

Mahmoud Arghavan,
Nicole Hirschfelder,
Luvena Kopp,
Katharina Motyl (eds.)

WHO CAN SPEAK AND WHO IS HEARD/HURT?

Facing Problems of Race,
Racism, and Ethnic Diversity
in the Humanities in Germany

From:

*Mahmoud Arghavan, Nicole Hirschfelder,
Luvena Kopp, Katharina Motyl (eds.)*

Who Can Speak and Who Is Heard/Hurt?

Facing Problems of Race, Racism, and Ethnic Diversity in the Humanities in Germany

April 2019, 352 p., pb., ill.

39,99 € (DE), 978-3-8376-4103-5

E-Book:

PDF: 39,99 € (DE), ISBN 978-3-8394-4103-9

Ethnic diversity, race, and racism have been subject to discussion in American Studies departments at German universities for many years. It appears that especially in the past few decades, ethnic minorities and 'new immigrants' have increasingly become objects of scholarly inquiry. Such research questions focus on the U.S. and other traditionally multicultural societies that have emerged out of historical situations shaped by (settler) colonialism, slavery, and/or large-scale immigration. Paradoxically, these studies have overwhelmingly been conducted by white scholars born in Germany and holding German citizenship. Scholars with actual experience of racial discrimination have remained largely unheard.

Departing from a critique of practices employed by the German branch of American Studies, the volume offers (self)-reflective approaches by scholars from different fields in the German Humanities. It thereby seeks to provide a solid basis for thorough and candid discussions of the mechanisms behind and the implications of racialized power relations in the German Humanities and German society at large.

Mahmoud Arghavan (Dr.) coordinates the unit for Help for Refugees, Migration, and Integration at the Innere Mission in Munich. He completed his PhD in 2013 at the Free University of Berlin with a dissertation on Iranian American literature. From 2014 to 2016, he worked as an adjunct lecturer at the American Studies department of the University of Tübingen.

Nicole Hirschfelder (Dr.) is an associate professor at the American studies department at the University of Tübingen and an associate member of the Collaborative Research Center (Sonderforschungsbereich) 923 "Threatened Order – Societies Under Stress". She was a visiting professor at the University of Maryland in 2016 and 2019.

Luvena Kopp (M.A.) teaches film, literature, and cultural studies at the University of Tübingen. Her research interests include concepts of figurational sociology as developed by Pierre Bourdieu and Norbert Elias, power relations, and the films of Spike Lee.

Katharina Motyl (Dr.) is an assistant professor at the American Studies department of the University of Mannheim.

For further information:

www.transcript-verlag.de/en/978-3-8376-4103-5

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments | 7

Who Can Speak and Who is Heard/Hurt? Facing Problems of Race, Racism, and Ethnic Diversity in the Humanities in Germany: A Survey of the Issues at Stake | 9

Mahmoud Arghavan, Nicole Hirschfelder, and Katharina Motyl

I. RACE IN TRANSLATION: COMPARING RACIAL AND XENOPHOBIC FORMATIONS IN GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES

**'Ausländer' – A Racialized Concept? 'Race' as an Analytical
Concept in Contemporary German Immigration History**

Maria Alexopoulou | 45

**Perspective Matters: Racism and Resistance in the Everyday Lives
of Youths of Color in Germany**

Lili Rebstock | 69

**Beyond a Trifling Presence: Afro-Germans and Identity Boundaries
in Germany**

Anthony Obute | 83

**Race and Racism in Translation: "Who Can Speak?" in German
Renderings of Literary African American English**

Annika Rosbach | 101

II. NORMATIVE WHITENESS IN THE GERMAN HUMANITIES

**Post-Racism, Colorblind Individualism & Political Correctness:
Contemporary Modes of Materialization in American Studies and
German Academia**

Courtney Moffett-Bateau and Sebastian Weier | 123

~~Kanak~~ Academic: Teaching in Enemy Territory

Ismahan Wayah | 153

The Migrant Scholar of Color as Refugee in the Western Academy

Mahmoud Arghavan | 177

Keeping Academia White: A Case Study

Kai Linke | 195

**III. DIVERSITY-CONSCIOUS APPROACHES TO
ACADEMIC AND PEDAGOGICAL PRACTICE**

**On Racism without Race: The Need to Diversify *Germanistik* and the
German Academy**

Priscilla Layne | 217

**“So You Want to Write about American Indians?” Ethical
Reflections on Euro-Academia’s Research on Indigenous
Cultural Narratives**

Amina Grunewald | 239

**“The Danger of a Single Story”: Addressing Contemporary Public
Discourse and Protest Movements in American Studies Classrooms
in Germany**

Saskia Hertlein | 261

**IV. SHIFTING PERSPECTIVES:
TRANSATLANTIC AND GENRE-CROSSING
REFLECTIONS ON WHITE NORMATIVITY**

**Goethe Meets Baldwin: Notes towards a Comparative Perspective
beyond Misappropriation**

Derek C. Maus | 285

**Notes from the Margin: Academic White Spaces and the Silencing of
Scholars of Color**

Kimberly Alecia Singletary | 295

**Transatlantic Postcolonial (T)Races in the Classroom: From Defoe’s
Desert Island to Larsen’s *Quicksand* and *Black-ish* Suburbia**

Elahe Haschemi Yekani | 315

Passing Tone/Note

Marius Henderson | 337

Contributors | 343

Acknowledgments

This project resulted from a workshop in Tübingen in 2016 that was among the first of its kind in American Studies in Germany: it took on the difficult task of self-reflection while talking about racism, power, representation, recognition, and pain – that is, the very issues many of us experience practically and/or work on theoretically as scholars – in a high-pressure academic context that is marked by (racialized) hierarchies and power dynamics. This endeavor proved challenging, at times hurtful, but also crucial and meaningful to all of us.

While scholars usually take pride in the ‘analytical distance’ they were able to uphold to their subject matter, with regard to this project, we look back with humility: one could say that we as an editing team encountered many issues on a micro-level that this volume seeks to address with regard to society, the university, and the Humanities as a whole. Ultimately, we were able to accomplish our common goal, which was to provide a forum for the voices of the contributors, which will hopefully result in their being heard and being afforded the respect they deserve.

We thus also look back with gratitude and would like to thank a number of people and institutions that have supported, funded, and expressed their belief in this project. First and foremost, we want to express our deep appreciation to the contributors in this volume for their trust, engagement, and patience with each other and us as editors. We also learned much from colleagues who presented at the workshop, but decided not to be part of the book project as well as from the discussions at the workshop – thanks to all presenters, panel chairs, and audience members. The decision to include both the contributions of those who wanted to expand their presentations given at the initial workshop into essays and to invite new colleagues to join this project allowed us to further broaden and diversify the conversation. We are grateful for this added focus.

While projects such as these require lots of idealism, they would not exist without the type of endorsement that ultimately results in a tangible publication,

which allows us to reach a wider audience at the very center of the discussion – the academic field. Hence, we would particularly like to thank the Collaborative Research Center 923 “Threatened Order – Societies under Stress” and the Center for Gender and Diversity Research (ZGD), both at Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, for their generous financial support.

Astrid Franke has given us a tremendous amount of trust for our work on this project while offering both her intellectual and professional support. We would also like to thank our editor at *transcript*, Annika Linnemann, for her expertise and patience in the course of this publishing process. We deeply appreciate the people who have each done their share to bring this project to fruition: Jasmin Hayn, Enno Küker, Marina Lieb, Vanessa Miller, Nadja Prpa, Denise Soydan, and Michaela Wildermuth, who chiefly helped organize and conduct the workshop, as well as Hanna Bozenhardt, Aileen Priester, Anthony Obute, and particularly Marcel Pichal for their extraordinary motivation, diligence, commitment, and competence throughout the editorial process. We are furthermore indebted to Yasmin Nasrudin for her involvement and input. Finally, we are grateful to those whose love sustained our spirits and thus ultimately this project.

Who Can Speak and Who Is Heard/Hurt? Facing Problems of Race, Racism, and Ethnic Diversity in the Humanities in Germany: A Survey of the Issues at Stake

Mahmoud Arghavan, Nicole Hirschfelder, and Katharina Motyl

Building on Gayatri C. Spivak's seminal essay "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (Spivak 1989), in which she argues that even if those occupying the subject position of the subaltern *can* speak, they will not be heard due to the Eurocentrism underlying power relations, this edited collection offers a forum for analysis of who can speak in the Humanities in Germany with regard to dimensions of race, ethnic diversity, and racism – and of who will be heard. That the contributions comprised in this volume also inquire into who is *hurt* by the social, institutional, professional, and disciplinary logics informing (the opportunity to formulate) current articulations of Humanities research and higher education as well as their reception, highlights the contributors' conviction that there are ethical commitments at stake in discussing these issues. The question whether the subaltern – in this context, Germans of color and migrants (of color) – can speak in the German Humanities, is multidimensional and entails a host of ramifications.

