

**ON THE POLITICS OF HOSPITALITY AND BELONGING IN
EUROPE: THE CASE OF GERMANY
WHEN INTEGRATION GOES WRONG**

0. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

My approach to the subject does not come from sociology or political sciences, and still less from the perspective of a politician or an expert on migration processes,¹ or that of someone with governmental responsibility, but from the perspective of cultural theory. My statements are the result of systematically following the particular issue of migration in the public debate and trying to connect between alternative ideas, empirical and hard realities, and the discourse of the “*Realpolitik*.”

In consequence, my approach is divided into two steps: The first and shorter one concentrates on some aspects of the migration politics in Germany, that are *pars pro toto* those of the European Union since local German regulations are based on the principles of the “Convention of Schengen” and of the “Lisbon Agenda.” While Schengen opens the doors for the countries belonging to the European Union, facilitating mobility (but not for all members of the EU, as it seems that the Roma ethnic group does not enjoy these privileges; on the contrary, they are highly unwelcome), the same convention erects an iron barrier to all kinds of migration that do not come from EU member states. Simultaneously, there is an opening and permeation of the inner frontiers, and a wall closing the external frontiers. This has led to deep changes, particularly for former colonial powers like France, Spain, Portugal, or the Netherlands with regard to countries that were former colonies. For France, for example, this convention represents an anachronism, a contradiction, and a paradox in the face of the concept of citizenship of 1789 as consequence of the Enlightenment – as the Moroccan francophone writer Ben Jelloun (1984/²1997: 58) explains. He believes that France has betrayed her tradition: “land of asylum and liberty for those who have had to flee a dictatorship, a political regime [...] land of asylum and exile where migration is itself a nationality]” (Ibid., 59).²

Another important aspect is the fact that the EU allows its citizens to have only one nationality, with the exception of a single parent who has another nationality, as is the case when a child born in Germany has, for example, a German father and a Moroccan mother. In this case, the child may have both nationalities; this is also possible where bilateral conventions between a country from the EU and a country that is not member of the EU exist as has been the case for some years between Germany and Mexico, for example, and is the case with many other countries. In all other cases, dual-nationality or citizenship is forbidden. For this proscription, I see not one logical argument explaining the dull and irrational fear that this group of persons will bring all of their “tribes” to the receiving country; and yet it exists. And these misguided politics affect hospitality, belonging, identity, and ultimately,

¹ I do not use the term “immigration” or “emigration” because they are loaded and have specific political connotations. For these reason I prefer the term “migration” as a concept in the context of the theory of culture that means only ‘movement’ and has a neutral status; it does not differentiate between illegal and legal “immigrant” because this differentiation is highly discriminatory.

² “terre d’asile et de liberté pour ceux qui ont dû fuir une dictature, un régime politique [...], terre d’asile et d’exil où l’migration est une nationalité en soi [...]” (Ibid., 59). All translations for which no particular edition is cited are my own.

integration. These regulations are a form of exclusion and particularly affect young Germans that have, for example, Turkish parents and were born in Germany in the second and third generation: when they reach eighteen years of age, they must choose between Turkish and German nationality. I shall return to this point later.

The second and the longer, more complex, and most important step in my considerations, I will dedicate to the conceptions of “hospitality,” “belonging,” “emotion,” “body,” and “desire,” and to a new concept of identity that I call “performative-hybrid-identity” or “trans-identity” that seeks to introduce a new concept of integration in the sense of “social interaction.”

1. WHAT GOES WRONG WITH INTEGRATION: SOME FACTS ABOUT MIGRATORY REGULATIONS AND PROBLEMS OF RECOGNITION AND DISCRIMINATION

It may come as a surprise that I dare to speak nowadays about “Transnationalities – Transidentities – Hybridities – Diasporization,” given the current situation in Europe and Germany. We are now confronted by serious and growing xenophobic, racist, and violent discourses from part of the political caste, not only from the extreme right, but also, statistics show, from members of democratically established parties, and to a lesser extent, from a portion of civil society.

On October 21st, 2010, to illustrate the situation, a sniper shot a foreign man in Malmö (Sweden). This was one incident in a series of ten to fifteen assaults against migrants. In the Netherlands, Wilders propagates an extremely racist political agenda. In France, Sarkozy’s discourses on migration were alarmingly close to Le Pen’s from the extreme right. In Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, we see very strong neo-Nazi groups, although these countries have, for decades, been models of tolerance. In Italy, xenophobia is virulent, although it seems that the situation in Switzerland, Spain, and Portugal is a bit better.

In Germany, and here I describe the situation of a country that can be considered one of the most tolerant countries worldwide, we see both negative and positive developments. On one hand, we can observe a very violent, demagogical, and dangerous discussion characterized by populism and opportunism, particularly from a portion of the political caste, but not just from this source. An example: the leader of the Christian Social Party of Bavaria and Prime Minister of the State of Bavaria, Seehofer, declared in 2010 in a seven-point program that Germany is not an immigrant country, despite the fact that there are more than 7 million foreigners and a large number of people with migrant origins living in Germany, who seem to remain “foreigners” forever.³ In a discussion on TV (“Hart aber Fair” on the 19th of October 2010), a U.S. journalist who has been living in Berlin for many decades got very upset and asked how long it would take for Germans to accept that someone, for example, the football player and member of the National Team, Mesut Özil, is a German and not an migrant. Özil is considered a football player “with migratory background” (“*mit Migrationshintergrund*”), but the national-league football players from Poland, Klose, and Podolsky (the latter having Polish and German citizenship), are not.

In light of the migration waves that we see in Germany and in Europe, Seehofer argues that we must stop migration, particularly from the Arab world, and especially from Turkey. Further, he argues that foreigners must submit to the *deutsche Leitkultur*, which means the leading German culture, in the same way that Huntington demanded for the U.S. in *Who Are We?* (2004). The same line of argumentation was used in an interview on the second of June 2012 by Michael Kretschmer, the General Secretary of the Christian German Union of Saxony and, since 2009, Vice Chairman of the Parliamentary Group of the Christian German

³ Seehofer’s “Sieben-Punkte-Plan”: <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/integration-merkel-erklaert-multikulti-fuer-gescheitert-a-723532.html> (retrieved 29.04.2014).

Union and of the Christian Social Union in the *Bundestag* (Federal German Parliament), heading up an endless list of similar claims.

In 2010, Thilo Sarrazin, a former senator for finance in Berlin and former member of the Social Democratic Party, published *Deutschland schafft sich ab* (*Germany Gets Rid of Itself*), a highly racist and dangerous book with argumentation about the genetic inferiority of Turks, in which Sarrazin shamelessly manipulated statistics and abused, falsified, and distorted very diverse critical discourses about the migration issue faced by experts and by the German and European governments. The indignation in Germany was proportionately (or respectively) severe.

An extreme, as well as a grotesque, distasteful, and embarrassing example of discrimination, racism, and lack of hospitality in Germany is the statement of the Free Democratic Party politician Jörg-Uwe Hahn, who himself ironically holds the post of “Minister for Integration” of the district Hessen, of all things. In an interview with the *Frankfurter Neue Presse* on the 8th of February 2013, he said, referring to Rösler, the Vice-Chancellor and Minister of Economy of the preceding and current German administrations who was reelected President of the Free Democratic Party on March 9th, 2013 and who was born in Vietnam and adopted by German parents in infancy: “In the case of Philipp Rösler he would like to ask if our society is already so far as to continue to accept an Asian looking Vice Chancellor”,⁴ a statement that provoked a huge discussion. In spite of this, Rösler himself did not imply that his colleague was discriminating against him in a racist manner, from a party on the verge of extinction, stumbling from one scandal to the next. Rather, Rösler and the entire party reflexively defended Hahn, saying that Hahn was expressing himself in a misleading way, and had not intended to discriminate, which Hahn himself immediately confirmed. Rösler reacted so mildly out of pure opportunism: before Hahn’s statements, he was highly controversial as Minister and as President of the Free Democratic Party. His colleagues blamed him for the disastrous condition of the party, which ranked between 2% and 4% in the polls. Ultimately, Hahn did Rösler a favor, because following Hahn’s lapse, no one dared to remove Rösler from his functions. However, despite Rösler’s behavior, we see the nature of the climate that is currently developing and is latent in Germany, and also in Europe – this is both a global and a European problem in matters of hospitality and belonging. The chairman of the Liberal Youth (Jungen Liberalen), Lasse Becker, alluded in an interview with the *Südkurier* on the 9th of February 2013 that there “exists a latent racism against Rösler” and adds that “he gets to hear at his stand during the election campaign in the pedestrian area: ‘I would vote for your party, but for that, the Chinese should go away first,’” and Lasse, aware of the problem, asks whether “Hahn’s statement really could be taken as a reason for a broad debate about racism.”⁵

The facts speak a very different language, at least in Germany, which is why kinds of statements à la Seehofer, and others, have been qualified as demagogic, and some cases as racist: first of all, only a part of members of the Turkish community are not integrated in

⁴ Jörg-Uwe Hahn’s interview in the *Frankfurter Neuen Presse* on Feb. 8, 2013; <http://www.fnp.de/rhein-main/Aufregung-um-Hahn-Interview-in-der-FNP;art801,140862> (retrieved 29.04.2014):

Ist die Debatte um Rösler also beendet?

HAHN: “Ja. Wir werden sicherlich noch eine kleine Personaldebatte bekommen über die Frage der Besetzung des FDP-Präsidiums auf Bundesebene auf dem Sonderparteitag Anfang März. Also, ob Herr Niebel und Herr Kubicki etwa nochmal eine Rolle spielen. Bei Philipp Rösler würde ich allerdings gerne wissen, ob unsere Gesellschaft schon so weit ist, einen asiatisch aussehenden Vizekanzler auch noch länger zu akzeptieren.”

⁵ “dass es tatsächlich latenten Rassismus gegenüber Rösler gebe” “bekomme [er] am Wahlkampfstand in der Fußgängerzone zu hören: Ich würde Euch ja wählen, aber dafür müsste erst einmal der Chinese weg.” But Lasse adds, “Trotzdem ist umstritten, ob die Äußerung Hahns zum Anlass für eine breit angelegte Rassismus-Debatte genommen werden soll,” in: <http://www.suedkurier.de/nachrichten/politik/themensk/Aeusserung-ueber-Roeslers-Herkunft-Ausrutscher-oder-Manoever;art1015367,5899399> (retrieved 29.04.2014).

Germany, and many of the problems that they have are in large measure social problems that they share with modest, low-income, and uneducated German families (a class called the “*Präkariat*,” a new euphemism of the political and sociologist caste). On the other hand, there are a large number of integrated Turks and many successful social integration projects that the media ignore because they do not offer scandal. For example: while 15,000 Turks came to Germany in 2010 (and that was the basis for Seehofer’s advertisement of the horror scenario of a “Turkish Invasion” in Germany), 30,000 left Germany for Turkey in the same year. This group is primarily made up of highly qualified and educated people, and they gave as a reason for their emigration the fact that “they can no longer tolerate being discriminated against because they are foreigners, and treated as second-class citizens in Germany.”⁶ This case reveals, in an exemplary way, the failure of hospitality and the feeling of belonging, and in the end, also of current so-called “integration,” which is praised, in this particular case, by the “German-Turks.” This case makes it obvious and palpable that – as we shall see in the argumentation of Derrida – neither language competence nor citizenship in the case of “particularly well integrated persons” contributed to truly *feeling at home* in Germany, finding a *gefühlte (erstrittene Heimat)*.

In the former East Germany, there were almost no statistically relevant numbers of foreigners, but the radical right-wing parties and splinter groups were and are very present in the public sphere, particularly in Thuringia and Saxony. The Zwickauer Terror Cell that executed the premeditated murder of several people, eight of whom were Turks, came from this region. Besides for the tragic murder of these people simply because they were Turks, the diverse security organs such as the police, the State Criminal Police Office, and the National Criminal Police Office suspected the families of the victims as perpetrators in a “Turkish Mafia war”: they were interrogated as suspects, and some were even arrested for several hours, humiliated, and treated very roughly. They were victims twice over, of the terror cell and of the poor behavior of the public authorities. Because of this, the murderers remained at large for years, undetected and free from the persecution of the police until two of them, men, committed suicide and the third, a woman, was sent to prison. The failure was also twofold: on one side the security services were greatly inefficient, while on the other side, the security services assisted by the respective ministers “did not want to acknowledge or accept a racially motivated crime,” and in some cases, attitudes that came very near to racism emerged as the enquiry commissions of the Federal Government and of the Federal States continued their investigation.

