4 Cultural Diversity in a Globalizing Age

> What if identity is conceived not as a boundary to be maintained but as a nexus of relations and transactions actively engaging a subject. The story or stories of interaction must then be more complex, less linear and teleological.
> (CLIFFORD 1988: 344)

In a 'global age,' sole linear self-conceptions and political constructs such as 'national identity' are not adequate anymore (Antor 2006: 30). Instead, as Clifford's quote hints at, an individual's multiple identities and different affiliations have to be taken into account. The concept of human identity is subject to change and contradictions. The model of 'one cohesive identity' is a sociopolitical construction because "the whole, the full, the complete 'I' (...) is (...) a fabricated reality like any other" (Chambers 1994: 26). By the era of postmodernism and deconstruction, at the latest, this nonconformity of identity was acknowledged. The different possible affiliations of belonging and identity encompass several features, such as "sexual orientation, gender, class, race, ethnicity, nationality, age, dress, politics, food, or taste" (Rosaldo 1989: 208; Ewing 1998: 263).

Enhanced by globalization and its effects, cultural exchange is increasingly understood and practiced in a multidirectional way. As exemplified in the abovementioned quote, cultures are not monocultural only but instead are characterized by mixing processes, resembling a 'human mosaic' (Nederveen Pieterse 2004: 47). As a consequence, constructions such as 'national identity' are progressively questioned. Identity is understood in a more flexible and dynamic way. The 'container' metaphor, for example, conceives the nation and its narratives as separate and enclosed containers (Beck 1997: 50). Nowadays, in addition to national conceptualizations, *trans*nationalism is of increased interest. Due to the interconnecting forces of globalization, as in the complex phenomenon of *transmigration*, a change of perspective is required (Schulze-Engler 2006: 43).

The approach of increased cultural mixing and permeations is not entirely new. Cultures have always been influenced by mobility and mixing processes, of so-called multidirectional, transnational 'cultural flows' (Appadurai 1996: 33) and cultural mixing is the presupposition for diversity (Welsch 1997: 78). Culture itself is a construct that aims at describing ways of life, customs and traditions as well as further similarities of individuals or groups. Shared language and heritage usually define the common ground for a specific cultural group. The acceleration of cultural flows, the interconnectedness of cultures, and the porosity of borders, however, is highlighted and furthered in the age of globalization.

Due to its political correctness, the term 'diversity' has become "a sacred concept in American life today" (Michaels 2006: 12). It is a relatively neutral term with regard to individual and group identity formation, designating "the presence of a variety of cultures and cultural perspectives within a society" (Parekh 2000: 165). The expression 'diversity' as such designates the opposite of uniformity, thereby involving a variety, assortment, mixture, or range of different elements. Similar to the concept of 'hybridity,' the term 'diversity' refers to the variety of different species or genes in biology. It also refers to multiplicity in algebra. Nowadays, the term diversity is the predominant term used with regard to human rights and the labor market, promoting equal opportunities for different genders, sexual orientations, ethnic groups, age groups, or people with disabilities. Launched in America in 1990s, diversity management in international businesses and globally-operating corporations has become one of the buzzwords in modern entrepreneurship and in the running of particular internationally operating political, economic, and non-profit organizations. It was adopted into German human resources as a topic in the new millennium. The management of diversity, however, is sometimes taken to an extreme like the introduction of "diversity of birth order workshops" (Michaels 2006: 13), in which groups of the oldest and the youngest siblings in a company are formed.

The expression 'diversity' gained significance in the United States in 1978 with the *Bakke v. Board of Regents* case of the Supreme Court (Michaels 2006: 3). In this case, university applicants were sorted by 'race' to ensure a 'diverse student body.' Thus, diversity became closely connected to the anti-racism movement as well as the goal to turn American society from a 'color-blind' into a positively connoted 'color-conscious' one (Michaels 2006: 5). Further features of anti-discrimination, such as class and social status, age, income, gender, sexual orientation, religious beliefs, and people with disabilities. Interestingly, the civil rights movement of the 1960s did not manage to trigger this change of conception, although 'affirmative action' was initiated by John F. Kennedy as a

promotion of equal opportunity for minority groups and as a mean of non-discrimination for the hiring of government employees in 1961.

The achievements of affirmative action formed the base for a change of attitude towards diversity. In the 1980s, the term 'political correctness' gained momentum not only in neutral, unprejudiced language use but also in terms of behavioral norms and values (Hughes 2010: 4) towards diversity. A reframing process has taken place. Instead of the elimination of difference, its appreciation was stressed (Michaels 2006: 5). Thus, the essential American belief of 'liberty and justice to all,' as featured in the pledge of allegiance, was extended to diversity. Political correctness, affirmative action, and the appreciation of diversity promoted equal opportunities and soon spread to other disciplines and topics, even to discussions on animal rights (Hughes 2010: 3).

Nevertheless, there are drawbacks to diversity. Celebrating diversity, for example, potentially ends up as ridicule (Michaels 2006: 14) because it encourages differences and category-thinking. Minority discourse, a related topic, is the study of American ethnic cultures and literatures, aiming at the promotion and revival of writing by Native Americans, African Americans, Latin Americans, or Asian Americans (Culler 2000: 131) as well as feminism, queer studies, or whiteness studies. This new perspective, however, can also enforce container logic, thereby creating ethnic silos with little exchange between the disciplines or departments.