First, there is the question of embodied representation: ethnic minorities and migrants (of color) are hardly represented in Humanist disciplines at German universities in numbers adequate to their proportion in German society at large – not among the student body, and certainly not on the level of scholars/teachers. When contemplating this lack of ethnic diversity, the issue that comes to mind immediately is that compared to other OECD countries, a pupil's educational opportunities in Germany are strongly determined by his or her family's socio-economic background (Kühne/Warnecke 2018). Not only does the German three-tiered system of secondary education put pupils of color and pupils from

migrant families¹ at a disadvantage *per se* (“PISA-Studie”); since pupils of color disproportionately hail from economically disadvantaged families (a circumstance itself caused by structural and political reasons), the fact that the German education system’s strong emphasis on meritocracy and its early segregation of the pupil population negatively impacts pupils from the lower socioeconomic strata, creates additional obstacles for pupils of color (“PISA-Studie”). Given the exclusionary tendencies of the secondary-education system, it seems logical that the student body at German universities should be less ethnically diverse than German society at large. And if there is but a limited percentage of students of color enrolled at Humanities departments, the lack of ethnic diversity among PhD students and faculty may not come as a surprise, either. But holding the German secondary-education system solely responsible for the lack of ethnic diversity at the Humanities departments of German universities falls short. While reform efforts aimed at increasing the permeability of the German education system are certainly needed (some of which will be explored in the contribution by Ismahan Wayah), from our experience,² there *is* a robust (if disproportionate) degree of ethnic diversity among the student body enrolled at Humanities departments.³

The question then becomes why so few of those enrolled in Humanities undergraduate studies go on to pursue a PhD and why even fewer decide to pursue a career in academia – that is, why so few Germans of color and migrants (of color) find themselves in positions that grant them the opportunity to speak in Humanist research and as teachers in higher education. “They’re simply not interested in pursuing an academic career,”⁴ some members of the (predom-

-
- 1 We try to avoid using the German concept *Migrationshintergrund*, which is used to categorize people who have migrated to Germany themselves or as hailing from a family who migrated to Germany (however many generations removed). This concept serves to abrogate the right to belong to German society from people of color who were born in Germany or have made a home in this country (cf. the contributions by Anthony Obute and Lili Rebstock).
 - 2 Collectively, the four editors have taught at the American Studies departments at the Universities of Berlin (FU), Mannheim, and Tübingen.
 - 3 Disciplines that strongly connote education ideals associated with the German *Bildungsbürgertum* such as Classics or Medieval German Literature, will probably boast less ethnic diversity among the student body than American Studies.
 - 4 Two tenured professors expressed this view in the discussion group “Race, Ethnicity, and Critical Whiteness” at the workshop “Diversity and/in the GAAS,” sponsored by the German Association for American Studies (GAAS) and held in Munich on October 20-21, 2017.

inantly white) tenured professoriate have put forth, pointing out that precarious employment conditions as they currently reign in the German Humanities may deter graduates of color, who often hail from economically challenged families, from going on to obtain a PhD. While an apprehensiveness of facing precarious employment may be part of the issue, it can hardly account for the totality of the problem. High school graduates whose main motivation is a high and steady income would hardly have chosen a Humanist course of study in the first place; people pursuing higher education with the primary aim of obtaining job security and a high salary will opt for studying business, engineering, or the natural sciences. Rather, it appears that the inability of the German Humanities to *retain* a robust percentage of students of color for doctoral studies and, even more so, for an academic career beyond the PhD, may have to do with the university's general and the Humanist disciplines' particular failure to *hear* people of color, causing many of them deep *hurt*. It seems, then, that people of color and migrants are interpellated as "space invaders" (Puwal 2004) in the structurally, culturally, and epistemologically "white space" (Anderson 2015: 10) that is the German Humanist academy. This assertion has various dimensions, which we will briefly outline vis-à-vis the Humanities at large before addressing the situation in German American Studies as a paradigmatic case in more detail.

First of all, racialized power structures in society tend to be reproduced in the university, perhaps particularly in the Humanities,⁵ as the contributions by Ismahan Wayah, Mahmoud Arghavan, Kai Linke, Priscilla Layne, and Kimberly Alecia Singletary highlight. For one, there are administrative reasons such as the "similarity attraction paradigm" (cf. Peus 2018: 207): committees hire colleagues 'like themselves,' that is, if a committee is all-white or majority-white, it is very likely that the chosen candidate will be white, too. Moreover, studies have shown that 'the trailblazing scholar' is still predominantly imagined as male and white, and that people of color and/or women who are equally qualified as white, male contenders, are evaluated more negatively by search committees (cf. Peus 2018: 207). Stereotypes about minorities are, of course, deeply engrained in the cultural archive and continuously reproduced by the mainstream media. In light of omnipresent tropes of 'the hypersexual black woman,' 'the oppressed Muslim woman,' or 'the violent black man' circulating in the cultural imaginary, it comes as no surprise that, as the abovementioned

5 One could argue that disciplines that rely on quantification more and/or generate more substantial third-party funding than do the Humanities, are less prone to racial discrimination than the Humanities (cf. Mahmoud Arghavan's contribution in this volume).

studies found, most will not associate the figure of the trailblazing scholar with women and/or people of color.

Arguing that racialized power dynamics are reproduced in the university is not to allege that academic staff and search committees generally discriminate against students and applicants of color in a premeditated fashion. First, in the words of Sara Ahmed, “racism should not be seen as about individuals with bad attitudes (the ‘bad apple model’), not because such individuals do not exist (they do) but because such a way of thinking underestimates the scope and scale of racism, thus leaving us without an account of how racism *gets reproduced*” (2012: 44; original emphasis). Second, it is to highlight how much effort is required by most white academics to become aware of their “unconscious bias” against people of color due to, among other things, the cultural narratives that accompanied their socialization, the coloniality of Western knowledge systems that inform these narratives and constitute the philosophical bedrock of the German Humanities, and finally, the force of habit (they are used to predominantly white staff meetings, classrooms, etc.) Becoming aware of one’s own “unconscious bias” and actively working towards transforming one’s own research, teaching, and administrative practices as well as those of one’s department/institution/discipline, requires effort and commitment – there’s a reason why it’s called “diversity *work*” (cf. Ahmed 2012: 29; our emphasis).

To add insult to injury, students and scholars of color are facing difficulty when it comes to articulating their grievances of racist exclusion and being overlooked, since the hegemonic narrative German society tells itself about itself stipulates that because the use of the term ‘*Rasse*’ ended with the downfall of the Nazi regime in 1945, racism no longer exists in German society (cf. the contribution by Maria Alexopoulou). This situation could be described as a particular type of colorblindness: not seeing racism because the lens that is needed to see it has gone missing (cf. Courtney Moffett-Bateau and Sebastian Weier’s contribution). The European consolidation process and the abolition of border controls between EU states has reinforced ties between Germanness/Europeanness and whiteness,⁶ while people of color, regardless of their citizenship status, are imagined as perpetual *Ausländer*/Others. In *European Others: Queering Ethnicity in Postnational Europe*, Fatima El-Tayeb argues that Europe is “a colorblind continent in which difference is marked along lines of nationality and ethnicized Others are routinely ascribed a position outside the nation, allowing the permanent externalization and thus silencing of a debate on

6 Since the inception of the so-called ‘refugee crisis’ in the summer of 2015, some EU states have reintroduced the practice of border controls; for instance, the German federal police is controlling the border of Austria/Germany again.

the legacy of racism and colonialism” (2011: 14). In short, when students and scholars of color seek justice for having been targeted by racism, their cases are all too often dismissed as ‘individual’ and sometimes ‘too petty’ stories; they are generally neither heard in the Germany university nor in German society.

Diversity in American Studies in Germany as Paradigmatic Case

Having outlined in broad strokes the dimensions involved in questions of race, ethnic diversity, epistemic coloniality, and racism in the German Humanities at large, we will now turn to the particular case of American Studies in Germany. Pragmatically speaking, this is the professional field of knowledge generation and transmission we know best. But there are other reasons why the discipline of American Studies may serve as paradigmatic case for our analysis of how Humanistic disciplines institutionalized at German universities, professionally organized (in associations, etc.), and embedded in German society deal with race, ethnic diversity, and racism. For one, said issues have received increased scholarly attention in light of the Black Liberation and ethnic revival movements of the 1960s and 1970s, which resulted in the institutionalization of African American/Black Studies and Ethnic Studies programs at U.S. universities. While these research interests have been mirrored in German Americanist scholarship, the mode of activist scholarship that has become the dominant paradigm of U.S.-based American Studies (a development related to the abovementioned social and racial justice movements), is regarded with great skepticism in the German Humanities, which are otherwise eager to adopt American trends in research and teaching, and at least eyed uncomfortably by some scholars in German American Studies. Two distinct philosophical traditions clash here: whereas scholar-activism, rooted in American Pragmatism, considers scholarship worthwhile that is useful to the political struggles of the marginalized, the German Humanities uphold the ideal of scholarship as objective and detached, which is rooted in German Idealism. We will outline the historical, political, and theoretical implications of both philosophical camps in more detail later. *Real-life* repercussions of this clash between two theoretical traditions became public a few years ago in Bremen. While we have decided to briefly outline this case in the following, as discussions about its aftermath also partly informed the workshop on which this volume builds, it is crucial to us to emphasize that what happened in Bremen is by no means endemic to that institution’s academic environment, but rather marks such an important example because similar events could have easily taken place in many other universities all over Germany, as well.

In June 2014, colleagues in American Studies and other Humanist disciplines at the University of Bremen filed a grant application for an interdisciplinary Creative Unit entitled “New Black Diaspora Studies: Ethical and Aesthetic Challenges of the 21st Century.” In January 2015, both the project, the content of the application, and the envisioned distribution of academic positions were strongly condemned in a 10-page open letter in German and English by signees from Germany and abroad, including the scholar and activist Angela Y. Davis. The main points of criticism were that the applied-for research program was *not* – as had been claimed – an innovative project, since black scholars had been dealing with the abovementioned contents for years without receiving academic recognition, but that it was merely new that black knowledge and culture were now being made the object of research by whites, as the grant application sought to allocate all applied-for positions to white scholars. Black scholars, the signees protested, were systematically excluded from resources, while white academics enriched themselves at the expense of people of color without self-critically reflecting on their (individual and historical) contribution to the preservation of racist structures and mechanisms.⁷ This controversy garnered considerable attention in the media (e.g. *Tagesspiegel*, *taz*, *FAZ*). The research group “Black Knowledges” at the University of Bremen, which had co-initiated the controversial grant application, disbanded in February 2015 as a reaction to the open letter, stating that it found the criticism voiced in the open letter justified.⁸ As mentioned initially, what lay at the core of this controversy was that the white German scholars who had applied for the grant either seemed oblivious to the tradition of American scholar-activism, or, more likely, ‘implemented’ it in a way that was firmly rooted in the belief in ‘objective’ scholarship, to the degree that the question of who can speak about whom with authority (and funding), simply appeared irrelevant.