The demagogic political discourses, as of Seehofer, or even that of Sarrassin, enjoy great public media attention which simultaneously transmits and propagates the idea that these new

⁶ See http://www.svr-migration.de/content/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/SVR_JG_2012_WEB.pdf and http://www.grimme-institut.de/imblickpunkt/pdf/imblickpunkt_migranten-und-medien.pdf; http://www.google.de/#hl=de&sclient=psy-ab&q=ARD+2010:+Mitb%C3%BCrger+T%C3%BCrkischer+Abstammung+wandern+in+die+T%C3%BCrkei+aus&oq=ARD+2010:+Mitb%C3%BCrger+T%C3%BCrkischer+Abstammung+wandern+in+die+T%C3%BCrkei+aus&gs_l=serp.3...493018.493018.0.493998.1.1.0.0.0.0.0.0...0.0...1c.1.ToKG9KMZ7o8&pbx=1&bav=on.2,or.r_gc.r_pw.r_qf.&fp=933ee2c2b6ca8d06&bpc=36601534&biw=1376&bih=659; <http://www.deutsch-tuerkische-nachrichten.de/2013/03/471159/keine-einbahnstrasse-tuerkisch-deutsche-migration-findet-in-beide-richtungen-statt/> (retrieved 29.04.2014); <http://blog.initiativgruppe.de/2013/03/17/30-000-kommen-50-000-gehen-die-turkische-ruckwanderung-schadet-deutschland/> (retrieved 29.04.2014); <http://www.deutsch-tuerkische-nachrichten.de/2013/03/471159/keine-einbahnstrasse-tuerkisch-deutsche-migration-findet-in-beide-richtungen-statt/> (retrieved 29.04.2014); <http://www.migazin.de/2012/05/08/die-abwanderung-hochqualifizierter-turkeistammiger-deutscher-staatsangehoeriger-in-die-turkei/> (retrieved 29.04.2014); <http://blog.initiativgruppe.de/30-000-kommen-50-000-gehen-die-turkische-ruckwanderung-schadet-deutschland/>.

arrivers need only be tolerated temporarily, and that they are otherwise unwelcome; and this in spite of millions of new citizens.⁷

Of course we have, on the other hand, in Germany and in other European countries as well, other discourses from the political caste. For example, that of Christian Wulff, the former president of the Republic, who, on the commemoration day of the German reunification, claimed that German culture and tradition is based on the Judeo-Christian tradition, but that Islam also belongs to Germany.⁸

This is a realistic and a very correct description of Germany's current social situation today. I confess that I was very surprised, but at the same time thankful, for the acknowledgement of the very evident relation between Christianity and Judaism, because this was the first time that I had heard of such a link being made in Germany. Of course, Christianity is a part of the Jewish tradition, and both religions also share the *Old Testament*. But, in my opinion, the Muslim tradition is also part of the Western tradition, since the Muslim religion is a part and a result of the Jewish and Christian traditions. They also have the *Old Testament* and many other aspects in common, as well as a shared history. The differences lie in the modern interpretation of various issues. I think that the true problems with regard to minorities are not the rooted practices of the different cultures, but the fatal mixture between religion and politics, the instrumentation of religions, and the abuse of the *Qur'an* for political goals. Why do we not have such a problem with minorities in Canada or in the U.S. where there are parallel societies in a sense, ones that could be considered as belonging to a new form of diaspora? There, Chinese or Vietnamese people live in their own quarters; they have their own supermarkets, their own banks, newspapers, and so on. Often, they do not speak English in their own restaurants or supermarkets, but they do not represent a problem for the authorities, and they provide their children with a first-class education.

Naturally, Wulff's speech provoked a resolute, and in some cases, aggressive reaction on the part of some politicians in the Christian Unions. Gauck also corrected Wulff, specifying that Islam does not *belong* to the German cultural tradition, but is *part* of a modern Germany. However, the Turkish diaspora reacted in a fascinating way, saying that, finally, a politician, and one in a so high a position, *recognized them as citizens with equal rights*. They spoke of "our President":

When German Muslim women and men write to me, "You are our President," then I answer from the bottom of my heart, "Yes, of course I am your President!" with the same passion and conviction with which I am the president of all people who live in Germany [...]

Turks: Mister Federal President: "You are our President."⁹

⁷ See http://www.svr-migration.de/content/wp-content/uploads/2012/05/SVR_JG_2012_WEB.pdf (retrieved 29.04.2014).

⁸ <http://www.handelsblatt.com/politik/deutschland/wulff-rede-im-wortlaut-der-islam-gehoert-zu-deutschland-seite-3/3553232-3.html> (retrieved 29.04.2014):

"Zuallererst brauchen wir aber eine klare Haltung: Ein Verständnis von Deutschland, das Zugehörigkeit nicht auf einen Pass, eine Familiengeschichte oder einen Glauben verengt, sondern breiter angelegt ist. Das Christentum gehört zweifelsfrei zu Deutschland. Das Judentum gehört zweifelsfrei zu Deutschland. Das ist unsere christlich-jüdische Geschichte. Aber der Islam gehört inzwischen auch zu Deutschland. [...]"

⁹ <http://politikforen.net/showthread.php?99321-T%C3%BCrken-Herr-Bundespr%C3%A4sident-quot-Sie-sind-unser-Pr%C3%A4sident-quot&s=a7984b0e598a346c74319a3b7779f2ba,%2015.-03.-2013> (retrieved 29.04.2014):

"Wenn mir deutsche Musliminnen und Muslime schreiben: „Sie sind unser Präsident“ dann antworte ich aus vollem Herzen: Ja, natürlich bin ich Ihr Präsident! Mit der gleichen Leidenschaft und Überzeugung, mit der ich der Präsident aller Menschen bin, die hier in Deutschland leben.[...] Türken: Herr Bundespräsident: "Sie sind unser Präsident."

Here, one major aspect of integration and peaceful cohabitation is expressed: *Recognition*. The lack of recognition is one of the main sources of a large number of conflicts, and acts of recognition are the solution to many of them. Albert Memmi, a Tunisian francophone, Jewish and Arab writer, wrote in his 1957 book *Portrait du colonisé. Précédé du Portrait du colonisateur* (with a prologue by Jean-Paul Sartre), speaking on the system of colonialism, that the worst hurt, aggression, and trauma that colonialism produced in the colonized was the disrespect of their culture and dignity, their recognition as humans beings, because this erased them from history, from reality, and from life.

But let me return to Gauck, who, together with Wulff, Merkel (and others politician of the Social Democratic Party and of the Alliance '90/The Greens that since years are demanding reforms in this field), begins to change the political thinking in matters of migration and the acceptance of new citizens. The speech that Gauck gave the day he was elected as President of the Federal Republic of Germany is remarkable and seems as though it could have been written by Lévinas or Derrida:

Our Constitution and our human condition task us with the brotherly recognition of ourselves in the Other: with a capacity and right to participate akin to our own. The philosopher Hans-Georg Gadamer was of the opinion, in light of the trials of history, that Europe in particular was expected to deliver a “true school” of getting along with one another in a crowded space. ‘To live with the other, as the other in another life.’ He saw this as the ethical and political duty of Europe.”¹⁰

This line of thinking is confirmed as President Gauck said in his European Speech on February 23rd, 2013: “Muslim citizens are a natural part of Europe and Germany.” The President of the Social Democratic Party, Sigmar Gabriel, said in an interview in the *Frankfurter Rundschau* on February 23rd to 24th, 2013: “I fully understand each person who wants to live here permanently, but does not want to cut himself off from his cultural roots. We definitely need a modern law of citizenship.”

Mrs. Merkel, the German Chancellor, has made some statements years before that are along the same lines as those of Wulff and Gauck. She declared “*multikulti*” to be dead and finished (2010), but she did not deny that we have a ‘multicultural’ society.¹¹ She understands “*multikulti*” as the failure of a naive approach that consisted in believing that diverse cultures, particularly those with big differences in everyday practices and levels of education, could live alongside one another without conflict and without any strategy implemented on the part of society, institutions, or government authorities. The idea of flower-power cheering on or celebrating diversity was not the right tool for dealing with real differences. In 2008 Merkel accepted that Germany is a migration country, and that the new Arrivers represent an enrichment of German culture.¹²

In addition to these discourses that not only encourage my position and that of both of the Diaspora Projects that we are developing – one with colleagues from Barcelona, Frankfurt,

¹⁰ “Unsere Verfassung wie unser Menschsein tragen uns auf, im Anderen geschwisterlich uns selbst zu sehen: begabt und berechtigt zur Teilhabe wie wir. Der Philosoph Hans-Georg Gadamer war der Ansicht, nach den Erschütterungen der Geschichte erwarte speziell uns in Europa eine ‘wahre Schule’ des Miteinanderlebens auf engstem Raum. Mit dem Anderen leben, als der Andere des Anderen leben, darin sah er die ethische und politische Aufgabe Europas.” http://www.bundespraesident.de/SharedDocs/Downloads/DE/Reden/2012/03/120323-Vereidigung-des-Bundespraesidenten.pdf?jsessionid=BEA04503B3E3F6DD6C00C99755F8139C.2_cid293?__blob=publicationFile (retrieved 04.05.2014)

¹¹ The contradictory situation is that Merkel made this statement after having supported Seehofer’s seven-point plan, which had nothing to do with Merkel’s own very liberal position. This is what I would like to call “the Art of politics and government.”

¹² See Merkel: Saturday, 16.10.2010 – 19:07; <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/integration-merkel-erklaert-multikulti-fuer-gescheitert-a-723532.html> (retrieved 29.04.2014).

and Lyon; the other with Prof. Ruth Fine and a number of colleagues from the Hebrew and Leipzig Universities – they also confirm that our goals are not at all utopian, but a courageous alternative to the usual “*Realpolitik*.” We can establish and realize many improvements in matters of acceptance and recognition.

Some examples: in November 2012, the Ministry of Federal Affairs, Europe and Media of the county North Rhine-Westphalia (*Ministerium für Bundesangelegenheiten, Europa und Medien des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen*) published an inquiry that was widely commented on in the TV broadcasting ARD on the 1st of November 2012. Here, the question was raised of how much longer new citizens, now in the third generation, like Turks, will be confronted with the embarrassing question that impedes integration: “Where do you come from?” The problematization of this question from a ministerial inquiry shows that something must be changed in terms of hospitality and that governmental German institutions begin to change their position and to ask the right questions. In the same inquiry, it is asserted that discrimination is not only directed against Muslims, but also against Latin Americans, Asians, Indians, and East Europeans.¹³

Other hopeful developments are the cultural contract agreement from the 14th of August 2012 between the Senate of the city-state (*Stadtstaat*) of Hamburg with the DITIB-Association of Hamburg, the SCHURA – Council of the Islamic communities of Hamburg and the Association of the Islamic Cultural Centers, or the contract agreement on the 22nd of August 2012 in North Rhine-Westphalia, where it is established that, in forty-four primary schools, courses in Islam will be taught in order to contribute to cohabitation. A final example from the 30th of October of the same year was the inauguration of the Center for Islamic Studies at the Universities of Münster and Osnabrück.

Against this backdrop, we must ask wherein the real problem lies. In my understanding of migration or integration conflicts, the problem is that we consider the term “integration” and its practice in very different ways: if we understand this term as the subjugation and assimilation of the arriving culture in favor of the culture of the country of arrival, and if the culture of the country of arrival merely tolerates the arriving culture, then we have real difficulties. I would say that the origins of many problems that we have with migrants and with the culture of the country of arrival lie in this *different understanding of integration and in the lack of recognition*. Nonetheless, the problem also consists, on one side, of the insufficient willingness on the part of migrants to accept the fact that living in another culture means wanting to have a supplementary identity, and on the other side, the lack of will and desire to receive.

But we may understand, as Mr. de Mezière, the former Secretary of the Interior, did some years ago, that on one hand, integration means accepting the differences of the arriving culture and is not a one-way street, but rather two converging paths; and that it is indeed possible to succeed in matters of integration and peaceful cohabitation.

¹³ <http://www.hamburg.de/contentblob/3551370/data/download-muslim-verbaende.pdf> (retrieved 29.04.2014); <http://www.hamburg.de/pressearchiv-fhh/3551764/2012-08-14-sk-vertrag.html> (retrieved 29.04.2014).

2. ON NEW AND PRAGMATIC ALTERNATIVES TO COHABITATION IN THE “DIFFERENCE”

In the present global world, culture, ideas, products, technology, sciences, communication and people are constantly crossing 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 U.S. The huge construction of a three thousand kilometer shield did not prevent or stop the migration of approximately 50 million Hispanics into the U.S. At the same time, the cultural borders between France and Europe and the Maghreb have also changed substantially over the past forty years, although in a completely different way. National and topographical bounds are being overwhelmed all over the world.

The European community has dissolved its inner borders, and sooner or later Europe will see its common constitution challenged by the necessity of common fiscal and foreign policies. In spite of these improvements, the differences between the various regions within Europe are enormous, and discrimination and racism, particularly against non-European migrants, are a part of everyday life (the most current case is that of the Roma citizens, as we indicated above). Still, migration can be stopped neither within Europe nor into it.

Shields, fences, and laws are merely desperate, ineffective practices aimed at controlling migration. Electronic mail, the World Wide Web, and constant movement 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 now live in a pluricultural world, leads to the necessity of rethinking terms like “nation,” “national identity,” “national culture,” and “citizenship” must be rethought and understood in a new way in order to promote peaceful coexistence.

Globalization is a manifold process with positive and negative sides. It opens borders and makes the world permeable, but at the same time it 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 (That in which 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 putting the values that the West had always claimed as its own to the test: mobility, free market, and not only considering supply and demand, but also human labor and the protection of human rights that protect each migrant worker.

I repeat: global interaction and communication cannot exist without people (Fuentes 2002: 342).

This kind of community is permanently growing with the consequence of radical, violent, hegemonic, and xenophobic reactions.

The strong presence and great importance of the construction of identities are made clear in Huntington's book, *Who Are We* (2004), in which the author believes that Hispanics in the U.S. pose a threat to the American State. I will not enter into this discussion now, since I have already done so in other publications (see A. de Toro in the bibliography), although I consider Huntington's book to be a contemporary and negative example of how not to deal with diasporas and their construction of identities. Huntington represents the very opposite of our approach and position, as well as our project, which we have already developed at two

congresses, in Leipzig (December 2011) and Jerusalem (June 2012), and continue to develop today.

2.1 HOSPITALITY – BELOGNING – EMOTION – BODY – DESIRE

In the construction of identity, “emotion” is a central aspect and concept to which I assign not only a psychological and affective status, but also a *cognitive status as a knowledge structure*. In this context, we implement, supplement, and expand the term “integration” in the sense of a “reciprocal, dynamic integration” based on the fundamental notions of “recognition,” “hospitality,” and “belonging” in a space of “shared responsibility” that constitutes the foundation of the construction of “performative hybrid identities” or “trans-identities.”