In literary and cultural studies, the term 'diversity' is connected to a multitude of neighboring concepts, such as 'postcolonial hybridity,' 'transnationalism,' and 'the melting pot.' These concepts are employed in cross-cultural discussions on literature, self-definition, and lifestyles. The full range of terms is frequently used interchangeably, although they can have a different meaning. All terms emerged in a similar academic environment that dealt with cultural identity formation. All terms refer to some kind of mixing, blending, stirring, crossover, or *métissage* of cultures (Nederveen Pieterse 2004), indicating topics of integration, immigration, adaption, cultural dominance, or assimilation and loss. Every concept has its strengths and weaknesses and became known in a different period of time, discipline, or geographical location.

The three main groups of terms related to the term 'diversity' are distinguished in the following sections. First, there are the six interconnected postcolonial terms of 'hybridity,' 'syncretism,' 'creolization,' 'mestizaje,' 'diaspora,' and 'liminality.' Second, the concepts of 'intraculturalism,' 'interculturalism,' 'multiculturalism,' and 'transculturalism' respectively concentrate on the interaction within a culture, the interaction between cultures, the interaction of different cultures within one social setting, or the interaction across cultural bounda-

ries. The third group of terms is metaphors and images, including the predominantly North American concepts such as 'the melting pot,' 'the salad bowl,' or 'the Canadian mosaic.' However, the ideas of 'identity' and the 'self' as well as psychoanalysis are essential for the understanding of each of the terms used. In order to examine the concept of cultural identity, the particular outlines and conceptualizations of the term are laid out in the following.

4.1 CONCEPTS OF IDENTITY

A simple explanation of the term 'identity' seems impossible. In psychology, the term 'identity' relates to topics such as self-image, self-esteem, and individualism. Identity portrays the congruence of being and consciousness while forming the self (Weidtmann 2002: 110). The model of a static position of identity is a direct establishment of society and its history, people, and traditions. Consequently, dominant discourses and social categorizations, such as ethnicity, class, and gender, play a major role in identity politics. Nowadays, identity is understood as an ongoing process of self-conception, self-construction, and the revision of this self (Glomb 1997: 7ff.).

In the context of cultures with diverse and multiple elements, such as the North American one, the identification process can be very difficult, often causing marginalized identities. In addition, a single person's identity can vary as a result of the power of mightier themes, such as conformity, collectivism, or the cultural pressure of constantly trying to adapt. Cultural identity is also determined by how a person is categorized by others in a specific social arrangement or cultural setting because the act of self-affiliation can be largely ascribed to the morals and mentality of a society. Therefore, the process of identity formation represents a continuous negotiation of societal influences, individual self-perception as well as the presentation and revision of the self (Glomb 1997: 27).

With regard to identity formation, early psychoanalysts distinguished between the *conscious* and the *unconscious* self (Langbaum 1977: 9). The most renowned name in this field is Sigmund Freud, a major part of whose studies included *self-analysis*, the interpretation of dreams, and the innovative account of the structure of the mind in the *superego*, *ego*, and *id*. Like Freud, Jacques Lacan is convinced that the conscious and the unconscious are bound together but with transference between the two (Slethaug 1993: 20f). This double state and the negotiation between the two parts are important when taking the split identity of a culturally mixed individual into account.

The crisis of the individual is frequently intensified in a multicultural context. Robert J. C. Young explains that "identity is self-consciously articulated through setting one term against the other" (1995: 4). Ferdinand de Saussure, the father of twentieth century linguistics, stated in his premise that there are no positive terms but only a *difference* (Wunderli 1972: 45), which was expanded upon and termed *binary opposition* by Jacques Derrida (1973). In this model, one body of terminology is set against another. This opposition becomes hierarchical as soon as one element is constantly dominated by the other (Reckwitz 2000: 25). According to Derrida's concept of *deconstruction*, strongly opposing relations are necessary in order for power imposition to be effective. A positive quality can only be determined as positive in relation to another, opposing entity. Thus, the negative term has to exist, needs to be identified *and* legitimized as a negative dichotomy in order to justify the existence and reasoning of a positive term.

When former colonies gained their independence, an awareness of *otherness* or alterity was accompanied by a strong feeling of a split or double identity. The colonized population was soon declared as *and* they themselves felt like *the other*. Stereotypes, clichés, and jokes aided the creation of various imaginary 'others.' Examples include the possible frightening *uncanny other* or the *exotic other*. 'The other' can further be defined as the alien, unknown, mysterious, feared, secretly admired, fascinating exotic, or the dissimilating 'other.' According to Sigmund Freud (1986), the unknown can easily end up being the *uncanny* or *das Unheimliche*. Therein, the one which used to be homely and known became the unknown or suppressed.

In the context of a colonized or a diverse culture, these oppositions are usually concerning ethnicity and race. Taken to the extreme, 'the other' then does not only represent the values, morals and other traits that the self is not but also these qualities that the self does not want to be or stand for, e.g. weakness or femininity. This constructivism is enhanced by the use of stereotypes and clichés, which establish images and a category of thinking in the Western mind. In colonialism, this dichotomy is translated via hard factors, such as laws and regulations, and soft factors, such as language, clothes, or the habit of having tea in the afternoon. Edward Said chooses this aspect as his central theme in his famous work *Orientalism* (1978). Fixed categories define a person or thing as the same or 'the other,' rarely anything *in-between*. Henceforth, 'difference' is used as a tool to encourage a polarity between the known and the unknown, the colonizer and the colonized, the civilized and the wild or exotic, the good and the evil, the center and the margin, or the self and 'the other.'

