

Alfonso de Toro

*Ibero-American Research Center
University of Leipzig*

**GLOBALIZATION – NEW HYBRIDITIES – TRANSIDENTITIES –
TRANSNATIONS: RECOGNITION – DIFFERENCE**

I am a citizen of two countries,
a member of multiple communities,
and a stubborn practitioner of many disciplines.
(Gómez Peña 1996: 80)

[...] *la reconquista* has arrived.
Demographically, socially, and culturally that is web
under way.
Second, the ideologies of multiculturalism and diversity
eroded the legitimacy of the remaining central elements of American identity,
the cultural core and the
American creed.
[...]
There is no Americano dream.
There is only the American dream created by an Anglo-Protestant society.
Mexican-Americans will share that dream in that society
only if they dream in English.
(Huntington 2004: 18; 256).

1. Introduction to the problem

In the actual global world culture, ideas, products, technology, sciences, communication and people are constantly crossing the existing borders. Cultural processes and mega migrations have flooded and are smuggled across them. A clear case for this observation is the border between Mexico and the USA. The huge construction of a three thousand kilometres shield did not prevent or stop the migration of almost 40mio of Hispanics into the USA. At the same time, also the cultural borders between France and the Maghreb have changed substantially in the past forty years, although in a completely different way. These floodings of national and topographical borders are taking place all over the world. European community dissolves its inner borders, and sooner or later Europe is going to have its common constitution. In spite of this improvements the differences between the various regions within Europe are enormous, and discrimination, racism and ethnic conflicts are a part of every day life. Still, migrations cannot be stopped, neither within nor into Europe.

Shields, fences and laws are merely desperate, but ineffective practices in order to control migration. The electronic mail and the World Wide Web have transformed the world into an ever-growing virtual surface that, on one hand, expands the world in an almost infinite way and, on the other hand, compresses it radically so that we live in a permanent implosion.

This condition of a global world and the insight that we today live in a pluricultural world leads to the consequence that terms like 'Nation', 'national identity', 'national culture' have to be thought and understood in a new way in order to develop a peaceful co-existence.

The globalization is a manifold process with positive and negative sides. It opens borders, makes the world permeable, but at the same time provokes nationalism, essentialism and affirmation of the Local and of the Own, racism and the construction of new shields.

Carlos Fuentes is very aware of this situation and concludes in his book *En esto creo* (*In what I believe*):

For five centuries the West has been travelling to the South and to the East and has imposed upon the cultures of the periphery its economic and political will without asking.

Now, these cultures are coming to the West and put the values which the West had always claimed to be its own, to the test: mobility, free market, and not only considering supply and demand, but also human labour and the protection of human rights that protect each guest worker.

I repeat: global interaction and communication cannot exist. (Fuentes 2002: 342)

In this given context, the concept, the thinking and the strategy of hybridity is to hold a prominent place within the actual cultural and epistemological debate. Particularly when thinking in Samuel Huntington's book *Who are we?* (2004), it is to be seen that this author finds himself in a binary opposition against the socio-political, intellectual, and historical position of Homi Bhabha, of William Luis with his concept of 'Latino-Culture', and also of the migration politics of Canada, Europe or Latin America in the context of a liberal tradition. Huntington's conception of the American society is based on the concept of "salience", "substance", and an "American creed" emerging from an Anglo-Protestant, profoundly religious settler tradition. For Huntington, global societies and multiculturalism, which lead to "cosmopolitan and transnational identities" (2004: xvi), represent an evil against the American project of modelling a uniform/integrated Nation. For him, they are the quintessence of the erosion of the American identity, for transnational identities, he claims; encourage the dissolution of the Nation-State into many parallel societies.

These two positions, on the one side hybridity or strategies of coexistence in hybrid societies, and on the other side unilateral identities and national concepts, entered into a new phase of discussion and signification when the signs of failure of a multicultural politics in the Netherlands, England and elsewhere could not be overlooked any more and the following "clash of civilizations" took place and when the debate concerning an existence of parallel societies in the Netherlands, Germany, and other countries got louder.

In fact, terms like ‘Identity’, ‘Nation’, ‘National Culture’, ‘Ethnicity’, as well as the notions of ‘Text’, ‘Fiction’, ‘History’ and ‘Arts’ have received a revision in the context of the *Cultural Studies* and of the theories evolved by Roland Barthes, Foucault, Derrida, Lyotard, and Deleuze, Homi Bhabha and Hayden White. These terms and notions have since then been redefined and are now thought to be at the intersections or crossings of culture and the disciplines of scientific thinking. ‘Border’ is, in this context, no longer a separating or excluding but a ‘transversal’ or rather ‘hybrid’ category, a strategy of thinking about the World, Life, Subject, Political Culture and Science as nomadic structures. The category ‘border’ as a hybrid system has achieved a powerful predomination in all fields of knowledge, sciences and life after post-structuralism and after moments like the fall of the Berlin ‘iron curtain’, after Huntington’s controversial books *The Clash of Civilizations* and *Who are we?*, after the war in Iraq, as well as in the context of the global economy and politics.

2. A poststructural Model of Hybridity

Since de early 90’s I dedicated several publications to the subject of postmodernism (cf. de Toro 1991; 1996a), to post-colonialism and hybridity. In these texts I analysed hybridity going beyond the evident, which is that hybridity is allways inherent to culture, to identity and nations, and going beyond the statements concerning the terminological exuberance of the application of the term and its distinction, in modern cultural theory, from its biological and zoological origin (cf. de Toro 1995; 1996; 1997; 2002a; 2004). Particularly in my publications of 2002a and 2004 I try to propose a sort of “model” for this term, which has been largely accepted and applied. To the debate of post-colonialism in Latin America itself and to that of Latin American scholars in the USA, I have dedicated to it a large essay in 1999. Furthermore I would like to mention in this context some very important works in this field, for example, that of Scharlau (1994), Hernlinghaus/Walter (1994), A. and F. de Toro (1999) as well as Sieber (2005). For this reason I will just consider some of those proposals in the context of the present volume.