I begin with the observation, or, in resolute terms, with the fact that individuals in postmodern and global migration movements (particularly to megacities) are no longer primarily determined by ethnic, cultural and religious origins, by colonization, decolonization, or by the project of return, but much more and primarily by the *specific situation and constellation that the migrants find in the country of arrival*, which we denominate the “*situation-imperative*” or “*situation-dispositive*.”

My main interest lies in the description of the question of how individual members of an arriving culture in a new society can, with time, develop the *feeling* of “belonging” to the new country, and whether they feel welcome and receive “hospitality.” In order to answer this, we focus on diasporic formations related to “hospitality” and “belonging” in the context of the Maghrebian culture and migration processes to Central Europe (France, Germany, Spain, and in some cases also to Israel). We consider the concepts of “hospitality” and “belonging,” which are closely related to those of “emotion,” “body” and “desire” (see below), to be fundamental in order to come to a new politics of migration, new ideas, notions and conceptions of integration and citizenship. Thus we consider the psychological, affective, and subjective aspects of persons without which neither hospitality nor belonging, nor any “felt or experienced citizenship,” would be possible. The “emotion” passes through the “body,” which is registered by the gaze. This process delineates a fundamental moment in culture and society for the recognition or refusal of the “Other” and the sources of the “desire” that results in refusal. Therefore, I understand “emotion” as the experience of the “hospitality” that passes via the “gaze,” via the “body,” and via “desire” – and not only via citizenship, language or via the “prosthesis of the origin” (“*prothèse de l’origine*”, Derrida). Similar lives and emotional situations (for example unfulfilled yearning for home vs. a long-term locational project) determine the immigrant’s situation. At the same time, the individual develops, on the basis of *self-determination* on one hand, and external allocations on the other, an *emotion* or *feeling of belonging*.¹⁴ This process should be understood as an individual experience with a fragmented belonging and identity that is collected through the *body* and the *emotionality* of the individual. This experience is then a *conditio* for cultural and social integration. In this context, “emotion” also means an affective and psychological security; the security of undistorted personal integrity; the secure access to opportunities and resources like education, work, respect and acknowledgement.

With regard to the concepts of “body” and “desire,” we follow the theories of Deleuze/Guattari (u.a. *Capitalisme et schizophrénie*), Foucault (*Surveiller et punir*; *Histoire de la sexualité*); Butler, in the consideration of her concept of performativity (*Gender Trouble*; *Bodies that Matter*), and Kamper/Wulf (*Die Wiederkehr des Körpers*).

We treat the concept of “body” as an anthropological category, as a discourse formation, as “*archéologie du savoir*” connecting the fields of desire and sexuality with those of power and institutions, and building them as a dispositive. Important in this context is the conception of a

¹⁴ Vaassen (1996: 214ff.) also refers to the self and external assignments when he speaks about the “context of references.”

knowledge machine as a network of relations that bleed in every direction, through all kind of layers and social, scientific and institutional structures. The body is the place where experiences are performed and treated, it is the starting point and arriving point of experience, the archive of memory, the "heterotopic space";¹⁵ "crisis heterotopias";¹⁶ "sitting or placement";¹⁷ "relations among sites";¹⁸ "heterogeneous space";¹⁹ "effective site";²⁰ and "counter-sites"²¹ of individual and collective history, the traced and tattooed surface.

"Emotion" is understood as the experience of "hospitality" and "belonging" that builds itself through the "Gaze," the "body" and "desire," and not through citizenship or the "*prothèse de l'origine*." Similar life experiences and destinies (for example the unfulfilled longing for the original homeland vs. the settlement in a new country for an indefinite length of time) determine the living situation of the new Arrivers. Based on self-determination, individuals develop, on the one hand, a feeling of emotional *belonging*; but, on the other hand and at the same time, are dependent on and vulnerable to external assignation, which also determines their feeling of belonging. This ambivalent process is experienced as fragmentary belonging and hospitality leading to a fragmentary identity, which itself constitutes a sort of *conditio* for cultural and social integration.²² "Emotion" refers to and implies a longing for the affective and psychological security of the inviolable rights of the individual, for access to individual possibilities for development such as education, work, respect, and so forth. "Emotion" is constitutive for the disposition and willingness to accept and recognize, and respectively to refuse the "different Other" on the basis of positive or negative experiences; of rational or irrational, justified or unjustified fear; of prejudices; and of similar aspects. "Emotion" can be conceived of as a dynamic and incessant process and is the determining factor for judgments, negotiations, and "finding a place in the world," as for example Nico H. Frijda (2000: 63) underlines. As I already indicated, "emotion" can be understood as an essential part of knowledge and as an instrument of cognition, in the encounter with "different Others," as Bedford (1956/1957), George Pitcher (1965: 327) or Robert C. Solomon (2000: 11) have already exposed. Following Errol Bedford (1956/1957) and René Ceballos,²³ we can assert that "emotions" must be considered to be conditions and fluctuations respectively, and as impulses that can explain, legitimate or sanction individual or collective behavior. Thus, "emotions" must be included in the political discourse on migration and considered constitutive for any concept of "integration," no matter how it is conceived. For all of these reasons, I have assigned "emotion" a pragmatic negotiation status.

We understand a new concept of "integration" as a reciprocal and dynamic interaction that includes immigrant cultures as well as the society of arrival aimed at creating the possibility for recognition, and consequently, for the hospitality and belonging that are fundamental to the conditions for the cohabitation of difference in a hybrid space, conceived as shared responsibility, as a sort of permanent "third space" (Bhabha); as a nomadic "*home*" and identity (= "hybrid-performative diaspora") that must be continuously performed, and relocated, negotiated, and developed in an endless nomadic process.

¹⁵ Foucault 1967/1994/²2001: "hétérotopie" 1575; Foucault 1967/1990: "Heterotopie" 39.

¹⁶ Foucault 1967/1994/²2001: "hétérotopies de crise" 1575; Foucault 1967/1990: "Krisenheterotopien" 40.

¹⁷ Foucault 1967/1994/²2001: "l'emplacement" / "la localisation" 1572; Foucault 1967/1990: "Lagerung" / "Plazierung" 36.

¹⁸ Foucault 1967/1994/²2001: "relations d'emplacements" 1573; Foucault 1967/1990: Lagerungsbeziehungen 37.

¹⁹ Foucault 1967/1994/²2001: "espace hétérogène" 1574; Foucault 1967/1990: "heterogener Raum" 38.

²⁰ Foucault 1967/1994/²2001: "lieux effectifs" 1574; Foucault 1967/1990: "Wirksame Orte" 39.

²¹ Foucault 1967/1994/²2001: "sortes de contre-emplacements" 1574; Foucault 1967/1990: "Gegenplatzierung" / "Widerlager" 39.

²² See Tal Dingott Alkopher's contribution (2013/2014) where she speaks in a similar way about "interculturalism."

²³ I would like to thank Dr. René Ceballos, who, in the context of his post-doc (*Perspektiven der Andersheit: Identitätskonstruktion in Mexiko, Brasilien und Kuba*), concentrates exhaustively on the theme of "Emotion," and makes many important remarks.

These concepts and praxis are located in particular situations for which we want to introduce the concept of the “situation dispositive” or “situation imperative” as one of the columns of the concept and practice of “performative hybrid diasporas.” These two terms encompass concrete and particular situations in which migrants live, as well as new cultural and social forms that are no longer shaped by colonialism and decolonization by traditional ethnic or cultural practices stemming from original homelands. This “*imperative of situationality*” is built by situations that develop from concrete positive or negative circumstances and experiences, such as success, settlement, dual or multiple origins, cosmopolitanism, a diverse and rich sense of being at ease, living as an illegal alien, living with discrimination, living in poverty, being socially downcast, dependence, exploitation, persecution (in cases of illegal migration), similar emotional and concrete situations, living in fear, living in ghettos. The social milieu, the surrounding environments, the neighborhood, and its inhabitants comprise the determining “*situation dispositive*” with their similar or equal fates and life situations. In this context, individual or collective subjects must reinvent themselves in a complex interaction of self-determination and the determination of that which is foreign; they must find a new identity and a new sense of belonging. Here, factors located both within and outside of the subject play a central role. These formations and situations become increasingly large and influential, so that for migrants, the micro-world comes to play a larger role than the macro-world qua State or nation; these in turn lose their primary identity-shaping influence. These formations do not compete with or question the State, with the exception of fundamentalist parallel societies; rather, they offer life alternatives that have altered and will continue to alter nations at their cores. From these diverse diaspora dispositives and situation dispositives, major issues and central questions emerge that are tied to security – the security of belonging; emotional, affective, and psychological security; the security of undistorted personal integrity; the secure access to opportunities and resources like education, work, respect, and acknowledgement.

The theory and praxis of the “performative and hybrid diaspora-concept,” constitutive parts of postmodern, global societies, express in the chosen corpora diverse experiences of writers, artists, media people, and migrants in general. The oscillation between difference and negotiation is a complex process that is rife with conflict. The degree of its complexity is made clear in light of this new concept of diaspora, which seeks at all costs to avoid the “clouding” of differences and conflicts within hybrid diaspora formations. For this reason, we considered the “performative / hybrid diaspora” to be a new form of economic, political, social, cultural and religious practice that consists primarily in a specific origin or particular form of government serving as its main reference; and that is independent from the number of members in, and the homogeneity of, any group; and independent from nostalgia or a longing to return, factors which no longer constitute a solid element of reality or primary objective. The concept and praxis of a “performative and hybrid diaspora” is also based on some characteristics. This non-comprehensive list of features includes those that are not ethnic (or that are multi-ethnic) in nature. Here, the concept of ethnicity is not only understood in Hall’s sense of “*new ethnicity*” (which, in the context of the project, is only one building block, one element among many others in the construction of performative / hybrid diasporas), but is also replaced by the term “***sociocultural constellation***,” **since this is not as semantically, historically and culturally charged as the term “ethnicity.”**

The constituents of performative / hybrid diaspora are:

1. Movement; de- and reterritorialization
2. Location in space and time
3. Identifying structures
4. Awareness of being part of a diaspora, strong group interest
5. Similar experience of destiny

6. Similar life and emotional situations (unfulfilled yearning for home vs. a long-term locational project)
7. Common forms of representation
8. Strong internal sense of loyalty and solidarity and external hybrid loyalty and solidarity
9. Transethnic, transcultural, transidentity
10. Reinvention of the self and invention of the homeland
11. External assignations and internal description of the Self

The advantage of this concept of diaspora is that it encompasses almost all of Cohen's other diaspora classifications, including the "victim diaspora," "work diaspora," "behavioral diaspora," and "deterritorialized diaspora" (those of the postmodernity and hybridity of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries). It also encompasses the Hispanic and Maghrebian diasporas that Cohen has not yet described.

In this dynamic context, the project uses the term "diasporization," or the concrete appearance of diaspora formations, situations, representations and practices in the sense of diverse "*stagings*" or "*performances*" of social, cultural and religious manners of cohabitation. This provides alternative or supplementary models to the traditional concepts of "nation," "culture," "identity" or "citizenship" that are based neither on the binomial "blood / land" nor on the "*prothèse de l'origine*," or on the "language prosthesis" as I will like to add, nor on citizenship, but rather on the result of a web of relationships and constellations, stagings, and performances (see Krämer/Stahlhut 2001: 45–47; 56; Fischer-Lichte 1998, 2004, 2004).

The terms "*staging*" and "*performance*" indicate a dynamic, nomadic, open, negotiated and contested representation of culture, identity and diaspora. They also indicate the *negotiated* and *contested* "*reinvention*" of themselves in an open and indeterminate process. For this reason, the "performative hybrid" diaspora term is distinct from the traditional diaspora term. It develops on the basis of a *self-determined belonging* and an *emotion* or *feeling of belonging* on one hand, and on external assignments on the other. It thus develops not only at the interfaces of cultures, but also between different subjects. This should be understood as an individual experience with a fragmented belonging and identity that is collected through the *body* and the *emotionality* of the individual, and not through citizenship. This experience is then a *conditio* for society. In these societies, individuals and groups live in a permanent state of tension between the nostalgia of origin and foreignness, new loyalties and group or situational conditions.

The "performative hybrid diaspora" concept implies not only new economic, political, and social formations, as already stated, but a concept and practice in which the decisive and sole determining reference is no longer the local or legal belonging to any nation state, but rather the social diasporic constellation. The "performative hybrid diaspora" concept means a "*warping*" of traditional dichotomy constructions like "oneness" vs. "otherness," "local" vs. "migrant culture," "old community vs. foreign or new community," or "national citizens vs. foreigners." We are dealing with cultural, psychological, and emotional constructions that yield "micro-republic networks."

This concept of "performative hybrid diaspora" considers migrants no longer as such, nor as negative migrants, "*expatrias*," persons without a homeland; but as part of a cosmopolitan, unresting, and fragmented world. It develops ideas of social cohesion and belonging, of being anchored, and of new homes ("*Heimaten*"). However, we must make clear that we understand "new performative-hybrid diasporas" as *societies that constitute temporal and spatial limits within which identification or cohesion becomes traceable or visible and that has an existential function for individuals or groups, regardless of which characteristics these individuals or groups evince.*

2. DERRIDA AND LEVINAS OR THE FUGACITY OF IDENTITY AND THE CONDITION FOR ITS CONSTRUCTION

2.1 DERRIDA: “PERFORMATIVITE VS. LA PROTHESE DE L’ORIGINE”

Derrida’s position draws on two particular experiences: the first is his participation in an international conference on francophonie in Louisiana, and the second is his experience living in Algeria as a 10-year old child in 1940. Concerning the first experience, Derrida explains that the conference included “all of these problems of identity, as it is obtusely put nowadays”²⁴ “” underlining the ambiguity of term “*franco-maghrébin*” (1996: 26) and raising it for discussion. Joking with Khatibi, Derrida says in his book *Le monolinguisme de l’autre* (1996) that, of all of the participants, he is the only true Franco-Maghrebian author, “the most Franco-Maghrebian of all” (Ibid., 25).²⁵ He unmasks such definitions as myths; the fugacity and difficulty of belonging to a particular culture; the fugacity of identity, belonging, hospitality, and citizenship are revealed. Moreover, he experiences the reality of being an Algerian Jew who lost his citizenship due to a decree by the Vichy regime. In order to demonstrate the problem, Derrida began writing a play with his friend, the Moroccan writer and philosopher Abdelkebir Khatibi, which showed that neither Khatibi nor the Caribbean writer Glissant but rather he himself is the Franco-Maghrebian, as we have already mentioned (Ibid.: 25 and ff.).

According to Derrida, the fundamental problem such a question acknowledges is that the binomial “franco-maghrebian” alludes to an “historical unity of France and the Maghreb, wherein no ‘and’ ever was” (Ibid., 26).²⁶ But the essay is, in the first instance, an effort to legitimate ironically his affirmation to be “the most Franco-Maghrebian of all,” as French-Jewish origins (fulfilling the criterion of blood), but born Algerian (fulfilling the criterion of soil) and French (fulfilling the criterion of citizenship) (Ibid., 30), he is indeed the “*plus franco-maghrébin de tous*.” In spite of this fact, Derrida questions just how these three criteria are insufficient to define the identity, the “belonging” of an individual and the “hospitality” of a culture. He speaks rather of the “identity trouble” (“*trouble de l’identité*”, a formulation that recalls Butler’s term “gender trouble”), since according to Derrida, identity, belonging, and hospitality cannot be rooted in blood, soil, or citizenship. He refuses a privileged relation between citizenship, language, cultural belonging, and identity because of his very arbitrary status, or according to our own formulation, because of the precarious quality of such a relation:

Citizenship, we know, does not define a general cultural, linguistic and historical participation. It does not cover all belonging. But it is not, however, a superficial and supra-structural attribution floating on the surface of experience (Ibid., 33).²⁷

Derrida’s observations are based on two crucial experiences that marked his whole life: first, the Vichy regime prohibited Jews from attending school. Later, in 1940, the same regime abolished his French nationality under the pretext of the Nazi “occupation” in Algeria (Ibid., 35) – but Algeria was never occupied by the Nazis, and this decision was therefore a pure “Franco-French operation” (“*opération franco-française*”, an arbitrary act of the French Algerian “*en absence de toute occupation allemande*” (Ibid., 36).

²⁴ “tous ces problèmes d’identité, comme on dits ibêtement aujourd’hui”

²⁵ “le plus franco-maghrébin de tous”

²⁶ “unité historique de la France et du Maghreb, [dont] le ‘et’ n’aura jamais été donné[...]

²⁷ “La citoyenneté, on le sait, ne définit pas une participation culturelle, linguistique ou historique en général. Elle ne recouvre pas toutes ces appartenances. Mais ce n’est pourtant pas un prédicat superficiel ou suprastructurel flottant à la surface de l’expérience.”

The fact that a government can arbitrarily abolish someone's nationality unmasks all current (and actual) discourses of the political caste, those in favor of integration based upon citizenship and mastery of the language – a fiction in light of the precarious status of citizenship, which cannot be the key to cultural identification or identity for a migrant in the country of arrival. Citizenship itself is revealed as a very fragile medium to serve as the source of a feeling of belonging. Additionally, the loss of nationality means a break from the sense of belonging to a language. This is indeed what prevents us from asking: Who is truly a “franco-maghrebin,” “Germano-Turk”?

We must also ask: Who possesses language (or a particular culture)? Who is the master of a particular language? This is a question that Derrida was forced to ask himself: Is language even in anyone's possession? “Can language be possessed by someone at all, and is it possessed, or does it possess? Can it be owned, as property?” (Ibid., 35-36).²⁸ Derrida denies the possibility of possessing a language, even in the case of the master of the language, saying that neither the native speaker, nor the national institutions, nor the networks of norms can possess the mother language because “the language it is not a natural good” (Ibid., 45).²⁹ Furthermore, it is an arbitrary act for one to consider “his language” “his own” (Ibid.):

Then, contrary to what tends to be the most prevalent belief, the master is nothing. And he owns nothing. Because, of course, the master does not own what he calls his language; because no matter what he wants or does, he cannot maintain relations of property or of a natural, national, congenital or ontological identity with language; because he cannot accredit or explain this appropriation except in the course of a non-natural process of political-phantasmal constructions; because the language is not his natural property, and for this reason, he can feign, historically and on the basis of the violation of cultural usurpation, that is, in a way that is always essentially colonial, the appropriation of language in order to impose it “as his” (Ibid., 45,).³⁰

This loss makes it very clear that neither language, nor any externally attributed identity, nor culture is essentially a superstructure that exists independently of the individual. On the contrary, language, identity and culture are developed through a direct interaction between the individual and manifestations of these elements in a performative emotional process, as we have previously asserted in another context, and they cannot be reduced to the “*prothèse de l'origine*” or to one specific cultural model. Inspired by the “non-possession of the language” (“*non-possession de la langue*”), Derrida designs a concept of language, culture, and politics that is not rooted in a particular culture or imposed from outside the individual; a culture that is “neither monolingual, nor bilingual, nor plurilingual”, (Ibid., 55),³¹ but “located in an unlocatable experience of language, of language in the broad sense of the word (Ibid., 55).³² The individual primarily has a connection with the practice of language, which penetrates his body and desire, and with the capacity of identification. However, at the same time, in the

²⁸ “Est-elle jamais en possession, la langue une possession possédante ou possédée? Possédée ou possédante en propre, comme un bien propre?”

²⁹ “la langue n'est pas son bien naturel”

³⁰ “Car contrairement à ce qu'on est le plus souvent tenté de croire, le maître n'est rien. Et il n'a rien en propre. Parce que le maître ne possède pas en propre, naturellement, ce qu'il appelle pourtant sa langue; parce que, quoi qu'il veuille ou fasse, il ne peut entretenir avec elle des rapports de propriété ou d'identité naturels nationaux, congénitaux, ontologiques; parce qu'il ne peut accrédi-ter et dire cette appropriation qu'au cours d'un procès non naturel de constructions politico-phantasmiques; parce que la langue n'est pas son bien naturel, par cela même il peut historiquement, à travers le viol d'une usurpation culturelle, c'est-à-dire toujours d'essence coloniale, feindre de se l'appropri-er pour l'imposer comme ‘la sienne’”.

³¹ “ni monolingue, ni bilingue, ni plurilingue”

³² “situé dans une expérience insitu-able de la langue, de la langue au sens large, donc, de ce mot”

cases of most immigrants or ethnic minorities, this relation remains “*unhomely*”(or “*unheimlich*” / “*uncanny*”) in the sense of the term by Bhabha (one that is used several times by Derrida (Ibid., 55, 66), as a place of privation. The result of this Derridian operation based on his own experience – as we already know, of having been treated as a Jew without really belonging to the Jewish tradition and community, but at the same time, of not truly being a Frenchman – is that the individual can belong to any place, and to any culture. This idea allows him to liberate belonging and hospitality, as well as that of citizenship, from the criteria of blood and soil. He also frees the individual from the aforementioned “*prothèse de l’origine*” and from the “*trouble de l’identité*.”

From here on, we can speak of a “performative” belonging, hospitality, and identity that are always dependent on language, on one’s own chosen language, which is inserted into the body and steered or driven by emotion. We understand “emotion” as the experience of hospitality that passes via the “*Blick*” or “gaze,” “glance”; via the “body”; and via “desire” – and not via citizenship or the “*prothèse de l’origine*.” This particular situation is that which, in another context, I have called the “*zero-situation of negotiation* (2006a: 41),” which Derrida expresses as follows, inspired by Khatibi’s term of tattoo:

The break with tradition, the uprooting, the inaccessibility of the histories, the amnesia, the indecipherability, etc., all of this unleashes a genealogical drive. The desire for language, the compulsive movement toward amnesia, the destructive love of the forbidden. That which I have already called the tattoo when it is revealed, right from the body, in all colors. The absence of a stable model of identification for an ego – in all its dimensions: linguistic, cultural, etc., – generate movements that, always on the verge of collapse, oscillate between three menacing possibilities (Derrida: 116).³³

The concept of “*cultural performance*” and the idea of a “*performative identity*” or of a “*performative diaspora*” do not imply alienation, rootlessness, or the impenetrability of history, amnesia, or the undecipherable. The concept of “performativity” and that of “*performative diaspora*” do not represent a threat to cultural patrimony or to the national state. Rather, they mean the reinvention of the Self: this is an indeterminate process in which the past performs both itself and the present through experience and emotion. It is a radical individual and democratic system spread by occidental politics, but devoured by the national state and by citizenship. It is a performativity of time, place, and of the individual, in which the “I” *invents and re-invents himself* incessantly because the individual cannot exist within a language, place, and time that are inaccessible to him (Derrida Ibid., 117):

[...] he is denied any language, and he has no other possibility – neither the Arab, nor the Berber, nor the Hebrew, nor any other language that have spoken his ancestors –, because this monolinguisism is a kind of aphasia [...] (Derrida, Ibid.).³⁴

³³ “La rupture avec la tradition, le déracinement, l’inaccessibilité des histoires, l’amnésie, l’indéchiffrabilité, etc., tout cela déclenche la pulsion généalogique. Le désir de l’idiome, le mouvement compulsif vers l’anamnèse, l’amour destructeur de l’interdit. Ce que j’appelais tout à l’heure le tatouage quand il en fait voir, à même le corps, de toutes les couleurs. L’absence d’un modèle d’identification stable pour un *ego*— dans toutes ses dimensions: linguistiques, culturelles, etc., —provoque des mouvements qui, se trouvant toujours *au bord* de l’effondrement, oscillent entre trois possibilités menaçantes.”

³⁴ “[...] qu’il est privé de toute langue, et qu’il n’a plus d’autre recours — ni l’arabe, ni le berbère, ni l’hébreu, ni aucune des langues qu’auraient parlées des ancêtres—, parce que ce monolinguisisme est en quelque sorte aphasique [...]”

The language that this diasporic individual practices is a “*pluri-language*,” which has its place “*in-between-the-languages*,” an “*on-the-way-language*” that is a nomadic process of being always in transition, that is not tied to a Logos or captive in a “*prothèse langagière*”; a language that it is always in a complex process of “*translatio*,” in motion, in perpetual performance, as Derrida expresses:

[...] it [monolingualism] is thrown into absolute translation, a translation without referential pole, without original language, without langue of departure. It only has languages of arrival, if you will, but languages that (what a singular affair) do not manage to occur, as they no longer know where they are speaking from, what they are speaking from, or which way they are going. They are languages without itinerary and, particularly, without a highway, and I do not know what information they impart (Derrida, *ibid.*, 117).³⁵

2.2 LÉVINAS – DERRIDA: POLITIC AND THE RIGHT OF “HOSPITALITY”

The term “hospitality,” the etymology of which is “*philoxenia*,” “love for the foreigners,” has a long etymological, conceptual, and cultural tradition reaching back into Antiquity, and has always played a fundamental role in religion, ethics, and philosophy.³⁶ But from the second part of the twentieth-century and in Lévinas’ and Derrida’s philosophy, in the context of the mass migrations that flood Europe, the term “hospitality” has become highly political, in a very particular sense. The magnitude of the philosophical proposition of both philosophers and their application to the reality of migrations are immeasurable as a proposition for coexistence in a reciprocal respect, and on the basis of the right to inhabit a territory and to have the same access to resources necessary for development and improvement. In the proposition of “hospitality,” both philosophers see the consideration of “recognition” as an instrument for the solution of conflicts. Conflicts or peaceful co-habitation will depend of the acceptance or refusal of “difference” and of “recognition.” This concerns the fundamental question about the status that we give the “Other” and the place that we give ourselves in front the “Other.” Therefore we can consider the term “hospitality” to be a *dispositive* if we understand this last concept, in the light of Foucault, as the totality of specific decisions that are concretized by different concepts in which the discourses, social actions, and interactions develop and find their representation in the registration, description, organization, and pragmatics of relevant aspects of life and society. The term “hospitality” implicates and demands diverse types of juridical, administrative, and political decisions within and on the part of institutions, discourses, regulations, and rules of scientific, philosophical, and political utterances (Foucault 1978/2000). The networks that constitute this dispositive can be considered a “Sociology of Knowledge” (“*Wissenssoziologie*”) or of the “theory of the social systems” (Luhmann). However, we wish to consider the category of “dispositive” in the context of Deleuze’s system of thought, with its specific sense of “dynamic” and “event” (Deleuze 1991), but also as a “micro-political” order, as an instrument of power rooted in the idea that the different elements that build “hospitality” as a dispositive produce the discourses and the practices of quotidian life, and that these, in turn, build new social facts; designing, modeling, reconfiguring, and renewing our thinking, our feelings, our will, and our actions.

³⁵ “[...] il [le monolinguisme] est jeté dans la traduction absolue, une traduction sans pôle de référence, sans langue originaire, sans langue de départ. Il n’y a pour lui que des langues d’arrivée, si tu veux, mais des langues qui, singulière aventure, n’arrivent pas à s’arriver, dès lors qu’elles ne savent plus d’où elles parlent, à partir de quoi elles parlent, et quel est le sens de leur trajet. Des langues sans itinéraire et surtout sans autoroute de je ne sais quelle information.”

³⁶ For example in the *New Testament* 5 (Rm 12.13, 29, 1Tm 3.2, 5.19, Hé 13.2, 1P 4.9, 3Jn 5s; 1S 25.41; Lc 7.44; Jn 13.4ss). The hospitality is here a saintly sign, a valid test for the Last Judgment (Mt 25.23).

Lévinas and Derrida give the category of “hospitality” a quality of an “*unconditional imperative*” in the sense that the one who arrives is placed at the center of the system, where “hospitality” is considered inherent to the absolute condition of being human, and as a concept that has nothing to do with geopolitical frontiers or with the national States, but rather with the aforementioned term of “micro-republics” (Gómez Peña 1996). The concept of “hospitality” in the Derridian and Lévinasian philosophical world consists in the reception of “the Other-Arriving” (“*l’autre-arrivant*”) without restriction and without political, social, juridical, cultural, or temporal limits.

They express the absolute of the imperative through different denotations such as “friendship,” “warmth” (“*amitié*,” “*bonté*,” “*bienveillance*”) and their *oppositum*, *xenophobia*, the refusal of migrants who crash against the supposed receiving arrival culture, which receives them with aggression, fear, animosity, alienation, hostility, and exclusion that extends to the use of violence.

The term “hospitality” in the context of the Derridian’s and Lévinasian’s world exceeds and transcends the narrow and conditioning concept of “hospitality” of Kantian origin (we will briefly return to Kant later).

In the following section we want to try to operationalize and to translate the radical nature of this philosophy of the “hospitality” that apparently refuses any kind of structure and rules in a *social interaction as an alternative to the “Realpolitik” of the European migration*. As a consequence of the “unconditional hospitality” (“*hospitalité inconditionnelle*”) that manifests itself in the formula: “It is not I – it is the Other who can say yes” (Lévinas *Totalité et Infini*, 66),³⁷ it does not entail the complete refusal of the prevailing juridical, social, or cultural system of the country of arrival, but rather “the incontestable right to have rights” (Ibid) to be there.³⁸

To talk about “hospitality” and to seek a concrete application of this concept in praxis only makes sense if we use it in a pragmatic-semantic way between the relationship of the one who arrives and the one who receives. The goal is not to eliminate the dichotomy and tension, but to resist the dichotomy: “foreign” / “foreignness” / “strangeness” vs. “hospitality.” The unconditional nature of “hospitality” cannot avoid this dichotomy, but the point is to establish *how we can negotiate this oscillation and tension between both poles*. To receive and to give “hospitality” requires and supposes *the reciprocal and shared obligations and responsibilities of both parts, that of the arriver and the receiver*. For this reason, “hospitality” being a measure of the good in all of us, it is not gratuitous; if it were, nobody would have to talk about it. In this sense I understand “hospitality” not only as a metaphysic of the absolute pure, but as a *hybrid construction, a way of operating and behaving*.

Derrida himself undertakes this in order to make Lévinasian “hospitality” operable and practicable, insofar as he analyses in his text *Adieu à Emmanuel Lévinas* “the relation between an *ethic* of the ‘hospitality’ (an *ethic as* hospitality) and the *right* or a *politique* of hospitality” (Derrida 1997: 45)³⁹ in the tradition of Kant’s “Perpetual Peace” (1796/1983) and seeks to introduce a concept of universal hospitality understood as a “cosmopolitan right” (“*droit cosmopolitique*”; Ibid.: 45).

Derrida tries to “find a right and a politics, beyond the familial context in a social, national, governmental, or national State space” (Ibid., 45)⁴⁰ (as Ben Jelloun also demands) and asks whether an “assured passage [...] between a first ethic or a philosophy of hospitality on one

³⁷ “Ce n’est pas moi – c’est l’Autre qui peut dire oui”

³⁸ “le droit incontestable d’avoir des droits”

³⁹ “les rapports entre une *éthique* de l’hospitalité (une éthique comme hospitalité) et un *droit* ou une *politique* de l’hospitalité”

⁴⁰ “fonder un droit et une politique, au-delà de la demeure familiale, dans un espace social, national, étatique ou état-national”

hand, and a right or a politics of hospitality on the other hand” are possible (Ibid., 45);⁴¹ to open the door, to reach out one’s hand, to receive must become, according to Derrida, “a way of speaking” (“*une façon de parler*”; ibid.).

Lévinas / Derrida call the act of receiving “the reason itself of receiving” (“*la raison à même de recevoir*”) or “the hospitality of the reason” (“*l’hospitalité de la raison*”); and they consider these to belong to the “reason,” or to be imperative, of hospitality, as the “law of hospitality”; and “law” is, for him, indivisible from “justice,” so that to say “hospitality” is to say “justice,” and “the first question in the intra-human is a question of justice” and “justice demands right”, as Derrida explains (Ibid., 65; 67).⁴²

For my argumentation about “hospitality” in an imperative sense and as a dispositive, I draw support from Derrida’s affirmation, commenting on Lévinas, relating to the implacability of the “law of hospitality” (“*loi de l’hospitalité*”; Ibid., 79) that states that the host is not, in reality, the owner of his house, but

[...] in reality a host received in his own house. He receives the hospitality that he offers in his own house, he gets it from his own house – which ultimately does not belong to him (Ibid., 79).⁴³

The very common attitude of receiving cultures toward arriving cultures is to consider their culture as a *property* in which those who arrive, or foreigners, are only tolerated; this affirmation of one’s own culture as patrimony is, for me, one of the main causes of a large number of “socio-(ethnic) conflicts,” which are rather social conflicts, including the refusal to recognize the arriving “Other” and to accept that the arriver has the same right to live in the country as that enjoyed by those who were born there. Here, Derrida introduces a new idea of the distribution of the right to belong by doing away with the imperative and the supremacy of the *Heimat* as the property of a receiving culture, thus condemning the “arriving Other” to perpetually overcome his status as an eternal “Other,” because “to receive is always the reception of the other” (Ibid., 53)⁴⁴ and because “hospitality precedes property”; (Ibid., 85),⁴⁵ and thus, the arriver retains his “dignity as a citizen” (“*dignité du citoyen*”; Lévinas 1984: 338; Derrida 1997: 65). Derrida demands that this hospitality without owner should be part of law and of politics as much as it is a part of ethics: “this [hospitality] is ethics itself, the whole and the principle of ethics” (Ibid., 94),⁴⁶ also, because hospitality is always an act of justice, one must “accept those who come to establish themselves in one’s home, as foreign as they may be” “Lévinas 1988: 113-114).⁴⁷ In the lévinasien-derridian world, that means

[...] the guarantee of a popular and public engagement, a *res publica* policy cannot be reduced to tolerance, unless this tolerance requires itself the affirmation of love without measure (Derrida 1997: 133).⁴⁸

On the other hand we have to consider that often the arriving cultures tend to expect that the country of arrival will unconditionally accept their different traditions.

⁴¹ “passage assuré [...] entre une éthique ou une philosophie première de l’hospitalité, d’une part, et un droit ou une politique de l’hospitalité d’autre part”

⁴² “la première question dans l’inter-humain est question de justice”; “*la justice exige le droit*.”

⁴³ “[...] en vérité un hôte reçu dans sa propre maison. Il reçoit l’hospitalité qu’il offre dans sa propre maison, il la reçoit de sa propre maison – qui au fond ne lui appartient pas”

⁴⁴ “l’accueil est toujours l’accueil de l’autre”

⁴⁵ “l’hospitalité précède la propriété”

⁴⁶ “elle [l’hospitalité] est l’éthique même, le tout et le principe de l’éthique”

⁴⁷ “accepte[r] ceux qui viennent s’installer chez lui, tout étrangers qu’ils sont”

⁴⁸ “[...] le gage d’un engagement populaire et public, une *res publica* politique qui ne se réduit pas à une ‘tolérance’, à moins que cette tolérance n’exige d’elle-même l’affirmation d’un ‘amour’ sans mesure.”

The imperative character of hospitality, however, leads Lévinas and Derrida to consider hospitality to be a “particular responsibility” (“*une responsabilité singulière*”) and a “human universality” (“*une universalité humaine*”) located “beyond the national States and their politics” (Derrida 1997: 133);⁴⁹ we have already examined these aspects. Furthermore, the concept of “hospitality” for Lévinas is closely connected to the concept of “peace,” a concept that – as he specifies – “[...] exceeds purely political thinking (“[...] *débord*e [...] *la pensée purement politique*”), but not that which is political, or the political, as Derrida adds (“*non le politique*”; Derrida 1997: 145), where the term “the political” is a concept

[...] where the thinking surpasses the thinking in that it would like remain pure politics. “A purely political thinking” would be inadequate here. To think, the concept of peace, should not leave the political order, but the order of what Lévinas calls the “purely political.” (Derrida 1997: 146)⁵⁰

The “purely political” (“*le purement politique*”) – as said by Derrida in his interpretation of Lévinas – consists in “inventing the political”; it entails a political invention” (Derrida 1997: 146),⁵¹ with the aim of creating a space for the realization of “hospitality” that is located beyond “political thinking” (“*de la pensée politique*,” of the “*Realpolitik*”, understood as a system of frontiers and rules that make “hospitality” impossible, and thus reception, and ultimately justice and peace.

Kant’s position in his “Third definitive article for a perpetual peace” begins with a motto that is extremely important in our context. He writes that “the rights of the world citizen must be restricted by the general conditions of hospitality” (Ibid. 213),⁵² which Derrida interprets and translates as “cosmopolitan rights must hold to the conditions of universal hospitality” (Derrida 1997: 155).⁵³ To this formulation by Kant, which is clarified by Derrida’s interpretation, comes another, in which Kant limits the hospitality of the “Stranger” (“*Fremdling*”; Kant: 213) who must “peacefully occupies his place (“*sich friedlich verhält*”; Kant *ibid.*), which could coincide with our conception of the “shared obligations and responsibilities,” but differs when he asserts that guests ought not to enjoy a “*Gastrecht*” (“right to hospitality”; Kant *ibid.*), but only a “*Besuchsrecht*” (“right to visit”; Kant *ibid.*), and that

“the right of hospitality, i.e., the privilege of foreign arrivals, no further than to conditions of the possibility of seeking to communicate with the prior inhabitants” (Kant: 214)⁵⁴

But at the same time, Kant refers to a concept through which he finds it possible to regulate hospitality between the arrivers and the original inhabitants on a legal basis.

Finally we have not sought to transform the untranslatable ethical law of hospitality into a law of “political thinking” (“*Realpolitik*”), but to attempt a translation that causes the ethical law of hospitality to traverse or cross the law of the “political.”

⁴⁹ “au-delà des États-Nations et de leurs politiques”

⁵⁰ “[...] dont la pensée débordait la pensée en tant que celle-ci voudrait rester purement politique. ‘Une pensée purement politique’ lui serait ici inadéquate. Pour le penser, ce concept de la paix, il ne faudrait pas quitter l’ordre du politique, mais l’ordre de ce que Lévinas appelle le ‘purement politique.’”

⁵¹ “inventer le politique, il s’agit d’une invention politique”

⁵² “Das Weltbürgerrecht soll auf Bedingungen der allgemeinen Hospitalität eingeschränkt sein”

⁵³ “le droit cosmopolitique doit se restreindre aux conditions de l’hospitalité universelle”

⁵⁴ “[...] welches Hospitalitätsrecht aber, d.i. Befugnis der fremden Ankömmlinge, sich nicht weiter erstreckt, als auf die Bedingungen der Möglichkeit, einen Verkehr mit den alten Einwohnern zu versuchen.”

3. “PERFORMATIVE-HYBRID IDENTITY” / “TRANS-IDENTITY”

In the context of postmodern and post-structural theory, I start from a type of multi- or pluri-identity that we call “trans-identity” or “transversal identity” using the term of transversality from Deleuze,⁵⁵ an identity that must always be renegotiated because it is located at the interface of cultures in contact with one another, in a trans-territorial cartography (Bhabha 1994; A. de Toro 1999, 2003, 2009/2011) that includes constant deterritorializations and reterritorializations in order to make the new place habitable and *cohabitable*. We also think, as a result of observations, of identity as “différance,” as “slide” (“*glissement*”), as performance and staging, as a hybrid phenomenon that imposes itself through the dynamic of life in a given anthropological situation.

In the following pages, I would like to contextualize my concept of a “performative-hybrid-Identity” (A. de Toro 2009/2011, and vid. Bibliography) in the frame of the international, and particularly German, discussion about identity.

I will not enter into the superfluous and unproductive discussion of whether the term “identity” should be avoided because it has become obsolete as a bourgeois construction of traditional civic societies;⁵⁶ whether this term is archaic or a product of hegemonic ideology; whether it is a monolithic and ontological, positivist and teleological construction, because the sciences of psychology, sociology, and philosophy have long since demonstrated that never in human history has something like a “pure identity” or homogeneous construction of identity existed, nor do individuals have just one identity (the contrary is right). Moreover, if we speak of hybrid identity or transidentity, we always work from a concept or idea of identity. The “hybrid” and the “trans” are only applicable in relation to some concept of identity that will be replaced by the new one. Every being with a subjective consciousness has an identity, and the interesting question is how we, as individuals, deal with living in a national state containing large communities of more than one cultural identity with loyalties and references, and what space we allow the different Other in the arrival society in the context of the discourse of “national culture” and heritage. Can we, in Europe, continue to speak of “our Nation,” “our Culture,” despite the presence of millions and millions of immigrants or citizens that were not born in, and do not even have a passport from, the country of arrival? We can hardly do so, as the current very critical political debate, at least in Germany, shows.

In several publications about hybridity in the sense of *différance*, I defined and understood this connection and strategy as the negotiation of difference, as a tensional oscillation in a

⁵⁵ See Wolfgang Welsch here in the bibliography, and his theory of transversality from 1987 and particularly 1996, as well as his fundamental concepts of Identity/Subjectivity, like “*Vielheit*”/“Multiplicity” (1991: 357 following Nietzsche; which term was previously developed in philosophy by Deleuze/Guattari (1972/1973 and 1980), or like “*Differenzierungs-, Begrenzungs- und Übergangsvermögen*” / “The capacity of differentiation, of delimitation and of corings” (Ibid., 360); or like “*Identität in Übergängen; transversale Identitätskonstruktionen*” / “Identity in passages; transversal identity constructions” (1990/⁵1998:); A. de Toro, see fn. 22, bibliography and <http://www.uni-leipzig.de/~detoro/>.

⁵⁶ For example Helga Bilen 1998: 29: “I tend to avoid the term ‘Identity’, because it evokes again and again the uniform idea, the civic idea of the *bürgerlich* identity in the pejorative sense of “bourgeois,” which has been inserted into all our heads. But in order to understand, it is often necessary” (“Ich neige dazu, den Begriff Identität möglichst zu meiden, weil das Einheitsdenken, die bürgerliche Identitätsvorstellung, die in unser aller Köpfen steckt, dadurch immer wieder evoziert wird. Aber zur Verständigung ist er oft nötig”; see Vaassen (1996:200ff.) who conceives of identity as negotiation (“Aushandeln”). On the contrary, I follow the very productive work of Keupp, particularly from the late 1980s onwards; see bibliography and Keupp’s et alii (1999/⁴2008) introduction about the stand of research in the field of identity; see Welsch (1991,1999, 1990/⁵1998) and see A. de Toro (2002; 2004; 2004a; 2009/²2011; 2011b; 2006-2006b; 2007).

space of conflicts and frictions.⁵⁷ Since the 1990s, I have insisted on and developed a concept of “performative identity,” based on concepts of hybridity, which is now a *locus communis* for many other scholars, for example Junge:

To the critical reservations belong current considerations that work from the assumption that precisely the assumed idea of the unity of the system of a personality under postmodern conditions can no longer be relied upon. At the latest, with the socio-theoretical and socio-philosophical arguments of Lyotard about the End of the Meta-Narrations, there has been a progressive tendency in the social theory no longer to work from the fictive assumption of a uniform/homogeneous personality, but rather to understand the Self as a multiple Self, as an amalgam of a multifaceted Fragmented-Self [...] and thus to displace the concept of an uniform personality. (Junge 2010: 117-118)⁵⁸

Or in Vaassen’s (1996) enlightening work in which he also developed a concept of transversal and performative identity:

In the way in which a decentralized understanding of a person can become, for us, thinkable and ‘lived,’ a new concept of freedom and ethics can open [...] The idea of an ‘inner nucleus,’ an instance that governs and controls the experience and behavior of a person, has itself epistemologically crystalized as untenable and as ever less socially ‘lived,’ for as the possibility of the delimitation is performed, the limits of the own person volatilize. The origins of actions can no longer be localized in preconceived structures of persons, but as narrative sequences that encompass the person (in their significance). [...] The topic of identity in this context of references with terms like person, I, Self etc. [...] may have important consequences for Psychology and Social Sciences in general. (Vaassen 1996: 214)⁵⁹

Particularly the contributions by Keupp (1999/⁴2008), who speaks of a “patchwork Identity” in “late Modernity” (I should say in “Post-Modernity”; see Keupp 1988: 146) as well Gross’ (1985: 78-81) theory of the “tinker mentality” (“*Bastel-Mentalität*”; also quoted by Keupp 1988: 144; vid) and the “paradigm of the rag-rug” (“*Paradigma des Fleckerlteppichs*” (Ibid.,

⁵⁷ See here similarly Reckwitz (2006: 88): “This Hybridity does not construct itself in a passive process of tradition, but in an active process of selective appropriation” (“Diese Hybridität konstituiert sich nicht in einem passiven Prozess der Tradierung, sondern in einem aktiven Prozess der selektiven Aneignung”; and also A. de Toro’s concept of “hybride Identität” (2002: 21) and Welsch (1987).

⁵⁸ “Zu den kritischen Vorbehalten gehören in der Gegenwart Überlegungen, die davon ausgehen, dass gerade die vorausgesetzte Idee der Einheit eines Persönlichkeitssystems unter postmodernen Bedingungen nicht mehr gewährleistet werden kann [...]. Spätestens seit der sozialtheoretischen und sozialphilosophischen Erörterungen von Lyotard über das Ende der Meta-Erzählungen hat sich auch in der Sozialisationstheorie schrittweise eine Tendenz entfaltet, nicht mehr von der fiktiven Unterstellung einer einheitlichen Persönlichkeit auszugehen, sondern vielmehr das Selbst als ein multiples Selbst, als ein Amalgam vielfältiger Teil-Selbst [...] zu verstehen und insofern das Konzept der Einheitlichkeit einer Persönlichkeit beiseite zu legen.” (Junge 2010: 117-118)

⁵⁹ Insofar as a “decentralized” understanding of the person and identity becomes thinkable and liveable, new concepts of freedom and ethics emerge [...]: “Die Vorstellung eines ‘inneren Kerns,’ einer Instanz, die Erleben und Verhalten der Person steuert und kontrolliert, hat sich als epistemologisch unhaltbar und sozial immer weniger ‘lebbar’ erwiesen, denn in dem Maße, wie sich eine Entgrenzung der Möglichkeiten vollzieht, verflüchtigen sich die Grenzen der eigenen Person. Ursprünge von Handlungen lassen sich nun nicht mehr in entitativ verstandenen Strukturen von Personen lokalisieren, sondern in narrativen Sequenzen, die die Person (in ihrer Bedeutung) mitumgreifen. [...] Die Thematik der Identität in ihrem Verweisungszusammenhang mit Begriffen wie Person, Ich, Selbst usw. [...] [kann] maßgebliche Konsequenzen für die Psychologie und auch für die Sozialwissenschaften allgemein [haben]. (Vaassen 1996: 214)

80);⁶⁰ also quoted by Keupp (1988: 145) or Vaassen's (1996: 211) "Patish-Personality" ("*Pastische-Persönlichkeit*") are fundamental to the concept of identity in my approach and coincide with my own positions. Keupp defines his term of the "tinker identity" in a way similar to ours following Lacan and Derrida, as a "decentralized identity" ("*dezentralisierte Identität*") (Keupp 1988: 147); Vaassen (Ibid., 214); A. de Toro 1999ff).

With the end, or change of the status, of Western logocentrism, and with it, of binarisms; with the end, or change of the status, of the meta-discourses or of messianic claims of truth; with the awareness of the Lacanian definition of the Self through a Third-Self-Instance, and that every enunciation is an "*Entäußerung*," a "relinquishing," and that every discourse is a part of a paralogical power structure (Lyotard, Foucault) and that all of this leads to a radical pluralism, comes the logical consequence that a conception of a homogenous Self and of an auto-defining identity is impossible to formulate and diffuse. Identities are in post-structural-deconstructionist, post-colonial and post-modern theory, a "construction" and a highly differentiated and complex system of relations (see Reckwitz 2001: 31 and 32; A. de Toro 1999a and ff.). In spite of monolithic, populist and demagogical political discourses on "nation," "identity," and "culture identity," "history," or "autobiography," like "identity," are also and always constructions that are submitted to the imperative of the temporal situation and of performativity.

In this context, the notions of nomadism and of the processing of identity construction, as for example Reckwitz understands them, are also important:

When identities are no longer understood as a dispositions structure, but as an interpretation of the Self, then for post-modernist authors it follows that the interpretation of the Self, and thus the assignment of specific meanings vis-à-vis the Self, no longer build a fixed structure, but represent a temporal problem, in that the meanings can continually slide and transform themselves. (Reckwitz 2001: 33)⁶¹

Identity can never be, and has never been, something static, and in our age of post-modernity and globalization, it represents a radical dynamic construction. According to Reckwitz and, as we have already illustrated in other essays, according to Lacan, Derrida, and the Maghrebian authors, the dynamic of identity constructions consists in the fact that, on one hand, they are built by self-assignments on the part of the Self, and on the other hand, by external assignments coming from other Selves. This basic role of performativity, upon which we have always insisted in past years (A. de Toro 1999a and ff.), has been now underlined in different contexts, particularly as an instrument against the binary and dichotomy construction of society and culture, in line with the formulations of, for example, Krämer/Stahlhut (2001: 55–56), performativity in the sense of "a particular form of building a situation [...] in a medium of any kind of symbolic acts" (see 45–47), as well Fischer-Lichte (2005: 236; 2004: 32) who understand performativity in the sense of "the construction of cultural acts" or in the sense of "institutionally and social relations". The destabilization and overcoming of binary logic as a consequence of the Derridian deconstruction of logocentrism, of the Lyotardian collapsed meta-discourses, and of the Lacanian anthropological decentering of the Self are that which

⁶⁰ The term I use is originally from Thomas Luckmann (1980). Gross uses the terms "tinker mentality" ("*Bastel-Mentalität*") and the "rag-rug" ("*Fleckerlteppich*") in his highly ideological, ranting article – crowded with clichés and half-digested theories of Post-Modernism – in a negative way. I see in those terms an adequate and an expression of a highly developed society in terms of freedom and self-determination. Both terms can be seen as equivalent with the term of "paralogy" of Lyotard (1983).

⁶¹ "Wenn Identität nicht mehr als Dispositionsstruktur, sondern als Sinnverstehen des Selbst begriffen wird, dann ist für die postmodernistischen Autoren die Annahme konsequent, daß dieses Sinnverstehen, das heißt die Zuordnung bestimmter Bedeutungen gegenüber dem Selbst, keine fixe Struktur bildet, sondern einen zeitlichen Prozeß darstellt, in dem sich die Bedeutungen beständig verschieben und wandeln können." (Reckwitz 2001: 33)

we draw from the concept of “performative hybrid identity,” and this is where innovation and evolution is to be expected.

If identity has always been basically and fundamentally built by different factors through self- and external-assignments, identity is, in a globalized world and in the context of diasporic formations, in a very particular and determined way, the result of very different, often contradictory kinds of individual and collective experiences, of origin and new cultural experiences that are determined by the “situation-imperative” or “situation-dispositive” that corresponds to Nünning’s statement:

Mutual consent seems, however, to reign concerning the circumstance that identity, unlike terms like “Self”, “Personality”, or “Character”, already implies a relational term (something that can only be identical to something else); that which is named is located within a network of relations in which the respective constituting relations depending on the different facets of identities are generated: as transtemporal continuities, as transsituative consistencies, and as compensation for inner and external perspectives. Thus, it follows that identity can neither be understood as a tangible static dimension [...] nor as simply given, but as the process of construction and revision of self-perception implemented by the individual subject at a point of intersection of social interaction and individual biographies, which must be accomplished over and over again. (Nünning 2008: 306-307).⁶²

And in this process –as we have already developed in other contexts (A. de Toro 1990ff.) – the hybridization of identity may be more or less intentional, more or less conscious; but it happens, and happens permanently and independently, whether the individual wishes it to do so or not. Wieviorka underlines the constructivity of identity as that

[...] new identities are constructed from migration, often at the price of a considerable distance, identities that, still extant, revive the elements borrowed from tradition – they “tinker” in the famous words of Claude Lévi-Strauss – but above all give birth to new faces of alterity (Wieviorka 2001: 116)⁶³

and what she calls the “*seconde figure de l’immigré*” (ibid: 118). Saurwein (1999: 9-27, here particularly 9) also shares the same position and refers explicitly to that which, once again, I denominate the “situation-imperative” or “situation-dispositive” when he affirms that:

⁶² “Einigkeit scheint jedoch bezüglich des Umstandes zu herrschen, dass Identität anders als Begriffe wie „Selbst“, „Persönlichkeit“ oder „Charakter“, als relationaler Begriff (etwas kann nur identisch mit etwas sein) bereits impliziert, dass sich das Bezeichnete innerhalb eines Beziehungsgeflechtes situiert, wobei die hierfür konstitutiven Relationen je unterschiedliche Facetten von Identität aufscheinen lassen: als überzeitliche Kontinuität, als übersituative Konsistenz, wie auch als Abgleich von Innen- und Außenperspektive. Hieraus folgt, dass Identität weder als dinghafte, statische Größe [...] noch als einfach gegeben zu verstehen ist, sondern als der von der oder dem Einzelnen immer wieder zu bewerkstellende, am Schnittpunkt von gesellschaftlicher Interaktion und individueller Biographie stattfindende Prozess der Konstruktion und Revision von Selbstbildern” (Nünning 2008: 306-307).

⁶³ “[...] se forment des identités nouvelles à partir de l’migration, au prix souvent d’un éloignement considérable, identités qui, là encore, reprennent des éléments empruntés à la tradition – «bricolent», selon le mot célèbre de Claude Lévi-Strauss – mais donnent surtout naissance à de nouvelles figures de l’altérité.” (Wieviorka 2001: 116)

Collective identities can only be generated and contested through communication. Questions of identification [...] are questions of a prevalent social “definition of the situation.” [...] The term of the collective identity refers to the prevailing *Idea* that should prevail in a distinguishable communicative and action context that connects the different members [of a community/diaspora] through specific solidarity expectations. (Saurwein 1999: 9)⁶⁴

The aspect of solidarity as result of the constitution of the “situation-imperative” or “situation-dispositive” (and not of a particularly ethnos, but of a social group) as we have already worked it out:

The social milieu, the environment, and the neighborhood and its inhabitants build, with their similar and identical destinies and life situations, the ‘situation-imperative’ or ‘situation-dispositive.’ (A. de Toro 2013: 93-94)⁶⁵

At this point, we cannot enter into the systematic description of the multiple socio-psychological effects and consequences of the theory of the “*differance*” of Derrida or of the “hospitality” of Derrida/Lévinas in relation to the theory of Keupp's “*Patchwork-Identity*” and my concept of “hybrid-performative-identity” (A. de Toro 2008), but the short panoramic view that I offered here should be sufficient, I hope, to follow what I mean by the term of “performative-hybrid-identity” and its central role in the current cultural-social-political debate and related to the new diasporas.

4. “COSMO-HUMANISM” AND THE “PERFORMATIVE DIASPORIZATION”

We want to understand “*cosmopolitism*” as part of “*cosmo-humanism*.” It is the passage from one cultural location to another. This can be voluntary or a forced decision; of course, it can also be an intellectual attitude. “Cosmopolitism” can also be a mental and/or territorial relocation. By “cosmopolitism,” we particularly mean the *movement*, the intellectual or geographical *permanent relocation* of an individual or group.

“*Cosmo-humanism*” generates the potential to find alternatives to nationalism, to monolithic and essentialist constructions of nation, culture, and identity. One of these alternatives is to think of the world as an intellectual, psychological, and emotionally cosmopolitan and cosmo-humanist cartography, and to try to develop a sort of theory regarding it. Initially, this purpose may seem astonishing, as theory can serve to delimit the cosmopolitan and cosmo-humanist practices; we are searching for ones that, however, imply an open-world-situation. For this we want to understand “*cosmopolitism*” and “*cosmo-humanism*” as a “beyond,” as a process of transcendence of the local, as travel, as a perpetual passage of “*aves de paso*” (“bird of passage”) after Ortíz. To think of cosmopolitism and “*cosmo-humanism*” as a “beyond” means more than considering them in mere terms of a change of place. They can, of course, be both, as particularly Kant in his *Zum ewigen Frieden. Ein philosophischer Entwurf* / *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch* (1795) asserted. The term “*cosmo-humanism*,” if it is to make any sense, must remain indeterminate.

⁶⁴ “Kollektive Identitäten können nur kommunikativ erzeugt oder bestritten werden. Identitätsfragen betreffen [...] die Frage nach der sozial geltenden »Definition der Situation.« [...] Der Begriff der kollektiven Identität bezieht sich auf *Vorstellungen* vom Gelten und Geltensollen eines Kommunikations- und Handlungszusammenhangs, der ihre Teilnehmer durch spezifische Solidaritätserwartungen verbindet.” (Saurwein 1999: 9)

⁶⁵ “Das soziale Milieu, die Umgebung und das Viertel und dessen Bewohner bilden mit ihren ähnlichen oder gleichen Schicksalen und Lebenssituationen das determinierende Situations-Dispositiv.” (A. de Toro 2013: 93-949).

“*Cosmopolitism*” and “*cosmo-humanism*” must be thought of as a permanent transition, as life at the interfaces, as an individual modus in the context of universal norms. Cosmo-humanism is the availability of hospitality, the willingness to receive someone.

In this context we want to understand the “new/hybrid diasporas” as the key constituents of cosmopolitism in the sense of “*cosmo-humanism*,” as a result of the epistemology of hybridity, and as a historical construction wherein the traces of individual and collective experiences are registered in the memory and in the body. The “new/hybrid diasporas” and their performance, the diasporization, also constitute the construction of a net or web of cultural identities and individual and collective experiences. The “new/hybrid diasporas” is a new form of plural cultural reference in which communities exhibit cultural hybridity as an experience of difference, which can be specified as what I call “performative diasporas.” This means nomadic or rhizomatic diasporas that have always been in motion, and that make up the core of the notion of “*cosmo-humanism*.”

Borges and Khatibi represent two examples of “*cosmopolitism*” and “*cosmo-humanism*.” With the exception of his seven-year stay in Europe, Borges lived nearly his whole life in Buenos Aires. However, he became rather cosmopolitan and a great cosmo-humanist at the very moment at which his father introduced him to timeless texts in literature and philosophy, which were written mostly in English, as well as the Encyclopaedia, his “peered genre.” Borges navigated many diverse worlds of systems of thinking, of literature, of culture and sciences – his universal erudition made him a cosmopolite and cosmo-humanist. It developed his way of placing himself in the world, and of reading and writing about the world. His life was a “worlding-life,” like that of Khatibi, another cosmopolite and cosmo-humanist within the interface of deconstruction, as well as of the Occidental and Oriental logoi (Khatibi 1983: 48–49). Both authors and philosophers share the concepts and experiences of interfaces and plurality. Similarly to Borges, he began in the 1920s and 1930s with a monumental transformation, translation, recodification and reinvention of the European, Latin American and Argentinean cultures and literatures in order to establish his own cultural location and to find his own voice. Khatibi, too, carried out a triple act of “*translatio*” on the base of the axis of a “*double critique*.” As Borges translated and recodified his and others’ cultures, and as Heidegger translated the Greeks into the thinking of his own epoch, so did Khatibi introduce a dialogue between Islamic culture and thinking and the Occident, particularly on the epistemology of Hybridity. Both consider the construction of the individual and of history as a plurivalent “*translatio*.” Furthermore, they see culture and literature as the result of an infinite trace of an infinite number of authors, and so do not consider them the property of a nation or an author, but rather of the world. Those planetary authors like Borges, Calvino and Rushdie always place themselves at the interfaces of two or more cultures, those sites that, for Khatibi, represent (the “impersonality”) “*l’impersonnalité*” and at the same time (“the Utopia of the writer”) “*l’utopie de l’écrivain. Son exil*” (Khatibi 1993: 81).

Khatibi thought, worked, and wrote in the fissure “of a double principle: that of the respect of the idiomatic variety and that of a plural universality placed on two poles” (cf. 1993: 82; Khatibi 1971/21979: 210).⁶⁶ According to him, this universalism has to do with “an idea that it will take the universe of beings and of things as a palimpsest without parchment, never written – and smudged by no one – *indifferent where it emerges* (ibid. 210).⁶⁷ Khatibi has, like Borges, this capacity, of which Roland Barthes speaks in his “Postface” in reference to Khatibi’s *La mémoire tatouée*, to de-center the culture: “it allows us to apprehend the other starting from ourself” (Ibid., 215).⁶⁸

⁶⁶ “d’un double principe: celui du respect de la variété idiomatique et celui d’une universalité plurielle, à plusieurs pôles” (cf. 1993: 82; Khatibi 1971/21979: 210).

⁶⁷ “une pensée qui prendrait l’univers des êtres et des choses pour un palimpseste sans parchemin, jamais écrit – et par personne effacé – d’où qu’elle vienne” (Ibid., 210).

⁶⁸ “nous permettre de saisir l’autre à partir de notre même” (Ibid., 215).

Writing about Joyce's *Finnegan's Wake* and following Borges' essay "El Ulises de Joyce" (*Inquisitions*, (1923/21994): 23-28), Khatibi (*Penser le Maghreb* 1993: 83) considered culture and literature a "beautiful literary work of a laboratory for the literary creation".⁶⁹ His concept of "*laboratoire*" corresponded to that of Derrida's "*trace*" and "*dissemination*," as well as to Borges' concept of "*criollismo*": "a creolism that speaks about the world and the I, about God and the Death. Who can help me to find it" (1926/1994:14),⁷⁰ that Khatibi formulated as follows:

[...] creole it is not a local question, but the potential of all language to nourish other languages, to enrich itself by means of other languages, without which it becomes babble or explodes into wailing. (Ibid., 83-84).⁷¹

Borges speaks in a very similar way of Irish authors: "[...] a Jew for whom it will always be easier to innovate the Occidental culture than for a non-Jewish Westerner" as was the case "in many of those illustrious Irish (Shaw, Berkeley, Swift) [that] were descendant of the English [...]" ("El escritor argentino y la tradición," *OC* 1989, I: 272-73).⁷²

Khatibi indicated that "of Irish origin, Joyce was not afraid to push the English language – a universal language – to the limits of aphasia" (1993: 84).⁷³ And he expressed his displeasure about the "metropolitan critic that celebrates Joyce, ignoring the creole part of his work" (Ibid.).⁷⁴

I would like to leave the last word to a boy of about eight years of age, who was interviewed on a major news program broadcasted on the first German channel. As an answer to the question of the journalist, where he felt he belonged, he said, "My mother is Chinese, my father is Algerian, and I am German."

This kind of multiple cultural reference, in which a community possesses cultural hybridity as an experience of difference, is what I call "performative-hybrid-diaspora," "performative-hybrid-identity," building "cosmo-humanism."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aprile, Sylvie and Alain Montandon, eds. *Le livre de l'hospitalité. Accueil de l'étranger dans l'histoire et les cultures*. Paris: Bayard, 2004.

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

Bedford, Errol. "Emotions." *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*. New Series, Vol. 57 (1956-1957): 281-304. also in: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4544581> (retrieved 04.05. 2014).

Ben Jelloun, Tahar. *Hospitalité Française*. Paris: Seuil, 1984/21997.

⁶⁹ "belle œuvre littéraire [d']un laboratoire pour la création littéraire." (Khatibi: *Penser le Maghreb* 1993: 83).

⁷⁰ "un criollismo que sea conversador del mundo y del yo, de Dios y de la muerte. A ver si alguine me ayuda a buscarlo" (1926/21994:14).

⁷¹ "[...] créole n'est pas qu'une question locale, mais la possibilité de toute langue de se nourrir des autres, de s'enrichir grâce à elles, sans pour autant retourner au babil ou éclater dans des cris sauvages."

⁷² "[...] un judío [al que] siempre le será más fácil que a un occidental no judío innovar en la cultura occidental," en uno de "[...] muchos de esos irlandeses ilustres (Shaw, Berkeley, Swift) [que] fueron descendientes de ingleses [...]."

⁷³ "Irlandais d'origine, Joyce n'a pas craint de pousser l'anglais – langue universelle – jusqu'aux limites de l'aphasie."

⁷⁴ "critique métropolitaine [qui] célèbre Joyce et [qui] ignore l'œuvre créole."

Bilden, Helga. "Jenseits des Identitätsdenkens. Psychologische Konzepte zum Verständnis 'postmoderner' Subjektivitäten." *Verhaltenstherapie und psychosoziale Praxis*. 30 (1998): 5–31.

Borges, Jorge Luis. *Inquisiciones*. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1923/²1994.

---. *El tamaño de mi esperanza*. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1926/²1994.

---. *Obras Completas*. Buenos Aires: Emecé, 1989.

Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 1990.

---. *Bodies that Matter: On the Discursive Limits of Sex*. New York: Routledge, 1993.

Deleuze, Gilles. (1991). "Was ist ein Dispositiv?" In *Spiele der Wahrheit. Michel Foucaults Denken*, eds. François Ewald and Bernhard Waldenfels, p. 153–69. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1991.

Deleuze, Gilles and Félix Guattari. *Capitalisme et schizophrénie. L'Anti-Œdipe*. Paris: Minuit, 1972/1973.

---. *Capitalisme et schizophrénie. Mille Plateaux*. Paris: Minuit, 1980.

Derrida, Jacques. *Le monolinguisme de l'autre ou la prothèse d'origine*. Paris: Galilée, 1996.

---. *Adieu à Emmanuel Lévinas*. Paris: Galilée, 1997.

Dingott Alkopher, Tal. "The Political Psychology of Integration Strategies: The Case of the European Commission's Interculturalism." *Journal of Intercultural Management* 2/1 (2013/2014): 78–88 (in Print).

Fischer-Lichte, Erika. (1998). "Auf dem Wege zu einer performativen Kultur." *Kulturen des Performativen. Paragrana* 7/1 (1998): 13–29.

Fischer-Lichte, Erika. *Ästhetik des Performativen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 2004.

---. "Performativität/performativ." In *Metzler Lexikon Theatertheorie*, eds. Erika Fischer-Lichte, Doris Kolesch and Matthias Warstatt. Stuttgart: Metzler (2005): 234–42.

Foucault, Michel. "Des espaces autres." In *Dits et écrits II. 1976-1988*, ed. Michel Foucault, 1572–81. Paris: QuatorGallimard, 1967/1994/²2001.

---. "Of Other Spaces. Heterotopias." 1967. <http://foucault.info/documents/heterotopia/foucault.heterotopia.en.html> (retrieved 04.05.2013).

---. "Andere Räume." *Aisthesis. Wahrnehmung heute oder Perspektiven einer anderen Ästhetik. Essai*, ed. Karlheinz Barck, 34–46. Leipzig: Reclam, 1967/1990.

---. *Surveiller et punir*. Paris: Gallimard, 1975/1995.

---. *Histoire de la sexualité I. la volonté de savoir*. Paris: Gallimard, 1976/1994.

---. *Dispositive der Macht. Über Sexualität, Wissen und Wahrheit*. Berlin: Merve, 1978/²2000.

Fridja, Nico H. "The Psychologists' Point of View." In *Handbook of Emotions*. Second edition, eds. Michael Lewis and Jeanette M. Haviland-Jones, 59–74. New York: The Guilford Press, 2000.

Fuentes, Carlos. *En esto creo*. Barcelona: Seix Barral, 2002.

Gómez Peña, Guillermo. *The New World Border: Prophecies, Poems & Loqueras for the End of the Century*. San Francisco: City Lights, 1996.

Gross, Peter. "Bastelmentalität: Ein 'postmoderner Schwebestand.'" In *Das pfeifende Schwein*, ed. Thomas Schmid, 63–84. Berlin: K. Wagenbach, 1985.

Gross, Peter. *Multioptionsgesellschaft*. Frankfurt (Main): Suhrkamp, 1994.

Hall, Stuart. "New Ethnicities." In *Black British Cultural Studies: A Reader*, eds. H. Baker, M. Diawara and R. Lindeborg, 163–72. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1988/²1996.

---. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." In *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory*, eds. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman, 392–403. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990/1994.

Huntington, Samuel. *Who Are We? The Challenges to American's National Identity*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 2004.

Junge, Matthias. "Die Persönlichkeitstheorie von Talcott Parsons." In *Schlüsselwerke der Identitätsforschung*, eds. Benjamin Jörissen and Jörg Zirfas, 109–121. Wiesbaden: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften VS, 2010.

Kamper, Dietmar and Christoph Wulf, eds. *Die Wiederkehr des Körpers*. Frankfurt (Main): Suhrkamp, 1982.

Kant, Immanuel. "Zum ewigen Frieden. Ein philosophischer Entwurf." In *Schriften zur Anthropologie Geschichtsphilosophie, Politik und Pädagogik*, Idem, 191–251. Darmstadt: WBG, 1796/1983.

---. *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*, from *Principles of Politics*. Trans. W. Hastie. Edinburgh: Clark, 1795/1891.

---. *To Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2003.

Keupp, Heiner. *Riskante Chancen. Das Subjekt zwischen Psychokultur und Selbstorganisation*. Heidelberg: Asanger, 1988.

---. "Ambivalenz postmoderner Identität." In *Riskante Freiheiten. Individualisierung in modernen Gesellschaften*, eds. U. Beck and E. Beck-Gernsheim, 336–50. Frankfurt (Main): Suhrkamp, 1988a.

---. "Auf dem Weg zur Patchwork-Identität?" *Verhaltenstherapie und psychosoziale Praxis* 20/4 (1988b): 425–38.

---. "Identitäten im Umbruch: Das Subjekt in der 'Postmoderne.'" *Initial* 7 (1990): 698–710.

---. "Die verlorene Einheit oder: Ohne Angst verschieden sein können." *Universitas* 9 (1992a): 634–47.

---. "Das Subjekt und die Psychologie in der Krise der Moderne: Die Chancen postmoderner Provokationen." *Psychologie und Gesellschaftskritik*. 16.3/4 (1992b): 17–41.

---. "Aktuelle Befindlichkeiten: Zwischen Postmoderner Diffusion und der Suche nach neuen Fundamenten." *Psychologie und Gesellschaftskritik*. 73/1 (1995): 29–55.

---. http://www.researchgate.net/publication/48666631_Aktuelle_%20Befindlichkeiten_zwischen_postmoderner_Diffusion_und_der_Suche_nach_neuen_Fundamenten?ev=srch_pub (retrieved 29.04.2014).

---. "Bedrohte und befreite Identitäten in der Risikogesellschaft." In *Identität. Leiblichkeit. Normativität. Neue Horizonte anthropologischen Denkens*, eds. Annette Barkhaus, Matthias Mayer, Neil Roughley and Donatus Thürnau, 380–403. Frankfurt (Main): Suhrkamp, 1996.

---. "Identitätskonstruktionen in der spätmodernen Gesellschaft." *Zeitschrift für Psychodrama und Soziometrie* 7/2 (2008): 291–308.

Keupp, Heiner and Helga Bilden, eds. *Verunsicherungen. Das Subjekt im gesellschaftlichen Wandel*. Göttingen: Hogrefe, 1989.

Keupp, Heiner et al. (1999/⁴2008). *Identitätskonstruktionen. Das Patchwork der Identitäten in der Spätmoderne*. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.

Khatibi, Abdelkebir. *La mémoire tatouée: autobiographie d'un decolonize*. Paris: Denoël, 1971/²1979.

---. *Penser le Maghreb*. Rabat: SEMR, 1993.

Krämer, Sybille and Marco Stahlhut, Marco. "Das 'Performative' als Thema der Sprach- und Kulturphilosophie." *Paragrana* 10/1 (2001): 35–64.

Lévinas, Emmanuel. *Entre nous. Essais sur le penser-à-l'autre*. Paris: Gasset, 1991/⁴2007.

---. *Altérité et transcendance*. Paris: Fata Morgana, 1995/²2008.

---. *Totalité et infini, Essai sur l'extériorité*. La Haye: M. Nijhoff/Kluwer Academic, 1971/2008.

---. "Politique après!" In *L'Au-delà du verset*, pp. 221–28. Paris: Minuit, 1982.

---. "Les villes-refuges." In *L'au-delà du verset*, pp. 51–70. Paris: Minuit, 1982.

Luckmann, Thomas. "Persönliche Identität als evolutionäres und historisches Problem." In Idem., *Lebenswelt und Gesellschaft*, S. 123–42. Paderborn, 1980.

Lyotard, Jean-François. *Le Différend*. Paris: Minuit, 1983.

Memmi, Albert. *Portrait du colonisé précédé de Portrait du colonisateur*. Paris: Petite Bibliothèque Payot, 1957/1973.

Nünning, Ansgar. *Metzler Lexikon Literatur- und Kulturtheorie. Ansätze – Personen – Grundbegriffe*. Stuttgart / Weimar: Metzler, 2008.

Ortiz, Fernando. *Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y el azúcar*. Habana: Editorial de Ciencias Sociales, 1940/1983.

Pitcher, George. (1965). "Emotion." *Mind*. 74/295 (1965): 326–46. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2251904?__redirected (retrieved 29.04.2014).

Reckwitz, Andreas. *Das hybride Subjekt. Eine Theorie der Subjektkulturen von der bürgerlichen Moderne zur Postmoderne*. Weilerswist: Velbrück, 2006.

---. *Subjekt*. Bielefeld: Transkript, 2008.

Reckwitz, Andreas. "Der Identitätsdiskurs. Zum Bedeutungswandel einer sozialwissenschaftlichen Semantik." In *Kollektive Identitäten und kulturelle Innovationen. Ethnologische, soziologische und historische Studien*, ed. Werner Rammer, pp. 21–38. Leipzig: Universitätsverlag, 2001.

Saurwein, Karl-Heinz. "Die Konstruktion kollektiver Identitäten und die Realität der Konstruktion." In *Gebrochene Identitäten. Zur Kontroverse um kollektive Identitäten in Deutschland, Israel, Südafrika, Europa und im Identitätskampf der Kulturen*, eds., Werner Gephart and Idem, pp. 9–29. Opladen: Leske+Budrich, 1999.

---. "Einleitung: Die Konstruktion kollektiver Identitäten und die Realität der Konstruktion." In Werner Gephart and Idem eds. *Gebrochene Identitäten. Zur Kontroverse um kollektive Identitäten in Deutschland, Israel, Südafrika, Europa und im Identitätskampf der Kulturen*, Opladen: Leske+Budrich, 1999.

Seehofers, "Sieben-Punkte-Plan." <http://www.spiegel.de/politik/deutschland/integration-merkel-erklart-multikulti-fuer-gescheitert-a-723532.html> (retrieved 29.04.2014).

Solomon, Robert C. "The Philosophy of Emotions." In *Handbook of Emotions*, eds. Michael Lewis and Jeanette M. Haviland-Jones, pp. 3–15. New York: The Guilford Press, 2000.

Toro, Alfonso de: for others works see: <http://www.uni-leipzig.de/~detoro/> (retrieved 29.04.2014).

---. "La postcolonialidad en Latinoamérica en la era de la globalización. ¿Cambio de paradigma en el pensamiento teórico-cultural latinoamericano?" In *El debate de la postcolonialidad en Latinoamérica. Una postmodernidad periférica o cambio de paradigma en el pensamiento latinoamericano*, eds., Fernando de Toro and Idem, pp. 31–77. Frankfurt (Main): Vervuert, 1999.

---. "Die postmoderne 'neue Autobiographie' oder die Unmöglichkeit einer Ich-Geschichte am Beispiel von Robbe-Grillet's *Le miroir qui revient* und Doubrovskys *Livre brisé*." In *Dulce et decorum est philologiam colere: Festschrift für Dieter Briesemeister zu seinem 65 Geburtstag*, eds., Sybille Groß and Axel Schönberger, pp. 1407–43. Berlin: Domus Ed. Europaea, 1999a.

---. "Jenseits von Postmoderne und Postkolonialität. Materialien zu einem Modell der Hybridität und des Körpers als transrelationalem, transversalem und transmedialem Wissenschaftskonzept." In *Räume der Hybridität. Zur Aktualität postkolonialer Konzepte*, eds., Christoph Hamann and Cornelia Sieber, 15–52. Hildesheim: Olms, 2002.

---. "Hacia una teoría de la cultura de la 'hibridez' como sistema científico transrelacional, 'transversal' y 'transmedial'." *Estudios Literarios & Estudios Culturales. Nuevo Texto Crítico*. 25/26 (2004): 275–329.

---. "Zu einer Kulturtheorie der Hybridität als Transrelationales. transversales und transmediales Wissenschaftssystem." *IBEROROMANIA* 59 (2004a): 1–40.

---. "La nouvelle autobiographie postmoderne ou l'impossibilité d'une histoire à la première personne: Robbe-Grillet Le miroir qui revient et de Doubrovsky Livre brisé." In *Autobiographie revisited : Theorie und Praxis neuer autobiographischer Diskurse in der französischen, spanischen und lateinamerikanischen Literatur*, eds., Idem and Claudia Gronemann, pp. 79–113. Hildesheim: Olms, 2004b.

---. "Figuras de la hibridez: Carlos Fuentes, Guillermo Gómez Peña, Gloria Anzaldúa y Alberto Kurapel." In *Aves de paso. Autores latinoamericanos entre exilio y transculturación (1970-2002)*, eds., Birgit Mertz-Baumgartner and Erna Pfeiffer, pp. 83–104. Frankfurt (Main): Vervuert, 2005.

---. "Pasajes – Heterotopías – Transculturalidad: estrategias de hibridación en las literaturas latino/americanas: un acercamiento teórico." In *Aves de paso. Autores latinoamericanos entre exilio y transculturación (1970-2002)*, eds., Birgit Mertz-Baumgartner and Erna Pfeiffer, pp. 19–30. Frankfurt (Main): Vervuert, 2005a.

---. "Globalization – New Hybridities – Transidentities – Transnations: Recognition – Difference." In *New Hybridities*, eds., Idem and F. Heidemann, pp. 19–38. Hildesheim: Olms, 2006.

---. "Introducción. Más allá de la 'Postmodernidad,' 'Postcolonialidad' y 'Globalización': Hacia una teoría de la hibridez." In *Cartografías y estrategias de la 'postmodernidad' y la 'postcolonialidad' en Latinoamérica. 'Hibridez' y 'Globalización.'*, ed. Idem, pp. 9–44. Frankfurt: Vervuert, 2006a.

---. "Hacia una teoría de la cultura de la 'hibridez' como sistema científico 'transrelacional,' 'transversal' y 'transmedial'." In *Cartografías y estrategias de la 'postmodernidad' y la 'postcolonialidad' en Latinoamérica. 'Hibridez' y 'Globalización.'*, ed., Idem, pp. 195–242. Frankfurt: Vervuert, 2006b.

---. "Escenificación de Nuevas Hibridaciones, Nuevas Identidades: Repensar las Américas. Reconocimiento – Diferencia – Globalización. "Latino-Culture" como modelo de coexistencias híbridas." In *Estrategias de la hibridez en América Latina: del descubrimiento al siglo XXI*, eds., Idem, Cornelia Sieber, Claudia Gronemann and René Ceballos, pp. 367–94. Bern: Peter Lang, 2007.

---. *Epistémologies Le 'Maghreb.' Hybridité – Transculturalité – Transmédialité – Transtextualité – Corps – Globalisation – Diasporisation*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 2009/2011.

---. "Autobiographie transversale et 'translatio'." *Expressions maghrébines* 10/1 (2011b): 31–51.

---. "Performativ-hybride Diasporas." In *Alteritäten: Literatur, Kultur, Sprache*, eds., Grit Mehlhorn, Hans-Christian Trepte, Alina Jurasz and Danuta Rytel-Schwarz, pp. 78–99. Hildesheim: Olms, 2013.

Vaassen, Bernd. *Die narrative Gestalt(ung) der Wirklichkeit. Grundlinien einer postmodern orientierten Epistemologie der Sozialwissenschaften*. Braunschweig: Vieweg, 1996.

Welsch, Wolfgang. *Unsere Postmoderne Moderne*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1987.

---. *Wege aus der Moderne. Schlüsseltexte der Postmoderne-Diskussion*. Weinheim: Acta Humanoria, 1988.

---. *Vernunft. Die zeitgenössische Vernunftkritik und das Konzept der transversalen Vernunft*. Frankfurt (Main): Suhrkamp, 1996.

---. "Subjektsein heute. Überlegungen zur Transformation des Subjekts." *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 39/4 (1991): 347–65.

---. "Die Kunst, mit Unsicherheit zu leben." (1999) <http://www2.uni-jena.de/welsch/> (retrieved 04.05.2014).

---. "Identität im Übergang. Philosophische Überlegungen in Kunst, Psychiatrie und Gesellschaft." In *Ästhetisches Denken*, ed., Idem, pp. 168–200. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1990/⁵1998.

---. *Ästhetisches Denken*. Stuttgart: Reclam, 1990/⁵1998.

---. "Was ist eigentlich Transkulturalität?" In *Hochschule als transkultureller Raum? Beiträge zu Kultur, Bildung und Differenz*, eds., Lucyna Darowska and Claudia Machold, pp. 39–66. Bielefeld: transcript (PDF-Datei; 213KB), 2010.

Wieviorka, Michel. *La différence*. Paris: Balland, 2001.