

PART III

INTERCULTURAL PERSPECTIVES
AND CHANGING PATTERNS IN THE
NEW HUMANITIES

Intercultural Humanities: What They Are and What They Can Do

Hiltraud Casper-Hehne and Christina Henkel

Introduction

The current state of humanity and the planet (mechanisation, climate, wars, migration, status of democracy and religion, human rights, etc.) requires new perspectives in the sciences that open up new paths of action, which is reflected in the call for transformation in the global university landscape. This chapter shows the potential that the humanities possess to contribute to the solution of not only major national social issues and to the monitoring of social developments and innovations, but also to universal, global processes. We argue that the humanities have special potential not only for a major global role, but also under the heading of sustainable development in research and teaching or education. While the Sustainable Development Goals were initially primarily socio-economic and politically oriented,¹ cultural aspects have become increasingly important.² In this context, global learning in schools and universities, and thus interculturality, is becoming increasingly relevant. Intercultural humanities, as a perspective on diversity in research and teaching, understood as a resource, represent a central new role for the humanities, since the cultural aspect is taken into account more strongly and emphasised for the global. We further argue that the potential of education is central to the old and new role of the humanities. In doing so, we present the fruitfulness of an intercultural perspective, as it has already been academically established in the humanities, as an argument for other sciences as well, and we formulate interculturality as a valuable concept that needs to be further promoted and disseminated. In this context, interculturality and cooperative research and education have already been dealt with in the past in individual departments, and exemplary transformations have taken place, which we will trace in a genealogical compact form using the three examples of Intercultural German Studies, Intercultural Philosophy and Intercultural Theology. All three subjects have innovatively and sustainably transformed themselves from the so-called *Old Humanities* and work cooperatively with international actors in research and education. Furthermore, their normative educational concept promotes and accompanies humanistic processes in world society. The present chapter is an attempt to understand and recognise some of the forces that have influenced the current situation of the humanities, and to make visible which developments have brought about the intercultural humanities and which paradigms and concepts support these developments. The perspective of intercultural humanities as the integration of a necessary perspective of the humanities is the focus of this chapter. The subjects mentioned represent disciplines of intercultural humanities per se. Central to humanities with an intercultural perspective is the focus on cooperation: research *with*

instead of research *about*. Furthermore, we argue that it is not crises, but the ability to transform, among other things through connectivity, that is one of the potentials of the humanities and that is a positive example for other sciences, or not only in higher education, whereby interculturality is an applicable and versatile concept.

Localisation – Discourses on Crisis and Transformation

Old Humanities: Attempts to Determine the Classic Humanities

Already at the turn of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Wilhelm Dilthey defined the humanities as an independent science in contrast to the natural sciences (Dilthey 1922: 4; 1927: 70), which marked the beginning of the entry of the humanities into the phase of self-contemplation (Rothacker 1920: 253f.). Among the humanities whose object was social-historical reality (Dilthey 1922: 4), Dilthey counted the social sciences: psychology, history, national economy, law and political science, religious studies, literature, art studies and education (Dilthey 1927: 70). The separation of the humanities from the natural sciences, following Dilthey's distinction between explaining (*erklären*) and understanding (*verstehen*), can be written as follows: 'We explain nature, but we understand social and historical life' (Ineichen 1975: 5). Understood by Dilthey, the humanities thus offer the tool not only to name objects, but to act in the social-historical reality through understanding. In our view, the humanities are not exclusively limited to the above-mentioned disciplines and are found both institutionalised as an academic discipline and intertwined with other disciplines in the person of the researcher. Even if neither philosophy nor philologies are mentioned in Dilthey's incomplete list, these are historically specific disciplines of the humanities. It is above all the combination of literary studies and national linguistics, as in German, English or Romance studies, for example, that plays a central role in the development of the humanities themselves and a formalisation of intercultural perspectives.

Discourse 1: Debate Since 1969 on the Core of Humanities Within the Humanities

The humanities, which had previously been a central and self-evident part of universities, were increasingly called into question in the 1960s. In 1969 a special edition of the journal *Daedalus* appeared under the title 'The Future of Humanities', which was published after the conference of the same name in 1968. It contained a collection of essays dealing with the methods of the humanities, their validity, the obligations of their time and their ability to fulfil them. It was stated that a change in access to and the content of science and research was a necessary condition for the further preservation of the humanities and that a crisis was imminent (Ong 1969). Since then, the current or future state of the humanities has been discussed again and again, and the questions raised back then are also reflected in today's discourse. The debate is dominated on the one hand by a sense of crisis and on the other by the perspective of an historically everyday change. While proponents of the crisis hypothesis see barbaric times as coming to an end with the end of humanism and critical thinking, which makes the humanities superfluous, as well as the collapse of democracy and the rise of authoritarian systems, other intellectuals see these dangers as persistent and the humanities as a repeatedly reliable tool for maintaining a humanism whose concept has yet to be defined (Braidotti 2014).

The repetition of the debate and its questions leads one to assume that it has stagnated. But apparent crises and transformation belong to the humanities. And instead of naming crises, we can act actively by talking to *each other* and not *about* something.

Discourse 2: The Two Cultures – Questioning the Role of the Humanities as Distinct from Other Sciences

In 1959 Charles Percy Snow described the separation of the humanities from other sciences in his famous text in ‘Two Cultures’ as follows: ‘Literary intellectuals at one pole – at the other scientists, and as the most representative, the physical scientists. Between the two a gulf of mutual incomprehension – sometimes (especially among the young) hostility and dislike, but most of all lack of understanding’ (Snow 1959: 4).³

This artificial separation persists despite all efforts⁴ and is another supporting aspect of the above-mentioned crisis discourse. A negative conception of technology and progress produces a diffuse sense of crisis in the humanities, which leads to the fact that the job market, economic crises and an apparently dwindling intellectual interest in the respective societies or the so-called barbaric times rob the humanities of parts of their potential for the future. These perspectives simulate an apparently necessary or real separation from other sciences. In view of the history of the humanities and the Enlightenment imperatives of progress and reason, the question of which disciplines and subjects are best suited to the universities and the world of tomorrow is circulating repeatedly in both social and academic circles. In the natural sciences, the social sciences or the so-called STEM fields (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics), results and benefits seem to be easier to measure. However, we do not believe that they would have any greater relevance or usefulness than the humanities for a regional or global higher education area. This is because the humanities have had a valuable wealth of experience in dealing with human crises since the beginning of their existence. One of many examples of this is the historical sciences, which preserve a rich archive of how people deal with natural and man-made ‘crises’. Belief in technology and progress without consideration of human dispositions leaves a vacuum, which forces us to ask questions about the location of the human being, as the humanities have always done. For, central to the humanities are the human being and the world in which he lives, understood as an economic, social, political, historical or even cultural context, and nothing of this can be reduced to one discipline. In our view, the high potential and social relevance of the humanities is largely due to their interaction competence and connectivity in terms of interdisciplinarity and interculturality.

The Unbroken Potential of the Humanities

(a) Connectivity to Other Subjects: Interdisciplinarity

The humanities consist of a complex of heterogeneous knowledge that makes the conditions of human existence – socially, culturally, philosophically, religiously, historically and artistically, to name but a few – explorable, and thus enables the human being or, depending on the discipline, the subject, the individual or even the actor, especially in interaction with other fields of knowledge, to act in his or her lifeworld. One of the earliest examples of the natural links between the humanities and the natural sciences in the exploration of our own and foreign cultural worlds is the universal scholar Alexander

von Humboldt and his brother Wilhelm von Humboldt, allowing interdisciplinarity and interculturality to be situated in the humanities at an early stage.

We assume that although the humanities were traditionally institutionalised separately, they have always been networked in spirit. They have constantly transformed themselves and have been accessible to other disciplines. Earlier approaches to securing the relevance of the humanities in an unknown future included the demand for interdisciplinary work and for opening up the individual disciplines to cooperation. Innovation stagnates not only without the synergy effects of interdisciplinarity, but also without those of interculturality. After all, the evaluation of current challenges and the development of proposed solutions are fundamentally about the integration of perspectives.

(b) Connectivity to Other Cultures: Interculturality

Calls for a transformation of the humanities and their fields of research are numerous, as are interdisciplinary and also intercultural research projects and educational concepts. The central point here is that the benefits of diversity in discipline and culture as a valuable resource in problem-solving are obvious and should be made fruitful in practice. In scientific discourses that are conducted transnationally, equal participation and acceptance of the other is necessary. Although this is also seen in other branches of science, it is only seen and theoretically discussed and practically implemented in research and teaching in the humanities. The humanities therefore offer scientific starting points for taking cultural diversity into account in all aspects. Through cooperation and inclusion, understood as equal participation, in international research discourses, the synergy effects of cultural diversity as a research resource, but also the necessary attitude of mind, are transported. Knowledge about culture, whether one's own or that of others, is an indispensable resource in the current global social debates, such as those on health and sustainability. More than ever, it is necessary to find solutions together with international partners to the most diverse problems of globalisation, such as the scarcity of resources, environmental issues, food distribution, violence and pandemics. Sustainability, understood as health for the planet and mankind, is one of the most central desiderata of the twenty-first century, whereby the concepts of sustainability are characterised by heterogeneous, discipline-oriented conceptual histories and result in divergent practices of sustainability (Kluwick and Zemanek 2019: 11). Culture can act both as a bridge-builder and a border-builder. What happens depends on how people act in the interspace. Intercultural humanities are interested in this 'in-between' as a productive space (Kostalova 2003: 242).

Culture, consisting of ascriptions of meaning, values and symbols, produces processes of interaction and negotiation, just as these in turn generate culture. Here the assumption is made that interculturality can fill gaps and build bridges. One of the reasons for this is that through interaction and cooperation, understood as practical lifeworld design, the transformation is carried out jointly and without a human vacuum. Interculturality is a research perspective that has been adopted in many humanities disciplines, such as Intercultural Philosophy, Intercultural German Studies and Intercultural Theology. It focuses on the meaning and relevance of culture and culturality as a dimension of texts/objects such as knowledge, horizon of experience and perception of the reader, the teacher and the researcher. It is an intermediate position in which the processual and reciprocal production of the self and the other takes place. From the perspective of the actors, interculturality is a cognitive process that emerges from this self-reflexive perception and experience of cultural plurality and helps to overcome ethnocentrism by making it possible to think and

anticipate the perspective of the other in one's own construction of reality and in one's own actions or research and teaching.

We argue that the above-mentioned natural connectivity of the humanities enabled the transformation of the classically understood humanities into intercultural humanities. But first we will briefly discuss the relationship between culture and the humanities, as well as the transformation of the perspective on culture and its influence on education, which has accompanied and influenced both positively and negatively not only in Europe but also in global social processes.

Culture and the Humanities

Culture as Self-education and the Classic Educational Concept of the 'West'

Culture understood in the original sense of antiquity means things shaped by humans, such as the cultivation of soil for agriculture or the breeding of farm animals and plants, but also religious care and, within this, education and training (Nünning and Nünning 2003: 19; Assmann 2011: 13f.). Culture is often related to nature and also presented as a contrast, as it is still practised institutionally at universities today in the division of cultural and natural sciences. Nature shaped by humans is considered culture. Just as people cultivate their environment, they also cultivate themselves. In terms of the history of ideas, humans distance themselves from the raw, natural state of origin and educate themselves. This idea is closely connected with the pursuit of progress and a central idea of development. Following the ideas of the Enlightenment, even in the twentieth century culture is still regarded as material spiritual progress of the individual and the collective.⁵ For a long time, the evolutionist concept of culture was based on a European ideal as the goal of human development. Cultures exist in the plural and people who are considered to belong to them are attributed specific characteristics. The change in the perspective on the development of the whole of humanity to a differentiation into cultures has massive consequences in the sense that values are incorporated into the description of the other or foreign (Daniel 2006: 445f.).

Culture as a Fighting Concept in Education Policy – The Primordial Understanding of Culture in Not Only the German Humanities

Dealing with culture has always had a sunny and a shady side, not only, but especially, in Germany. An example of the perversion of cultural theory is Johann Gottfried Herder's *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*⁶ (*Ideas for the Philosophy of the History of Mankind*). These treatises by the theologian and philosopher, who saw himself as a cosmopolitan, are an early example of Enlightenment travel and research reports, which represent an attempt to classify not only nature, but also the country and its people. Herder understood reason, language, education, community in the sense of folk spirit, but also agriculture, as the origin of that which the word from Latin describes, as manifestations of culture(s). Even if Herder's cultures are characterised by inequality, they are of equal value. However, for National Socialism, which for a few years at German universities also took in the humanities (Hausmann 2011: 99f.), these thoughts unintentionally became grateful tools of their racial ideology. The examination of the four 'S's': Stamm, Sitte, Sprache und Siedlung (tribe, custom, language and settlement) (Sievers 2001: 35) led to a strengthening of the first culture-related courses of study: such as folklore, for example, which was initially

based in German studies. The increased institutionalisation of culture-related humanities under National Socialism can be measured, among other things, by the increased number of chairs (Jeggle 2001: 65). This phase of degeneration resulted in the instrumentalisation of theories in the humanities on the exercise of cultural violence against Jews and others. In the post-war period in Germany, cultural studies in the humanities therefore withdrew primarily from politics and efforts to de-Nazify the subjects. In the German-speaking world, this led to a specific development of cultural studies based on a specific confrontation with the past and an accompanying depoliticisation, although parallel global developments in the 1970s and 1980s led to a culturalistic turn in the humanities in general. Cultural studies developed in the occupying powers of Great Britain, the Chicago School in the USA, and in France in academic disciplines with a focus on cultural studies in the everyday world (Höhne 2013; Allerkamp and Raulet 2010; Gipper and Klengel 2008). Cultural studies in the German-speaking world have developed primarily from the field of literary studies and have also been shaped by interdisciplinary influences. Both the Frankfurt School of the 1960s (Jeggle 2001: 68) and the return of researchers who had emigrated from exile (Zacharaszewicz and Prisching 2017) were of great importance for the further development of a cultural studies perspective in the humanities. A further impulse came in the 1980s from British Cultural Studies and the American Chicago School, but also from French philosophy and Marxist, feminist and postcolonial perspectives (Leggewie et al. 2012). These theoretical currents in the humanities take a critical look at the production of knowledge and its institutional location and preconditions.