How does the ‘Bremen case’ fit into the larger context of German American Studies? Conversations about ethnic diversity, race, and racism have existed in American Studies in Germany for many years. Especially in the past few decades, ethnic minorities, Indigenous peoples, and ‘new immigrants’ could even be said to have advanced to the *center* of a considerable number of scholarly inquiries. However, these studies have overwhelmingly been conducted by white scholars who were born in Germany, speak German as their first language, and hold German citizenship; that is, ethnic minorities and migrants of

7 For further information, see <https://blackstudiesgermany.wordpress.com/statement-bremen/>.

8 The statement can be accessed here: http://www.fb10.uni-bremen.de/inputs/pdf/BK_RG_Aufoesung-Disbanding_deu-engl.pdf/.

color have been the objects, but rarely ever the subjects of Americanist research and theorizing in Germany. While the aforementioned research in such fields as Black Studies and Ethnic Studies in Germany has focused solely on the issues of ethnic diversity, race, and racism *in* U.S. society and on negotiations of said issues in cultural productions, meta-level discussions of ethnic diversity in the field of American Studies in Germany have thus far been absent from scholarship. Moreover, in the Americanist classroom in Germany, educating students about historical and current racist formations in the U.S. is hardly ever accompanied by drawing parallels to racism and xenophobia in the German context. If the critical thinking that a Humanities education is meant to impart is not merely an end in itself, but a means to help create a more democratic society, this seems to be a grave omission in view of the renewed *Salonfähigkeit* of ethnonationalist and racist positions in Germany's political landscape in the context of the so-called 'refugee crisis' of 2015.

The contributions in this volume, more broadly, analyze the mechanisms behind and the implications of the lack of ethnic diversity in the field of American Studies in Germany and in the German Humanities at large. These considerations also necessitate thinking through the workings of race, xenophobia, the education system, and hegemonic understandings of *Germanness* in German society. By highlighting ways in which the academic field in Germany may become more reflective and inclusive of Germany's ethnic diversity, contributions also discuss the role of the ethical and the political in German Humanities research and pedagogy.

To elaborate, it is the edited collection's first aim to highlight how American Studies/the Humanities in Germany will benefit (in terms of epistemic pluralism and social justice) by diversifying itself/themselves. The contributors to the edited collection share the assumption that the Habermasian *Erkenntnisinteresse* and the presuppositions with which Humanities scholars approach their object of inquiry are influenced by the ways of knowing they have acquired by having occupied particular subject positions throughout their biographies. Thus, research results in the fields of Black Studies and Ethnic Studies, but also in American Studies at large, remain selective as long as the ways of knowing of people of color and migrants (of color) are largely excluded from the academy. Moreover, the exclusion of ethnic minorities and migrants (of color) counteracts one of the main ideas behind the institutionalization of Black Studies – that of creating an academic space in which scholars of color and members of other marginalized groups could engage in practices of empowerment by *actively* producing and sharing knowledge about themselves and their (historical, social, political, cultural, and economic) conditions. In light of the current under-

representation of racialized and ethnicized minorities in German American Studies and the concomitant overrepresentation of Germans constructed as white, it seems as though this knowledge production about the former has been appropriated, and thus monopolized, by the latter. As editors of the volume (and this probably holds for many contributors, as well), we do not subscribe to the demand that research on the African or Arab diasporas, for example, be entirely left to members of the African or Arab diaspora; but it neither should be – as tends to be the case in Germany – the sole prerogative of whites. Thus, we consider as untenable the situation that white scholars in Germany (two of which are editors of this volume) adopt the theories of W.E.B. Du Bois, Frantz Fanon, and Edward W. Said to analyze cultural productions of the black or Arab diasporas in the U.S., while representatives of the black or Arab diasporas and their ways of knowing are largely excluded from the professional field of American Studies in Germany.

Second, the volume seeks to analyze the mechanisms that exclude people of color and migrants (of color) from a career in German American Studies – and that restrict access for pupils of color to higher education in the Humanities, in the first place. These discussions necessitate considering racial and xenophobic formations in the larger societal context in which the German academic system is embedded. Select contributions compare and contrast the workings of race, racism, and xenophobia in the German and U.S. contexts, analyze hegemonic understandings of Germanness, and theorize the figure of the *Ausländer*. Why, for instance, would a Polish person be called *Ausländer* in Germany, while a Swede would be described as a Swede? Why is Germanness still associated with whiteness, so that Afro-Germans born in Germany regularly receive compliments on their excellent German-language skills?

Third, in highlighting ways in which American Studies in Germany may become more inclusive and conscious of ethnic diversity, the contributions to the edited collection touch upon the role of the ethical and the political in Humanities research and pedagogy in Germany, thus problematizing the conception of scholarship as *objective*. As already alluded to, the model of the scholar-activist, which is quite widespread in U.S. Humanities at the present moment, has not held sway among Humanities scholars in Germany. But is it not more ethical, contributions ask, to explicitly reflect one's own positionality and to make one's political commitments (and potential blindspots) transparent, as the scholar-activist does, rather than to pretend one does not have any?

But before we provide a more detailed survey of the issues at stake concerning race, ethnic diversity, and racism in American Studies and other Humanist disciplines in Germany, a critical engagement with the term 'diversity'

and an evaluation of some of the political uses that have been made of diversity in times of neoliberalism, seems warranted.

Diversity: Neoliberal Appropriation vs. Critical Intervention

The insight that according to the logic of neoliberalism, it is economically inefficient to discriminate based on race and other markers of social difference, has become widely accepted among Humanities scholars and social scientists who position themselves in the tradition of critical theory. Walter Benn Michaels writes:

one of the great discoveries of neoliberalism is that they [racism and sexism] are not very efficient sorting devices, economically speaking. If, for example, you are looking to promote someone as Head of Sales in your company and you are choosing between a straight white male and a black lesbian, and the latter is in fact a better salesperson than the former, racism, sexism and homophobia may tell you to choose the straight white male but capitalism tells you to go with the black lesbian (2008: 34).⁹

More generally, ethnic difference has become commodified *and* depoliticized under the neoliberal paradigm: customers at a Mexican restaurant in Phoenix, Arizona, might consume burritos while talking of the need for tighter border controls, and it's safe to assume that some participants in PEGIDA marches (a political movement in Germany which alleges that Europe is in danger of becoming 'Islamized') stop at Turkish fast-food joints to fill up on *Döner Kebab* on their way home. Not only have corporations realized that discrimination is bad for business; they have come to conceive diversity as an asset to enhance value extraction. Angela Y. Davis sums up: "Diversity is a corporate strategy [...] It's a difference that makes no difference at all" (qtd. in Ting 2015). University administrations, too, have begun to discover that diversity promises profitability – this certainly holds true for private institutions of higher education in the U.S., but increasingly also for German universities, inspite of the fact that

9 While we concur with Michaels in this assessment, we disagree with Michaels' line of reasoning in *The Problem with Diversity: How We Learned to Love Identity and Ignore Inequality*, which fails to take into account that axes of oppression intersect, overlooking, for instance, that communities racialized as non-white are disproportionately affected by the economic inequalities ushered in by neoliberalism. For a detailed critique of *The Trouble with Diversity*, see Priscilla Layne's contribution in this volume.

they are by and large public. Education scientists Gerd Grözinger and Marlene Langholz-Kaiser write that the disproportionate representation of women and ethnic minorities in the German academy not only translates into loss of intellectual potential, but also into loss of role model potential for future generations: “Especially universities that compete internationally – particularly with US-American elite universities, which have a lot of experience in diversity management – can no longer afford this loss” (2018: 200; our translation).

As alluded to in the previous quote, diversity management has been the dominant strategy universities have chosen to commit to the goal of attaining a more socially heterogeneous faculty, student body, and potentially also administrative body: that is, universities have issued diversity mission statements and appointed diversity officers or even created equal-opportunity offices. Sara Ahmed, the author of *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life* (2012), a book-length study of how institutions of higher education in the U.K. approach (ethnic) diversity, has reached an astounding conclusion. Maintaining that universities’ approach to diversity could be paraphrased as “*how not to do things with words*” (2016: 1; original emphasis), she points to what she theorizes as the “non-performativity” of diversity (2016: 1):

commitments [to diversity] were makeable *because* they were not doable: it seems you can make a commitment because commitments do not commit institutions to a course of action. Commitments might even become a way of not doing something by appearing to do something. Understanding the role or function of institutional commitments was to understand how institutions do not do things with words, or how institutions use words as a way of not doing things. [...] Policies can be adopted, words can be uttered; decisions can be made, without anything really changing. Sometimes we refer to this as the “lip service” model of diversity. To use a word like “non-performativity” is to reveal something about institutional mechanics: how things are reproduced by the very appearance of being transformed (Ahmed 2012: 1-2; original emphasis).

Putting things a little less abstractly, Ahmed explains:

A typical goal of diversity work is “to institutionalize diversity.” [...] However, if institutionalizing diversity is a goal for diversity workers, it does not necessarily mean it is the institution’s goal. [...] We could say that practitioners are given the goal of making diversity a goal. [...] An appointment becomes a story of not being given institutional support, as if being “just there” is enough. An appointment of a diversity officer can thus represent the absence of wider support for diversity (Ahmed 2012: 22-23).

In sum, the managerial paradigm with which German universities have operationalized diversity actually depoliticizes issues of ethnic difference, which are, of course, embedded in power dynamics, and thus reproduces racialized power dynamics at the very same time as it nominally celebrates cultural pluralism. As Vanessa Eileen Thompson and Veronika Zablotsky succinctly put it:

the discourse of ‘diversity’ objectifies relations of power and stabilizes them through neoliberal inclusion of figures of difference in ways that, as Angela Davis has argued, make no difference [...], while simultaneously perpetuating and stabilizing social injustices within the realms of higher education (Thompson/Zablotsky 2016: 79).

A bureaucratic-managerial approach to diversity, then, may render the population represented at a university more heterogeneous; it will not, however, result in the voices of people of color being *heard* in institutional life, in Humanist knowledge production, or in the classroom. As we will argue in the following, if people of color and/or people with migrant experience are to be truly *included* in German universities in general, and in Humanities departments in particular, that is, if they are to feel at “home” in the institution (Mbembe 2015: 5) and if they are to contribute all that they are uniquely positioned to contribute, a number of reforms pertaining to practices of knowledge production, teaching practices, and administrative practices are necessitated. In the words of Thompson and Zablotsky, what is needed is a move away from the model of “neoliberal business management and the individualization of political struggles over social justice” (2016: 91), and towards “a repoliticization of difference as a matter of social justice” (2016: 78), the latter conceived as “a political process of contestation in continued political struggles over processes of deliberation and harmonization with their effects of concealed asymmetrical relations” (2016: 91). The German Humanities stand much to gain from becoming more ethnically inclusive – and we are not speaking of economic profit maximization.