Hybridity is, as a mayor concept in our times, the object of very diverse reflections and definitions and it is applied in very different fields (cf. Schneider/Thomsen 1997). In order to work in a transdisciplinary and productive, but also, systematic way it is necessary to come to an understanding of the notion of hybridity in a broader metacontext. Hybrid systems are seen as systems “that have a high complexity and that can only be described at the base of the combination of different models and processes” (Schneider/Thomsen 1997: 19). In this context the research for artificial intelligence develops “intelligent hybrid systems”. The mixing of systems has, for example in the fields of technology and medicine the objective to increase efficiency. Acceleration, speed, multifunctionality, increase of the complexity and synergy are other terms to describe hybridity. Often, terms are synonymous and have the same or a similar extensional and intentional relation as for example such as ‘interculturality’, ‘multiculturalism’, ‘nomadism’, ‘heterotopy’, ‘difference’/‘diffaerence’, ‘alterity’/‘altarity’, ‘mimicry’, ‘in-between’, ‘un-

‘unhomely’, ‘third space’, ‘diversity’, ‘discontinuity’ and ‘intertextuality’ ‘temporality’, ‘heterogeneity’, ‘syncretism’, ‘otherness’, etc.

Because of this variety or terminological labyrinth we would like to risk a first model for a classification of the different levels on which we think hybridity and apply its concept. We distinguish between seven different fields or levels for locating hybridity (cf. de Toro 1997, 1999; 2002a; 2004):

1. Hybridity as a epistemological category or as a category of philosophy of sciences (the disposition of thinking the world as a rhizome and not in dichotomies);
2. Hybridity as a theoretical/methodological category (as a synonym of ‘transversal science’);
3. Hybridity as a category of cultural theory, as the strategy to manage with different cultural, ethnical and religious groups (that is the site of cultural difference and plurality);
4. Hybridity as transmedial category, as the use of various media, systems of signs (Internet, Video, Film, virtual worlds, analogous and digital techniques etc.), diverse aesthetics (literature, theatre, essay), mixed fields (literature/internet, theatre/video/film/installations, painting/virtual design);
5. Hybridity as an urban category, as form and different types of organisation, plurality of products and heterogeneous objects, art, city culture, architecture, companies, ecology, nature, societies, politics, live styles;
6. Hybridity as territory of the body;
7. Hybridity as technology (natural sciences: i.e. molecular biology; medicine: micro artificial limbs, virtual surgery; industries: engines with hybrid drive).

In these fields, hybridities are to be thought in different ways considering their respective functions. Therefore we should locate the processes of hybridity and determine their fields of application.

Hybridity as an ‘epistemological’ category (1) means to think the world, life and knowledge in a temporary discontinual way starting from the concepts of difference and alterity. We understand difference as the *approach to the ‘othering of rationality’ and history, as a logic of ‘supplementary’, as ‘fold’/‘pleat’, as the sliding of cultural unities*, so that they cannot be reduced to signs of any cultural or ethnical origin. While ‘difference’ means the deconstruction of the metaphysical occidental Logos, ‘alterity’ refers to an operation of difference to describe very contradictory and heterogeneous objects. With the notion of ‘alterity’ the procedural character of the negotiation of difference is marked.

Hybridity as theoretical/methodological concept (2) is the result of a network of theories built upon the base of one main discipline. The term ‘trans-’ in the notion of transdisciplinarity, then requires a concept of discipline thought as a *net and intersection of elements or parameters appealing to a dialog about determined objects on de base of formulating common questions and problems*.

Hybridity, then is a matter of *transversal* relations of disciplines, which means the possibility to use scientific models of a diverse provenience as the sciences of theatre, literature, communication, history, anthropology, ethnology, sociology or philosophy, or the recourse to elements of some of these disciplines or theories. Firstly, hybrid and transversal sciences are a concept of transdisciplinarity. Secondly, hybrid and transversal sciences are also related to transculturality (3), which means the recourse to diverse models of culture (or fragments of them) that are not part of the base of the ‘home culture’. Thirdly, hybrid and transversal sciences are related to transtextuality understood as the dialog between texts and discourses which come from different disciplines and cultures. Transtextuality leads to multiple recodifications and reinventions of cultural signs without asking where a certain element is coming from or if it is “original” or “authentic” or not. Only the productivity of the reinvention is important. These are the main aspects of a hybrid and transversal science (de Toro 1999, 2002a; 2004).

With the term ‘transversal science’ we would like to follow Wolfgang Iser’s (1996) concept of transversal rationality which is understood as a type of thinking or an operation of passages/border crossings, “the building of cross-relations between different complex systems” (ibid.: 761), that “allow diverse forms of interchange, competition, communication, correction, recognition and justice” (ibid.: 762). Transversality does not have *a priori* norms or principles (ibid.: 763); it is not normative (ibid.: 764).

Néstor García Canclini formulates this type of thinking as a necessity:

Hoy concebimos a América Latina como una articulación más complejada de tradiciones y modernidades (diversas, desiguales), un continente heterogéneo formado por países donde, en cada uno, coexisten múltiples lógicas de desarrollo. Para repensar esta heterogenidad es útil la reflexión [...] del posmodernismo, más radical que cualquier otra anterior. Su crítica a los relatos omnicomprendidos sobre la historia puede servir para detectar las pretensiones fundamentalistas del tradicionalismo, el etnicismo y el nacionalismo, para entender las derivaciones autoritarias del liberalismo y el socialismo. (1990/1992/²1995: 23)

In order to avoid essentialism or hegemony, and taking the warning by García Canclini seriously, we plead for the aspect of *productivity* as the only important criterion when deciding to choose one theoretical approach. Under ‘productivity’ we understand two simultaneous processes: on the one hand, *potentiality*, that is the capability of explanation which lies in a given theory, and, on the other hand, the ability of *recodification*, that is the capability to relocate and apply a theory to the context of the present investigation.

Culture, which is our object of research, is then never only local, it is as well trans-local (cf. de Toro 2002a; 2004). Culture can be defined by transculturality, like the category ‘text’ can be defined by transtextuality, as again García Canclini makes clear:

But there is nothing in saying this, since it has always been apparent in cultural processes that messages circulate from ‘high’ art to the ‘popular’, that they then pass through the media and become popular culture, while all the time being re-elaborated and re-cycled throughout this process. (García Canclini 1996: 85)

In the context of the crossing of cultures, hybridity means furthermore *the emphasizing of the difference by simultaneous recognition of the difference of the other in a common territory that all the time has to be inhabited all over again*. In the transcultural communication, there are negotiated, recodified and built a new 'Otherness', the 'Own' and the 'Foreign', the 'Homely' and the 'Unhomely', the 'Uniform' and the 'Heterogeneous', the 'Essentialism' and the 'Hegemonial'. The concept of hybridity represents the *perlaboration/Verwindung* of binary systems in a "third space" as a site of enunciation.