These cognitions in the fields of psychoanalysis, post-structuralism, and linguistics contributed and continue to contribute to the development of different cultural and identity topics in the diverse areas of research. These landmark revelations paved the way for discourses on diversity and identity, a strong concept of 'hybridity,' and a number of further neighboring terms emerging in the post-colonial context, which are introduced and discussed in the following section.

4.2 POSTCOLONIAL DISCOURSE

> Hybridity is one of the emblematic notions of our era. It captures the spirit of our times with its obligatory celebration of cultural difference and fusion, and it resonates with the globalization mantra of unfettered economic exchanges and the supposedly inevitable transformation of cultures.
> (KRAIDY 2005: 1)

As exemplified by the above-mentioned quote**,** the term *hybridity* has become a key term in the phenomenon of globalization from a cultural studies perspective. This concept of cultural mixing and in-betweenness, however, has come a long way from its original meaning and connotation. Over the course of its development, the term 'hybridity' has gone through several stages, of which post-colonialism is the most significant. Homi K. Bhabha and further post-colonial critics grounded their ideas of 'identity' and cultural influence on earlier concepts originating in the field of psychoanalysis, post-structuralism, and linguistics. Critics, philosophers, and linguists, such as Said, Fanon, Bakhtin, Lacan, Freud, De Saussure, Derrida, Deleuze, Barthes, and Foucault laid the conceptual groundwork for the progression and maturation of the term 'hybridity' with regard to cultural studies and identity formation.

The peak usage of the term 'hybridity' was reached in the context of post-colonial discourse in the late twentieth century. Hybridity is discussed in various professional fields, such as sociology, cultural studies, history, political science, and literary criticism. Seven different fields of hybridity exist (de Toro 2006: 22). Among others, it can be found beyond its biological origin in technology, media science, and philosophy. In each field of study, hybridity features intertextuality, interdisciplinarity, and a mixing of categories. It also includes elements of *alterity*, recombination, or new approaches to viewing known things from a

different angle. The first discussions about hybridity, however, began as early as in the eighteenth century. The term was related to "the perceived contamination of White Europeans by the races they colonized" (Kraidy 2002: 319), which is referred to by the term *miscegenation*. In the late nineteenth century, this particular characteristic of the term's origin in biology was applied to evoke racial connotations and was utilized as an instrument to validate colonial dominance (Grobman 2007: 21).

By the 1990s, the growing power of the concept of 'hybridity as a part of an awareness of post-colonial identity formation was recognized. One of the most eminent post-colonial critics of contemporary time is Homi K. Bhabha, who was the first to notice that both sides of the colonial coin, the colonized and the colonizer, are affected by the colonizing process. This readjusted the stereotypical way of viewing hybridity as simply exotism (Bhabha 1994: 38).

Bhabha derives his definition of hybridity from the Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin (Easthope 1998: 342), who distinguishes *single-voiced* and *double-voiced* texts. Whereas single-voiced texts, such as poems, portray only one viewpoint, novels with a narrator that provides two or more perspectives are double-voiced texts. This is a revelation because Bhabha's definition of hybridity "stresses the interdependence and mutual construction" of the colonizer and the colonized (Ashcroft et al 2000: 118). Thus, while Said (1978, 1994) is mainly concerned with the colonizer and Fanon (1967) with the colonized (Kraidy 2002: 320), Bhabha takes both into account. He explains that cultural discourse "overcomes the given grounds of opposition and opens up a space of translation: a place of hybridity, figuratively speaking, where the construction of a political object that is new, *neither the one nor the other*" (Bhabha 1994: 25).

Furthermore, Bhabha's revolutionary model of the *Third Space* paved the way for the term 'hybridity' to develop a new meaning, namely, a 'hybridity' that encourages mixing and cultural diversity. This conception is predominantly used in an age of globalization. The 'Third Space of enunciation' (Bhabha 1994: 37; emphasis original) represents a more positive space in which culture and identity are constructed while taking the influence of both colonizer and colonized into account. Hence, the so-called 'in-between' space is a non-prejudice space, like a mélange, open to a hybrid cultural identity formation. Thus, hybridity is gaining a process character, namely a process of *hybridization* on both sides. In a Third Space, cultures are not influenced by a hierarchy or power imposition (Bhabha, 1990: 211). This creates the opportunity of an *empowering hybridity* (Ashcroft et al 2000: 118) in which the exoticism of cultural diversity is left behind because the hybridity of culture per se is acknowledged (Bhabha 1994: 38).

In a hybridization process, both, colonizer and colonized, have to rethink their identities. The use of language constitutes a prime example because not only the culture and speech of the colonized are changed but also that of the colonizer (Beise 2002: 221). This influence is related to the act of *speech communication*. The colonizer and the colonized have to find a *common ground* in order to understand each other. Thus, the search for similar elements leads to correspondence and eventually to a mixing of language and culture because culture is articulated via language. The colonizer-colonized relationship goes beyond dependence. It is of interdependence and mutual influence, changing both of the cultural identities. Thus, neither side of the discourse is left untouched. This influence, however, is unbalanced due to the colonizer's power. Bhabha explains this situation of dependency with the concepts of 'ambivalence' and 'mimicry.'