An Intersectional Approach to Ethnic Diversity

That viewing someone predominantly through one singular lens constitutes a reductionist mode of perception and that it is important to consider that a person can be subject to several forms of discrimination at once, is chiefly addressed by scholars by using the term ‘intersectionality.’ Coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw (1991; 2012), ‘intersectionality’ captures the fact that different forms of discrimination are not isolated from another but frequently *intersect*, leading to a considerable difference in the lived experience of, for example, a *white* and a

black woman. Even though both women may be exposed to sexism, it is crucial to understand that sexism may not only look and present differently for each of them but also have very different repercussions in both women's lives, given that a number of other axes of oppression, such as racism, economic marginalization, heteronormativity, etc. must also be taken into account. Transferred to (migrant) scholars and students of color in Germany, an *intersectional* analysis would thus be concerned with the fact that the experience of a black, gay migrant scholar of color may differ substantially from that of other blacks, gays, or migrant scholars, who may each find themselves faced with discrimination but who do not experience the specific *combination* of these facets, which can complicate feelings of solidarity but also recognition for one's pain in a hierarchical environment. While the underlying idea and methods of intersectionality are considered and employed, respectively, in various contributions, discrimination based on race constitutes the focus of this volume. This is not to suggest, however, that discrimination due to sexism, heteropatriarchy, neoliberal exploitation, etc., is undeserving of recognition or was not part of the conversation for (migrant) scholars and students of color in Germany. Rather, this volume seeks to raise awareness for the specific relevance of race and racism in the German Humanities/academy, because these aspects have – compared to discrimination based on gender or class – not received adequate consideration thus far.

Diversifying and Decolonizing Knowledge Production in the German Humanities

As we mentioned initially, the argument that the German Humanities ought to become more inclusive of ethnic diversity is informed by more than ethical and political concerns for social/racial justice (though this is a crucial dimension). Including more faculty, PhD candidates, and students of color will also alter the process of knowledge production at German Humanities departments in fundamental (and, we argue, beneficial) ways. As feminist scholars demonstrated by developing standpoint theories in the 1980s, power relations are analyzed with particular acumen from the vantage point of those oppressed by the power relations in question (cf. Rolin 2009; Harding 2004). Transferred to the thematic context of our volume, this posits that scholarship and classroom discussions pertaining to issues of race, racism, and colonialism will gain additional and vital perspectives by German Humanities departments' *including* (which is, as discussed above, different from merely adding) more researchers and students of color and/or with migration experience. Highlighting the unique perspective scholars of color bring to the study of racialized power dynamics, the

colonial residue in the Western cultural imaginary, etc., is not to suggest, however, that scholars of color had better limit their research interests to fields of Humanist inquiry that are concerned with race, ethnicity, and colonialism (cf. the contribution by Amina Grunewald). Rather, as we put it above, the presuppositions with which Humanities scholars approach their object of inquiry are influenced by the ways of knowing they have acquired by having occupied particular subject positions throughout their biographies. (This point is, of course, related to the assumptions informing feminist standpoint theories). Thus, *any* field of inquiry in any Humanist discipline stands to gain from diversifying the ways of knowing represented qua increasing diversity in various ways among scholars, and particularly at the current historical conjuncture with movements such as #BlackLivesMatter and #metoo, which deliberately raise the question of whose *humanity* is truly recognized and respected. Accordingly, the so-called Humanities in Germany *must* critically reevaluate their attachment to the notion of the universal Human subject postulated by Enlightenment philosophies, and broaden their self-definition in order to still live up to their label in the future.

It is the abovementioned link between socialization and epistemic orientation that points to a crucial contiguous dimension that increasing ethnic diversity among Humanities scholars would entail: a move towards decolonizing knowledge, which represents an endeavor that far exceeds diversifying the canon of primary sources, e.g. by amending the canon of American literature with African American, Indigenous, Chican@, etc. voices, and employing (and respecting) different *forms* of rendering knowledge, such as the anecdote that ‘theorizes from experience.’¹⁰ (Kimberly A. Singletary and Mahmoud Arghavan employ anecdotal knowledge in their contributions, for example). The fact that decolonial critique questions the very concept of the ‘canon,’ points to the epistemological, methodological, and political assumptions as well as demands it encompasses. In his lecture “Decolonizing Knowledge and the Question of the Archive,” Achille Mbembe argues for the necessity to dismantle the “Eurocentric *epistemic* canon,” which “attributes truth only to the Western way of knowledge production” (2015: 9; our emphasis). According to Mbembe:

Western epistemic traditions are traditions that claim detachment of the known from the knower. [...] They are traditions in which the knowing subject is enclosed in itself and peeks out at a world of objects and produces supposedly objective knowledge of those objects. The knowing subject is thus able, we are told, to know the world without being

10 The method of ‘theorizing from experience’ was developed by women of color social scientists such as Anna Julia Cooper and popularized by the feminists (of color) associated with standpoint theories (cf. May 2012: 168).

part of that world and he or she is by all accounts able to produce knowledge that is supposed to be universal and independent of context. [...] This hegemonic notion of knowledge production has generated discursive scientific practices and has set up interpretive frames that make it difficult to think outside of these frames. But this is not all. This hegemonic tradition [...] actively represses anything that actually is articulated, thought and envisioned from outside of these frames (2015: 9-10).

Boaventura de Sousa Santos has conceptualized this last dimension (the Western epistemic tradition's will to power) as *epistemicide* (2014: 149).¹¹ The utopian *telos* of attempts to decolonize knowledge, that is, to de-center Western epistemologies, diversify syllabi, and transform the university from a "white space" into a "home" for diverse constituencies, is the "pluriversity" (cf. Boidin, Cohen, and Grosfoguel 2012).

Since people of color and/or migrants may have been socialized in cultures that feature epistemologies and cosmologies outside the Western epistemic legacy, scholars of color and/or with migration experience are uniquely positioned to contribute to the project of decolonizing knowledge and the university. However, due to reasons located in Germany's political and philosophical histories, a theoretical and methodological mode that has served influential in other societies' epistemic contexts by challenging the notion of detached, disembodied, and objective scholarship Mbembe identifies as central to hegemonic Eurocentric knowledge production, has thus far remained marginal in the German Humanities: we are, of course, referring to scholar-activism.

Although the exhortation "The philosophers have only interpreted the world in various ways. The point, however, is to change it," was famously penned by a German political economist (Karl Marx), today, activist scholarship is met with considerable skepticism in the German Humanities, while it – albeit not Marxism or Marx himself – is widely accepted in the North American Humanities (and perhaps even mainstream in U.S.-based American Studies).

Scholar-activism is rooted in the philosophical tradition of Pragmatism originating in the U.S., which judges a given proposition's validity based on its

11 Defining epistemicide as "the murder of knowledge" (2014: 149), de Sousa Santos argues: "Unequal exchanges among cultures have always implied the death of the knowledge of the subordinated culture, hence the death of the social groups that possessed it. In the most extreme cases, such as that of European expansion, epistemicide was one of the conditions of genocide. The loss of epistemological confidence that currently afflicts modern science has facilitated the identification of the scope and gravity of the epistemicides perpetrated by hegemonic Eurocentric modernity" (2014: 149).

usefulness. It was simultaneously popularized in U.S.-based American Studies in light of various emancipatory social movements of the second half of the 20th century and the proliferation of identity politics. Academics involved in these political struggles ‘on the streets’ drove forth the crystallization of such academic fields as African American Studies, Women’s Studies, Queer Studies, Indigenous Studies, etc., some of which have become institutionally anchored through the creation of African American Studies departments, Women’s Studies departments, etc. Simultaneously, an academic revolt in U.S.-based American Studies took place against the hegemony of New Criticism, which focused on artefacts’ aesthetic strategies, but steered clear of discussing artefacts’ political implications and was judged by a vanguard of scholars who came to be called ‘new historicists’ as failing to question social power structures and thus, as colluding with the societal status quo. By delegitimizing aesthetics as a dimension of inquiry, new historicism, then, centrally contributed to ideology critique becoming the dominant method of U.S.-based scholarship on American literary and cultural productions.

In the German Humanities, by contrast, the scholar-activist mode has not gained much acceptance, due to a wariness that arises from the historical awareness of academia’s ideological *Gleichschaltung* during the Nazi and SED regimes. After all, Marx’ above-cited statement was installed in golden letters in the lobby of the main building of Humboldt University of Berlin (located in what was then East Berlin) in 1953: only those Humanities scholars whose work was deemed as furthering the political goals of the GDR’s Marxist-Leninist state doctrine were granted academic positions. Moreover, the lasting impact Enlightenment philosophy has had in the German Humanities has also contributed to the unpopularity of activist scholarship, whereas the U.S.’ philosophical legacy of Pragmatism is the *conditio sine qua non* of activist scholarship. Third, every field of knowledge production is conditioned by what Craig Calhoun calls the “hierarchical structure of scientific knowledge” (2008: xviii); to put things a bit provocatively, in German American Studies, research on Henry James or Thomas Pynchon endows a colleague with more symbolic capital than research on, say, African American women writers – especially when research on the latter topic is conducted by a black woman. In the Anglo-American realm, on the other hand, Americanist research that does not practice ideology critique in some form will have to vie mightily for recognition. Unsurprisingly, researchers gravitate towards those topics that promise the most recognition in their respective fields of knowledge production. More generally, activist scholarship is viewed critically, since modern (i.e. Western) science, as indexed in the above quotation by Mbembe, has developed an ideal of

knowledge based on detached, objective observation, and activism is widely understood as expressive of individual interests, emotions, or ethical commitments rather than of a broader, more reflective, and more intellectually informed perspective on social issues (cf. Calhoun 2008: xviii).

