists from North America, Europe, and Asia and a bias could be found toward global cultural hubs such as London or New York City. In terms of geographic location, a review of the nineteen single artists and one art collective showed that artists hailed from six out of seven continents. Yet even though almost all continents apart from Oceania and Antarctic were included, the majority was associated with only three: Europe, North America, and Asia. Six of the nineteen artists were born and grew up in Europe. The number of cities in which the artists had their primary place of residence was very small, and most artists worked in major cultural centers of the 'West,' such as Berlin, London, or New York.

By comparing the actual works that formed the *Garden of Earthly Delights* with their depiction in the exhibition map, it became obvious that some artists are equally prominently presented in both media, meaning that the depiction of the same objects stands out in the map as well in the form of long artistic statements by People of Color Rashid Johnson and Taro Shinoda. However, in the case of Taro Shinoda, only a few steps further into the exhibition a series of photographs by her was positioned. In the exhibition map, by contrast, this part of her work was missing.

4.2 The Postcolonial Reform Process at MARKK

For our second research field concerning the *MARKK* in Hamburg, the analysis of the question whether or not the reform paid tribute to the decolonial turn by revising the colonial past of this formerly ethnological museum showed that this new self-conception, as it is displayed prominently on the website, succeeded in fulfilling the decolonial task to a great extent. The museum decided to create a completely new visual identity which reflected contemporary taste and a consistent image based on the logo, the fonts, the colors, and the overall layout. The new website communicated itself mainly through pictures and headlines. Texts on events and exhibitions were mostly short. The visual element of the colorful markings alluded to the name of the museum *MARKK* and the selection of the pictures was intended to avoid stereotypes and clichéd representations of cultures, as explained in the expert interview with a representative of the museum's administration. The structure of the website invited visitors to browse and find new interesting content, while the most important information remained directly accessible.

Equally significant changes could be found in the information of the website about the self-conception of the *MARKK*, which was most explicit in its mission statement and concerning the history of the museum. Regarding their new self-understanding, the *MARKK* explained that today they want to establish themselves as a reflexive forum, which critically examines the traces of colonial heritage and traditional colonial thought patterns. In the previous versions of the website, it was written that "we offer a forum for the exchange in partnership between people of all cultures" and "as a world cultural archive, we collect, preserve and index testimonies of all cultures in order to make them accessible" (WEB.ARCHIVE.ORG 2020). The explicit naming of the colonial past on the website was avoided before 2018. The function of the museum as an institute of 'racial biology' during the period of National Socialism was not named until 2018 either. Instead, it was emphasized that Franz Termer, the then director of the museum, was known as an opponent of National Socialism.

In contrast, other texts from the *MARKK* concerning its own history we found in a book published by the *MARKK* itself in 2002, that is, long before the transformation period around 2018, did not conceal the problematic background of the museum (KÖPKE/SCHMELZ 2002: 13-41). The problematic distinction between artworks and artifacts ethnological

museums often put forward was also already discussed by the *MARKK* in an exhibition in 2000 (KÖPKE/SCHIFF 2000: 28f.).

Furthermore, an analysis of the guided curator's tour of the exhibition *Amani* and another complementary program at *MARKK* revealed that the critical revision of the museum's own colonial past stood at the forefront. For instance, at the beginning of the tour the curator pointed out the arrangement of a showcase, which was no longer intended to be a showcase for an object to look at, but was instead meant to be accessible to visitors and thus influence their perspective by looking from the inside on the outside, therefore becoming the 'Other.' During the tour the curator often emphasized the museum's own standpoint, for example by making gaps in the museum's own collection history visible. Also worthy of mention was the inclusion of female artists, as highlighted by the curator. Without the tour, this critical view of the themes of the artworks could easily be overlooked.

However, the question of how the museum deals with the distinction between art and artifacts in decolonial terms cannot be answered with equal clarity, even though the exhibition *Amani* presented not only ethnological objects of the research station of the Organic Agricultural Institute Amani but also artworks by four contemporary female artists: Rehema Chachage, Evgenia Arbugaeva, Mariele Neudecker, and Syowia Kymabi. The artistic positions ought to "narrate surprising stories and evoke emotional memories that usually get lost through musealization" (PLANKENSTEINER 2019: 9). These works of art were positioned in central places of the exhibition surrounding a showcase with ethnological objects which was placed in the middle of the room. Between these artworks and the other parts of the exhibition, white partition walls could be found.

We analyzed the works (Z)Amani za Kale: A Former Glory(?) by Rehema Chachage and Amani by Evgenia Arbugaeva. Chachage's installation was composed from a video installation with sound as well as organic material such as red soil and grey stones that were mostly placed on white museum steles, holding glassy slides covered with dark purple liquids. These organic materials stood in contrast to the seemingly objective and modern presentation of the video installation, whereas the slides formed a bridge between this strong contrast between organic and museum display (Figure 8). Chachage described her works as „(her) stories," promoting a feminist approach to narrating and preserving life stories and conditions of women (CHACHAGE 2020). In a guided tour, Chachage's work was depicted as a critical confrontation with colonial

rule and ethnological research methods at the Organic Agricultural In-
stitute Amani, memorizing the pain of the local population of the time.
This reading was not found in the accompanying text in the exhibition
catalogue.

Evgenia Arbugaeva's work consisted of a series of photos depicting
a Black man in different locations of the research station. The pictures
were highly aesthetic arrangements in dark colors dominated by brow-
nish and yellowish tones, evoking reference to a past time (Figure 9).
The high resolution of the photos again stood in strong contrast to the
illumination in the pictures, which visitors to the exhibition and a cu-
rator described as "atmospheric," "over-aestheticized," "nostalgic," or
"thoughtful."[2] In the exhibition catalogue, a longer text about Arbugaeva's
work was missing, and the artist was presented as a documentary photo-
grapher. Again, the exhibition catalogue left out important information
for understanding the work which was provided only in the guided tour.
Here, the cooperation with John Mganga, the man pictured in the pho-
tos, was emphasized. Mganga, a former assistant at the research station,
still lives in the area around the Organic Agricultural Institute Amani
(PLANKENSTEINER 2019: 77).

