

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 sciences²⁴⁹ as well as in the humanities²⁵⁰, 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 soziale 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, Oetl, 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, Espahan-gizi 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 Gurinder 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, Oetl, 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 decorators 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 Oetl 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, Oetl 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 Oetl'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, Oetl 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 playwrighting 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 Petruzeli 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. “imaginings 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 Global 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 (Claudo), *Ballet Russes* (Marten-Finnis), multi-media performance as well as bodily practices (Oetl), 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, Oetl, Pelillo-Hestermeyer, Niccolai, Höhne, Pelillo-Hestermeyer and Cismondi), Espahangizi, Marten-Finnis and Claudo 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 (Oetl), gender and queer studies (Höhne, Oetl), neo-materialism (Claudo, Reichardt), entangled history (Espahangizi, Claudo, 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.
- Bhabra, 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.