Of course, there are a number of pitfalls when it comes to activist scholarship. The Pragmatist imperative at the heart of activist scholarship demands that the knowledge Humanities scholars produce be ‘useful’ to the public; on the one hand, this has entailed research in support of emancipatory struggles, for instance, the African American quest for equality; on the other hand, the assessment of knowledge based on its ‘usefulness’ has allowed (private) university administrations to interfere with the research agenda conducted at their institutions, as the contributors of the volume *The Entrepreneurial University: Engaging Publics, Intersecting Impacts*, edited by Yvette Taylor (2014), have pointed out. Also, scholar-activism is ill-conceived when researchers assume that activism and scholarship are mutually exchangeable. Scholar-activism neither means that writing about political action is tantamount to engaging in political action; nor does it mean applying already established truths to a scenario of political importance. As Calhoun states:

[I]t is easy to elide the difference between contributing knowledge and analysis to social movements or other practical efforts and simply sharing in the general tasks of struggle. [...] But if activist scholarship is to contribute all that it really can (and if it is to be appreciated well in either scientific or practical realms), it has to do so through production and mobilization of knowledge (2008: xxi).

In the realm of Americanist activist scholarship, a particular and common pitfall lies in practitioners’ disregarding the specific mediality and aesthetic strategies of the cultural productions they analyze. Obviously, however, it makes a difference whether a character in an Afrofuturist novel or a demonstrator at a #BlackLivesMatter march utters a statement.

When minding these potential pitfalls, activist scholarship may also have exciting implications for Humanist disciplines in Germany as a whole; as Calhoun states in view of activist social science:

The primary purpose of activist scholarship thus may be to address public issues or help specific constituencies. Activist scholarship is one way to make social science useful. But activist scholarship can also make social science better, providing occasions for new knowledge creation, challenges to received wisdom, and new ways of thinking (2008: xxv).

Pedagogical Advantages of Learning in Diverse Classrooms and Methods for Diversity-Conscious Teaching

Education scientists Grözinger and Langholz-Kaiser emphasize two dimensions when it comes to ethnic diversity and the higher-education classroom: first, including more teaching staff of color and/or with migration experience has an empowering impact on students of color/migrant students, because the former serve as role models: “Institutions in liberal societies should be seen as principally accessible to anyone. And the higher the position, the higher the visibility. [...] The symbolic authorization through visibility is crucial. It empowers members of these groups to trust in their capacity to likewise achieve a career of high visibility” (2018: 200; our translation). Second, learning in ethnically diverse classrooms prepares students for a respectful and democratic conviviality in an increasingly diversifying German society and a globalizing world (Grözinger/Langholz-Kaiser 2018: 200).

In terms of subject matters, theories, and methodologies taught in higher education, decolonizing and diversifying syllabi will benefit not only students of color/with migrant experience, but all students, by pluralizing the cultural, political, and epistemic perspectives with which students are encouraged to engage. However, for students of color/migrant students, finding voices represented on the syllabus and acquiring theoretical concepts (such as Eurocentrism) that help them make sense of their own experiences, can prove particularly valuable. Humanities scholars without a designated emphasis in the study of race and ethnicity tend to deflect demands for diversifying and decolonizing syllabi. Priscilla Layne, a professor of German, writes in her contribution to this volume:

When I raise the issue of diversifying a German Studies curriculum, many of the skeptics echo the same excuses. They say there are not enough texts by People of Color in German. Or they say they do not have the expertise to teach an entire class on “people with a migration background.” Or perhaps they claim a unit on “diversity” would not fit into their syllabus. What they get wrong is the assumption that including texts in German by People of Color means you need an entire unit, lesson, or course about diversity or multiculturalism. While this has been the approach taken for decades, it also creates a literary ‘ghetto’ for authors of Color, keeping them at the margins. It is just as possible to incorporate more texts by People of Color in whatever lesson or syllabus you intend to teach, whether it is about literature and science, Romanticism, or poetry (226).

At the same time, classes pertaining to the study of race and ethnicity in another cultural context (e.g. the United States) often lead students in German Humanities classrooms to engage in what one could describe as ‘cathartic fingerpointing’: class discussions of police brutality against unarmed African Americans may include passionate denunciations of *American* society’s racism, the implication being that contemporary German society is free from such blatant manifestations of racism. Pointing out that police in the state of Bavaria engage in racial profiling; that there is evidence for police brutality against people of color in Germany;¹² that the African and Arab individuals drowning in the Mediterranean Sea on a daily basis are kept out of ‘fortress Europe’ in the name of German and other E.U. citizens, may encourage students to think more critically of matters pertaining to race, ethnicity, and racism in contemporary German society/Europe. Moreover, in class discussions of U.S. settler imperialism, drawing students’ attention to the legacy of German colonialism in Africa may be politically worthwhile.¹³

However, this comparative approach also poses the potential pitfall of students’ lack of appreciation for the specificity of the cultural and political phenomena discussed in class. For instance, students should ideally not reach the conclusion that the treatment of the so-called guest workers in Germany in the 1950s was ‘just like’ the experiences of African Americans in the American South during the Jim Crow era. Saskia Hertlein’s contribution in this volume proposes an approach to teaching intercultural subject matters in diverse higher education classrooms in Germany that seeks to sensitize students to related sociopolitical and cultural issues in Germany while doing justice to the specific context of the issue in question.

Orienting one’s teaching in an increasingly diverse university classroom towards encouraging students to develop “Critical Diversity Literacy” (and continuously self-reflecting whether one’s teaching practice is diversity literate) constitutes a helpful pedagogical methodology. According to sociologist Melissa Steyn:

“Diversity literacy” can best be characterised as a “reading practice” – a way of perceiving and responding to the social climate and prevalent structures of oppression. The analytical criteria employed to evaluate the presence of diversity literacy include the following: 1) a recognition of the symbolic and material value of hegemonic identities [...]; 2) analytic skill at unpacking how these systems of oppression intersect, interlock, co-construct and

12 Cf. the case of Oury Jalloh, which Courtney Moffett-Bateau/Sebastian Weier and Saskia Hertlein briefly discuss in their respective contributions.

13 Thanks go to René Dietrich for bringing this point to our attention.

constitute each other; 3) the definition of oppressive systems such as racism as current social problems rather than a historical legacy; 4) an understanding that social identities are learned and an outcome of social practices; 5) the possession of a diversity grammar and a vocabulary that facilitates a discussion of race, racism, and antiracism, and the parallel concepts employed in the analysis of other forms of oppression; 6) the ability to translate (interpret) coded hegemonic practices; 7) an analysis of the ways that diversity hierarchies and institutionalised oppressions are mediated by class inequality and inflected in specific social contexts; and 8) an engagement with issues of transformation of these oppressive systems towards deepening democracy/social justice in all levels of social organisation (Steyn 2007; qtd. in Steyn 2010: 20).

Those readers seeking to familiarize themselves with methods for diversity-conscious teaching in the higher-education classroom in more detail, may refer to Saskia Hertlein's contribution for further resources as well as to the website of *Zentrum für Kompetenzentwicklung für Diversity Management in Studium und Lehre an Hochschulen* (<http://www.komdim.de/>). Lili Rebstock's article on the experiences of youths of color in Germany may be of particular interest to (prospective) teachers and those engaged in teacher-training at university.

Institutional Measures to Meaningfully Increase Diversity¹⁴

Highlighting that universities conceptualize diversity as an issue of management, organizational sociologist Lukas Daubner states that it has become increasingly common for universities to issue mission statements in which they commit themselves “to fostering the perception, recognition, and use of diversity” or to “raising awareness for discrimination and fostering appreciation for difference in any area of life” (2018: 202; our translation). This approach to diversity, of course, is rooted in the neoliberal logic that discrimination is to be avoided because it is economically inefficient. A dominant strategy German universities have used to ‘manage diversity,’ Daubner critically remarks, has been to add an organizational unit for equal opportunities/diversity to extant structures without changing the latter. Since the “success or failure” of such a unit “depends on

14 The measures introduced here highlight what short-range or medium-range changes may be reached in light of the status quo. That is, while the abolition of the three-tiered secondary education system may be the measure that would most significantly reduce the disparities in educational opportunities, passing this policy is a long-term goal (and, if one assumes a *Realpolitik* stance, politically unrealistic in several German states).

how large its influence is on the operative processes of research, teaching, and administration” (2018: 202; our translation), equal opportunity/diversity officers, committed to their task though they may be, “rarely succeed in influencing the modes of interaction and working, which are often characterized by a large degree of informality” (ibid.; our translation). This dynamics, of course, reflects what we discussed above as Ahmed’s theory of the “non-performativity” of diversity (Ahmed 2012: 1). In other words, as institutions, universities will only change in the direction of greater diversity if the administrative steps taken exceed paying lip service to diversity in mission statements and creating positions for diversity officers, and are pursued concomitantly to steps on the part of faculty outlined above towards decolonizing knowledge production as well as diversifying syllabi and fostering critical diversity literacy in the classroom.

What might these administrative steps look like? Claudia Peus, professor of research and science management, underscores that universities need to devise strategies and define clear criteria for recruiting talented individuals at every level (students; non-tenured faculty; tenured professors). If they want to work against the “similarity attraction paradigm” (all-white committees are likely to pick white candidates) and the impact of stereotypes (such as ‘the white male research genius’), universities need to devise a selection process that is structured clearly and in detail, since a study of professor recruitment in the Netherlands shows that candidates from underrepresented groups are assessed particularly negatively when there is a lack of clear criteria on which to base selection decisions (for details, cf. Peus 2018: 207). Peus further recommends implementing diversity monitoring in universities’ recruitment processes, “e.g. introducing the duty to document the number of applications from underrepresented groups at various levels of the selection process” (2018: 207; our translation). Said measures, Peus argues, are particularly effective when concrete goals are set (e.g. x percent of those candidates invited for job talks should come from communities of color) and when failing to meet these goals will entail consequences, such as proactively approaching candidates of color (ibid.; cf. Peus et al. 2015 for best practices from the German context; cf. Sensoy/Diangelo 2017 for best practices from the U.S. context).