For an analysis of how the *MARKK* presents ethnological objects
alone, we took a look at the exhibition *Re-Interpreted*, which was de-
signed as a round tour and consisted of eight ethnological objects on
display in two showcases next to each other in the *Zwischenraum* (space
in-between), the place that accompanied the changes of the museum. A
booklet guided visitors to the numbered objects and provided further
information about each of them. A short text in the first room explained
that this exhibition sought to ask new questions concerning these ob-
jects. In particular, it emphasized the diversity, beauty, and greatness of
global art. The last part of the sentence was highlighted in yellow.

The objects were well illuminated and easy to recognize. Every object
had its own shield with information about the artist/producer/work-
shop, location, year, material, and height in centimeters. The texts of
three out of the eight objects contained information about external fea-
tures and the interpretation of aesthetic motives, some of which were
highlighted in yellow. One object, *Anhänger in Form eines Mischwesens*
(Pendant in the form of a mixed entity), was displayed in the entrance
to *Inkagalerie* (Inca Gallery) and called the *Schatzkammer* (Treasury).
The Treasury was completely painted in gold, and it took a long time

2   Field notes of participatory observation collected January 19, 2020.

Fig. 8: *Installation view, Rehema Chachage's "(Z)Amani za Kale: A Former Glory(?)", Exhibition: Amani. On the Footsteps of a Colonial Research Station, MARKK, Hamburg 2019 (Photo by Viviane Schnitzler 2019).*

Fig.9: *Sketch of Evgenia Arbugueva's Photo "Amani, 2019", Exhibition: Amani. On the Footsteps of a Colonial Research Station, MARKK, Hamburg 2019 (Sketch by Anna Catharina Mulder 2020).*

to find the pendant (Figure 10). In the *Schatzkammer* it was not clear whether an object was produced by an artist, a manufacturer, or in an anonymous workshop. Furthermore, in the text next to the picture of the *Moghul Fürst* (Mughal Prince), no external aesthetic aspect of the object had been marked, but instead its geographical origin "North India." Lastly, there was a table showcase on the first floor with an arrangement of the *Löffelsammlung* (collection of spoons). The spoons were closely arranged next to each other, and the shield only contained information about the collector. Artist/producer/workshop, location, and year were marked as unknown.

In order to understand how visitors responded to the recent reform at *MARKK* and their willingness to engage with the content in the context of anti-racist curation, we assessed various impressions of the visitors, among other places in a joint discussion about selected works of art in the exhibition. While many spoke of a "nostalgic image" or a "historicizing gaze" when looking at photographs of Evgenia Arbugaeva, criticism was voiced that precisely such images fulfill the expectations of the "European view." Such criticism was also underlined by the curator's statements.[3]

Finally, the results of our audience research also showed that most of the interviewees clearly discerned the reformation of the museum and were interested in topics that deal with the reappraisal of the museum history in a postcolonial context. For families and children, however, this topic still involved too much reading and was not presented in a sufficiently clear, tangible, and child-oriented manner. Several participants mentioned that the museum had a very heterogeneous target group and should prepare the contents accordingly. This was also pointed out by the few visitors we interviewed, who were not very interested in these topics. According to them, the interest in exhibitions that deal with topics such as racism ought to be present, but the pleasure faded away when it came to long sections of writing. International guests were also interested in more and better legible content in English and other languages. Even some established museum visitors complained about the mediation of some of the contents and wished that they were made to be more vivid. There was also interest in the presentation of the reappraisal of colonialism in a larger historical context, the big picture, in which the museum itself should also be placed. Older museum visitors who had already visited the museum before clearly

3   Field notes of participatory observation collected December 1, 2019.

Fig. 10: *"Re-Interpreted", Outdoor Photo-Exhibition of MARKK, Organized by "Lebendiger Jungfernstieg e. V." at Jungfernstieg, Hamburg 2019 (Photo by Paul Schirmweg/MARKK 2019).*

noticed the change in the museum and showed a great interest in critical exhibitions that focus on German colonial and migration history.[4]

5.   Toward a Decolonial Turn in the Museum?

5.1 Representations at Martin Gropius Bau

As we have seen in our extensive observation of the *Gropius Bau* exhibition, textual as well as spatial curatorial decisions influence the way and the extent to which visitors can comprehend the exhibited artworks. These dimensions inevitably combine xyz with what is perceivable in terms of what is highlighted, altered, or downplayed. When considering the growing autonomy of the curator as a creator of juxtapositions between artworks for a self-chosen, overarching theme, it was the curatorial choices made in the exhibition *Garden of Earthly Delights* that stood at the center of our observations. All in all, both the textual and the spatial dimensions analyzed for the exhibition showed both critical as well as affirmative stances to anti-racist curating. This suggests two major outcomes: firstly, the priority of interpretational/representational

---

4   Qualitative audience survey conducted December 29, 2019.

choices concerning the curatorial theme, rather than the artists' articulated position(s); and, secondly, discrepancies between translation and paraphrasing when touching on the topic of colonization.

By comparing the exhibition texts, we encountered several points of divergence. Criticisms against colonialism were pointed out as a central topic in the artworks of some artists. Although working very closely with the information given by the artists themselves on their official website, it was decided to exclude certain vocabulary from the exhibition text that would have resulted in a less neutral tone than the way in which it was framed in the end. The curatorial theme of "the garden as a metaphor of the state of the world" was often imposed on the artist's actual intentions. This is problematic since artworks thereby become representative of something which they never claimed to be. In this context, Artists of Color who have gained access to the 'Western' art system, despite institutional obstacles, are often instrumentalized as tokens: as representatives of their national and potentially ethnic origins, they are expected to refer to them in their artistic expression. This curatorial action has also been described by John Pfeffer as the production of the 'Other' in a 'Western' understanding of art, by inscribing a certain essentialism to the art produced by People of Color (PFEFFER 2006: 221f.).

Furthermore, contexts that seemed unfitting to the overarching exhibition theme or that were simply too lengthy have been excluded, such as omitting aspects of queerness in the case of the artist Zheng Bo. What Chandra Frank has defined as the main principle of a decolonial curatorial process, namely "to contribute to the unearthing of hidden histories," (FRANK 2015) cannot be detected for all curatorial decisions taken for this exhibition; on the contrary, some her*histories stayed hidden. However, if we aim to establish an inclusively curated exhibition space, we cannot stop and focus on only one group, such as People of Color or Indigenous People, who have been subjected to (neo)colonization, with the revolutionary aim to 'diversify' the art institution. We argue that an overall inclusive, decolonial curatorial praxis needs to be sensitive to several forms of oppression, as the main of such a praxis is to open up the predominantly White, hetero-normative institutions to those that have been kept out (KOSOKO 2018: 121).

Moreover, the exhibition decided to adopt an allegedly neutral standpoint when reflecting on colonialism in the explanatory texts, which stood as the sole informational content next to the artwork itself. However, by reproducing certain vocabulary (e.g. "European discoverers"), excluding historical contexts that stem from a racist political order

(e.g. the Apartheid regime in South Africa), and partly diminishing the continuity of systemic racial oppression as well as the reproduction of a Eurocentric hierarchy of knowledge, this alleged 'neutrality' needs to be questioned critically. While Lungiswa Gqunta, for example, posed a very clear and critical standpoint to continuing disparities between the White and Black population in South Africa, which stem from an explicit historic context (namely the Apartheid regime), the curated description of her work left several points open-ended. Her sharp criticism can, therefore, only be properly understood if the visitor reads the interview sequence of the catalogue and brings with them a certain background knowledge about South African Apartheid and its repercussions today.

Referring to Peruvian visual artist Daniela Ortiz, Caceres, Mesquita, and Utikal argue that rather than creating such short-cuts, in order to realize the approach of a decolonial curation, the institution needs to assume a clear standpoint against power inequalities and violent systems of oppression, which are historically grown from colonialism and are still in place today (2017: 206). An anti-racist, decolonial curatorial practice needs, therefore, to intervene with the political status quo.

Furthermore, it has been noted that, when explicitly talking about colonialism, the German exhibition text happened to reproduce vocabulary that emerged during colonialism. It remains unclear and worthy of critique why it was decided to use the outdated term "Ur-Einwohner" in the exhibition text for Libby Harward, who defines herself as indigenous, a term that exists in German ("indigen").

To answer the question of who has been invited to present their perspective on global topics, the geographical residencies of the artists displayed at the exhibition shows a clear connection to an established 'Western' art world, to which the *Gropius Bau* is already linked. This suggests that the curators of *Garden of Earthly Delights* did not try to create a new and direct link with the so-called 'periphery.' Artists still have to (be able to) move their center of living and working to 'center'-cities in order to become part of these artist-networks. Especially in the field of contemporary art, this protection of established art circles amongst themselves in the 'center' can be criticized from a postcolonial perspective (BAYER/TERKESSIDIS 2017: 60). Only since the early 1990s is there a trend towards a "new visibility [...] for the reception of hitherto unknown and/or non-canonized [contemporary non-'Western'] art forms by 'international' (i.e. 'Western') publics." (BHAGWATI 2018: 192) Curators need to change their conventional requirements and aesthetic preferences of the 'center' in their selection process (BHAGWATI

2018: 192f.). If not, two fundamental prerequisites for anti-racist curating are missing: equal access into the museum context, regardless of the artists' origin, and a range of unfiltered perspectives by the symbolic hegemonic selection-filter of the center (BAYER/TERKESSIDIS 2017: 61, 65). It can be concluded that the Berlin curators should have chosen a way of anti-racist curating which not only depends on the established Berlin art world, but also creates new points of connection between the societally constructed zones of 'center' and 'periphery.'

The second spatial dimension which we analyzed with the help of the exhibition map showed a curatorial sovereignty through creating a selective depiction of the exhibited artworks in the visitor's map. This limitation of content may be cited as the reason for avoiding an overloading of the map. As we are asking generally whether the curatorial process of *Garden of Earthly Delights* implies any need for improvement towards a postcolonial maxim, the map, as a highly regulated translation by the curating authority, has to be questioned for doing exactly that. The necessary possibility of self-translation from the side of the artists is not ensured if the map is only created by a one-sided canonical perspective of a curator.

When looking at the spatial representation of the artists in the actual exhibition space, it becomes clear that the curators blocked the visitors' perceptions of some artists' works, due to the already-cited unfortunate spatial arrangements in small rooms, or due to the positioning of artworks or information on the artist in dark corners. Therefore, accessibility as a basic prerequisite for anti-racist curating (BAYER/TERKESSIDIS 2017: 60) was not fully in place.

As it has become clear up to this point, our analysis of the exhibition *Garden of Earthly Delights* shows several failures within the curatorial process – regarding the decisions on presentation or the selection of a textual as well as spatial dimensions – in which we see chances missed for a truly anti-racist curatorial practice. Even though some decisions have been made which point towards a paradigm shift in the predominantly White curatorial practice – e.g. by not stating the origin of the artists, by including theoretical texts about (post)colonialism in the exhibition catalogue, as well as the critical positions articulated by the artists, and by including artists from the 'periphery,' – it does not seem as if the *Gropius Bau* clearly tried to enforce the changes that authors such as Caceres, Mesquita, and Utikal want to see in the art world. What they argue for is a curatorial practice which leaves behind the notion of the "curator as the author" and looks for alternative strategies, such as

QTIBPoC artists (Queer/Trans/Inter/Black/People of Color), which are otherwise excluded from the discourse of contemporary art, in curatorial practice. (CACERES/MESQUITA/UTIKAL 2017: 204)

Despite the negative aspects of this curatorial approach, there were also bright spots that have to be mentioned. Choosing the atrium as a space to display artworks by Artists of Color – Rashid Johnson and Taro Shinoda – was a choice that appeared to be a reasonable curatorial decision in terms of fulfilling decolonial demands. Firstly, the barrier to the artwork is quite low, as it is the first space that visitors enter. They do not even have to pay for this impression of the whole concept of *Garden of Earthly Delights*, as there is free access until the entrances on the side. Secondly, the artworks are presented in the manner of a dialogue, in which each of them has enough space regarding the size of the artworks. This multi-perspective display of two very different interpretations of the exhibition's topic is welcoming and can hence be considered a successful decolonial curatorial approach.

5.2 Change in Progress at MARKK

The results from our second research field at *MARKK* clearly showed that the postcolonial discourse and problematic implications of ethnological museums were already discernible in curatorial practice before its fundamental repositioning in 2018 in terms of its historiography on the website and in further detail in books and exhibition catalogues. However, it was striking that before 2018, the explicit mention of the colonial background was omitted on the website, one of the main (communication) media the museum uses to present itself directly to its visitors.

Now, by contrast, the *MARKK* makes self-criticism the central theme of the museum. On the new website, a self-critical outline of the museum's history makes clear that the *MARKK* is aware of its own roots and derives from this the necessity of dealing with the colonial background of the museum exhibits, of researching the contexts of origin, and the possibility of returning the exhibits. This fundamental repositioning is reflected in a new visual design and online presence which adapts the *MARKK*'s corporate identity to contemporary tastes and thus supports the general idea of updating ethnological museums in a decolonial manner as well as adhering to the demands of new museology.

These transformations and the fact that the museum is still undergoing change can be seen in the exhibition *Amani. In the Footsteps of a Colonial Research Station*. With reference to the question of exclusion in the narrative of history (BUURMAN et al. 2018: 21), the participation

of external experts from Amani and surroundings during the curatorial development of the exhibition was neither addressed in the guided tour, nor was it evident in the exhibition's texts or catalogue. Gaps in the mode of representation were thus named during the guided storytelling in the exhibition, but not in the process of developing media that convey knowledge about the exhibitions.

In the exhibition *Amani*, the ethnological "degradation" of artworks as artifacts (LEEB 2013) did not seem to play a major role for the inclusion of contemporary artworks that were presented in an aesthetic way. However, when looked at in the context of the entire museum, such artworks' contemporary and artistic status appears in a different light, especially when being commissioned by the museum. This problem is only solved on the surface without creating a "post-ethnological museum" (LEEB 2013).

Besides important questions about the origin and meaning of ethnographical objects, the exhibition *Re-Interpreted* also tried to focus on these objects' artistic value. However, this artistic value could have been emphasized more clearly. No balance was established between the two points of view artistic and ethnological. The eight objects could have been displayed more clearly, too. They were too close to each other. Instead, it "should become clear that diverse perspectives on (museum) objects exist and that their messages change depending on the respective contextual presentation" (MUTTENTHALER/WONISCH 2006: 22).

Especially in our research on *Amani*, the (active) role of the (speaking) curator as a mediator between the artistic works and the visitors plays an important role for decoding the meaning of art. However, the investigations also demonstrate the possibility of reading the texts of the exhibition against the statements of the curators. For this to happen, however, there must be the possibility of thoroughly examining the individual exhibits and thus of being able to contradict what is said about them, so as to uncover the role of the "expository actor" as an individual who makes decisions based on own experiences and as an institutional representative. The verbal exchange during the tour was decisive for such an exchange.

In contrast to *Amani* the exhibition *Re-Interpreted* is not an aesthetic-artistic but an ethnological form of presentation of the exhibits at *MARRK*. The "expository actors" are far more in the background of the presentation and therefore their function is more difficult to uncover. Opportunities for a decolonial exhibition therefore also lie in exchange,

not only at a global level but also between individuals, in order to achieve a change in narrative and presentation forms.

For this it is important to take into account different "trajectories" (BUURMAN et al. 2018: 19) in order to abandon the great narrative that is only informed by a single perspective (LEEB 2013). The question whether artistic practice can revise *MARKK*'s structural perspective of narration, despite the differentiation between 'ethnological art' and 'contemporary art,' remains unsolved. Approaches such as anti-racist curating can hardly overcome the institutional separation between art museums and ethnological museums at present, largely due to the two separate perspectives of narration resulting from the separation of artworks. So, whereas contemporary art is continuously set in opposition to and not entangled with ethnological art, interweavings between these two categories cannot be decoded.

This is also what the visitors at *MARKK* underlined. The discussion of racism and postcolonial theory was considered important by all those questioned, but the curatorial practice was nevertheless identified as being in need of improvement. It was mentioned how important it is to include multiple and hitherto underrepresented expert perspectives. Anti-racist curating, therefore, aims at a curatorial practice which is far from the legitimized quasi-objectivity of Eurocentric museums in the Global North, which still allows for only a few privileged perspectives on culture and the arts. This "historiography from below" (BAYER/TERKESSIDIS 2017: 57) aims at a form of knowledge formation that is carefully and comprehensively processed and reflected on, and that extends beyond the racialization and relations of identity/alterity. In committing to such an approach of curation and knowledge formation, the necessity arises to traverse and question all narratives and exhibits of an exhibition in different ways from the outset. By considering the subjectivity of the actors involved and a forward-looking consideration of several perspectives, the aim is thus to strive for a holistic reflection of curatorial practice (BAYER/TERKESSIDIS 2017: 56).