Hybridity understood as a 'transmedial' category (4) refers to the use of different media that remain autonomous and keep their own function in a representation. The media enter into a competition with each other; they operate in a field of permanent tension. Hybrid transmediality means, for example in the works of Jürgen Meier, a transgression, crease/fold/pleat or piles in the context of esthetical, dissonant processes as the mixture of architecture, art and light installations and virtual works (www.medienfueralles.de). He projects his light composition "Lust for Life" on the façades of buildings like a department store at the Mönckeberg-Passage in Hamburg or a "virtual surface" at the Siemens Office in Berlin, and users can surf and create diverse colour landscapes with different intensities, sequences and speeds.

Here, different systems get into contact: physical methods and processes for the construction and refraction of light, artistic processes, media techniques, esthetical, arts and philosophy concepts, in order to construct a virtual interactive world that raises a lot of questions, for example concerning perception and reality. Jürgen Meier speaks of "light climates" or "digital skins" in his works. The borders of such usually separated fields are overcome in a rhizome-structure (Deleuze/Guattari). Hybridity here takes place on the level of the objects and on that of the disciplines.

Hybridity understood as a category of the body (6) is related to desire, sexuality, power, passion, violence, perversion, memory, history (personal or collective) and knowledge. The hybrid body results from diverse discourses and experiences. Here, the body functions as his own signature, as his own sign, as *body-sign*. The *body-sign* produces knowledge and contains love and hate, acceptance and refusal, and it is first of all body-material, flesh, odour and sweat, it is its own message and medium without an external function, it is not anymore mask or a second-degree sign, an allegory or metaphor.

3. Nationalism vs. hybrid societies

3.1 Huntington's Nationalist Model of Society: Creed – Salience – Protestant – White

As we see, the hybrid condition of our time also causes severe reactions such as the negation of multicultural or hybrid societies and a demand to returning to mythical and nationalist roots like in the case of Huntington.

An opposite model has been developed since the middle of the 90's by the Mexican-US-American performer and theoretician Guillermo Gómez Peña who has begun a tremendous translation process that he calls '*borderizing*' in opposition to dichotomy-

terms as ‘Own/Other’, ‘Periphery/Center’ or “*First World/Third World*” that for Gómez Peña now are part of an “*outdated colonialist vocabulary*” and “*completely overlapped*” (1996: 7). The recent events in Iraq show, on the other hand, very clearly that imperialism – which we had believed to be overcome – returns with full power and with a missionary and religious discourse covering strategic and economic interests.

The crucial question today is: who is the owner of culture if at the same time migrations have flooded and have been smuggled through the geographical borders? In opposition to the nomadic status of a culture that does not stop at geographical borders, the problem begins when culture is thought as an ontological substance belonging to one ethnic group.

Meanwhile Gómez Peña wants to develop and emphasizes the “new world borders”, Samuel Huntington in *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (1996) wants a “new World Order” under the leadership of a radically conservative USA which divides the world in evil/barbaric and good/civilized, on the one side the USA and Western Europe and on the other the Arab world – and since *Who are we?* (2004) the Hispanics.

This dichotomy builds the intersection between racism and the negotiation and recognition of difference. According to Huntington, dual and transnational identities as they are given in the case of the Hispanics, are a real threat for the culture and the cohesion of the US-American State: “In the 1960s, however, subnational, dual-national, and transnational identities began to rival and erode the preeminence of national identity back to de fore” (2004: xv), because “Race and ethnicity are now largely eliminated: Americans see their country as a multiethnic, multiracial society” (ibid.) and he adds that

In the late twentieth century, however, the salience and substance of this culture were challenged by a new wave of immigrants from Latin America and Asia, the popularity in intellectual and political circles of the doctrines of multiculturalism and diversity, the spread of Spanish as the second American language and the Hispanization trends in American society, the assertion of group identities based on race, ethnicity, and gender, the impact of diasporas and their homeland governments, and the growing commitment of elites to cosmopolitan and translational identities. (Ibid: xvi)

Multiculturalism and the transidentities treat the “Anglo-Protestant culture and the Creed of the founding settlers” (ibid.: xvii), which he supposes to be the core of American Society. One can say, that with this book he begins a crusade in order to save the USA (a position that he shares with Harald Bloom in his *The Western canon*):

All societies face recurring threats to their existence, to which they eventually succumb. Yet some societies, even when so threatened, are also capable of postponing their demise by halting and reserving the processes of decline and renewing their vitality and identity. I believe that America can do that and that Americans should recommit themselves to the Anglo-Protestant culture, traditions, and values that for three and a half centuries have been embraced by Americans of all races, ethnicities, and religions and they have been the source of their liberty, unity, power, prosperity, and moral leadership as a force for the good in the world.

This is, let me make clear, an argument for the importance of Anglo-Protestant culture [...] I believe one of the greatest achievements, perhaps the greatest achievement, of America is the extent to which it has eliminated the racial and ethnic components that historically were central to its identity and has become a multiethnic, multiracial society in which individuals are to be judged on their merits. That happened, I believe, because of the commitment successive generations of Americas have had to the Anglo-Protestant culture and the Creed of the founding settlers. (Huntington 2004: xvii)

White, protestant, religious entrepreneurs built the opposite to a Hispanic ethnic, transcultural, and transidentitary, cosmopolitan society that has all characteristics of a Diaspora group. Huntington accepts a “multiracial”, but not a “multicultural” society of “diversity”, because he considers that the first type of society can be assimilated in the melting pot, while the second cannot be assimilated. But both affirmations are simply wrong. Statistics show very clearly that Hispanics of the third generation do not speak anymore Spanish or they are bilingual. Clifford Geertz has described already many years ago the failure of the melting pot which has been replaced by the idea of ‘diversity’ as a new cultural, social and political model.

Guillermo Gómez Peña expresses himself in this context in a very lapidary way:

Today, in the ‘90s, our communities are ferociously divided by gender, race, class, and age. An abyss – not a borderline – separates us from our children, our teenagers, and our elders. The Columbian legacy of divisiveness is more present than ever. This is contemporary America: a land of diversity where no one tolerates difference; a land of bizarre eclecticism where everyone must know their place. (1996: 15)

As well, Gloria Anzaldúa formulated in the 80’s:

The only “legitimate” inhabitants are those in power, the whites and those who align themselves with whites. Tension grips the inhabitants of the borderlands like a virus. (Anzaldúa 1987: 3-4)

The growing number of Hispanics in the USA provokes the construction of very violent and racist metaphors as “*mexicanization*”, “*hell at our doorsteps*” or “*the brown wave*” (ibid.: 68), but nevertheless the process of hybridization is an ongoing one in the USA, as Huntington (2004) himself diagnoses.