Increasing pupils’ of color/migrant pupils’ educational opportunities and encouraging gifted pupils to stay course, however, falls outside the terrain of the university. As expressed earlier, a thorough reform of the traditional three-tiered secondary-education system in Germany is structurally best suited to increase the enrolment of students of color/migrant students at university. Until such reforms are enacted, gradual steps towards educational justice for pupils of

color/migrant pupils can still be taken: the state of North Rhine-Westphalia has developed an interesting program in this regard; dubbed “talent scouting,” the state’s Department of Culture and the Sciences has sponsored an initiative since 2011, in which over 70 scouts based at 17 universities/schools of applied sciences visit high schools “to work in unison with teachers to identify motivated adolescents who have not had the opportunity thus far to make the most of their potential” (“NRW-Zentrum für Talentförderung”). Adolescents from non-academic and/or economically challenged families are the particular focus of the program. In individual council sessions, scouts and students determine what educational/professional options there are; scouts continue to be available for the young adults if the latter decide to enroll at university. 12,500 students are involved in the program as of 2018 (ibid.). We would like to close our remarks on increasing the inclusion of students/scholars of color and/or with migrant experience in the German Humanities by pointing to this initiative aimed at increasing the access of students of color to institutions of higher education, since it underscores the holistic approach to diversity-as-inclusion-and-social-justice that we have argued for.

Contributions

In her article, “‘*Ausländer*’ – A Racialized Concept? ‘Race’ as an Analytical Concept in Contemporary German Immigration History,” Maria Alexopoulou questions the term ‘*Ausländer*’ as a racialized concept and emphasizes ‘race’ as an analytical concept in contemporary German immigration history. She particularly puts pressure on the fact that a large number of renowned academics deliberately refrain from using the word ‘*Rasse*’ (race) even when writing about the United States in German. Alexopoulou notes that mainstream German historiography almost entirely avoids terms such as ‘race,’ ‘racism,’ or ‘*Volks-gemeinschaft*’ lest they evoke *Angst* (fear) in white Germans. According to Jacques Derrida’s notion of *différance*, Alexopoulou asserts, concepts bear traces of forgotten, suppressed, and silenced meanings. She suggests that this is the case with the binary of ‘*Ausländer*’ and ‘German.’ Her thesis is that discourses and practices around this binary in the context of migration reproduce racist knowledge that has been transferred historically, albeit it was also transformed or even questioned. While terms and ideas of embodiment of ‘the’ *Ausländer* changed over time, the negative images associated with these groups have constantly stayed the same. This shows that the term ‘*Ausländer*’ – just like all of its substitutes – are ultimately racialized concepts: they construct a distinct group with particular characteristics, which is set as the Other to ‘the Germans.’

Furthermore, intersections such as origin, religion, class, and gender, explain the changing position in the hierarchy of ‘*Ausländer*.’

In “Perspective Matters: Racism and Resistance in the Everyday Lives of Youths of Color in Germany,” Lili Rebstock weaves together interviews with young people of color in Germany and various theoretical insights on *microaggressions*, racism, and intersectionality. She sets out with the contention that since extremely overt or blunt forms of racism have lost moral and social acceptance and have also changed in the course of the past decades, more subtle forms such as *microaggressions* deserve both attention and recognition. Employing Chester Pierce’s concept of *microaggressions* and Philomena Essed’s concept of *everyday racism*, Rebstock points out that today’s lived experience of racism is marked by the staggering, long-term effect of constant demeaning and excluding messages that frequently go unsanctioned, for their harmful impact is either ignored or dismissed once it is addressed. Rebstock argues that in Germany, dominant research about racism mainly represents the perpetrators’ views. Thinking about the question of “Who can speak?” with regard to positionality and academia, she asserts that conversations on both race and racism must always take intersecting features such as age, gender, sexuality, class, disability, etc. and power relations into account. This insight is central to her discussion of the perspectives of youths of color on the issue of racism in Germany because their voice is hardly heard. In order to examine the topic of everyday racism and *microaggressions*, Rebstock conducted qualitative research with problem-centered interviews through the *Grounded Theory* approach and the concept of *Co-Construction* as developed by Paul Mecheril (2003). This research design encourages a self-reflective approach and transparency in the sense that topics can be evolved together and that Rebstock, as the interviewer, is also involved in sharing her views and feelings with her interviewees. She concludes that *microaggressions* are very hard to detect and to prove and therefore also hard to confront. She suggests that more recognition of the experiences of youths of color, but also support from other persons like peers, teachers, parents as well as educational, medial, and political institutions is needed.

In his article, “Beyond a Trifling Presence: Afro-Germans and Identity Boundaries in Germany,” Anthony Obute starts off with the observation that being German and being black does not seem to go together in the mind of most Germans. Whiteness thus functions as a synecdoche, accompanied by the expectation of ‘blonde hair and blue eyes’ by default in order to qualify Germanness. The imaginary boundaries of German identity also directly confront a remarkable history of the description of the German body. Obute argues that the spirit of citizenship law, tightly constructed around body and color politics,

sustain(ed) microaggressive tendencies, as well as the exclusion of black features from German identity and Germany as a space. Hence, Germans of African descent need to situate their belonging within German society. They cannot regard it as a given, as white Germans, by contrast, can. Furthermore, Obute questions the production of black identity through the white gaze and the right of black subjects to define and name themselves. He critiques the tripartite workings of history with regard to black presence in Germany. Emphasizing the importance of race with regard to this discourse, he runs *Critical Race Theory* across the documentary “Afro Germany – Being Black and German” by Jana Pareigis et al. as an example to illustrate said workings. The documentary provides multiple viewpoints and experiences of black Germans across diverse spectra of life. He concludes that the black body emerges from the construction site of the white gaze as the figure of the strange and direct opposite of all that the white body represents. This shows that the production of black identity through the lens of the white gaze relies on self-generated precolonial knowledge of the African space, as the allegedly ill Africa, its space, place and people, were the imagination and production of Europe, too. The future, therefore, remains a void space and a recipient of the fast accelerating past, which imbricates the history of the ‘trifling presence’ and the exclusion of the black body from the consideration of Germanness.

Annika Rosbach draws attention to translation practices deployed in rendering African American vernacular in the German that have effectually (if unintentionally) reified anti-black racism. Her essay “Race and Racism in Translation: ‘Who Can Speak?’ in German Renderings of Literary African American English” first foregrounds the aesthetic functions African American vernacular assumes in the narration of Zora Neale Hurston’s novel *Their Eyes Were Watching God* (1937) and Alice Walker’s novel *The Color Purple* (1982) to subsequently highlight problematic strategies German translators have mobilized to render these literary texts in the German. Rosbach demonstrates that Barbara Henniges’ choice to render African American English in the German Rhine-Ruhr dialect in her translation of Hurston’s novel, *Und ihre Augen schauten Gott* (1993), represents African Americans as linguistically inferior. In translating Walker’s novel, Helga Pfetsch’s choice of using German colloquial language (*Umgangssprache*) to approximate African American English in *Die Farbe Lila* (1983), Rosbach argues, limits the main character Celie’s voice to indexing a lack of education. Rosbach closes by introducing the translation strategies Hans-Ulrich Möhring has developed in *Vor ihren Augen sahen sie Gott* (2011) as a paradigmatic example of how African American English may be translated in ways that convey the language’s aesthetic properties (e.g. its

musicality) while eschewing racist stereotypes in portraying African American culture.

“Post-Racism, Colorblind Individualism & Political Correctness: Contemporary Modes of Materialization in American Studies and German Academia,” by Courtney Moffett-Bateau and Sebastian Weier, highlights the structures of a specific strategy in racial discourse – that of materialization – which has come to characterize our contemporary post-racist era. The authors define post-racism “as a ‘new’ period of racism that positions itself in line with mainstream descriptions of colorblind individualism and contemporary language policies that claim we live in a period that is beyond racism and therefore beyond political correctness” (123). Strategies of materialization, then, reinforce the systemic exclusion of blacks by disavowing “race-based structures” and relegating them to the past “in the name of American democratic progress” (123). Moffett-Bateau and Weier highlight examples such as Clint Eastwood’s famous “chair-ologue” at the 2012 Republican National Convention, the *Dred Scott v. Sanford* and *State of Missouri v. Celia* court cases, the lynchings of black effigies at the University of California, Berkeley in December 2014, and the controversial April 2016 edition of the German academic journal *Forschung und Lehre*, to elucidate the two main forms in racialized discourse: legal and artistic materialization. In so doing, the authors outline the history of the formation of a democratic order – an order that, relying on racialized modes of symbolic violence (Pierre Bourdieu) to exclude blacks from the concept of humanism, “carries an extensive tradition of making people matter differently” (134).

In her article, “~~Kanak~~ Academic: Teaching in Enemy Territory,” Ismahan Wayah addresses the absence of non-normative bodies of black and people of color (BPoC) from German academic spheres and the concomitant absence of their non-normative knowledge from the white, middle-class, heteronormative system of knowledge production in the German academy. Wayah explains how the exclusion of BPoC bodies begins in the German three-tiered secondary-school system of *Hauptschule*, *Realschule*, and *Gymnasium*, which encourages students from higher socioeconomic status to pursue a university education while preparing children from immigrant families/families of color, who are disproportionately affected by socioeconomic marginalization, for vocational training, leading to low-income job opportunities. Even those BPoC students who make it to the university are expected to mimic a white middle-class *habitus* in order to be considered almost German, but not quite. Germanness, as Wayah argues, in the hegemonic cultural imaginary to this day indexes whiteness and Christianity. Referencing literature and critical thought by and about marginalized people such as migrants and BPoC in Germany, publicly known

incidents of racism in the German academy, and her own experiences, Wayah illustrates the odds and obstacles that the racialized, non-normative body of a black female Muslim academic in *hijab*, the “~~Kanak~~ academic,” will have to overcome in order to teach in “enemy territory” and to gradually subvert longstanding structural and epistemological regimes of white middle-class heteronormativity in the German academy.

In “The Migrant Scholar of Color as Refugee in the Western Academy,” Mahmoud Arghavan proceeds from Giorgio Agamben’s remark that the figure of the refugee, who destabilizes the foundations of the nation-state and nationalism, must be the point of reference for thinking the world anew, to tease out parallels between the political-structural positionality of the figure of the refugee (of color) in contemporary Europe and the epistemic-structural positionality of the figure of the migrant scholar of color in the Western Humanist academy. Combining theoretical insights gleaned from personal experience with the theoretical work of Hannah Arendt, Giorgio Agamben, and Zygmunt Baumann, Arghavan concludes that the promise of academic freedom proves elusive for migrant scholars of color upon their arrival in Germany/Europe: while they overwhelmingly left their home countries due to a lack of academic freedom and other indices of political repression, their freedom to research and teach in Germany is often denied in covert ways, as the German Humanist academy is a white-dominated space set on reproducing itself and is generally inimical to epistemic approaches beyond Eurocentrism, which Arghavan, building on Walter Dignolo, calls “epistemic racism.” Arghavan discerns certain similarities between this situation and that of refugees (of color), who have fled persecution in their home countries, but continue to face tenuous relations to human rights in Europe/Germany. But, Arghavan contends, just as the figure of the refugee (of color) forces the German society to confront its own racism, the migrant scholar of color forces the German academy to confront its own structural and epistemic Eurocentrism, thus gradually pushing the German Humanities in the direction of decolonization.