The historical background led to a specific development of the culturalisation of the humanities, especially in the German-speaking world. It can be said that English cultural studies, whose claim is more closely related to political theory, has not had a lasting theoretical effect on the development of German-language cultural studies (*Kulturwissenschaften*), which owe their existence to a specific examination of the humanities and with the exception of gender studies, cultural studies and German *Kulturwissenschaften* should be understood as parallel research developments with different theoretical traditions (Brandt 2017: 93). Today, cultural studies have their own departments, journals, conferences and graduate programmes throughout Europe. In the course of their development, the humanities can be divided into two perspectives, namely primordial and constructivist cultural studies. Primordial is understood to mean that human action is a reaction to cultural 'constraints', specifications or influences. This perspective carries the danger of stereotyping and the instrumentalisation of so-called national or cultural characters and has been criticised for decades (Hannerz 1992). For a long time, however, culture was – not only in German history, but albeit to an incomparable extent – a fighting term for the implementation of national goals and for identity. In the colonial past, too, a primordial understanding of culture dominated, which found expression in self- and foreign ascriptions as well as in dealing with the foreign and the mostly Western power of interpretation of ascriptions.

Transformation of the Perspective on Culture – Recognition of Postcolonial Voices and Criticism of Knowledge Production and the Western-dominated Canon of Knowledge

In the 1970s, the primordial understanding of culture was contrasted with a constructivist understanding that is characterised by the perception of difference and a perspective on culture as being shaped by human beings. Here, German studies serves as an example of the linking of academic discipline with national culture and identity, as do national

literary studies in other European countries. Other examples of this include English or Romance studies and also postcolonial literary studies. The examination of culture in the humanities has led to a sensitisation to the perspective and context of both one's own culture, which often gave preference to 'Western' or European-dominated academic perspectives, and the other, which has led to a demand for recognition of 'non-Western', non-European voices.

In the following, national literary studies and German studies, as well as German-speaking philosophy and theology, serve as examples of classical humanities that experienced a phase of post-war and/or postcolonialism and intercultural transformation in the second half of the twentieth century, which resulted in a change in one's perspective on oneself as a cultural studies discipline and the manifestation of this cultural turn through institutionalisation in the university landscape. Other disciplines in Europe have undergone a similar development, most notably British cultural studies. The roots of institutionalised postcolonial studies can be located at different times, depending on the interpretation (Ashcroft 2001). In 1961 Frantz Fanon pointed out cultural factors in the exercise of colonial power and is regarded as a pioneer of the 'cultural turn', which entered colonialism research in the 1980s (Heé 2017: 80). A central concern of postcolonial studies is the critical examination of Eurocentric knowledge systems and orders. Towards the end of the Cold War, postcolonial topics were taken up and passed on by English-speaking literary and cultural studies scholars and in India, whereas in the German-speaking world a delayed debate did not occur until the new millennium (Heé 2017: 81). In 1978, in his central work on ethnocentrism criticism, *Orientalism*, Edward Said formulated criticism of the Western representation and appropriation of the 'Other' and referred to the epistemic aspect of colonialism, namely the production of meaning by attributing it to foreign and own, thus opening up the struggle for the hegemony of discourse in the academic space of the humanities. The prevailing premise is that (colonial) rule is constructed and maintained through the dichotomy of foreign and own. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak poses the question 'Can the subaltern speak?' in the 1988 essay of the same name (Spivak 2006), and states that subalterity, namely the exclusion of hegemonic social roles and articulatory power, is not given nature as it is perpetuated, for example, in colonialism, but is socially constructed. Later, it calls for the death of the classical (Western-oriented) literary and humanities sciences in the sense of a deconstruction and transformation into a transdisciplinary and transnational cultural studies that critically examines (neo-) colonialism (Spivak 2003). The division of the world into the own and the foreign or the other, with emphasis on the construction of the other (Othering), creates worlds. Spivak (1985) critically calls this process – in which colonial space is created and located in the world – Worlding. A similar form of critique of the mapping or making of the world in relation to academic space is found in Dipesh Chakrabarty's *Provincializing Europe* (Chakrabarty 2000). He criticises a methodical Eurocentrism especially in the historical sciences: knowledge of Western history, for example, is professionally qualifying for Asian or African scholars, but not vice versa. He demands that Europe should be provincialised, i.e., that it should no longer be regarded as the centre of the world by itself and others, but as one region among many. Furthermore, a readjustment of the research perspective of colonial science studies, which for a long time lay on the colonialists, has shifted. More recent studies include the knowledge and perspective of the colonised or the 'former objects'. For example, Bayly used the term 'information order' (Bayly 1996: 3) to examine the function of knowledge as an instrument of rule or to investigate the extent to which knowledge or the production/deconstruction of knowledge made the exercise

of colonial rule possible. For the academic world, questions arise as to the emergence and establishment of individual academic disciplines in colonial interdependence.

George Basalla's essay 'The Spread of Western Science' from 1967 is regarded as the 'explosive material' (Heé 2017: 86) of the debate to this day. Basalla developed a diffusion model with Europe at its centre, which he describes as 'the original home from modern science' (Basalla 1967: 611). He describes in three phases, which he classifies vaguely in terms of time, how, in his view, science has spread from Europe to the rest of the world. In the first phase, which is vaguely located from early modern times up to the twentieth century, European explorers create knowledge in foreign territories with their scientific methods. In the second phase of 'colonial science', colonised intellectuals conduct research on the model of the colonial powers and are given the opportunity to train in the European educational system through colonisation. Even if the colonised have their own scientific tradition in 'embryonic form', they are, according to Basalla, inferior to the European sciences due to dependence, intellectual and institutional autonomy and practical and theoretical orientation towards Europe. The third phase describes a possible development towards a new intellectual centre, but only through the absolute appropriation of the European tradition of knowledge (Basalla 1967: 611f.). Basalla's 'contribution' expresses the mentality and arrogance that had to be broken up in the wake of the cultural revolution after 1968 by the intellectual left in Europe and the academic emancipation movements of the formerly colonised actors. Central to this at the beginning were debates on the essential importance of translation in the transfer of knowledge and the dynamic change to which knowledge is subject (Latour 1987). However, concepts such as knowledge transfer and knowledge diffusion also came under criticism, because all forms of knowledge are acts of communication (cf. Secord 2004) in which knowledge circulates. Here, already, the perspective shifts from the focus on culture to the space of transfer in-between and introduces the turn of humanities' perspectives to the 'inter', i.e., the 'in-between'. The concept of circulation of knowledge is also found in Kapil Raj's work (2013), with the aim of breaking up familiar dichotomies between producers and users, among other things. According to Raj there are no exclusive producers or exclusive users. The concept of circulation considers the different participation of all actors in the interactive production of knowledge as well as the dynamics of knowledge itself and specific (economic, geopolitical, etc.) power relations.

As a site of knowledge production, the global higher education landscape plays a central role in the task of not only deconstructing Eurocentric narratives, but also, together with other educational policy and knowledge-generating actors, providing operationalisable concepts and approaches that sustainably promote intercultural polylogue and thus consider the manifold interrelationships of our globalised world in the past and in the future. Interculturality and the perspective of the humanities based on it is such a central and necessary concept, as will be demonstrated in the following examples of three classical humanities. But first of all, the term and concept will be explained in more detail.

Intercultural Transformations in the Humanities

Interculturality as a Normative (Educational) Concept – Recognition of the Other (Knowledge)

The examination of the field of the concept of culture makes it clear that many concepts are not only characterised by a strong dynamic, but that they also often differ in

interdisciplinary communication practice (Neumann and Nünning 2012). The concept of interculturality first appeared in the USA in 1924 when the Bureau of Intercultural Education was founded to develop new educational concepts for the fusion (melting pot) of cultural differences among the American civilian population (Demorgon and Kordes 2006). After the Second World War, the concept of interculturality is also found in connection with the training programmes of the American government, which the cultural anthropologist Edward T. Hall was to develop in the course of the creation of a 'new world order' for experts from the academic, military and diplomatic worlds who were seconded to serve abroad. Hall taught not only facts about the country but also the competence to interact interculturally, and he called his method *Intercultural Communication* (Hall 1959: 10). In the Anglo-American world, the term *interculturalism* predominates, while in the German-speaking world *interculturality* is dominant. American interculturalism is primarily intraculturally oriented in order to promote intercultural dialogue to prevent the segregation tendencies of a failed multiculturalism within a culture in favour of an active acceptance of other cultures within a society: Martha Nussbaum defines interculturalism as 'the recognition of common human needs across cultures and of dissonance and critical dialogue within cultures' (Nussbaum 1997: 82).

In the German-speaking countries the concept of interculturality, until its differentiation in the 1980s, was initially used primarily in the field of business for the internationalisation of employees under the heading of intercultural training, but also in academic disciplines, such as foreign language didactics and above all in the field of educational science, and then in literary studies or theological discourses (Hock 2011: 21). New questions and methods have been developed to establish interculturality in research and teaching. Interculturality was not only a scientific but also a public concept, which was reflected in an interdisciplinary and application-oriented way in education, business and politics. A closer definition of the term interculturality is characterised by the meaning of the word 'inter', which is to be understood as between, reciprocity and together. The concepts of internationality and interculturality are connected with each other via the category of reciprocity (Wierlacher and Hudson-Wiedenmann 2000). Interculturality is not international qua existence, but rather the research and mediation of a specific object in the cooperative exchange of culturally different perspectives while reflecting on one's own culturality. The new perspective on interculturality led to a changed perception of interaction and cooperation in the cultural context. Central to this is the recognition of culture, both one's own and that of others. In Intercultural German Studies, interculturality:

presupposes a sharpened awareness of one's own culture (cultural awareness) and in this first and general sense refers to a science which, in research and teaching, takes into account the starting point of one's own culture in the sense of the leading understanding of culture that people are both riders and bearers of cultures at the same time, thinks beyond cultural borders and addresses the conditions of the possibility of a cultural dialogue and polylogue. Intercultural aspects in this sense can become apparent in the interaction between people, in the analysis of language and texts, in the life and production processes of the working world or in the various discourses. (Wierlacher 2003: 258 [translated by the authors])

The encounter with other cultures is always also connected with certain ideas and miniature theories about what is one's own and what is foreign, or what the others are, which in turn suggests cultural homogeneity that does not really exist. As the past has shown,

attributions of the foreign hold great dangers. In times of globalisation, however, identity constructions are always abstractions of individual sets of thoughts, values and needs that must be considered in interaction. In this context, it is necessary that the respective identity of the counterpart is acknowledged. Furthermore, constructions of identity serve the purpose of self-security, since they produce meaning and consistency despite all dynamics, which are necessary for the own identity foundation. They place the individual in relation to the world and enable the development of relevant cultural experiences and understanding competence for future interactions with the other. It is necessary that the actors learn to recognise and understand the mutual difference. For in order to participate in shaping the reality of a world society, the conditions that create or generate realities are central. These conditions or even supposed constraints are biologically, sociologically, politically and also culturally determined and relevant for a global or even a science-specific discourse. Realities and the handling of them do not take place in an external, culturally free of culturally connoted identities, but rather through understanding and coordination in scientific interaction or cooperation.

In the interculturality debate, there are many different guiding and controversial terms (Kirloskar-Steinbach et al. 2012).⁷ Among other things, the concept of transculturation, which is primarily represented by Wolfgang Welsch, was developed in the 1990s as a counter-concept (Welsch 1994). However, the two concepts of inter- and transculturation cannot be clearly separated from each other and have numerous overlaps. Transculturality implies the crossing of constructed cultural boundaries by the actors. It assumes that cultures are networked and hybrid, just as interculturality also assumes the permeability of borders and heterogeneity within 'one' culture. The concept of interculturality is wrongly assumed to have a primordial understanding of culture (Welsch 2011: 321f.). For this assumed concept of culture is not the core of the interculturality concept of intercultural humanities, but rather the inclusion of diversity and plurality. Interculturality is not a state but a dynamic concept of social practice, and thus an ongoing process. It is negotiated between two or more actors from different cultural orientations, with intercultural action taking place in the interspace of this encounter. In an age of border transgressions or global and digital migration, the potential of interculturality lies in the cooperative border spaces. The difference between cultures is seen as a productive in-between, which is a space of exploration and discovery, but also of suppression.

The key concepts of interculturality are: the appreciation or recognition of the other as well as of different constructions of reality; the perspective on difference as a resource; self-reflection and reflection on others; the focus on common ground; and the goal of cooperative design or the use of synergies. The concept of interculturality is used in many humanities as a suffix to define themselves as a subject and to emphasise their own perspective, which is why we understand them as intercultural humanities according to their self-understanding.

Intercultural Humanities: Interculturality as a Global Academic Mindset Using the Example of the Three 'Old and New Humanities' or Timeless Humanities: Intercultural German Studies – Intercultural Philosophy – Intercultural Theology

The perspectivation and entanglement of the humanities with culture led to a transformation of their perspective on culture and finally to an 'intercultural transformation' (Schellhammer 2015: 109) of classical humanities departments. The central assumption

is that cultures are based on exchange (for example, acceptance, imitation or rejection). The concept of culture of intercultural humanities is open, connectable (to anthropology, behavioural sciences, cultural analysis and cultural concepts of other cultures) and versatile. It is not homogeneous, timeless or free of contradictions, but is shaped by dialogue. Intercultural humanities sees itself as an applied, multidimensional cultural science, with a concept of culture that is as open as it is multidimensional, and which understands difference as a resource and potential. Using the following examples, the blatant intercultural transformations of the three selected disciplines of philosophy, German language and literature studies and the potential of the intercultural are presented genealogically and the potential of the intercultural is traced. This makes it possible to create common perspectives and not monocultural solutions to problems or one-sided cartographies of the world that bring danger rather than welfare and equality. These three disciplines are presented as examples, but the experience with transformation and an intercultural perspective is transferable to other disciplines. The practical support and promotion of such a development is described and demanded in this chapter as necessary. The three presented intercultural humanities – Intercultural German Studies, Intercultural Philosophy and Intercultural Theology, grown from former traditional subjects of the ‘classical’ university – are characterised by intercultural transformation for coming to terms with their subject-specific pasts. The dialogic reappraisal of the respective past of the subject, such as the postcolonial heritage or the hegemony of Western concepts or a Western-influenced academic canon, is to be seen as a participation in the shaping of a new intercultural history of mentality, which can be found both in the universities and in other socio-political institutions. The recognition of (cultural) diversity in philosophy, religion and literary studies is central to making the diversity in the human production of faith, thought and knowledge available to all, because all are cultural productions, which in turn have an impact on human co-existence and interaction with the world that surrounds people, as well as interaction with human and non-human actors. Education is thus to be seen as an intercultural process per se. A critical meta-reflection is needed which takes into account the plurality of educational traditions and for the forms of learning that have been ingrained in people’s cultures of knowledge and wisdom over the centuries if learning is to contribute to a meaningful life (Schellhammer 2015: 110). Cultural products, such as art, music, film, literature, philosophy and religion, have an immense influence on how people see the world and what norms and values they represent. Furthermore, related ideas and concepts are also transported and researched in other disciplines of humanities and social sciences and have consequences beyond the academic context, as already considered in Agenda 2030. There is ‘the ethical necessity of taking cultural dimensions of sustainability into account, whereby culture must not be understood as an instrument for conveying sustainability, but as a horizon within which values and normative preferences can be developed in the first place’ (Kluwick and Zemanek 2019: 19 [translated by the authors]).

Intercultural German Studies

The paradigm shift in German studies towards a self-conception as an applied cultural science took place as a process in the subject even before the wave of cultural turns in the humanities since 1975, and it was completed with the establishment of *xenology* or the theory of foreigners in the 1980s (Wierlacher and Hudson-Wiedenmann 2000: 219). In the 1980s, the concept of interculturality within German studies developed into a

research-guiding concept and stood for a new paradigm. Since then, intercultural German studies has understood itself as an alien subject with framework terms such as perspective and recognition, which refers to people both as researchers and those who are researched. The perspective is characterised by recognition of the point of view or the reflection of the respective point of view as well as by an open and different view of man. The classical image of man as a reasonable white man is outdated – actors can be anyone. The human being has relevance, but so does the respective context or the specific conditions of knowledge and experience. These must be acquired reciprocally as one's own or other people's or other lifeworld knowledge. A partial task of intercultural humanities is to provide the tools for this knowledge acquisition; namely, the ability to think critically about one's own and not just the foreign and to go beyond mere naming, i.e., to think about the other in a culturally conscious way. Interculturality opens up the perspective of a mutual interrelation of different cultural contexts and notions of a process resulting from this interrelation. The examination of culture takes place in the interaction between cultures, people and things. Interculturality is a mode of cooperative self-enlightenment and scientific partnership (Wierlacher 2003: 259), i.e., the process of overcoming ethnocentrism through cultural bridging and reciprocal perspectives, which allows the other and the foreign not only to be thought through but also to be perceived with different eyes. This is what makes a common understanding conceivable in the first place and creates the prerequisites for a dialogue that nobody dominates from the outset. Understanding the other and the foreign is based on the act of self-understanding and is dependent on interaction. Thus, interculturality is also a constitutional process and an expression of a cultural overlap situation (Wierlacher 2003: 260), which does not force the contrast between one's own and the other, or the foreign, but rather focuses on the mutual constitution of identities, the interaction processes of people and the respective context. Interculturality as a creative milieu of active tolerance (Wierlacher 2003: 261) ideally promotes the overcoming of dichotomies such as own–foreign by jointly shaping a 'third', while recognising the equal rights of culturally different positions.

Intercultural Philosophy

For intercultural philosophy, too, the criticism of a centrism that regarded philosophy primarily as a product of the West led to the assumption of a need for dialogue. As an alternative to the comparative or dialogical procedure, Wimmer introduced the intercultural polyphony, or the concept of the polylogue. This is defined as follows: 'Conversation between many about one subject' (Wimmer 2004: 67 [translated by the authors]). It is a conversation between people 'who are culturally shaped in different ways' (Wimmer 2004: 73 [translated by the authors]). With reference to a philosophy orientation that distinguishes between a comparative and an intercultural philosophy, the polylogue is about the participation of many traditions instead of an East–West comparison without the Global South. This reflects a critique of comparison without dialogue and calls for a common comparison characterised by 'openness to the other and equality of different partners' as an ideal of intercultural philosophy. The 'inter' serves as a space for understanding. For only there does culturality become clear through interaction or perspectivation. The inter is not a space of cultural entities, but rather depends on actors, because its essence is shaped by change, exchange and the shaping of lifeworlds and realities by the actors. Cultures can only perceive themselves in their cultural reality in the intercultural encounter, because there the basic experiences on which the individual cultures rest are experi-

enced (Weidtmann 2016: 180). Intercultural philosophy can be seen as a 'corrective' to comparative philosophy (Mall 2003: 44f.), which until now has focused on comparative studies of non-European philosophical traditions with an emphasis on difference, thus reproducing a classical Eurocentric heritage of philosophy. In contrast to this: 'The theme of intercultural philosophy (. . .) is the communication processes taking place between different philosophical traditions' (Staub 2009: 298 [translated by the authors]). In contrast to comparative philosophy, intercultural philosophy is not only observational but also action-oriented (Staub 2009: 298), and it is characterised by the fact that it sets in motion a mutual process of understanding, 'which makes the former objects of comparative philosophy the subjects of conversation' (Staub 2009: 304 [translated by the authors]). The normative relevance of intercultural discourse and thus of mutual recognition is brought to the point by Wimmer using the example of human rights, thus building a bridge both to the theoretical understanding of interculturality as a normative concept and to the practical understanding of interculturality as an operable concept for education, sustainability and human rights: 'The path to demonstrating universal validity or recognition of human rights as well leads via dialogues and polylogue and therefore actually has only one prerequisite – that people take each other seriously as argumentators' (Wimmer 2004: 178 [translated by the authors]). Thereby all philosophical approaches from the different regional traditions of thought have in common that they are open 'to culturally different traditions of thought as well as in the search for an orientation of a future world society' (Wimmer 2004: 50 [translated by the authors]). Ideally, the polylogue is preceded by a debate between different traditions on issues such as method, concepts or questions of truth. For no philosophical thesis is well-founded if it only comes from one cultural tradition (Wimmer 2004: 51). This leads to the recognition and treatment of formerly mute voices as equal partners in dialogue.

Intercultural Theology

Intercultural theology is closely connected with a postcolonial heritage and was for a long time also methodically Eurocentric in its approaches. At the latest, since 2005 missiology with its Eurocentric educational claim of missionarisation understands itself as intercultural theology (Feldtkeller 2013: 4):

The subject in its current orientation is dedicated in a broad theological perspective to the encounter and discussion of Christianity with non-Christian religions as well as to the theological perspective of Christianity's encounter and discussion with non-Christian religions and the theological reflection of non-Western dialects of Christianity in close relation to general economic questions. (Feldtkeller 2013: 4 [translated by the authors])

This also includes the realisation that non-Western forms of Christianity cannot be described with Western categories, which results from the break with the European history of origin and the contextual diversity of non-Western variants and with it the associated own diverse identities (Hock 2011: 22f.). While intercultural theology is regarded as overcoming missiology (Feldtkeller 2013: 5), it is also critically questioned whether the emergence of intercultural theology is a transformation or continues to be missiology with a new label (Hock 2011: 22). Furthermore, the question arises as to whether the intercultural debate is not a specifically European project: 'the fact that intercultural theology

began its life as part of a European conversation on culture and transcendence' (Ustorf 2008: 229). For outside of Europe one continues to hold on to Mission Studies by name, because a new subject title is not absolutely necessary, since Christianity per se is intercultural. However, it is recognised that the combination of missiology and intercultural theology, as it is institutionally usual at most German universities, has proved fruitful, and it is seen as a necessity 'for change of attitude and style in the way we discuss and relate with people of other cultural and religious traditions in our missiological research and education' (Oborji 2008: 113). Decisive for the paradigm shift in the 1970s in theology is the change of attitude towards people of other cultures, which 'takes the autonomy and value of foreign religions and cultures theologically into account by being ready to listen to and learn from the religious-cultural other' (Schmidt-Leukel 2011: 8 [translated by the authors]). Especially in Europe, the intercultural orientation represents an attempt to correct postcolonial guilt, as it has determined the debate since the 1970s until today. 'Intercultural theology does not think on behalf of others, but reflects its own premises in the presence of these others and, if things go well, together with them' (Ustorf 2008: 244f.). This also includes acceptance of the missionary in Christianity of other non-European forms and a non-European self-definition of the discipline. Just as the polylogue interreligious dialogues are a central dimension of intercultural theology (Friedli 1987: 183f.), which in the ideal case lead to the shaping of common attitudes and finally to a so-called global ethic (Küng 1995), here too we find a draft of the interdisciplinarily shared concept of *xenology*, the teaching of understanding the foreign. Differences in faith are not understood as a problem or boundary to be solved, but they should be made fruitful in interreligious dialogue (Sundermeier 1996: 38).

As already in postcolonial feminist philosophy, feminist and intercultural theology also focus on who the interlocutors of this aspired polylogue are. The role of religion in culture and society is relevant for the localisation of women in general and for the establishment and consolidation of images of women, which is why there are also feminist currents in intercultural theology, whether in the interpretation of the Bible (Dube 2000) or in the theological practice of women in non-European countries (Fabella 1993). Historically, there is also a connection with the examination of the postcolonial heritage of women in mission history (Smith 2007) or the export of a European ideal of women to the colonies (Prodolliet 1987). Thereby Intercultural theology/mission studies deals with emancipation movements as well as with the perpetuation of Christian-promoted traditional women's roles. Intercultural theology works in interdisciplinary exchange with gender studies against the (new) invention of women from foreign cultural contexts or other non-European religions (Walz 2003). Heike Walz pleads for the deconstruction of Euro-American-centred conceptions of gender in intercultural theology and gender studies, because thereby new horizons for the development of a gender-sensitive intercultural theology open up, which makes it its future task 'to take a critical look at tendencies of a Euro-American-centric gender imperialism, to take note of gender theory formation and theology from non-European, southern drafts, to enter into dialogue with them and to let them change us' (Walz 2010: 129 [translated by the authors]).

The development of a classical European humanities scholarship as outlined here through its interdisciplinary practice and intercultural perspective represents a discipline of intercultural humanities which recognises the other and the knowledge of the other and opens up the foundation for the prospect of 'a viable value basis for intercultural relations in the process of globalization' (Rüsen 2009: 15 [translated by the

authors]) beyond scholarship by recognising different traditions of mentalities. Paradigm shifts in philosophy, theology and also German studies, with its branch of folklore, lead to dialogue/polylogue with the former objects, without which the recognition of the other, self-reflection and the will for transformation would lead to a waste of global potential.

Interculturality as a Normative Global Concept of Action and Education with Current Relevance

Without interculturality as a perspective in research and teaching, as well as a normative concept of action, questions about how we want to live and what values we want to orient our actions in areas such as climate protection, justice or education cannot be answered. Culture and cultural products have *one* key function: intercultural dialogue or polylogue another. Only through interculturality are fruitful and sustainable solutions to universal global problems possible. It must first be clarified which conditions make intercultural scientific discussions possible (Albrecht and Bogner 2017: 29ff.). For this purpose, ‘more and more people (. . .) need and expect multilingual and multi-cultural competence and a well-founded knowledge of peculiarity, otherness and foreignness as part of their basic intellectual equipment’ (Wierlacher and Albrecht 2003: 280 [translated by the authors]). For different thinking promotes new solutions and strategies. One’s own actions and those of others influence these situations. The actions can be traced back to the cultural context and standpoint of the individual as well as to motives, meaningfulness and values which, as pre-orienting patterns, determine the actions. The cultural context becomes the object of consideration and the starting point for scientific action.

All examples are characterised by a classical tradition in the humanities, which have undergone a transformation through interaction with partners from other disciplines or countries who have shaped new fruitful concepts that have a global social impact beyond the university environment. These developments show that the humanities were and are crisis-tested and open to constant change, and that they have experience that they are happy to share with others. On a practical level, the maintenance of innumerable programmes and the structural design to promote international cooperation in order to position themselves internationally have long been part of the day-to-day business of universities in Europe and around the world. Even if the aim is to enhance diversity and difference in order to promote global learning, there is criticism that the internationalisation of universities is rather a uniformity measure (Schellhammer 2015: 109). Even the dominance of English as the single language (Lenzen 2012: 77) and the narrow-minded, arrogant adherence to Western intellectual traditions and attitudes – which are found above all in the departments represented here, but also in other departments beyond the humanities – are criticised for working against the basic idea of the value of intercultural diversity. The intercultural humanities are people-centred, considering context, whereby (self-) reflection is both a central tool and a central object. The intercultural humanities are examples of global learning, which defines itself as the recognition of lifeworld context in its globality and the development of local possibilities for action, which means taking global developments and at the same time local conditions, developments and practices into account (Kluwick and Zemanek 2019: 16). Global learning has the goal of ‘achieving a dignified life for all and preserving the natural foundations of life for future generations (. . .) Education for sustainability is also education for peace and respect for human rights’ (Wanning 2019: 302 [translated by the authors]).

Summary

We have shown that interculturality, in its institutionalised form and not only implicitly present, has a valuable impact both in research and education and in global society. Through the cooperative reflection of their professional tradition and a dynamisation of their core concepts, plus the necessary perspective on diversity, the intercultural humanities can act and take responsibility beyond the university on a global social level. The starting point of this chapter was the assumption that the concept of culture has always been present in the humanities. We argued that the intercultural humanities themselves have implemented these paradigms in the course of their profiling. Furthermore, we argued that intercultural humanities have always been present in an interdisciplinary way, even if culture was initially considered without meaning. Intercultural humanities as an academic discipline has become increasingly clear over the last forty years and assumes that research and teaching are carried out from a cultural perspective. Its potential lies above all in the use of various fruitful perspectives and synergies and at the same time in its bridging function in the international university landscape. Interculturality is insufficiently represented outside of the subjects that define themselves as intercultural humanities, because it is only implicit. The subjects presented are evidence of the sustainable, global and cooperative potential inherent in them. The institutionalisation of the intercultural in the humanities and the resulting networking makes the potential of intercultural humanities observable and measurable. The translation of critical thinking into structured courses of study is one of the core services of intercultural humanities to sustainably and continuously maintain the relevance of the humanities as a whole:

The humanities and the arts are being cut away, in both primary/secondary and college/university education, in virtually every nation of the world. Seen by policy-makers as useless frills, at a time when nations must cut away all useless things in order to stay competitive in the global market, they are rapidly losing their place in curricula, and also in the minds and hearts of parents and children. (Nussbaum 2010: 2)

Universities and world society are challenged to counteract this, both on a theoretical and practical level. The bundling of experiences and perspectives and the establishment of new forms of cooperation mean using synergies and opportunities of intercultural diversity and intercultural dialogues. More than ever, it is clear that different actors from politics, business and education must assume a global role in order to meet the challenges of our time. Even though Agenda 2030 has already formulated seventeen central goals, the so-called goals for sustainable development, the process is not progressing fast enough. Scientists are forced not only to talk but also to act and find out what works, and why and why not. Failure is also an opportunity to learn. In order to find out what will be useful in the future, you need not only an institution that does a good job but a network of teaching and research beyond the borders of the university and beyond the borders of a country. But it is not enough to bring together outstanding scientists with an intercultural background. Even if the actors are highly motivated, there are factors that reduce and promote success, such as the importance of structure and context: time, space, communication, and identity. Sharing experiences and learning from each other is necessary to develop ideas for actions with a global character, as they are increasingly needed. Everyone must be part of it and be involved: either we do it together or we can't do it. The task of the intercultural humanities is to make this visible to all actors, whether from politics or business, and to

the public; because we share responsibility for our common future: sustainability is everyone's business.

Notes

1. Cf. Brundtland-Report 'Our Common Future', UN World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) (ed.) (1987).
2. Cf. UNESCO (2013): The Hangzhou Declaration. Placing Culture at the Heart of Sustainable Development Policies. Adopted in Hangzhou, People's Republic of China, on 17 May 2013.
3. A brief reference is made here as an example of the ongoing academic discourse: Immanuel Kant (1798), *Der Streit der Fakultäten: In drey Abschnitten*, Königsberg: Nicolovius.
4. A brief reference should be made here to the report of the Global University Network for Innovation (GUNi), *Higher Education in the World 7th Humanities and Higher Education: Synergies between Science, Technology and Humanities*, with the core topic of interdisciplinarity from 2019.
5. Cf. Albert Schweitzer (1923), *Verfall und Wiederaufbau der Kultur*, München: Beck; cf. William Durant (1935), *Die Geschichte der Zivilisation*, Bern: Francke; cf. Norbert Elias (1939), *Über den Prozess der Zivilisation*, Basel: Verlag Haus zum Falken.
6. Cf. Johann Gottfried Herder (1784), *Ideen zur Philosophie der Geschichte der Menschheit*, Riga: Johann Friedrich Hartknoch. [Published in four parts from 1784–91.]
7. Examples of this are: interculturality, transculturality, multiculturalism, and cross-culturality.

References

- Albrecht, C. and A. Bogner (eds) (2017), *Tischgespräche: Einladung zu einer interkulturellen Wissenschaft*, Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Allerkamp, A. and G. Raulet (eds) (2010), *Kulturwissenschaften in Europa – eine grenzüberschreitende Disziplin?*, Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.
- Ashcroft, B. (2001), *Post-colonial Transformation*, London: Routledge.
- Assmann, A. (2011), *Einführung in die Kulturwissenschaften: Grundbegriffe, Themen, Fragestellungen*, 3rd edn, Berlin: Erich Schmidt Verlag.
- Basalla, G. (1967), 'The spread of Western science', *Science*, 156, 611–22.
- Bayly, C. (1996), *Empire and Information. Intelligence Gathering and Social Communication in India, 1780–1870*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Braidotti, R. (2014), *Posthumanismus. Leben jenseits des Menschen*, Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus.
- Brandt, C. (2017), 'Kulturwissenschaften und Wissenschaftsgeschichte', in M. Sommer, S. Müller-Wille and C. Reinhardt (eds), *Handbuch Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, Stuttgart: Metzler, pp. 92–106.
- Chakrabarty, D. (2000), *Provincializing Europe. Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Daniel, U. (2006), *Kompendium Kulturgeschichte: Theorien, Praxis, Schlüsselwörter*, 5th edn, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Demorgon, J. and H. Kordes (2006), 'Multikultur, Transkultur, Leitkultur, Interkultur', in H. Nicklas, B. Müller and H. Kordes Hagen (eds), *Interkulturell denken und handeln: Theoretische Grundlagen und gesellschaftliche Praxis*, Bonn: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung, pp. 27–36.
- Dilthey, W. (1922), *Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften, Gesammelte Schriften 1*, Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner.
- Dilthey, W. (1927), *Der Aufbau der geschichtlichen Welt in den Geisteswissenschaften, Gesammelte Schriften 7*, Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner.
- Dube, M. (2000), *Postcolonial Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*, St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press.
- Fabella, V. (1993), *With Passion and Compassion. Third World Doing Theology: Reflecons from the Women's Comission of the Third World Theologians*, 5th edn, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.

- Fanon, Frantz (1966) [1961], *Die Verdammten dieser Erde*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Feldtkeller, A. (2013), 'Missionswissenschaft und Interkulturelle Theologie: Eine Verhältnisbestimmung', *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 138(1), 3–12.
- Friedli, R. (1987), 'Interkulturelle Theologie', in K. Müller and T. Sundermeier (eds), *Lexikon missionstheologischer Grundbegriffe*, Berlin: Reimer, pp. 181–5.
- Gipper, A. and S. Klengel (eds) (2008), *Kultur, Übersetzung, Lebenswelten: Beiträge zu aktuellen Paradigmen der Kulturwissenschaften*, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann.
- Global University Network for Innovation (GUNi) (2019) *Higher Education in the World 7. Humanities and Higher Education: Synergies between Science, Technology and Humanities*. <http://www.guninetwork.org/report/higher-education-world-7> (accessed 19 December 2019).
- Hall, E. T. (1959), *The Silent Language*, New York: Doubleday.
- Hannerz, U. (1992), *Cultural Complexity: Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hausmann, F.-R. (2011), *Die Geisteswissenschaften im 'Dritten Reich'*, Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann.
- Heé, N. (2017), 'Postkoloniale Ansätze Wissenschaftsgeschichte', in M. Sommer, S. Müller-Wille and C. Reinhardt (eds), *Handbuch Wissenschaftsgeschichte*, Stuttgart: Metzler, pp. 80–91.
- Hock, K. (2011), *Einführung in die Interkulturelle Theologie*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Höhne, S. (ed.) (2013), *Kulturwissenschaft(en) im europäischen Kontext: Fachhistorische Entwicklungen zwischen Theoriebildung und Anwendungsorientierung*, Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Ineichen, H. (1975), 'Erkenntnistheorie und geschichtlich-gesellschaftliche Welt: Diltheys Logik der Geisteswissenschaften', *Studien zur Philosophie und Literatur des 19. Jahrhunderts*, 28, Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann.
- Jeggle, U. (2001), 'Volkskunde im 20. Jahrhundert', in R. Brednich (ed.), *Grundriß der Volkskunde: Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 3rd edn, Berlin: Reimer, pp. 53–75.
- Kirloskar-Steinbach, M., G. Dharampal-Freick and M. Friele (eds) (2012), *Die Interkulturalitätsdebatte – Leit- und Streitbegriffe: Intercultural Discourse – Key and Contested Concepts*, Freiburg and Munich: Alber.
- Kluwick, U. and E. Zemanek (eds) (2019), *Nachhaltigkeit interdisziplinär. Konzepte, Diskurse, Praktiken: Ein Kompendium*, Vienna: Böhlau Verlag.
- Kostalova, D. (2003), 'Grenze', in A. Wierlacher and A. Bogner (eds), *Handbuch interkulturelle Germanistik*, Stuttgart: Metzler, pp. 238–44.
- Küng, H. (1995), *Ja zum Weltethos: Perspektiven für die Suche nach Orientierung*, Munich: Piper.
- Latour, B. (1987), *Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers through Society*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Leggewie, C., D. Zifonun, A. Lang, M. Siepmann and J. Hoppen (eds) (2012), *Schlüsselwerke der Kulturwissenschaften*, Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Lenzen, D. (2012) 'Humboldt aufpoliert', *Die Zeit*, 12. <https://www.zeit.de/2012/12/Studium-Ausbildung/komplettansicht2> (accessed 23 March 2020).
- Mall, R. A. (2003), *Essays zur interkulturellen Philosophie*, edited by H. R. Yousefi, Nordhausen: Bautz.
- Neumann, B. and A. Nünning (eds) (2012), *Travelling Concepts for the Study of Culture*, Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter.
- Nünning, A. and V. Nünning (eds) (2003), *Konzepte der Kulturwissenschaften: Theoretische Grundlagen – Ansätze – Perspektiven*, Stuttgart and Weimar: Metzler.
- Nussbaum, M. (1997), *Cultivating Humanity. A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Nussbaum, M. (2010), *Not for Profit: Why Democracy Needs the Humanities*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Oborji, F. A. (2008), 'Missiology in its relation to intercultural theology and religious studies', *Mission Studies*, 25(1), 113–14.

- Ong, W. J. (1969), 'Crisis and understanding the humanities', *Daedalus*, 98(3), The Future of the Humanities, 617–40. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20023897> (accessed 24 September 2019).
- Prodolliet, S. (1987), *Wider die Schamlosigkeit und das Elend der heidnischen Weiber: Die Basler Frauenmission und der Export des europäischen Frauenideals in die Kolonien*, Zurich: Limmat Verlag.
- Raj, K. (2013), 'Beyond postcolonialism . . . and postpositivism: circulation and the global history of science', *Isis*, 104, 337–47.
- Rothacker, E. (1920), *Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften*, Tübingen: Mohr.
- Rüsen, J. (2009), 'Einleitung: Einheitszwang und Unterscheidungswille – die kulturelle Herausforderung der Globalisierung und die Antwort des Humanismus', in J. Rüsen and H. Laass (eds), *Interkultureller Humanismus, Menschlichkeit in der Vielfalt der Kulturen*, Schwalbach: Wochenschau Verlag, pp. 8–22.
- Said, E. (1978), *Orientalism*, London: Routledge.
- Schellhammer, B. (2015), 'Bildung als interkultureller Prozess. Philosophische Reflexion auf den Bildungsbegriff als Impetus für die interkulturelle Transformation akademischer Ausbildung', in R. Fornet-Betancourt (ed.), *Bildungstraditionen, Spiritualität und Universität: Perspektiven zur interkulturellen Transformation akademischer Ausbildung*, Aachen: Wissenschaftsverlag Mainz, pp. 109–26.
- Schmidt-Leukel, P. (2011), 'Interkulturelle Theologie als interreligiöse Theologie', *Evangelische Theologie*, 71, 4–16.
- Secord, J. (2004), 'Knowledge in Transit', *Isis*, 95(4), 654–72.
- Sievers, K. D. (2001), 'Volkskundliche Fragestellungen im 19. Jahrhundert', in R. Brednich (ed.), *Grundriß der Volkskunde: Einführung in die Europäische Ethnologie*, 3rd edn, Berlin: Reimer, pp. 31–51.
- Smith, S. (2007), *Women in Mission. From the New Testament to Today*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Snow, C. P. (1959), *The Two Cultures and the Scientific Revolution*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (1985), 'Three women's texts and a critique of imperialism', *Critical Inquiry*, 12(1), 235–61. <http://knarf.english.upenn.edu/Articles/spivak.html> (accessed 14 April 2020).
- Spivak, G. C. (2003), *Death of a Discipline*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Spivak, G. C. (2006) [1988], 'Can the subaltern speak?', in B. Ashcroft (ed.), *The Post-colonial Studies Reader*, London: Routledge, pp. 28–37.
- Staub, C. (2009), 'Komparative oder interkulturelle Philosophie? Bemerkungen zu einem Methodenstreit', *Zeitschrift für Kulturphilosophie*, 3(2), 295–304.
- Sundermeier, T. (1996), *Den Fremden verstehen: Eine praktische Hermeneutik*, Goettingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- UN World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) (ed.) (1987), *Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development: Our Common Future*, Oxford: Oxford University Press. <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/5987our-common-future.pdf> (accessed 10 March 2020).
- UNESCO (2013), *The Hangzhou Declaration: Placing Culture at the Heart of Sustainable Development Policies*. <http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/images/FinalHangzhouDeclaration20130517.pdf> (accessed 5 March 2020).
- Ustorff, W. (2008), 'The cultural origins of "intercultural theology"', *Mission Studies*, 25(2), 229–51.
- Walz, H. (2003), '"Die Dritte-Welt-Frau"? Geschlechterdifferenz im Scheinwerfer der Kritik postkolonialer Denkerinnen', in H. Walz, C. Lienemann-Perrin and D. Strahm (eds), *Als hätten sie uns neu erfunden: Beobachtungen zu Fremdheit und Geschlecht*, Lucerne: Edition Exodus, pp. 41–54.
- Walz, H. (2010), 'Interkulturelle Theologie und Geschlecht: Herausforderungen für Europa am Beispiel lateinamerikanischer Theologinnen', *Berliner Theologische Zeitschrift*, 27(1), 107–32.
- Wanning, B. (2019), 'Bildungspolitik/Didaktik', in U. Kluwick and E. Zemanek (eds), *Nachhaltigkeit interdisziplinär: Konzepte, Diskurse, Praktiken: Ein Kompendium*, Vienna: Böhlau, pp. 295–311.

- Weidtmann, N. (2016), *Interkulturelle Philosophie: Aufgaben – Dimensionen – Wege*, Tübingen: Francke.
- Welsch, W. (1994), 'Transkulturalität. Lebensformen nach der Auflösung der Kulturen', in K. Luger and R. Renger (eds), *Dialog der Kulturen: Die multikulturelle Gesellschaft und die Medien*, Vienna: Österreichischer Kunst- und Kulturverlag, pp. 147–69.
- Welsch, W. (2011), 'Auf dem Weg zur transkulturellen Gesellschaft', in L. Allolio-Näcke, B. Kalscheuer and A. Manzeschke (eds), *Differenzen anders denken. Bausteine zu einer Kulturtheorie der Transdifferenz*, Frankfurt am Main and New York: Campus, pp. 314–41.
- Wierlacher, A. (2003), 'Interkulturalität', in A. Wierlacher and A. Bogner (eds), *Handbuch interkulturelle Germanistik*, Stuttgart: Metzler, pp. 257–64.
- Wierlacher, A. and C. Albrecht (2003), 'Kulturwissenschaftliche Xenologie', in A. Nünning and V. Nünning (eds), *Konzepte der Kulturwissenschaften: Theoretische Grundlagen – Ansätze – Perspektiven*, Stuttgart: Metzler, pp. 280–306.
- Wierlacher, A. and U. Hudson-Wiedenmann (2000), 'Interkulturalität: Zur Konzeptionalisierung eines Grundbegriffs interkultureller Kommunikation', in A. Wierlacher (ed.), *Kulturthema Kommunikation: Konzepte – Inhalte – Funktionen*, Möhnesee: Résidence, pp. 219–32.
- Wimmer, F. M. (2004), *Interkulturelle Philosophie: Eine Einführung*, Vienna: Facultas.
- Zacharasiewicz, W. and M. Prisching (eds) (2017), *Return from Exile – Rückkehr aus dem Exil: Exiles, Returnees and Their Impact in the Humanities and Social Sciences in Austria and Central Europe*, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.