For Gómez Peña and William Luis, the position of Huntington is a xenophobic projection or a sort of valve in order to cover other problems inside the country. But Huntington is convinced that the USA is going through a deep identity crisis as result of the demons of the “Globalization, multiculturalism, cosmopolitanism, immigration, subnationalism, anti-nationalism” which “had battered American consciousness” (Huntington 2004: 4) and have lead to “dual loyalties and dual citizenships” (ibid.) as a problem that has “raised questions concerning America’s linguistic” (ibid.) unity and the security of the nation. Those processes have been supported, says Huntington, by the “Corporate executives, professionals, and Information Age technocrats [which] exposed cosmopolitan *over* national identities” (Huntington 2004: 4) and deny the education system: “The teaching of national history gave way to the teaching of ethnic and racial

teaching of national history gave way to the teaching of ethnic and racial histories. The celebration of diversity replaced emphasis on what Americans had in common” (ibid).

Statements like these [he adds in his demagogical polemic] reflected the extent to which some people in American elite groups, business, financial, intellectual, professional, and even governmental, were becoming denationalized and developing transnational and cosmopolitan identities superseding their national ones. (ibid.: 7)

Huntington appeals to the founding myths of the USA saying that they

[...] were few and homogeneous: overwhelmingly white British and protestant, broadly sharing a common culture, and overwhelmingly committed to political principles embodied in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and other founding document. (Ibid.: 11)

thanks to the exclusion of blacks and Indians from citizenship.

Beside of the presence of Hispanics and the denationalization, the threat to the USA has one more reason: the End of the cold war, with the disappearing of the “evil empire”, the Soviet Union (ibid.: 11; 17), which until then had contributed in a particular way to the national identity and national cohesion. Enemies are necessary to build an identity and cohesion and for surviving:

Historical experience and sociological analysis show that the absence of an external “other” is likely to undermine unity and breed division within a society. It is problematic whether intermittent terrorists attacks and conflicts with Iraq or other “rogue states” will generate the national coherence that twentieth century wars did. (Ibid.: 18)

Bilingual or multilingual societies like Suisse or Canada are, for Huntington, a real horror vision to the measure that he conjures a race/racist conflict:

The various forces challenging the core American culture and Creed could generate a move by native white Americans to revive the discarded and discredited racial and ethnic concepts of American identity and to create an American that would exclude, expel, or suppress people of other racial, ethnic, and cultural groups. (Ibid.: 20)

And he provokes directly such a conflict:

Historical and contemporary experience suggest that this is a highly probable reaction form a once dominant ethnic-racial group that feels threatened by the rise of other groups. It could produce a racially intolerant country with high levels of intergroup conflict. (Ibid.: 20)

In order to avoid this, he recommends:

This could mean a recommitment to America as a deeply religious and primarily Christian country, encompassing several religious minorities, adhering to Anglo-Protestant values, speaking English, maintaining its European cultural heritage, and committed to the princi-

ples of the Creed. Religion has been and still is a central, perhaps the central, element of American identity. (Huntington 2004: 20)

Huntington sees in the Hispanics a colonization movement against the interests of the USA

Mexican immigration is leading toward the demographic *reconquista* of areas Americans took from Mexico by force in the 1830s and 1840s, Mexicanizing them in a manner comparable to, although different form, the Cubanization that has occurred in southern Florida. It is also blurring the border between Mexico and America, introducing a very different culture, while also promoting the emergence, in some areas of blended society and culture, half-American and half-Mexican. Along with immigration from other Latin American countries, it is advancing Hispanization throughout American and social, linguistic, and economic practices appropriate for an Anglo-Hispanic society. (Ibid.: 221)

with devastating consequences:

Mexican, together with other Spanish-speaking population, are creating a bifurcation in the social-political structure of the United States that approximates nationality division... [and] this could lead to a move to reunite these territories with Mexico. That seems unlikely, but Professor Charles Truxillo of the University of New Mexico predicts that by 2080 the southwestern states of the United States and the northern states of Mexico will come together to form a new country. (Ibid.: 246)

3.2 Gómez Peña: “nomadic Mexican – multicentric – hybrid American culture” and Anzaldúa: “new mestiza” and the “borderlands”

Guillermo Gómez Peña’s is a completely contrary position to that of Huntington, which he described already in the 90 as a “*sinister cartography of the New World Order*” in opposition to his own “*conceptual map of the New World Border*” of a “*Fourth World*”, which he sees as an alternative to “*the old colonial dichotomy of First World/Third World*” (1996: 7), as a cartography of plurality built by “*Micro-republics*” (ibid.: 5), where each one is a nomadic center in a virtual cartography: “*I am a nomadic Mexican [...in a ...] multicentric, hybrid American culture*” (ibid.: 1). Gómez Peña describes a hybrid reality which is ignored by the political elites and which has consequences for that he finds expressions as: “*Nuyo Rico, Cuba York, Mexamerica, Amerindia, Afroamerica, Americamestiza y -mulata, Hybridamerica and Transamerica*” (ibid.: 6), or simply “*other America*”.

Gómez Peña’s concept of community is not based on an idea of national state, but on a structure of a plurality of places of enunciation: “*a continent made of people, art and ideas, not countries*” (ibid.: 7). The people that habit the different spaces define the topography as a ‘Latin-Culture’, as a Culture of Difference and of Otherness, where Difference and Otherness is not charged by a pejorative semantic, where the one who opposes against hybridity is “the other”, “the marginated”: “*It’s all margins, meaning there are no ‘others’, or better said, the true ‘others’ are those who resist fusion, mestizaje, and cross-cultural dialogue*” (Gómez Peña 1996: 7). For Gómez Peña, the “*micro*

republics” or the “*New World Border*” represent an “*utopian cartography*” in which “*hybridity is the dominant culture*” (ibid.: 5, 7) and an *irreversible conditio of our time* in spite of nationalist discourses such as that of the politician of the German Christian Democratic Union, Friedrich Merz, with his claim for the “leading culture” (“*Leitkultur*”), and in spite of the very dangerous nationalist ideology of the ‘Own’ by Huntington.

The process of hybridization causes a delimitation and a redefinition of the concept of ‘border’ or ‘border-culture’. The peripheries settle down in the center and they introduce a thinking, culture and habits of *passages* or of the *intersections* and make one aware that monosocial and monocultural concepts of society, identity and culture belong to an already past type of world. This fact demands new strategies for social coexistence.

3.2.1 ‘Latin-Culture’ as a hybrid model of coexistence

This model, that considers the publications of William Luis, Gloria Anzaldúa and Guillermo Gómez Peña, is based on the concept of ‘Otherness’ as the recognition of the Other as the different-other with same rights. That requires *recognition of an irreducible difference in a common space*, or as we already formulated *the potentiality of the difference in a reciprocal act of recognition*. ‘Potentiality’ and ‘recognition’ are expressions for a constant negotiation of identities, an oscillation between exclusion and recognition; they express the opposite to submission, adaptation and assimilation. This means at the end a revocation of the culture of the foreign. My proposition is based on two aspects: an ontological and a practical-pragmatic one. Otherness is the awareness and the acceptance that the mere and simple encounter with a different-other demands a deterritorialization of the Own and a reterritorialization to the Other and vice versa. It is the awareness that a cultural space is not the property of an ethnic or social community that has inhabited a territory for centuries, but a very nomadic and complex process and manifestation of today’s impossibility to think and live in the nostalgic notion of “pure identities”, that makes it clear that now the normal is the construction of transidentities as the result of intersectional encounters (cf. de Toro 2002). Cultures that tried to establish monolithic identities committed the genocides of Jewish people in the European Middle Ages and caused those in the former Yugoslavia. ‘Otherness’ or a hybrid identity does not demand a specific form or essence of being. Every enunciation is – as Lacan formulated, Derrida developed and Bhabha applied to the post-modern migrations and identities – an act of deprivation (*Entäußerung*), that creates a new identity space (cf. de Toro 2002a). Strategies of hybridity have the function to make evident this space “in-between” where different ethnic groups are part of these space and not only tolerated.

The imperative to accept a hybrid society is the result of the mega-migration that cannot be stopped by whatever types of laws and walls. The examples of USA/Mexico, of Ceuta, the Spanish enclave in Northern Africa, of the inter-Latin American migration or of the immigration to Europe show this fact every day more clearly. Both, the epistemological-cultural and ontological deterritorialization that happen in a migration space, force a recodification of the ‘Own’ and of the ‘Other’. Without such a strategy, people will go on to be discriminated as foreigner and alien. These terms are themselves highly discriminating because they are based on the criteria of blood and soil, which led towards a hierarchy and exclusion. The biggest number of ethnically and racially moti-

wards a hierarchy and exclusion. The biggest number of ethnically and racially motivated social conflicts are the results of exclusion or the lacking of recognition. If societies have millions of “foreigners” in the core of their countries, they cannot claim for national purity and homogeneous identities or for the exclusive possession of the culture.

I’m convinced that one of the sources of the conflict with the Muslim world has its origin in the missing recognition shown in the accusation that they were a medieval society or underdeveloped and representing the evil of our post-modern world. They are the actual barbarians evoking those of which Herodotus, Pliny and Federman wrote. And to this barbarians, the Hispanics are added in the ideology of *Who are we?* by Huntington.

Taking into consideration all this arguments we can understand Gómez Peña when he observes that

Mexican identity (or better said, the many Mexican identities) can no longer be explained without the experience of ‘the other side’, and vice versa. As a socio-cultural phenomenon. Los Angeles simply cannot be understood without taking Mexico City – its southernmost neighborhood – into account. (Gómez Peña 1996: 178)

For him, culture is ‘border’ or ‘borderland-culture’ and is equivalent with a new notion of ‘home’ as open topography built by proliferating lines. Expressions as “*Home is always somewhere else. Home is both ‘here’ and ‘there’ or somewhere in between. Sometimes it’s nowhere*” (ibid.: 5), where ‘somewhere’ or ‘nowhere’ or ‘somewhere in between’ formulate the oscillation of identities between and through different cultures, lead to a thinking in which ‘home’ gets the same status as ‘unhomely’ (in the language of Homi Bhabha) and turns into the source for building a ‘third space’.

Beyond that recodification of the place of the ‘home’, ‘border’/‘borderland’ means in the terminology of Gómez Peña also a type of sciences that I denominated – following Wolfgang Welsch – “transversal science”. He proposes, in opposition to a neo-liberal type of culture and of cultural theory based on the NAFTA-Contract, a “*network of thinkers, artists, and arts organizations from Mexico, the United States, and Canada (and why not the Caribbean?)*”, in order to inaugurate a “*cross-cultural dialogue*” and to develop “*interdisciplinary artistic models*” (ibid.: 9). In this way Gómez Peña, as well Anzaldúa, introduces a new concept of art, culture, and sciences. Each of them is the starting point for the other. In this context, ‘border’ gets a semiotic status of ‘edge’ as a locus of enunciation and cultural production in a way Jorge Luis Borges already used it in the 30’s und 40’s of the 20th century in Buenos Aires. For Gómez Peña:

[...] the border is no longer located at any fixed geopolitical site. I carry the border with me, and I find new borders wherever I go.

[...] My America is a continent (not a country) that is not described by the outlines on any of the standard maps. (Ibid.: 5)

The term ‘border’ loses its topographic and excluding meaning and turns into an expression of a permeable concept. ‘Border’ is now “*a map of the Americas with no borders; a map turned upside down*” (Gómez Peña 1996: 6), where ‘no borders’ is not equivalent with ‘borderless’ in the sense of culture without face (or identity) in the frame

of a unification process of globalization, but includes the differences and does not mean their elimination:

[...] ‘total culture’, ‘total television’, a grandiose pseudo-internationalist world view à la CNN that creates the illusion of immediacy, simultaneity, and sameness, thereby numbing our political will and homogenizing our identities. (Ibid.: 10)

For Gómez Peña, ‘border’ represents the negotiation of different cultural identities as a very hard work similar to a “*border Sisyphus*” (Gómez Peña 1996: 1) with the aim of “[...] *redefinition of [...] continental topography*” where

[...] the countries have borders that are organically drawn by geography, culture, and immigration, and not by the capricious hands of economic domination and political bravado. (Ibid.: 6)

The category ‘border’ is, in his concept, a privileged space of experiment, of reinvention, recodification and a new form of inhabiting a space as a Möbius-Surface:

The border became my home, my base of operation, and my laboratory for social and artistic experimentation [...]. But the border was not a straight line; it was more like a Möbius strip.¹

[...]

We began to use the border art technique of recycling (border culture is by nature one of recyclement).

[...]

We proclaimed the border region ‘a laboratory for social and aesthetic experimentation’. (Ibid.: 63; 86; 88)

The category ‘border’ is substantially widened by Gómez Peña, ‘border’ means ‘*the road*’, “*a sort of moving Bermuda triangle inhabited by a floating community of troublemaking travelers [...] my other, the conceptual one – the road, ‘la jornada’ [...]*” (Gómez Peña 2000: 10).

The ‘chicana’ artist Gloria Anzaldúa proposed with her understanding of ‘*borderlands*’ a similar concept to that of ‘border’ by Gómez Peña, but also there are some differences. ‘*Borderlands*’ has, for Anzaldúa, a different meaning in comparison with *frontera*/border as a topographic category of the exclusion, discrimination, violence and death, where the difference become to be a martyrdom, a place of fight, of danger and persecution. ‘*Border*’ is in the terminology of Anzaldúa, the hard frontier where day af-

1 Cf. my definition: A. de Toro (2001: 68-110):

El término de ‘orilla’ [...] lo quisiera definir no como la orilla excluida, sino como *fisura* (*Spalt* y no *Riß*, sino *clivage*) donde se reúne lo uno y lo otro, donde en un plano se negocian las tensiones de la diferencia, una especie de cuadro de Escher o de una superficie de Möbius, un plano pluridimensional, abierto, sin centro, simultáneo. ‘Orilla’/‘*fisura*’ como altaridad, como ‘en medio’ (*inbetween*), como mímica [...], como ‘*pli*’ (*Falte*, *Knick*, *Zwischenlage*; ‘arruga’, ‘pliegue’, ‘dobladura’, ‘intercalación’) [...].

ter day hundreds of Mexicans are taken as prisoners, are hurt or killed. On the other side, ‘borderlands’ is “*a vague and undetermined place created by the emotional residue of an unnatural boundary. It is the constant state of transition*” (Anzaldúa 1987: 3). To this semantic widening, Anzaldúa includes the female sexuality and her own lesbianism:

The actual physical borderland that I’m dealing with in this book is the Texas-U.S. Southwest/Mexican border. The psychological borderlands, the sexual borderlands and the spiritual borderlands are not particular to the Southwest. In fact, the borderlands are physically present whenever two or more cultures are physically present, wherever two or more cultures edge each other, where people of different races occupy the same territory, where under, lower, middle and upper classes touch, where the space between two individuals shrinks with intimacy. (Anzaldúa 1987: “Preface”)

[...]

running down the length of my body,
staking fence rods in my flesh,
splits me, splits me
me raja, me raja. (Ibid.: 1987: 2)

[...]

The secret I tried to conceal was that I was not normal, that I was not like the others. I felt alien, I knew I was alien [...].

[...]

She felt shame for being abnormal. The bleeding distanced her from others. Her body had betrayed her. (Ibid.: 42-42; cf. Luis 2005 and Sieber 2004)

‘Borderland’ means in her context *chicana*, a *cross-border-emancipated-woman*: “*As a mestiza I have no country, my homeland cast me out; yet all countries are mine because I am every woman’s sister or potential lover*” (Anzaldúa 1987: 80) or “*As a lesbian I have no race, my own people disclaim me*” (ibid.).

The concept of the ‘borderlands’ reveals the mechanism of power that oppresses the woman in the chicano-machista social context as well as the stigmatization that the chicana suffers as writer, artist and lesbian. Anzaldúa refuses the comparison of the chicana and of the Malinche (the indigenous lover and translator of Hernán Cortés, the Spanish conqueror of Mexico) with the negative figure of the “chingada”, the “fucked one” (ibid.: 22), as the dirty and traitor of her people. Her concept of ‘borderlands’ is therefore inseparably tied to those of body, sexuality and gender.

We have two different positions concerning the definition of frontier: one colonial and post-colonial (that of Anzaldúa) and an other post-modern one (that of Gómez Peña) who accept the hybrid condition not only as a momentary situation, but describe it as the epistemological and cultural situation of ambivalence which defines our presence: “*the essence of [...] borders is oscillation*”, (Gómez Peña 1996: 12) and underline “*the importance of [...] establishing cross-cultural alliances*” (ibid.: 11).

For Gómez Peña, hybridity is not the same as multiculturalism because he understands the latter – in a similar way as Homi Bhabha – as exotization of the differences in function of economic reasons (tourism): “*They literally cross the border in helicopters, and prefer to deal directly with what they perceive as ‘the center’*” (ibid.: 11).

His concepts of ‘*World Border cross-cultural alliances*’, the ‘*New World Border*’ or ‘*Fourth World*’ result as a model of hybridity that is equivalent to my own concept since the 90th (1990; 1995, 1997, 1999); he formulates:

[...] the hybrid – a cultural, political, aesthetic, and sexual hybrid – is cross-racial, polylinguistic, and multicontextual. From a disadvantaged position, the hybrid expropriates elements from all sides to create more open and fluid systems. (Gómez Peña 1996: 12)

Hybridity means for Gómez Peña the performance of diverse identities in different contexts, it is the capacity to act as “*nomadic chronicler*” or “*intercultural translator*”. Hybridity includes actions such as “*trespass*”, “*bridge*”, “*interconnect*”, “*reinterpret*”, “*re-map*” and a strategy (not a credo) that unmasks ruptures and discontinuities of history and the mechanism of hegemonic power: “[it] *denounces the faults, prejudices, and fears manufactured by the self-proclaimed center, and threatens the very raison d’être of any monoculture, official or not*” (ibid.: 12).

Hybridity represents for Gómez Peña a new paradigm of coexistence in the face of an institutionalized multiculturalism and of essentialist monocultures, “*the separatist cultures of resistance*” (ibid.: 12). Finally, hybridity is for Gómez Peña a demographic, social, ethnic and cultural fact, which takes place inside of all human beings – all of them are “the other” and need the “other” for their own survival (ibid.: 70). We find a similar strategy of thinking when taking into consideration Assia Djebar’s work. The Algerian writer and movie director based her theory evidently on the same ideas as Homi Bhabha, Gómez Peña and Anzaldúa. She defines her identity in her writings as “*territoire multiple*” (Djebar 1999: 28) that results from her Algerian origin and her French education in a space “*marge de ma francophonie*” (ibid.), as “*marche*” (ibid.) based on a “*écriture portée par un corps de femme*” (ibid.: 11), in a writing as a space “*au-dehors*”, as a “*voix double*” and “*multiple*” (ibid.: 12, 13), which is deeply rooted in her Berberian language, in the classical Arab language, in the classical literary tradition and in the language of the body (ibid.: 14). She is a writing subject “*entre deux mondes*”/“*entre deux cultures*” (ibid.: 15). She has a “*writing-identity*” and means a “*route à ouvrir*” (ibid.: 17), in the intersection between woman and man, between Occident and Orient, between France and the Maghreb, connected with the figure of the ‘*androgynous*’: “*habillé à l’européenne mais parlant le dialecte local, je me sentais, malgré mon costume, admise d’emblée parmi les assis de la route – ceux qui ont tout le temps*” (ibid.: 20).

Her identity is ambivalent and lives in the permanent deterritorialization, identity is a movement and breaks spaces, frontiers:

[...] chercher à sortir des limites géographiques de la langue française pour analyser, discuter, mettre en question cette notion ambiguë de *francophonie* [...] je me place, moi, sur les frontières... Une francophonie en constant et irrésistible déplacement, pourquoi pas?... (Djebar 1999: 27)

Djebar replaces the formulation ‘*entre-deux-langues*’ because of its ambivalent meaning as potential confrontation or a possibly negative in-between through ‘*entrelangues*’ or ‘*entre-des-langues*’ (ibid.: 32), as ‘*sur marges*’:

Rester sur les marges d'une, de deux ou trois langues, frôler ainsi le hors-champ de la langue et de sa chair, c'est évidemment un terrain-frontière, hasardeux, peut-être marécageux et peu sûr, plutôt une zone changeante et fertile, ou un *non man's land*, ou... [...] 'Sur les marges' de la langue à traverser et à inscrire, ce serait la seule marche, notre seul mouvement profond, au creux même de la langue-en-action [...]. [...] il s'agit d'expérimenter le passage entre les langues... (Djebar 1999: 30-31, 32)

William Luis finally proposes a model of Latin-Culture as a global epistemology:

Latino literature dismantles borders, between fact and fiction, literature and history, the social sciences and the humanities. A study of Latino literature implies a redefining of academic disciplines and discourses. It brings together literature, language, sociology, history, political science, demography, anthropology, music, and the departments and programs they represent. Latino literature recognizes differences and establishes a dialogue among American Studies, African-American Studies, Native American Studies, Latin American Studies, Comparative Literature, English, and Spanish and Portuguese. It undermines the autonomy of these divisions, and proposes a different way of envisioning them, not only as independent territorial entities, but more importantly as ones that share common interests, research, and methodology. (Luis 2005: 429)

He projects a future task for the humanities in a very similar way in which Gómez Peña used to formulate it:

Our cultural institutions can perform an important role: they can function as experimental laboratories to develop and test new models of collaboration between races, genders, and generations, and as "free zones" for intercultural dialogue, radical thinking, and community-building.

[...]

The real tasks ahead of us are to embrace more fluid and tolerant notions of personal and national identity, and to develop models of peaceful coexistence and multilateral cooperation across nationality, race, gender, and religion.

[...]

Cultural education is at the core of the solution.

[...]

We need to educate our children and teenagers about the dangers of racism and the complexities of living in a multiracial, borderless society – the inevitable society of the next century.

The role that artists and cultural organizations can perform in this paradigm shift is crucial. Artists can function as community brokers, citizen diplomats, ombudsmen, and border translators. And our art spaces can perform the multiple roles of sanctuaries, demilitarized zones, centers for activism against xenophobia, and informal think tanks for intercultural and translational dialogue. (Gómez Peña 1996: 16, 70)

"Yes, we can talk to one another", says Gómez Peña, "We can get along, despite our differences, our fear, and our rage" (ibid.: 71), and Djebar concludes:

Suis-je vouée à être une femme de transition, l'écrivain du passage, à délivrer un message sur deux canaux?

[...] Déplacement progressif, déracinement lent et à l'infini, sans doute: comme s'il fallait s'arracher sans cesse [...].

[...]

Pour ma part, bien qu'écrivant chaque jour dans la langue française, ou justement parce qu'écrivant ainsi, je ne suis en fait qu'une des femmes de cette multitude-là... Simplement une *migrante*. La plus belle dénomination je crois, en culture islamique. (Djebar 1999: 48)

Bibliography

- Anzaldúa, Gloria. (1987). *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza*. San Francisco: Aunt Lute.
- Bhabha, Homi. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Ciani Forza, Daniela M. (2001). "From 'the-world-in-the home to the-home-in the world': Cristina García's *The Agüero Sisters*", in: Susanna Regazoni (ed.). *Cuba: Literatura sin fronteras/Cuba: A Literature beyond Boundaries*. Frankfurt/Main: Vervuert. p. 95-108.
- Djebar, Assia. (1999). *Ces voix qui m'assiègent*. Paris: Michel.
- Friedman, John Block. (1981). *The Monstrous Races in Medieval Art and Thought*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Fuentes, Carlos. (2002). *En esto creo*. Seix Barral: Barcelona.
- García Canclini, Néstor. (1996). "Cultural Studies Questionnaire", en: *Journal of Latin American Cultural Studies*, Vol. 5, No. 1: 83-87.
- Gómez Peña, Guillermo. (1990). *Border Brujo*. (Video).
- Gómez Peña, Guillermo. (1990a). *Son of Border Crisis*. (Video).
- Gómez Peña, Guillermo. (1994). *Warrior for Gringostroika*. St. Paul, Minnesota: Greywolf Press.
- Gómez Peña, Guillermo. (1995). *El Naftazteca*. (Video).
- Gómez Peña, Guillermo. (1996). *Friendly cannibals*. San Francisco: Artspace Books.
- Gómez Peña, Guillermo. (1996a). *The New World Border. Prophecies, Poems & Loqueras for the End of the Century*. San Francisco: City Lights.
- Gómez Peña, Guillermo. (1997). *Temple of Confessions: Mexican Beasts and Living Santos*. New York: PowerHouse Books.
- Gómez Peña, Guillermo. (1998). *Borderstasis*. (Video).
- Gómez Peña, Guillermo/Chagoya, Enrique. (1998). *Codex espangliensis: from Columbus to the border patrol*. Santa Cruz, California: Moving Parts Press.
- Gómez Peña, Guillermo. (2000). *Dangerous Border Crossers: The Artist Talks Back*. New York: Routledge.
- Gómez Peña, Guillermo. (2001). *The great mojado invasion. Part 2: The US-Mexico war*. (Video).
- Graff, Gerald. (1992). *Beyond Culture Wars: How Teaching the Conflicts Can Revitalize American Education*. New York: Norton.
- Hernlinghaus, Hermann/Walter, Monika. (1996). (eds.). *Posmodernidad en la periferia. Enfoques latinoamericanos de la nueva teoría cultural*. Langer: Berlin.
- Huntington, Samuel. (1996). *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

- Huntington, Samuel. (2004). *Who are we? The Challenges to American's National Identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Luis, William. (1997). *Dance Between Two Cultures: Latino Caribbean Literature Written in the United States*. Nashville: Vanderbilt University Press.
- Luis, William. (1999). "Latino Identity: A Postmeditation", in: Alfonso de Toro/Fernando de Toro. (eds.). *El debate de la postcolonialidad en Latinoamérica. Una postmodernidad periférica o cambio de paradigma en el pensamiento latinoamericano*. Frankfurt/Main: Vervuert. p. 165-180.
- Luis, William. (2006). "Into the Millennium: Toward a Theory of Latino U.S. Literature", in: Alfonso de Toro (ed.). *Cartografías y Estrategias de la 'postmodernidad' y 'postcolonialidad' en Latinoamérica. 'Hibridez' y 'Globalización'*. Frankfurt/Main: Vervuert. p. 421-432.
- Plinii, Secundi C. (1992). *Naturalis Historia*. D. Detlefsen recenit. Bd. I-III. Hildesheim: Olms.
- Scharlau, Birgit. (ed.). (1994). *Lateinamerika denken. Kulturtheoretische Grenzgänge zwischen Moderne und Postmoderne*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Sieber, Cornelia. (2004). "Gloria Anzaldúas Konzept der 'autohistoria' in *Borderlands/La frontera*", in: Alfonso de Toro/Claudia Gronemann (eds.). *Autobiographie revisited. Theorie und Praxis neuer autobiographischer Diskurse in der französischen, spanischen und lateinamerikanischen Literatur*. Hildesheim: Olms. p. 207-224.
- Sieber, Cornelia. (2005). *Die Gegenwart im Plural. Postmoderne/postkoloniale Strategien in neueren Lateinamerikadiskursen*. Frankfurt/Main: Vervuert.
- Toro, Alfonso de. (1991). "Postmodernidad y Latinoamérica (con un modelo para la novela latinoamericana)", in: *Revista Iberoamericana*. 155-156: 441-468. German version: "Die Postmoderne und Lateinamerika", in: E. Höfner/K. Schoell (Hrsg.) (1996). *Erzählte Welt: Studien zur Narrativik in Frankreich, Spanien und Lateinamerika. Festschrift für Leo Pollmann*. Frankfurt/Main: Vervuert. S. 259-299.
- Toro, Alfonso de. (1995). "Jorge Luis Borges. The Periphery at the Center/The Periphery as Center/The Center of the Periphery: Postcoloniality and Postmodernity", in: Fernando de Toro/Alfonso de Toro (eds.). *Borders and Margins: Post-Colonialism and Post-Modernism*. Frankfurt/Main: Vervuert, p. 11-45. Spanish version: "Postcolonialidad, Postmodernidad y Jorge Luis Borges. La periferia en el centro-la periferia como centro-el centro de la periferia: postcolonialidad y postmodernidad", in: *Iberoromania*. 44, 2 (1996a): 64-98.
- Toro, Alfonso de. (1997). "Fundamentos epistemológicos de la condición contemporánea. Postmodernidad, Postcolonialidad en diálogo con Latinoamérica", in: Alfonso de Toro (ed.). *Postmodernidad y postcolonialidad. Breves Reflexiones sobre la cultura latinoamericana*. Frankfurt/Main: Vervuert. p. 11-50. English version: "The Epistemological Foundation of the Contemporary Condition: Latin America in Dialogue with Postmodernity and Postcoloniality", in: Richard A. Young (ed.). *Latin American Postmodernisms. Postmodern Studies 22*. Amsterdam/Atlanta: Rodopi. p. 29-51.

- Toro, Alfonso de. (1999). “La postcolonialidad en Latinoamérica en la era de la globalización. ¿Cambio de paradigma en el pensamiento teórico-cultural latinoamericano?”, in: Alfonso de Toro/Fernando de Toro (eds.). *El debate de la postcolonialidad en Latinoamérica. Una postmodernidad periférica o Cambio de paradigma en el pensamiento latinoamericano*. Frankfurt/Main: Vervuert. p. 31-77.
- Toro, Alfonso de. (2001). “Überlegungen zu einer transdisziplinären, transkulturellen und transtextuellen Theaterwissenschaft im Kontext einer postmodernen und postkolonialen Kulturtheorie der Hybridität und *Trans-medialität*”, in: *Maske und Kothurn*. 45, 3-4: 23-69.
- Toro, Alfonso de. (2001a). “Reflexiones sobre fundamentos de investigación transdisciplinaria, transcultural y transtextual en las ciencias del teatro en el contexto de una teoría postmoderna y postcolonial de la hibridez e *inter-medialidad*”, in: *Gestos*. 32: 11-46.
- Toro, Alfonso de. (2001b). “La literatura menor, concepción borgesiana del Oriente y el juego con las referencias. Algunos problemas de nuevas tendencias en la investigación de la obra de Borges”, in: *Revista Iberoromania* 53: 68-110.
- Toro, Alfonso de. (2002). “Die Spezies ‘Aus-Länder’ – Wort oder Unwort”, in: *Journal der Universität Leipzig*. Mai, Heft 3: 30-31.
- Toro, Alfonso de. (2002a). “*Jenseits von Postmoderne und Postkolonialität. Materialien zu einem Modell der Hybridität und des Körpers als transrelationalem, transversalem und transmedialem Wissenschaftskonzept*”, in: Christoph Hamann/Cornelia Sieber (eds.). *Räume der Hybridität. Postkoloniale Konzepte in Theorie und Literatur*. (“Passagen – Studien zu Wissenschaft und Kultur. Frankophonie und Anglophonie”). Hildesheim: Olms. p. 15-52.
- Toro, Alfonso de. (2004). “Hacia una teoría de la cultura de la hibridez como sistema científico transrelacional, transversal y transmedial”, in: *Texto Crítico* 25/26 (Stanford University): 197-235.
- Toro, Alfonso de. (2004a). (ed.). *Estrategias postmodernas y postcoloniales en el teatro latinoamericano actual. Hibridez – Medialidad – Cuerpo*. Frankfurt/Main: Vervuert.
- White, Hayden. (1973). *Metahistory. The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore/London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- White, Hayden. (1978/1985). *Tropic of Discourse: Essays on Cultural Criticism*, Baltimore/London: The John Hopkins University Press.
- White, Hayden. (1987). *The Content of the Form. Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore/London: The John Hopkins UP.