Along with hybridity, *ambivalence* is an important stepping stone in postcolonial vocabulary. The term 'ambivalence' is frequently exchanged with hybridity in Bhabha's work and features a close connection to the concepts of 'inbetweenness' and 'Third Space.' The expression 'ambivalence' is initially taken from psychology, referring to a situation of indeterminacy (Young 1995). Ambivalence, meaning 'duality' or 'indecision,' results in a state of ambiguity (Roh-Spaulding 2002: 21). Bhabha chose the term 'ambivalence' to illustrate the constant *love-and-hate relationship* between colonizer and colonized. This relationship of the colonial presence of the colonizer or formerly colonized areas results in an ambivalent situation of both repulsion and attraction towards the colonizer. In his landmark essay *The Location of Culture* Bhabha argues that "colonial presence is always ambivalent, split between its appearance as original and authoritative and its articulation as repetition and difference" (1994: 107) because the colonized is never simply and exclusively opposing the colonizer. Nederveen Pieterse defines this love-and-hate relationship as a "continuum of hybridities: on one end, an assimilationist hybridity that leans over towards the center, adopts canon and mimics hegemony and, at the other end, a destabilizing hybridity that blurs the canon, reverses the current, subverts the center" (2004: 73). Hence, the colonized is in Bhabha's famous words "less than one and double" (1994: 166) or, put differently, being torn between cultures or being in two places at once. This draws attention to the concept of mimicry.

The term *mimicry* derives from the verb 'to mimic,' which refers to an act of copying.[11] Mimicry describes an act of replication or camouflage in which the colonized unconsciously tries to become like the colonizer. This reaction is

11 For more details, please see V.S. Naipaul's *The Mimic Men* (1967). It provides excellent examples of how colonial mimicry works.

caused by the love-and-hate relationship. Bhabha's concept of 'mimicry' is based on Lacan's *mirror stage* (1978). Lacan uses the example of an infant to show that self-consciousness precedes identification of 'the other.' At a certain age, the child manages to identify its own mirror image and then starts to perceive a self and other, recognizing difference. Mimicry can be compared to a modern form of guerilla warfare (Lacan 1978; Bhabha 1994: 85). In this approach, the colonized continuously struggles to meet the colonizer's expectations, constantly trying to fit in. The colonized then unsuccessfully tries to be like the colonizer himself. This draws the attention to the concept of 'otherness,' which explains and supports the hierarchical application of binaries that support the colonial rhetoric.

The term 'otherness' was first used by Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel who is renowned for his *master-slave dialectic* (Barnett 1998). The colonial process of *othering* deeply entrenched boundaries. It can be employed on many levels of difference, such as geography, economy, gender, ethnicity, and race. This process is also regarded as a strategy of reversal, a so-called *Umkehrung* of the self into the alien. Edward Said, for instance, explains in his *Orientalism* (1978) the discursive invention of the 'exotic other,' which is constructed through language, laws, and further rhetoric devices. He manages to illustrate how imperial countries, such as France and England, used the theme of 'the other' to explain colonizing and being superior, or having the privilege to impose laws and regulations on the colonized peoples.

Hence, imperial culture utilizes alterity with a process of 'othering,' aiming at legitimizing their pretension of power. Thus, in the process, the colonized is marginalized. This is performed by the projection of selective information via stereotypes, clichés, and fears that work due to the establishment of an 'uncanny other.' Then, the putatively universal is connoted as, for instance, white, male, and heterosexual. The trial of equating this stereotype is extremely problematic due to the underlying categorization in homogenized groups and the natural habit of viewing your own group as good and good to begin with (Kley 2002: 61). In most cases, this act of setting one term against the other results in a process of grouping or *categorical thinking*.

This categorical thinking can be traced back to the intuitive assertion that the self is better than 'the other', which is a result of the trail of conformity or the assumption of one's own normalcy. The phenomenon is called *ethnocentrism*. As the word suggests, the rhetoric encompasses a centering on the own ethnicity, which comes quite naturally. The term describes the act of automatically viewing one's own culture as good and, consequently, ascribing to it only positive connotations. With regard to the concept of 'alterity,' viewing the other automat-

ically as the opposite symbolizes the extension of ethnocentrism. Typical dichotomies applied include white versus black, good versus evil, and civilized versus uncivilized. Thus, categorical thinking is established that carries a *binary opposition*. With the help of colonial power, dominance and hierarchy are articulated, e.g. via language. Ethnocentrism can also boost this difference while creating and intensifying new clichés of another ethnicity. In *Orientalism*, for example, the East is portrayed as being exotic, female, and weak, in opposition to the West, which automatically gains the opposite attributes of being the usual, male, and strong. Ethnocentrism of the dominant culture is the rhetoric logic of why the assimilation of 'the other,' as in 'mimicry', can never be accomplished completely (Beise 2002: 222). Colonialism needs a binary opposition in order to function and, thus, culturally diverse individuals can never fully become like the colonizer but remain hybrid or marginalized.

The term 'hybridity' existed before under the disguise of other names, such as 'syncretism' or 'creolization' (Fludernik 1998; Brathwaite 1971). Different perceptions of mixing and the various terminologies are heavily dependent on the particular culture, its geographical location, history, and political as well as (post)colonial experience. The six concepts of 'hybridity,' 'syncretism,' 'creolization,' 'mestizaje,' 'diaspora,' and 'borderlands' have the underlying process of an identity crisis in common. The majority of the concepts developed in a combination of the same circumstances: an aboriginal culture that, in one way or another, was suppressed by a more dominant culture. For this reason, many similar or even synonymous terms are used when it comes to explaining a process of identity formation in association with either colonial rule, migration, or being a so-called 'scattered culture.'