Kai Linke discusses the ongoing institutional racism in academia, which excludes people of color through hiring practices and admission policies, in his article “Keeping Academia White: A Case Study.” His case of study is an incident that occurred at a public conference at a German university, which led to a series of controversies between students and professors. Through close reading of the controversial statements during the conference and after that, Linke exposes the racist implications and exclusionary consequences of some statements by white people who even perceive themselves as anti-racist but are actually engaged in racist practices. Linke suggests that only by reflecting on the

criticisms addressed at white people we shall move away from the illusion of innocent whiteness and towards a more egalitarian society.

Priscilla Layne's article, "On Racism without Race: The Need to Diversify *Germanistik* and the German Academy," deals with the issue of diversity in the field of German Studies (*Germanistik*) in Germany. As an African American scholar working in the field of German Studies and as both a former student and now professor, she has experienced first-hand that there is a lack of diversity in German higher education. She argues that many white academics and students fail to acknowledge their privilege, racializing practices, and racist structures in Germany, which contribute to the lack of diversity within the academy. While this is an issue in American Studies, it is likely an even larger problem in *Germanistik*, as scholars often work within a paradigm of German literature and culture that reflects the homogenous ideal of Herder's *Volk*, and marginalizes the important contributions of minorities, such as those of black German and Turkish German authors. Against this background, Layne emphasizes the importance for white German professors to critically position themselves when working on topics such as *blackfacing*, and proposes that it is important to have more people of color at the university, both in positions of power and as students. She argues that German Studies or *Germanistik*, depending on whether one talks about the U.S. or Germany, tends to see itself as being free from racial problems, aside from recognizing the importance of German Jewish Studies. In order to combat racism in the German academy as a whole, diversifying disciplines like *Germanistik* occupies a central role, Layne asserts. She suggests that one needs to start with *what* is taught and decolonize the canon. This demonstrates that authors of color *belong* to the canon of German literature. With that, German professors should dare to challenge their students and themselves to think more critically about race and think about *how* they can work to deconstruct racial stereotypes in every context. Layne affirms that white Germans have to work towards dismantling white supremacy in the academy and restructure it to create a space of learning in which diverse backgrounds, opinions, experiences, and skills are valued. Only when the universities, departments, and disciplines can commit to deconstructing white privilege, she concludes, real progress can be achieved; progress towards building an academy that better reflects reality.

In "'So You Want to Write about American Indians?': Ethical Reflections on Euro-Academia's Research on Indigenous Cultural Narratives," Amina Grunewald discusses how Indigeneities can be negotiated by Western agents in particular places of education and therefore in spaces of power. She questions what kind of cultural, sociopolitical, and ethical contexts need to be taken into

account within a North American decolonizing discourse when dealing with Indigenous peoples, their knowledge and belief systems, and their self-representations. In her article, Indigenous voices such as scholars and artists are given a major authoritative position to represent their agendas in order to let Indigenous culture insiders have their say about problematic Western cultural outsiders' involvements – Western outsiders that often enough have insensitively been trespassing invisible borderlines regarding Indigenous spaces of protection and/or disregarding issues that arise for Indigenous people(s), who are forced to live within Westernized settler nation-states. In this context, Amina Grunewald draws not only from Indigenous authors'/scholars' works and linked methodologies and philosophies, but rather from her personal research stays in Vancouver and Montréal – all dealing with Indigenous issues on the power of (self-)representations and therefore, alterNative political and cultural agendas and visibilities in North American public spaces.

Saskia Hertlein addresses the challenge of teaching contemporary race-related issues in U.S. society in the higher-education classroom in Germany in ways that encourage students to draw parallels to German culture and society while nuancing the contextual specificity of the issue under discussion in “‘The Danger of a Single Story’: Addressing Contemporary Public Discourse and Protest Movements in American Studies Classrooms in Germany.” Taking as her point of departure the recent upsurge of right-wing social and political movements in both the U.S. and Germany, which agitate against racial and religious minorities at the very same time as the U.S. is projected to become minority-white and Germany is becoming decidedly more ethnically diverse, Hertlein builds on literary critic Paula Moya's approach in *The Social Imperative* to outline how close reading can bring the schemas through which individual participants in a classroom discussion engage with issues of race to the fore, and how these schemas may be productively transformed through an open, but respectful discussion of clashing views. Hertlein goes on to highlight how sociologist Melissa Steyn's approach of *Critical Diversity Literacy* can be operationalized as both a method for and a subject of teaching in the Humanist higher-education classroom, and fleshes out why Inter-American Studies approaches and subject matters are particularly suited for inclusion in American Studies syllabi that seek to foster critical thinking regarding racism, colonialism, and border regimes in students.

In “Goethe Meets Baldwin: Notes towards a Comparative Perspective beyond Misappropriation,” Derek C. Maus takes an anecdote from his intellectual biography as a point of departure to problematize iterations of the theories of cosmopolitanism and multiculturalism, and subsequently propose

ways of ‘doing transcultural interpretation’ that actively work against misappropriation and Othering. Recalling his enthusiasm for cosmopolitanism as an undergraduate, which he conceived as an antidote to Cold War-fuelled nationalism, Maus details his gradual disenchantment with cosmopolitanist philosophy, whose articulation, he argues, presupposes security afforded by the very nation-state that cosmopolitanism seeks to transcend, and, like multiculturalism, often retains “a quasi-colonialist subjective privilege” (289). Critiquing parallel approaches in the realm of literary criticism, which retain an Othering of the cultural work of authors classified as non-white or postcolonial, Maus proposes frameworks for transcultural interpretation that take their cue from James Baldwin’s provocative solution to the outlined dilemma: rather than visit black country (i.e. practice cosmopolitanism), a white person has to ‘consent to be black.’ Maus subsequently builds on John Pizer’s conception of world literature to outline a practice of literary interpretation that takes Baldwin’s demand seriously, and “involves remaining receptive to the unfamiliar without prejudging it – either positively or negatively – because of its alterity” so that “the Other ceases to be defined either in opposition to the Self or as a desirable exoticism to be appropriated into it” (293).

Academic white spaces and their (in-)ability to produce knowledge that accurately captures the dynamics of racial, ethnic, and class diversity in 21st century Europe and the U.S. are the focus of Kimberly Alecia Singletary’s essay “Notes from the Margin: Academic White Spaces and the Silencing of Scholars of Color.” Looking at such spaces – that is, spaces marked by a predominating white presence that relegates people of color to object rather than subject positions when it comes to academic inquiries into racism – entails looking at the “university’s position as a white space that silences Other narratives through an adherence to colorblindness and race neutrality, even as the university purports to educate students about racial and social justice” (298). The notion of colorblindness is key here as it allows for particularly subtle forms of black marginalization. “[C]olorblindness,” Singletary argues, following Eduardo Bonilla-Silva, “‘otherizes softly,’ creating opportune moments for covert discrimination and [...] a ‘racial grammar’ [that] normalizes white domination to the point that it remains invisible to many, if not most, people” (306). Singletary augments her investigations of academic white spaces with field notes and diary entries that show how colorblindness undergirds a European problem of “imagining difference,” based on a widespread imagination of Europe as completely untouched by ‘race’ and the effects of colonialism, as well as it informs an American tendency of “choosing ignorance,” in other words, an unwillingness to acknowledge, and thereby equalize, the alternative knowledge

produced by people of color. In scholars of color such conditions elicit “racial fatigue,” as they constantly strive to attain recognition by the white majority, “doing research that benefits their communities while overworking themselves to be seen as equally capable as their white colleagues or avoid[ing] race-related research, opting instead for a colorblind approach that treats whiteness as a race-neutral category at the expense of People of Color” (302). Thus, the question of academic diversity is, as Singletary ultimately argues, not simply one of countering racial discrimination; it is also closely tied to the university’s role as an institution of productive “interpersonal and academic relationships” and “a leader in political and social thought” (309).

In “Transatlantic Postcolonial (T)Races in the Classroom: From Defoe’s Desert Island to Larsen’s *Quicksand* and *Black-ish* Suburbia,” Elahe Haschemi Yekani traces race as discursive and aesthetic formation through reconstructing it from its time and space of emergence. In doing so she takes us on an inter-genre journey to revisit three spatiotemporally different texts, that is, Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe*, Nella Larsen’s *Quicksand*, and finally the TV series *Black-ish* through the transnational and intersectional framework of postcolonial epistemology. In *Robinson Crusoe*, Haschemi Yekani investigates the gradual formation of English national identity as white with religious, geographical, racial, and civilizational demarcations. In her reading of *Quicksand*, she interrogates the relationality of race in studying the mixed-race heroine of the novel, Helga Crane, daughter of a white Danish woman and an African American man. In her analysis of *Black-ish*, she reminds us of how much race still matters in 21st century America and that blackness needs to be claimed and remade. Haschemi Yekani proposes a non-binary and non-static framing of categories of difference as a postcolonial contribution to an interdisciplinary understanding of intersectionality.

Marius Henderson rounds off our edited volume with a poetic reflection on the issues under discussion in the volume. His poem is titled “Passing Tone/ Note.”

Works Cited

- Ahmed, Sara (2012): *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*, Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Ahmed, Sara (2016): “How Not to Do Things with Words.” In: *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women’s and Gender Studies* 16/1, pp. 1-10 (<http://sites.cortland.edu/wagadu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2017/02/v16-how-not-to-do-ahmed.pdf/>).