5.3 Conclusionary Remarks

In this way, a museum practice of exclusion is to be opposed. Instead, the circle of artists as well as curators should be expanded. This form of collaborative curating through the unconditional inclusion of the hitherto invisible participants can contribute to the de-monopolization of museum practice (BAYER/TERKESSIDIS 2017: 67–69). To this end, it is necessary to rethink established processes in organizations such as

museums. As a practice that is still developing, anti-racist curating is part of an ongoing reflexive differentiation towards situational role shifts and new forms of organization (BAYER/TERKESSIDIS 2017: 69). This has the potential to involve a multitude of participants in organizational processes and to continuously incorporate their individual perspectives.

The classic curator could thus be opposed by a team of curators with different subject areas. Traditionally curated exhibitions could be replaced by new exhibition forms involving the direct participation of artists and audience. (ibid.: 68) Collaborative curating means not to place one's own positions behind or in front of another, but rather next to those involved and to act together. However, it is important not to ignore socio-economic inequalities and persisting power relations between the various actors and to take these into account when designing content for museums (BAYER/TERKESSIDIS 2017: 69).

In addition, a museum should come to terms and confront its own colonial and racist past, present, and future. The examination of the museum's own history regarding the provenance of artworks offers a starting point for the entire social debate on colonialism and racism. By using the museum building itself as a visual example for the approach with the subject matter, visitors can be involved in the process of reflection, and region-specific forms of racist and colonial violence can be illustrated. The museums, for their part, would thus be fulfilling new museology's claim to educational work, by paving the way for museums to act as 'teaching institutions' or instruments of cultural mediation and participation in times of globalization, migration, and cultural plurality (Figure 11).

In conclusion, such a form of pluralization of cultural as well as artistic content can contribute to the development of contemporary and interesting cultural work in the long run and support the ethnological and art museums that have been criticized for their efforts to promote a global perspective on culture and art beyond racialization and beyond colonization. Even though anti-racist curating has succeeded in some respects in both museums studied in this paper, we can conclude that the decolonial turn in the predominantly White curatorial practice at visual art museums has not yet been fully achieved – at least we can say so in respect to what we found at *Gropius Bau*. This can still be seen in the ongoing exclusion of underrepresented artists and the reproduction of colonial concepts in the museums' discourses on "disciplinary power" (FOUCAULT 1978: 51) and their spatial structures.

Fig. 11: *Open Doors at MARKK, Hamburg 2020 (Photo by Anna Catharina Mulder 2020)*.

Thus, there is still a need to further strengthen a decolonial perspective in curating, to balance strategies of visual representations in museum spaces, as well as to increase audience participation in order to establish a more active role for the public, including in the control of the curatorial function in the sense of new museology.

> When museums and exhibitions are understood as places of confrontation, in which historiographies, categories of knowledge and aesthetic practices are discussed every time anew, not only meanings themselves but also curatorial practices are open for re-negotiation. (WUTTENTHALER/WONISCH 2006: 24)

Likewise, all three of the museums' "expository actors" (BAL 1996) need to be analyzed together as entangled and mutually influencing each other in order to overcome the separation between different forms of narration.

The application of these questions also appear pressing from a wider socio-economic perspective "both within and outside the museum context" (VERGO 2009: 41). Thus, we should think of more ways to establish the decolonial turn in museums, as well as to seek to discuss and negotiate a decolonized (visual) culture beyond museums. Curating the 'global' from a decolonial perspective is not only a necessary but also an achievable goal.

References

BAL, Mieke (1996): *Double Exposures: The Subject of Cultural Analysis*. New York, London: Routledge.

BAYER, Natalie/TERKESSIDIS, Mark (2017): Über das Reparieren hinaus. Eine antirassistische Praxeologie des Kuratierens. – In: Bayer, Natalie/Kazeem-Kamiński, Belinda/Sternfeld, Nora (eds.), *Kuratieren als antirassistische Praxis* (= Curating – Ausstellungstheorie & Praxis, 2). Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter, 50–71.

BHAGWATI, Annette (2018): Of Maps, Nodes and Trajectories. Changing Topologies in Transcultural Curating. – In: Dornhof, Sarah/Buurman, Nanne/Hopfener, Birgit/Lutz, Barbara (eds.), *Situating Global Art: Topologies - Temporalities - Trajectories*. Bielefeld: transcript, 192–212.

BUDEN, Boris (2012): Towards the Heterosphere: Curator as Translator. – In: Lind, Maria (ed.), *Performing the Curatorial*. Berlin: Sternberg, 23–44.

BUURMAN, Nanne/DORNHOF, Sarah/HOPFENER, Birgit/LUTZ, Barbara (2018). Situating Global Art: An Introduction. – In: Dornhof, Sarah/Buurman, Nanne/Hopfener, Birgit/Lutz, Barbara (eds.), *Situating global art. Topologies - temporalities - trajectories*. Bielefeld: transcript, 11–32.

CACERES, Imayna/MESQUITA, Sushila/UTIKAL, Sophie (2017): Anti-Colonial Fantasies/Decolonial Strategies: A Conversation. – In: Bayer, Natalie/Kazeem-Kamiński, Belinda/Sternfeld, Nora (eds.), *Kuratieren als antirassistische Praxis* (= Curating – Ausstellungstheorie & Praxis, 2). Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter, 201–211.

CHACHAGE, Rehema (2020): *Artist. Writer. Arts Coodinator. Researcher. About* <https://rehemachachage.co.tz/bio/> [01.05.2020].

FOUCAULT, Michel (1978): *Dispositive der Macht. Michel Foucault über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit*. Berlin: Merve.

FRANK, Chandra (2015): *Policy Briefing: Towards a Decolonial Curatorial Practice. Discover Society* <http://www.chandrafrank.com/towards-a-decolonial-curatorial-practice> [05.05.2020].

GAUPP, Lisa/PELILLO-HESTERMEYER, Giulia (eds.) (2020): *Diversity and Otherness. Transcultural Insights into Norms, Practices, Negotiations*. Berlin, Boston, Peking: deGruyter.

GAUPP, Lisa (2020): "The West" vs. "The Rest"? Festival Curators as Gatekeepers for Sociocultural Diversity. – In: Durrer, Victoria/Henze, Raphaela (eds.), *Managing Culture: Exchange on Exchange in a Global Times*. Wiesbaden: Springer, 127–153 <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-24646-4>.

GIBLIN, John/RAMOS, Imma/GROUT, Nikki (2019): Dismantling the Master's House: Thoughts on Representing Empire and Decolonizing Museums and Public Spaces in Practice. – In: *Third Text*, 33, 4/5, 471–486 <https://doi.org/10.1080/09528822.2019.1653065>

GQUNTA, Lungiswa (2019): Interview. – In: Rosenthal, Stepahnie (eds.), *Garten der Irdischen Freuden/Garden of Earthly Delights*. Exhibition catalogue. Mailand: Silvana Editoriale, 292–297.

GROPIUS BAU (2019): Program 2019. *Garden of Earthly Delights* <https://www.berliner-festspiele.de/en/berliner-festspiele/programm/bfs-gesamtprogramm/programmdetail_274528.html> [05.05.20].

GROPIUS BAU (2020): *The House. About Us* <https://www.berlinerfestspiele.de/en/gropiusbau/haus/ueber-uns/start.html> [05.05.2020].

HARWARD, Libby/HARWARD-NALDER, Glenda (2019): Interview. – In: Rosenthal, Stephanie (eds.), *Garten der Irdischen Freuden/Garden of Earthly Delights*. Exhibition catalogue. Mailand: Silvana Editoriale, 282–289.

JACOBI, Daniel/POLI, Marie S. (1995): Scriptovisual documents in exhibitions: Some theoretical guidelines. – In: Blais, Andrée (ed.), *Text in the exhibition medium*. Québec: Société des musées québécois, Musée de la civilisation, 48–78.

JANNELLI, Angela/HAMMACHER, Thomas (2008): Einleitung – Warum Ausstellungsanalyse? – In: Institute of Ethnic and Cultural Anthropology of the University of Hamburg (eds.), *Volkskundlich-kulturwissenschaftliche Schriften*, 18/1. Hamburg: Universität Hamburg, 7–10.

KARENTZOS, Alexandra (2012): Postkoloniale Kunstgeschichte. Revisionen von Musealisierungen, Kanonisierungen, Repräsentationen. – In: Reuter, Julia/Karentzos, Alexandra (eds.), *Schlüsselwerke der Postcolonial Studies*. Wiesbaden: VS, 237–254.

KASTNER, Jens (2012): Doppelte Interventionen. Feministische Effekte zwischen Kunstproduktion und sozialen Bewegungen. – In: Hartmann, Doreen/Lemke, Inga/Nitsche, Jessica (eds.), *Interventionen. Grenzüberschreitungen in Ästhetik, Politik und Ökonomie*. Paderborn: Fink, 73–83.

KAZEEM, Belinda/MARTINZ-TUREK, Charlotte/STERNFELD Nora (2009): Vorwort. – In: Kazeem, Belinda/Martinz-Turek, Charlotte/Sternfeld, Nora (eds.), *Das Unbehagen im Museum. Postkoloniale Museologien*. Wien: Turia+Kant, 7–10.

KÖPKE, Wulf/SCHIFF, Hajo (eds.) (2000): *Kunst - Museum - Völkerkunde. Beiträge zu einer aktuellen Debatte. Texte von 1995–2000* [on the occasion of the exhibition „GegenStände - Der Innere Reichtum des Museums," from the 20th of February till the 4th of June 2000]. Hamburg: Museum für Völkerkunde.

KÖPKE, Wulf/SCHMELZ, Bernd (eds.) (2002): *Ein Dach für alle Kulturen. Das Museum für Völkerkunde Hamburg*. Hamburg: Museum für Völkerkunde.

KOSOKO, Jaamil O. (2018): Crisis in the Gallery: Curation and the Praxis of Justice. – In: Liepsch, Elisa/Warner, Julian (eds.), *Allianzen: Kritische Praxis an weißen Institutionen*. Bielefeld: transcript, 120–129.

LEEB, Susanne (2013): Asynchrone Objekte. – In: *Texte zur Kunst* <https://www.texte-zurkunst.de/91/asynchrone-objekte/> [01.05.2020].

MARKK (2019): *Museum am Rothenbaum. Kulturen und Künste der Welt. Geschichte des Museums* <https://markk-hamburg.de/geschichte/> [25.11.2019].

MARKK (2020): *Museum am Rothenbaum. Kulturen und Künste der Welt* <https://markk-hamburg.de/> [28.02.2020].

MAYRING, Philipp (2015): *Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse: Grundlagen und Techniken*. Weinheim, Basel: Beltz.

MICOSSÉ-AIKINS, Sandrine/SHARIFI, Bahareh (2017): Widerstand kuratieren. Politische Interventionen in eine elitäre, hegemoniale Kulturlandschaft. – In: Bayer, Natalie et al. (eds.), *Kuratieren als antirassistische Praxis*. Berlin, Boston: de Gruyter, 135–155.

MODEST, Wayne/NICHOLAS, Thomas/PRLIC, Doris/AUGUSTAT, Claudia (eds.) (2019): *Matters of Belonging: Ethnographic Museums in a Changing Europe*. Leiden: Sidestone Press.

MUTTENTHALER, Roswitha/WONISCH, Regina (2006): *Gesten des Zeigens. Zur Repräsentation von Gender und Race in Ausstellungen*. Bielefeld: transcript.

O'NEILL, Paul (2007): The curatorial turn: from practice to discourse. – In: Rugg, Judith/Sedgwick, Michèle (eds.), *Issues in curating contemporary art and performance*. Chicago: Unviersity Press, 13–28.

PFEFFER, John (2006): Die Essentials. – In: Jongbloed, Marjorie (ed.)*, Entangled. Annäherungen an zeitgenössische Künstler aus Afrika/Approaching contemporary African artists*. Hannover: Volkswagen Foundation, 193–224.

PLANKENSTEINER, Barbara (2019): Geleitwort zur Hamburger Ausstellung. – In: Geißler, P. Wenzel/Gerrets, Rene/Kelly, Ann H. (eds.), *Amani - Auf den Spuren einer kolonialen Forschungsstation in Tansania* (= Postcolonial Studies, 37). Bielefeld: transcript, 9–10.

ROBERTS, Les/COHEN, Sara (2015): Mapping Cultures. Spatial Anthropology and Popular Cultural Memory. – In: Duxbury, Nancy/Garrett-Petts, William F./MacLennan, David, *Cultural Mapping as Cultural Inquiry*. New York: Routledge, 170–192.

ROSENTHAL, Stephanie (ed.) (2019): *Garten der Irdischen Freuden/Garden of Earthly Delights*. Exhibition catalogue. Mailand: Silvana Editotiale.

SCHMITT-LINSENHOFF, Viktoria (2005): Das koloniale Unbewusste in der Kunstgeschichte. – In: Below, Irene/von Bismarck, Beatrice (eds.), *Globalisierung/Hierarchisierung: kulturelle Dominanzen in Kunst und Kunstgeschichte*. Marburg: Jonas, 19–38.

SUHRBIER, Mona (2015): Lastenverteilung: Zum Verhältnis von Museum, Universität und Kunst nach der Krise der ethnographischen Repräsentation. – In: Kraus, Michael/Noack, Karoline (eds.), *Quo vadis, Völkerkundemuseum? Aktuelle Debatten zu ethnologischen Sammlungen in Museen und Universitäten*. Bielefeld: transcript, 93–110.

VERGO, Peter (2009[1989]): Introduction & The Reticent Object. – In: Vergo, Peter (ed.), *The New Museology*. London: Reaktion Books, 1–5, 41–59.

WEB.ARCHIVE.ORG (2020): *Museum für Völkerkunde Hamburg - Start* <https://web.archive.org/web/20110203051109/http://www.voelkerkundemuseum.com/> [28.02.2020].

Kulturelle Diversität in der kuratorischen Praxis: Politik(en) globaler Künste

4 Resümierendes Rahmenpapier

4.1. Fazit & Schlussfolgerungen

Die vorliegenden kumulativen Habilitationsschriften fokussieren auf die sozialen Prozesse, die bei der Standardisierung und der Dekonstruktion von soziokulturellen Differenzen zu Tage treten. Der Schwerpunkt liegt dabei auf den Arten und Weisen, in denen verschiedene Konzepte der Diversität und Alterität in der kuratorischen Praxis globaler Musik- und Performing Arts-Festivals (de-)konstruiert werden. Aus transkultureller Perspektive profilieren sie eine postkolonial orientierte Kulturforschung, die sich auf soziale Ungleichheiten, ambivalente sowie konflikthafte Aushandlungsprozesse und zugrundeliegende Machtverhältnisse beziehen. Dem zugrunde liegt ein gemeinsamer kulturtheoretischer Ansatz, der sich als praxeologisch, prozessual, konstruktivistisch und situational versteht. Der Blick auf sowohl Kontingenzen des menschlichen Zusammenlebens als auch auf ihre symbolischen Routinisierungen zeichnet den transkulturellen Ansatz der Schriften unter Berücksichtigung des Spannungsfelds zwischen Standardisierung und Dekonstruktion in verschiedenen Kontexten und aus interdisziplinären Perspektiven auf verschiedenen Mikro-, Meso- und Makroebenen der Gesellschaft aus. Damit wird das komplexe Zusammenspiel von Diskursen (beziehungsweise Symbolen und Narrativen) und Performanz (beziehungsweise von Praktiken und sozialen Beziehungen) als auch von Repräsentation (beziehungsweise von Politiken und Strukturen) von Diversität und Alterität im Forschungsfeld untersucht.

Meine drei Forschungsschwerpunkte a) Kultursoziologie: Transkulturelle Diversitätsforschung, b) Postkoloniale Soziologie der Kultur, Globale Künste und Politik(en) und c) Migration & Urban Music Studies finden sich in unterschiedlicher Schwerpunktsetzung in allen vorliegenden Schriften. Überschneidungen und Mehrfachzuordnungen sind selbstverständlich virulent. Dabei sind vor allem die folgenden Schriften zuvorderst dem jeweiligen Forschungsschwerpunkt zuzurechnen:

Eine transkulturelle Diversitätsforschung aus vorrangig kultursoziologischer Perspektive (a) unternehmen vor allem die Beiträge

2. Transcultural Music Studies,

4. Kulturelle Diversität in den Künsten,

7. Epistemologies of Diversity and Otherness und

9. Decolonizing Otherness through a Transcultural Lens: Conclusion.

Als postkolonial orientierte Soziologie der Kultur mit Fokus auf Politik(en) globaler Künste (b) lassen sich vor allem die folgenden Beiträge benennen:

3. Symbolische Räume kultureller Diversität,

4. Kulturelle Diversität in den Künsten,

5. The „West" vs. the „Rest",

8. How to Curate Diversity and Otherness,

9. Decolonizing Otherness through a Transcultural Lens: Conclusion sowie

10. Curatorial Practices of the „Global".

Der Blick auf (post-)migrantische Prozesse unter anderem in musikalischen Praktiken mit Bezug zu urbanen Räumen (c) ist vor allem in den folgenden Beiträgen zu finden:

1. Dekonstruktion des „Anderen",

2. Transcultural Music Studies und

6. Listening to the Street.

Alle Schriften diskutieren jeweils exemplarisch die vielfältigen *Politik(en) der Macht* im Feld der globalen Künste, die mit komplexen sozialen Prozessen der Normierung und Konventionalisierung als auch mit Gegenmaßnahmen und Dekolonialisierungsbestrebungen einhergehen sowie strukturierenden Rahmenbedingungen unterliegen. Das untersuchte Dispositiv der *kulturellen Diversität* in den globalen performativen Künsten ist vor allem hinsichtlich zwei standardisierender Konzepte erkennbar: als intersektionale Diversität und Alterität, welche multiple und sich überkreuzende soziale Zugehörigkeiten in sowohl Inklusions- als auch Exklusionsprozessen betonen und unter anderem gleiche

Repräsentationsmöglichkeiten von Minderheiten anstreben; sowie als transkulturelle (cross-cultural) Diversität und Alterität, die die in diesen Prozessen entstehenden Ambivalenzen, Uneindeutigkeiten und Zwischenräume fokussieren und grenzüberschreitende kulturelle Praktiken fördern möchten.

Dieser genuin kulturwissenschaftliche Ansatz hebt die etablierte Trennung zwischen eher geisteswissenschaftlichen kulturwissenschaftlichen Disziplinen und eher sozialwissenschaftlichen kulturwissenschaftlichen Disziplinen auf beziehungsweise entlarvt sie als „theoretische Fiktion"[1]. Dies bedeutet, dass sowohl materialistische als auch idealistische Ansätze miteinander verbunden werden. Allgemein definiere ich in meinen Schriften die als sozialwissenschaftlich bezeichnete Ansätze darüber, dass der Fokus darauf liegt, wie kulturelle Konstruktionen praktiziert werden und welche Effekte diese Praktiken in einer Gesellschaft besitzen beziehungsweise wie diese Praktiken wirkungsvoll gemacht werden. Diese Ansätze untersuchen meist die Formen, Ursachen, Prozesse, Funktionen und Wirkungen sozialen Lebens, das heißt jegliche Arten menschlicher Beziehungen sowie ihrer Materialisierungen unter anderem in Strukturen sozialer Ungleichheit. Kulturwissenschaftliche Ansätze, die dagegen eher als geisteswissenschaftlich bezeichnet werden, konzentrieren sich auf Wandlungsprozesse von Kultur verstanden als Bedeutungskonstruktionen in einem idealistischen Sinne, die ihren Ausdruck unter anderem in Kunstwerken finden.

Der erste Ansatz zu Materialisierungen von kulturellen Praktiken findet sich prominent unter anderem in den vorliegenden Beiträgen:

4. Kulturelle Diversität in den Künsten,

5. The „West" vs. the „Rest" und

8. How to Curate Diversity and Otherness.

Eine semiotische, idealistische Herangehensweise zeichnet dagegen vor allem diese Beiträge aus:

1. Dekonstruktion von Alterität,

3. Symbolische Räume kultureller Diversität sowie

10. Curatorial Practices of the „Global".

---

[1] Derrida, J. (2004). Die différance: Ausgewählte Texte (P. Engelmann, Ed.). Philipp Reclam jun., S. 135.

Da jedoch bei diesen und allen weiteren vorliegenden Schriften auch jeweils die „andere Perspektive" beleuchtet wird, kann festgestellt werden, dass die etablierten disziplinären Abgrenzungen zwar noch ihre Wirkmächtigkeit vor allem hinsichtlich hochschulpolitischer und berufungspolitischer Belange besitzen, die vorliegende kumulative Habilitationsschrift diese Abgrenzungen jedoch überschreitet und zu einer postkolonial informierten kritischen Kulturanalyse von Diversität weiterführt. Ebenso werden mehrere kulturwissenschaftliche Felder wie unter anderem die Migration & Mobility Studies, die Gender & Queer Studies und die Postcolonial Studies mit der Transkulturalitäts- und Diversitätsforschung konzeptionell miteinander verbunden. In allen Schriften wird dabei ein besonderes Augenmerk auf *das Soziale* gesetzt, in Bezug auf soziale Beziehungen, gesellschaftliche Diskurse und soziale Organisation(en). Da vor allem die Disziplin Kultursoziologie neben strukturellen, organisationalen und materialisierten kulturellen Formen und Praktiken auch Kultur als bedeutungsgebendes Tun untersucht, was ebenfalls dem Brückenschlag zwischen den skizzierten Abgrenzungen entspricht, beschreibt die vorliegende Arbeit neben dem Fachgebiet der Kulturwissenschaften im Allgemeinen auch das Gebiet der Kultursoziologie im Speziellen.

Auch für die Zukunft lässt sich festhalten, dass ich mich aus postkolonialer und transkultureller Perspektive, die ich mit den vorliegenden Schriften profiliert habe, in den beschriebenen Fachgebieten Kulturwissenschaften und Kultursoziologie mit Fokus auf Fragen der Diversität, auf Machtbeziehungen, urbanen Räumen, Politik(en), kulturellen Feldern sowie Globalisierungs- und Migrationsprozessen engagieren werde und diese Forschungsgebiete damit als kritische sozialwissenschaftliche Kulturforschung weiter ausbaue.