The term closest to and most frequently exchanged with hybridity is *syncretism*. It derives from the field of theology, referring to the merging of analogies and the combination of different practices. It is sometimes exchanged with the term *eclecticism*.[12] The term's religious background constitutes the fusion of different cultural elements. Many critics view hybridity and syncretism as aliases (Nederveen Pieterse 2004: 71). Stuart Hall draws a direct connection between hybridity and syncretism by saying that both are a mixture of cultural traditions (1992). Syncretism was established in post-colonial works of literature, such as Bill Ashcroft's *The Empire Writes Back*, to relate to the frequent association with the idea of 'synergy' (Ashcroft et al 2000: 229). This definition arose because of a possible negative connotation of the term 'hybridity,' which was emi-

12 The term 'eclecticism' originates in architecture and refers to the mixture of different styles.

nent throughout the nineteenth century. Syncretism circumvents the racial issue and instead concentrates on "cross-cultural plots of music, clothing, behaviour, advertising, multi-ethnic and multi-centric patterns" (Canevacci 1992: 3). In contrast to hybridity, Fludernik interprets syncretism as something that "emphasizes a peaceful coexistence rather than an uneasy and agonistic self-splitting" (1998: 19). Therefore, syncretism is employed to circumvent the problematic features of the term 'hybridity' because 'synergy' describes the more positive process of cultural mixing of the different but equal elements (Ashcroft et al 2000: 229).

Creolization was used interchangeably with the term 'hybridity' before its canonization in postcolonial discourse. Whereas creolization was predominantly referred to colonized Africans, hybridity does not refer to any particular skin color (Fludernik 1998: 12f.). The term 'creolization' itself was coined in the sixteenth century. The idea developed and was shaped by the experiences from living in a new environment that required adaption of its new inhabitants, e.g. black individuals born in Brazil. The term and the concept designate a linguistic blend of French, Spanish, and Portuguese influence, triggered by European colonialism in the Americas, Africa, and parts of Asia. Creolization, like hybridity and transculturality, focuses on a rather "flexible concept" of cultures and their characteristic of being "a social practice" (Doff et al 2011: 3).

Creolization is closely connected to the concept of *mestizaje*. The term 'creole' was incorporated into the English language as a generic and thus was more often used than the term 'mestizo' (Ashcroft et al 2000: 137). Mestizaje, also commonly referred to as 'mestizo' or 'métisse,' was originally applied with regard to the cultural and racial mixing of Amerindians and Europeans.[13] The term was coined by José Vasconcelos in 1925 to describe the cultural encounter close to borders. Both terms, 'hybridity' and 'mestizaje,' are considered aliases (Nederveen Pieterse 2004: 53) and have undergone a shift from a negative to a positive connotation. Mestizaje is now widely accepted as a name for the interchange of cultures between diasporas (Ashcroft et al 2000).

Diaspora can be translated as 'the scattered' because it derives from 'to disperse.' The term has been used since the late nineteenth century to refer to many different ethnic, religious, or minority groups that have been separated from their home country and scattered across the world, such as, among many others, Jews. This movement can be forced or voluntary (Ashcroft et al 2000: 68f.). The minorities who are forced to leave their homes do not necessarily leave their traditions behind. In the age of *European imperialism*, for example, forced migration

13 The term 'mestizo' is of Spanish origin, whereas *métisse* designates the French origin equivalent.

and slavery were accounting for the global diffusion of different *diasporas*. Nowadays, many writers utilize the term 'diaspora' and 'diasporic identity' to highlight their hybridity in a positive way (Ashcroft et al 2000: 69f.).

Chicana or Chicano literature focuses on *borderlands*, border crossing, biculturalism, and bilingualism. Gloria Anzaldúa's 1987 *Borderlands/La Frontera: The New Mestiza* remains the most prominent text. Whereas 'the frontier' refers to a dominant center and its weak periphery, the expression 'borderlands' implies a transterritorial cultural contact zone with multidirectional exchange (Kaplan et al 1993: 16). The related term *liminality* derives from 'limen' or 'limit,' meaning a threshold, an interstice, or something in-between (Ashcroft et al 2000: 130). Hence, liminality is related to the concepts of 'borderlands' and 'border crossing' but concentrates on the space *in-between* instead.

As the brief definition of the neighboring concepts has shown, 'hybridity' as a concept is more developed than its many competitors presented. Thanks to Homi K. Bhabha, hybridity as well as his approach of a Third Space were a break-through in the field of colonial discourse and identity politics. Its terminology is defined in detail and by now canonized. The key words forming this vocabulary, such as 'mimicry,' 'ambivalence,' and 'displacement,' have been cited various times by the majority of post-colonial critics and, as a matter of fact, symbolize milestones in the cross-cultural discourse, its theories, and beyond. As contemporary critics of globalization and culture, such as Nederveen Pieterse (2004) Kraidy (2005), and de Toro (2006), have shown, hybridization processes play a major role in a globalizing age.

Nevertheless, some critics argue against the concept of 'hybridity.' Due to its theoretical approach, hybridity is sometimes disputed and viewed as a 'political dead end' (Hutnyk 1997; Kraidy 2002; Werbner 1997). Moreover, 'hybridity,' as a term stemming from biology, is still criticized because it has been used in the past to justify racism and colonial rule (Young 1995).

The criticism of the term 'hybridity' justifies this study's presentation of further terms used with regard to cultural mixing, self-definition, and group identification in the subsequent sections. The term 'transculturality,' for example, does not have a long history of negative connotations associated with genetics; rather, a history of acceptance. In contrast to hybridity, it has been widely accepted in Latin America because it has no racial implication to start with. Instead, transculturality, as its name spells, focuses on culture or ethnicity and transaction between the two. Since the different prefixes 'intra,' 'inter,' 'multi,' and 'trans' are recurrently used interchangeably, the different assumptions of their distinct meaning will be elaborated on in the following section.

4.3 INTRA, INTER, MULTI, AND TRANS

> Following in the wake of previous concepts in cultural and literary studies such as creolization, hybridity and syncretism, and signaling a family relationship with terms such as transnationality, translocality, and transmigration, 'transcultural' terminology has unobtrusively, but powerfully, edged its way into contemporary theoretical and critical discourse.
> (SCHULZE-ENGLER ET AL 2009: IX)

By the end of the twentieth century, the German philosopher Wolfgang Welsch sparked a new, mainly German-based discourse on the modern form of cultures with his landmark essay "Transculturality – The Puzzling Form of Cultures Today" (1999). His concept has by now spread across national discussions. More recently, several disciplines, such as media and communication studies (e.g. Hepp 2006) as well as transcultural educational studies (e.g. Doff et al 2011), have developed a discourse on Welsch's definition of 'transculturality.' Several critics of literary and cultural studies propose 'transculturality' as the appropriate descriptive term for the modern form of cultural mixing that does not exclusively rely on one nation state or culture in a globalizing age (Antor 2010; Huggan 2006; Schulze-Engler et al 2009; Eze 2005; Birkle 2004).

Most critics do not distinguish between the similar yet different concepts of ethnic diversity, such as 'multiculturalism' or 'interculturality.' The different prefixes have considerable impact on the meaning of the terms and their concepts of culture. The prefixes 'intra,' 'inter,' 'multi,' and 'trans' are used in frequent combination with nouns such as culture, ethnicity, difference, nation, locality, or migration. The selected nouns can specify a space or region, a political construct, a movement, or other means of categorizations. Selected terms are used with two different suffixes 'ality' or 'lism' as in multiculturality and multiculturalism, translocality and translocalism, or internationality and internationalism. The different suffixes are recurrently used interchangeably across the disciplines and discourses. Thus, a slightly different meaning is generated, which respectively focuses on a person's attributes or functions as a descriptive term of the phenomenon as a whole. To illustrate the function of the different prefixes, the noun 'culture' is used exemplarily. The delineation of 'transculturality' from 'interculturality' and 'multiculturality' stresses the difference between the different prefixes and the accompanying conceptualizations. *Intraculturality* focuses

on the interaction within a specific culture and within its limits. *Interculturality* describes the interaction of different cultures and *multiculturality* concentrates on different cultures and their interaction "*within one society*" (Welsch 1999: 196; emphasis original).

To Welsch, the two terms 'interculturality' and 'multiculturality' are almost as inappropriate as the outdated model of 'single culture' because all three feature an element of separation that can easily trigger racial connotations (1999: 195). According to the theory of 'single cultures,' cultures can be compared to 'billiard balls,' 'islands,' or 'silos,' which translates into an underlying model of separate units. This theory relates to Johann Gottfried Herder's concept, which dates back to the eighteenth century (Welsch 1999; Tomlinson 2001).

Similar to the concept of '*intra*culturalism' and '*multi*culturalism,' '*inter*culturalism' assumes cultures as separate entities (Huggan 2006: 58). Intercultural self-definition, though, is still practiced around the world, mostly referring to monocultural narratives, such as the nation (Antor 2006: 36). Interculturality focuses on the relationship between cultures. Therefore, an intercultural conception is not superfluous but needs to persist (Schulze-Engler 2006: 45). One example is the reduction of racism through recognition and respect of cultural difference within a multicultural society. While the term 'interculturality' is chiefly applied on an international level, 'multiculturalism' is predominantly used with regard to most national debates (Antor 2006: 29).

Multiculturalism tends to entail clear-defined and differing cultures within one society and thus, the prefix 'multi' can create borders, boundaries, and categorizations of different cultures. The prefix 'multi' is frequently used interchangeably with the prefix 'poly,' as in 'multiculturalism' and 'polyculturalism.' There is, however, a difference between the two terms. Whereas the former is criticized for focusing on the division of the different cultures, the latter focuses on the interrelated and integrative function of all world cultures.

Multiculturalism, a model for considering a variety of different cultures and their interplay within one society, captures only half of the picture of modern cultures of today (Welsch 1997: 87). The term is flawed because it still conveys separate entities of cultures as in the outdated model of 'single cultures' (Welsch 1999). Welsch acknowledges, however, that different societies have different forms of multiculturalism (Welsch 1999: 196). Welsch refers to a number of cultural influences within one society as 'inner transculturality' that only explains part of the actual polycultural societies of today (Gippert et al 2008: 11; Welsch 1997: 87).

In addition to Welsch's 'inner transculturality,' the external networking of different cultures defined as 'outer transculturality' explains cultural exchange

across national borders more precisely (Welsch 1999). A global transcultural network of cultures illustrates their constant and dynamic processes of intertwining, interlocking, and exchange. Multiculturalism, which describes "the existence of different cultures in one nation" (Birkle 2004: 6), stresses the *coexistence* of different cultures rather than their *dialogical exchange* and the productive transgression of (cultural) boundaries (Antor 2006: 330). This uniqueness and thus difference of a particular culture constitutes the weakness of the concept of 'multiculturalism.' Some critics claim that this conception of culture relies on the concept of single cultures as monolithic entities based on Herder (Welsch 1999; Eze 2005: 21; Benhabib 2002: 4). This understanding of cultures as distinct cultural communities within a society can result in mutual forms of separation or even 'ghettoization' (Welsch 1999).

In contrast to the neighboring terms mentioned above, Welsch's 'transculturality' describes a potentially non-hierarchical networking of cultures across borders. The concept of 'transculturality' manages to capture the multidirectional relationship both between *and* within cultures because "the prefix 'trans' clearly expresses the transitional character, which includes the adoption of various cultural elements as well as the change of the groups involved" (Fitz 2001: 38).

Welsch's definition of transculturality goes beyond the early concept of 'single cultures' and the more recent ideas of 'multiculturalism' and 'interculturality' (1999: 194). In the age of globalization, cultures are not monocultural but instead have undergone a shift towards increased mixing and permeations. According to Welsch, transculturality describes a new form of cultures today that "*passes through* classical cultural boundaries" (1999: 196; emphasis original). The approach of different, separate spheres as in monocultures is no longer valid. Rather, cultures are characterized by mobility and inspired by constant dynamics of change and exchange. Complex hybridization processes take place between different cultures as well as within individual cultures. Thus, Welsch introduces the term 'transculturality' as a new concept of culture that transcends the notion of "inner homogenization and outer separation" (1999: 195).

Wolfgang Welsch makes the distinction between transculturality on the *macro-level* and on the *micro-level*. The macro-level of transculturality refers to cultures as societies. Enhanced by globalization and its effects, cultures are both increasingly diverse within themselves and also progressively interconnected with and influenced by other cultures. In addition to the global and almost instantaneous availability of cultural elements, the detachment of culture from a specific location weakens the definitions of cultural 'ownness' or 'foreignness.' Identity formation on the micro-level refers to the cultural identity of the individual. Welsch claims that "we are all cultural hybrids" (1999: 197). In his approach,

Welsch calls for more acceptance and tolerance. He argues that recognizing "a degree of internal foreignness forms a prerequisite for the acceptance of the external foreign. It is precisely when we no longer deny, but rather perceive, our inner transculturality, that we will become capable of dealing with outer transculturality" (Welsch 1999: 201). Hence, inner plurality must first be recognized before global plurality can be acknowledged.

The transgression from 'inter' to 'trans' can be summarized by a change of perspective and the degree of subject involvement from what different cultures do with an individual to what different individuals do with culture (Schulze-Engler 2006: 46). This change of perspective designates a new form of agency in which an individual has the ability to select different cultural affiliations. Although a new trend can be recognized, political, social, or economical oppression are still present. Nonetheless, both, intercultural and transcultural conceptions, continue to coexist.

Wolfgang Welsch's concept of 'transculturality' provides many opportunities but also features some limitations. Welsch's interpretation of Herder's concept of culture is heavily criticized for misinterpreting Herder as 'culturally racist' (Löchte 2005: 23). Welsch argues that single cultures are defined by "social homogenization, ethnic consolidation and intercultural delimitation" (1999: 194). In line with this approach, cultures barely have contact with each other due to their isolation. Moreover, 'transculturality' is conceived as a model of a cultural pluralism that "leads to openness and a limited form of freedom, although loss of orientation and aimlessness may also be experienced" (Nadig 2004: 10). Indeed, transculturality can lead to processes of cultural (de-)fragmentation as in some cases of migration, diasporas, or political and religious exile. Therefore, the question needs to be raised whether Welsch fails to consider the negative aspects of his idea of culture. Transculturality does include processes of destructing and restructuring, however, "the new construction of geographically-independent, transcultural and virtual identities is the central theme" (Nadig 2004:10). Hence, borders and categories are redefined. Moreover, Welsch fails to mention whether transculturality is a final stage of something culturally new or simply a type of interstage of cultural identity. Thus, the main question is whether 'transculturality' truly is a new approach or simply a new version of the renowned concept of 'hybridity' in disguise. Transculturality can function as an additional model to describe cultures and their (co)existence but not every culture is transcultural.

The notion of 'transculturality' is not entirely new. In his works published in the 1990s, Welsch does not mention the term's earlier diffusion in Central and South America. In 2009, the critic explains that he just learned that the attribute

'transcultural' has been used in cultural studies as early as the 1960s (2009: 3). In fact, Welsch' definition of 'transculturality' is closely linked to Fernando Ortiz's concept of 'transculturation.' In the 1940s, Ortiz coined the term 'transculturation' (1978; Ashcroft et al 2000: 233) in his book *Contrapunteo cubano del tabaco y el azúcar* (Cuban Counterpoint: Tobacco and Sugar). The Cuban sociologist aimed at replacing the coupled terms of 'deculturation' and 'acculturation,' which referred to the one-directional transfer between cultures in a fashion envisioned by the colonial center (Pratt 1992: 228). Whereas 'acculturation' explains the process of a forced adoption of foreign cultural elements of the colonized by the colonizer, 'deculturation' describes the act of losing or abandoning culture of the 'uncultivated' colonized, a process that is forced by the colonizer. Both entail the underlying assumption of a hierarchical dichotomy in which the colonizer dictates cultural adoption or loss.

With Ortiz's studies, the concept of 'transculturation' sparked a predominantly Latin American discourse in the 1960s, which has slowly been recognized in non-Spanish speaking countries recently. According to Malinowski, who is quoted in Ortiz's *Cuban Counterpoint – Tobacco and Sugar*, transculturation "provides us with a term that does not contain the implications of a certain culture towards which the other must tend, but an exchange between cultures, both of them active, both contributing their share, and both co-operating to bring about a new reality of civilization" (1995: ix).

The terms 'intraculturalism,' 'interculturality,' 'multiculturalism,' and 'transculturality' continue to exist, each describing cultures and their specific interplay in a distinct way. The existence and coexistence of the different forms is a social reality. The prefixes help to distinguish between different forms of cultural exchange as well as forms of integration within one society. Their difference, however, it not always recognized as many use the prefixes interchangeably. Furthermore, many metaphors of identity and integration, such as the Canadian mosaic, describe cultures and their forms of adaption and integration of immigrants. These literary idioms are introduced in the following section.

4.4 THE MELTING POT, SALAD BOWL, AND CANADIAN MOSAIC

Literary idioms such as the *melting pot*, *salad bowl*, and *mosaic* are commonly used with regard to immigration, integration, and cultural pluralism in North America. The three metaphors function as an ideological guideline of how cultural adaption is expected (Wilson 2010: 24). These forms of narratives, myths,

and stories are thus often used for nation-building purposes. They are applied as a socio-political strategy, targeted at new arrivers to easily refer to the concept of how cultures interact in a certain society. Depending on the type of concept, cultural integration is limited.

This idea of 'cultural fusion' was sparked along the major waves of immigration to the U.S. at the turn of the twentieth century (Wilson 2010: 2). The play *The Melting-Pot* by Israel Zangwill (1916 [1909]) described a new form of cultural pluralism and thus initiated the term's usage. The melting pot model is similar to the less renowned concept of a 'stew' in which different ingredients mix into one new entity. Taken in a cultural context, different cultural influences blend to form one identity, such as a national one. The metaphor of the melting pot was used to unite the relatively young American nation and its diverse people. Thus, the melting pot has become the famous illustration of how immigrants should assimilate, integrate, and incorporate into American society upon arriving. Some critics describe the concept as an unsuccessful form of assimilation (Glazer et al 1964; Wilson 2010: 15) because *intra*cultural individualism is lost.

The main difference between the metaphor of the 'melting pot' and the 'salad bowl' lies in the different degree of assimilation and cultural uniformity. In contrast to the 'melting pot,' the metaphor of the 'salad bowl' improves the acknowledgement of these intracultural variances because the distinct ingredients do not simply mix but form a picture in its entirety. The prerequisite is, however, metaphorically speaking, an interesting dressing that goes well with all ingredients. The common culture of Americans can be interpreted as such a dressing (Fitzgerald 1997: 68). The idiom suggests that one nation is made of different parts that remain different but connected by a common American identity. This understanding of distinct cultures forming a whole is similar to the Canadian model of the mosaic.

The Canadian model of the 'mosaic' is similar to the U.S. American model of the 'salad bowl.' Both argue against wholesale assimilation. A mosaic features different sizes, colors, and shapes of its pieces, forming a picture only in its multiplicity, a so-called 'patterned whole' (Fitzgerald 1997: 68). The metaphor of the mosaic was established much later in the history of the Canadian nation and represented a shift in Canadian society and the integration of different ethnicities at the beginning of the twentieth century (Ernst et al 2010: 7f.). The sociologist John Arthur Porter introduced the concept of the 'vertical mosaic' to describe Canadian culture and society and its hierarchical ranking of classes and thus ethnicities (1965). He explains that Canada has different cultures, languages, and regions that can be compared to the form of a mosaic. The theme of the 'mosaic' is uniquely Canadian and mostly contrasted with the American

model of the 'melting pot' in which every immigrant's culture is dissolving to form the new, assimilated American culture. In a mosaic, the distinct cultures within a society remain visible, forming together the whole picture of Canadian culture, society, and identity.

The distinct entities of a multicultural society, however, may form ethnic silos due to their coexistence instead of intermingling processes. Thus, the criticism of the Canadian model of multiculturalism encompasses three main issues. First, the 'vertical' aspect of the Canadian mosaic metaphor, as Porter claims, can hint at the uneven distribution of power through classes (1965: 27). Second, the government's involvement in a society's cultural and ethnic issues is criticized (Ernst et al 2010: 9). And lastly, two of the most deep-rooted Canadian-based groups, the French-speaking in Quebec and the indigenous population (Inuit), have been largely neglected in this model. Since English and French, in this order, are still the official languages and the favored cultures in Canada, the concept of a multicultural mosaic is somewhat undermined (Ernst et al 2010: 8).

In the three selected novels of this study, different forms of cultural identity, community and incorporations of immigrants into the city's and nation's society prevail. Even within a novel, different ideologies exist, coexist, and sometimes clash. With the help of the poetics of narrative, place, and code-switching, the different concepts of cultures and their mixing, coexistence, or coercion will be analyzed. Thus, before the literary analysis, the basic features of comparison will be identified in the following chapter.