- Anderson, Elijah (2015): "The White Space." In: *Sociology of Race and Ethnicity* 1/1, pp. 10-21.
- Auernheimer, Georg (2013): *Schieflagen im Bildungssystem: Die Benachteiligung der Migrantenkinder*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Batson, Daniel C. (2016): *What's Wrong with Morality?: A Social-Psychological Perspective*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Black Diaspora and Germany Network (ed.) (2018): *Black Diaspora and Germany – Deutschland und die Schwarze Diaspora*, Münster: edition assemblage.
- Boidin, Capucine/Cohen, James/Grosfoguel, Ramón (2012): "Introduction: From University to Pluriversity: A Decolonial Approach to the Present Crisis of Western Universities." In: *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knowledge* 10/1, pp. 1-6.
- Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo (2006): *Racism Without Racists: Color-blind Racism and the Persistence of Racial Inequality in the United States*, Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Calhoun, Craig (2008): "Foreword." In: Charles R. Hale. (ed.), *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship*, Berkeley: University of California Press, pp. xiii-xxvi.
- Chin, Rita/Fehrenbach, Heide/Eley, Geoff/Grossmann, Atina (2009): *After the Nazi Racial State: Difference and Democracy in Germany and Europe*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé (1991): "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence Against Women of Color." In: *Stanford Law Review* 43/6, pp. 1241–1299.
- Crenshaw, Kimberlé (2012): *On Intersectionality: The Essential Writings of Kimberlé Crenshaw*, New York: Perseus.
- Dabashi, Hamid, and Walter Dignolo (2015): *Can Non-Europeans Think?*, London: Zed Books.
- Daubner, Lukas (2018): "Leitbildprosa reicht nicht. Kann man Diversität in der Universität managen?" In: *Forschung & Lehre* 25/3, pp. 202-203.
- de Sousa Santos, Boaventura (2014): *Epistemologies of the South – Justice against Epistemicide*, Boulder and London: Paradigm Publishers.
- de Sousa Santos, Boaventura (2017): *Decolonising the University – The Challenge of Deep Cognitive Justice*, Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Dhawan, Nikita (ed.) (2016): *Difference that Makes no Difference: The Non-Performativity of Intersectionality and Diversity (Special Issue)*, In: *Wagadu*:

- A Journal of Transnational Women's and Gender Studies 16/1 (<http://sites.cortland.edu/wagadu/v-16/>).
- Drews-Sylla, Gesine/Makarska, Renata (eds.) (2015): *Neue alte Rassismen? – Differenz und Exklusion in Europa nach 1989*, Bielefeld: transcript.
- El-Tayeb, Fatima. (2005): "Vorwort." In: Maureen Maisha Eggers/Grada Kilomba/Peggy Piesche/Susan Arndt (eds.), *Mythen, Masken und Subjekte: Kritische Weißseinforschung in Deutschland*, Münster: Unrast Verlag, pp. 7-9.
- El-Tayeb, Fatima. (2011): *European Others: Queering Ethnicity in Postnational Europe*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- El-Tayeb, Fatima (2016): *Undeutsch: Die Konstruktion des Anderen in der postmigrantischen Gesellschaft*, Bielefeld: transcript.
- Fereidooni, Karim (2011): *Schule – Migration – Diskriminierung: Ursachen der Benachteiligung von Kindern mit Migrationshintergrund im deutschen Schulwesen*, Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Foucault, Michel (1980 [1972]): *Power/Knowledge – Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977*. Colin Gordon (ed.), Colin Gordon/Leo Marshall/John Mepham/Kate Soper (trans.), New York: Pantheon Books.
- Großklaus, Götz (2017): *Das Janusgesicht Europas: Zur Kritik des kolonialen Diskurses*, Bielefeld: transcript.
- Grözinger, Gerd/Langholz-Kaiser, Marlene (2018): "Bewusste Anerkennung von Unterschieden: Diversität in der Wissenschaft." In: *Forschung & Lehre* 25/3, pp. 198-200.
- Gutiérrez y Muhs, Gabriella/Flores Niemann, Yolanda/Gonzalez, Carmen G./Harris, Angela P. (eds.) (2012): *Presumed Incompetent: The Intersections of Race and Class for Women in Academia*, Boulder: University Press of Colorado.
- Hale, Charles R. (ed.) (2008): *Engaging Contradictions: Theory, Politics, and Methods of Activist Scholarship*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Harding, Sandra (ed.) (2004): *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies*, New York: Routledge.
- Karen L. Dace (ed.) (2012): *Unlikely Allies in the Academy: Women of Color and White Women in Conversation*, New York: Routledge.
- Kelly, Natasha (2017): "Rassismus betrifft alle Fächer." In: *Tagesspiegel* August 30 (<https://www.tagesspiegel.de/wissen/uni-dozentin-natasha-a-kelly-rassismus-betrifft-alle-faecher/20255456.html>).
- Kilomba, Grada (2010): *Plantation Memories: Episodes of Everyday Racism*, Münster: Unrast.

- Kilomba, Grada (2015): "Decolonizing Knowledge." *Voicerepublic*, 62:47 (<https://voicerepublic.com/talks/grada-kilomba-decolonizing-knowledge-016ae920-48de-445f-845d-dcfe6926c4b4>).
- Kühne, Anja/Warnecke, Tilmann (2018): "Schüler im Milieu gefangen." In: *Der Tagesspiegel* October 23 (<https://www.tagesspiegel.de/wissen/oecd-zu-chancengerechtigkeit-schueler-im-milieu-gefangen/23218686.html/>).
- Kuokkanen, Rauna (2007): *Reshaping the University: Responsibility, Indigenous Epistemes, and the Logic of the Gift*, Vancouver and Toronto: University of British Columbia Press.
- Kuria, Emily Ngubia (2015): *Eingeschrieben: Zeichen setzen gegen Rassismus an deutschen Hochschulen*, Berlin: w_orten & mehr.
- Lennox, Sara (ed.) (2016): *Remapping Black Germany: New Perspectives on Afro-German History, Politics and Culture*, Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Linde, Frank/Auferkorte-Michaelis, Nicole (2018): "Auf mehreren Ebenen agieren. Diversitätsorientierte Hochschullehre." In: *Forschung & Lehre* 25/3, pp. 210-212.
- May, Vivian M. (2012). *Anna Julia Cooper, Visionary Black Feminist. A Critical Introduction*, Foreword by Beverly Guy-Sheftall, New York: Routledge.
- Mbembe, Achille (2015): "Decolonizing Knowledge and the Question of the Archive." Lecture, Wits Institute for Social and Economic Research (<https://wiser.wits.ac.za/system/files/Achille%20Mbembe%20-%20Decolonizing%20Knowledge%20and%20the%20Question%20of%20the%20Archive.pdf>).
- Michaels, Walter Benn (2006): *The Problem with Diversity: How We Learned to Love Identity and Ignore Inequality*, New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Michaels, Walter Benn (2008): "Against Diversity." In: *New Left Review* 52, pp. 33-36.
- Mignolo, Walter D. (2012): *Local Histories/Global Designs. Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. New preface, Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Mignolo, Walter D./Escobar, Arturo (eds.) (2013): *Globalization and the Decolonial Option*, New York: Routledge.
- Mignolo, Walter D. (2013): "Introduction: Coloniality of Power and De-Colonial Thinking." In: Walter D. Mignolo/Arturo Escobar (eds.), *Globalization and the Decolonial Option*, New York: Routledge.
- Nagel, Mechthild (2016): "Pitfalls of Diversity Management within the Academy." In: *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women's and Gender*

- Studies 16/1, pp. 40-76 (<http://sites.cortland.edu/wagadu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2017/02/v16-pitfalls-of-diversity-management-nagel.pdf/>).
- NRW-Zentrum für Talentförderung. <https://nrw-talentzentrum.de/talentscouting/grundverstaendnis/>.
- “PISA-Studie: Deutsche Schüler über dem Durchschnitt.“ In: Bundeszentrale für politische Bildung December 3, 2013 (<https://www.bpb.de/politik/hintergrund-aktuell/174546/pisa-studie/>).
- Peus, Claudia/Braun, Susanne/Hentschel, Tanja/Frey, Dieter (eds.) (2015): *Personalauswahl in der Wissenschaft – Evidenzbasierte Methoden und Impulse für die Praxis*, Heidelberg: Springer.
- Peus, Claudia (2018): “Fortschritt durch Vielfalt. Ansatzpunkte für das Diversitätsmanagement an Hochschulen.” In: *Forschung & Lehre* 25/3, pp. 206-207.
- Puwar, Nirmal (2004): *Space Invaders: Race, Gender and Bodies out of Place*, Oxford: Berg.
- Sensoy, Özlem/Robin Diangelo (2017): “‘We Are All for Diversity, but...’ – How Faculty Hiring Committees Reproduce Whiteness and Practical Suggestions for How they Can Change.” In: *Harvard Educational Review* 87/4, pp. 557-580.
- Sow, Noah (2008): *Deutschland Schwarz Weiss – Der alltägliche Rassismus*, München: Bertelsmann.
- Spivak, Gayatri C. (1988): “Can the Subaltern Speak.” In: Cary Nelson/Lawrence Grossberg (eds.), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press, pp. 271-313.
- Steyn, Melissa (2010): “Critical Diversity Literacy. Diversity Awareness in 12 South African Organisations.” In: Melissa Steyn (ed.), *Being Different Together: Case Studies on Diversity Interventions in some South African organisations*, Cape Town: iNCUDISA, pp. 15-42.
- Taylor, Yvette (ed.) (2014): *The Entrepreneurial University: Engaging Publics, Intersecting Impacts*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Thompson, Vanessa Eileen/Zablotsky, Veronika (2016): “Rethinking Diversity in Academic Institutions.” In: *Wagadu: A Journal of Transnational Women’s and Gender Studies* 16/1, pp. 77-95 (<http://sites.cortland.edu/wagadu/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2017/02/v16-rethinking-diversity-thompson-zablotsky.pdf/>).
- Ting, Jenevieve (2015): “Angela Davis’s Legacy of Collective Solidarity.” *Ms. Magazine Blog*, February 26 (<http://msmagazine.com/blog/2015/02/26/angela-daviss-legacy-of-collective-solidarity/>).

Vertovec, Steven (ed.) (2014): *Routledge International Handbook of Diversity Studies*, New York: Routledge.

Zuberi, Tukufu/Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo (eds.) (2008): *White Logic, White Methods: Race, Epistemology, and the Social Sciences*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield.