

INTERKULTURELLE PÄDAGOGIK UND POSTKOLONIALE THEORIE

Band 2

Heike Niedrig / Christian Ydesen
(eds.)

Writing Postcolonial Histories
of Intercultural Education

PETER LANG

Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

Writing Postcolonial Histories of Intercultural Education

INTERKULTURELLE PÄDAGOGIK UND POSTKOLONIALE THEORIE

Herausgegeben von Heike Niedrig und Louis Henri Seukwa

Band 2



PETER LANG

Frankfurt am Main · Berlin · Bern · Bruxelles · New York · Oxford · Wien

Heike Niedrig / Christian Ydesen
(eds.)

Writing Postcolonial Histories of Intercultural Education



PETER LANG

Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

**Bibliographic Information published by the Deutsche
Nationalbibliothek**

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the
Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data is
available in the internet at <http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

Cover Design:

© Olaf Gloeckler, Atelier Platen, Friedberg

Gratefully acknowledging financial support
by the Danish School of Education
at the University of Aarhus
and by iMiR - Institut für Migrations- und
Rassismussforschung e.V., Hamburg

ISSN 1867-626X

ISBN 978-3-631-60904-0 (Print)

ISBN 978-3-653-02004-5 (E-Book)

DOI 10.3726/978-3-653-02004-5

© Peter Lang GmbH

Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften

Frankfurt am Main 2011

All rights reserved.

All parts of this publication are protected by copyright. Any
utilisation outside the strict limits of the copyright law, without
the permission of the publisher, is forbidden and liable to
prosecution. This applies in particular to reproductions,
translations, microfilming, and storage and processing in
electronic retrieval systems.

www.peterlang.de

Preface and Acknowledgements

The idea for this book has its roots in a symposium titled “Writing Histories of Intercultural Education”, held at the European Conference on Educational Research (ECER) in Vienna in September 2009. Susanne Spieker and Christian Ydesen, both members of the European Educational Research Association’s (EERA) Network 17, “Histories of Education”, had invited members of the EERA Network 7, “Intercultural Education and Social Justice”, to convene a joint symposium in an effort to explore the historical dimensions of current concepts, theories and practices of Intercultural Education.

The experimental attempt to intermarry these two educational sub-disciplines – the ‘historians’ and the ‘interculturalists’ – proved to be more of a challenge than anticipated. The reactions to the eight contributions by members of the two different EERA networks ranged from interested openness and mild bemusement to the sceptical question of whether what these ‘others’ were doing really qualified as science. One may conclude that the historically developed and ingrained differences between ‘scientific cultures’ should not be underestimated. In the metaphorical terms of courtship patterns, the symposium was certainly not a marriage, but rather a first date. However, even though many participants did not experience ‘love at first sight’, others were intrigued by the encounter and decided to create an anthology in order to follow up on the interesting issues that arose from these initial discussions.

Only three of the contributions to this volume (Baquero Torres, Niedrig, Ydesen) are based on papers presented at the symposium. Since, for personal reasons, Susanne Spieker could not embark on such a project, Heike Niedrig (Intercultural Education) took her place, joining Christian Ydesen (History of Education) as co-editor of the anthology. Through our various scientific networks and connections, we invited additional contributions. Many positive responses came from a ‘new’ generation of educational researchers not yet firmly established in the institutionalised structures; thus to some extent, this anthology has also evolved into a platform for up-and-coming young researchers.

With few exceptions, the contributions were written in English by non-native speakers or had to be translated into English. Since we had limited financial resources, we could not afford professional translation services. Proofreading the final text versions was, therefore, a particularly challenging task. We were extremely fortunate to have our two English speaking authors from the United States helping us in this endeavour, and would like to express our special gratitude to *Adrea Lawrence* and *Christopher J. Frey* who tirelessly provided valuable input that far exceeded our expectations for the proofreading process.

Many messages crossed the ocean in order to negotiate the finer nuances of meaning. Their commitment to the anthology project was truly priceless.

We gratefully acknowledge the financial support from the Danish School of Education, University of Aarhus, for funding the proofreading, and from the “Institut für Migrations- und Rassismusforschung e.V. (iMiR)” (Institute for Research about Migration and Racism) in Hamburg, Germany, for subsidising the publication costs. We are further indebted to Prof. Dr. İnci Dirim, University of Vienna, for providing financial aid as well as linguistic assistance in translating the Turkish contribution to this anthology.

Heike Niedrig and Christian Ydesen, June 2011

Contents

Writing Postcolonial Histories of Intercultural Education – An Introduction

Heike Niedrig and Christian Ydesen 9

Othering and its Effects – Exploring the Concept

Oscar Thomas-Olalde and Astride Velho 27

Re-Writing the History of Intercultural Education in Germany from a Postcolonial Theory Perspective

Patricia Baquero Torres 52

Intercultural Education in a post-National Socialist Society – Processes of Remembrance in Dealing with Racism and anti-Semitism

Astrid Messerschmidt 74

‘Ethnic Conflicts’ or Racism? – A German Case Study about “‘Problematic’ ways of acquiring NS-History in Multicultural Classrooms” re-interpreted from a “Racism-Critical” Perspective

Rosa Fava 95

Yoshitsune Legends in Ezo-Hokkaido: Myth and the Teaching and Learning of Colonialism in Japan’s North

Christopher J. Frey 122

Lessons of Colonization: Uni- and Multi-Directional Learning in Pueblo Indian Country

Adrea Lawrence 148

Contents

‘No man is a man who does not discover something, be it a new star or an old manuscript’ – The Debate over New Education in Late Colonial India

Catriona Ellis 171

‘The Others’ in the Turkish Education System and in Turkish Textbooks

Mustafa Çapar..... 195

Education, Recognition and the Sami People of Norway

Jonas Jakobsen..... 222

Educating Greenlanders and Germans – Minority Education in the Danish Commonwealth, 1945 – 1970

Christian Ydesen..... 239

Post-Colonial Education in West Africa: The Relevance of Local Cultural Teachings for Understanding School, Community, and Society Interface

George J. Sefa Dei..... 268

Multicultural Education and Apartheid – Educational Discourses in South Africa

Heike Niedrig 289

Notes on Contributors 316

Writing Postcolonial Histories of Intercultural Education – An Introduction

Heike Niedrig and Christian Ydesen

1. “Intercultural Education” – an educational concept with a “short history”...

Even though our report of the dynamics at the symposium from which this anthology originated (see preface) might suggest it, we do not claim that a historical accounting of the development of “multicultural education” is completely new. In fact, almost any academic publication that provides an introduction to issues of multi- or intercultural education/pedagogy starts with a short review of the different stages of its development. As a rule, however, this educational development is located in the context of mass migration after World War II, and the scope of historical research is rather limited (cp. the comprehensive critical review by Myers 2009). This might not be so very surprising when considering European nations. But as far as we know, the discussion about intercultural or multicultural education does not reach further back than the 1970s, even in countries with a long history of immigration that define themselves explicitly as immigration countries such as Australia, Canada and the United States (see e.g., Kasinitz, Waters & Mollenkopf 2002; Levitt & Waters 2002). For a long time, the dominant cultural identity in Australia and Canada was – due to their Commonwealth membership – British; and their “native populations” were not perceived as cultural collectives of equal standing. Therefore, a new orientation in education globally only came about as a result of post-war immigration from Southern and Eastern European and from Asian countries; and in the case of Canada, was assisted by demands of the self-assertive francophone minority. In the U.S., before the 1960s, the “melting-pot-ideology” had prevented any serious educational interest in ethnic and cultural differences, even though Steiner-Khamsi (1992) reports about a first multicultural movement in education in the 1920s and 1930s. But it was the Civil Rights Movement in the 1950s and 1960s against ‘racial segregation’ in schools that proved to be the decisive impulse to make cultural differences and conflicts subjects of study in the formal school system, along with the public acknowledgement of minority cultures and their political rights. Other ethnic minorities followed the example of African Americans; and the Ethnic-Revival-Movement instigated according developments in pedagogy in the 1970s, which was labelled as “multicultural education” (Auernheimer 2007: 26f.).

2. ... but with a “long past”

The dominant view in Western Europe that “multicultural” issues in education are recent phenomena that date back no further than the labour immigration after World War II has been challenged by a group of educational historians in Germany since the late 1980s (e.g. Krüger-Potratz 1989; Krüger-Potratz, Jasper & Knabe 1998, Knabe 2000). Their historical research of the educational policies in the German Empire (*Kaiserreich*; 1871 – 1918) and during the Weimar Republic (1918-1933) shed light on early patterns of constructing differences along the lines of nationality, ethnicity, culture and language, and a number of educational responses that have been – unconsciously – revitalized after 1945 in dealing with immigrant children. This research has, therefore, given valuable insights into the “long past” of the “short history” of intercultural education in Germany, and into the many unnoticed continuities of patterns in educational responses by the German national education system to the presence of “other” children – to children who are perceived as not really belonging to the ‘German national collective’ which is imagined as culturally homogeneous (Krüger-Potratz 2005: 62ff.). Only very recently, though, since about 2005, German colonialism was included in the investigation of the “long past” of multicultural discourses in education.

As recounted by Goodman, McCulloch & Richardson (2009: 696f.), the International Standing Conference for the History of Education (ISCHE) turned its attention to these questions a decade earlier at a conference in Lisbon 1993 under the heading of “Education Encounters Peoples and Cultures: The Colonial Experience (16th – 20th Centuries)”. The subsequent publication of selected papers included an inspiring, programmatic historiographical essay by António Nóvoa who proposed *rethinking history and history of education* in an interdisciplinary manner, drawing on the insights of postcolonial theory and related critical theory traditions in order to “bring multiple and diversified points of view into the historical narrative” (Nóvoa 1995: 25).

In this spirit, the contributions to our anthology give insights into the (pre)-history of intercultural issues in education across a vast range of historical, national-geographical and political contexts – from medieval Japan via colonial India to post-Apartheid South Africa and post-Holocaust Germany. In the words of Cornel West, we may say that this anthology is a veritable attempt

To thrash the monolithic and homogeneous in the name of diversity, multiplicity, and heterogeneity; to reject the abstract, general, and universal in light of the concrete, specific, and particular; and to historicize, contextualize and pluralize by highlighting the contingent, provisional, variable, tentative, shifting and changing (1990: 93).

Yet, from these diverse accounts a number of patterns do emerge that transcend the historically specific and the contingent. We will try and outline some of these more general issues.

3. The history of the terminology of “culture”

One of the most contested conceptual issues in the recent internal debates in the field of “multicultural/intercultural education” has been the term “culture” itself – as well as its derivatives. There are plenty of attempts to differentiate, for instance, between the most common terms “multicultural” and “intercultural.” In his first introductory textbook for teacher education students in 1990, Auernheimer, one of the most renowned German educational scholars in the field of “intercultural education“, summarized the conceptual discussions of the time around this term in German, English and French discourses: Some authors suggested, for instance, that “multicultural” was a descriptive term to denote the fact that Western immigration societies were made up of a multitude of ‘cultures’, whereas “intercultural” should be used as normative or prescriptive term to discuss appropriate educational responses to the multicultural reality. Other authors saw “intercultural” as a term that helped to overcome some of the shortcomings of the ‘multicultural perspective’ because the prefix “inter” underscores the idea of interaction and exchange as opposed to the idea of a mere neighbourhood of self-contained ‘cultures’ (Auernheimer 1990: 1ff.). The more recent terms “transcultural” and “cross-cultural” have been promoted on similar grounds; in fact, they go beyond the idea of a simple exchange by implying mixture and hybridization.

The debate around the most appropriate prefix already hints at the core of the problem, which actually resides in the basic notion of “culture”. The term “culture” in its ethnographic sense has been traced back to Sir Edward Burnett Tylor (1832–1917), considered by many as founding figure of British Social Anthropology. Tylor used the elitist German term “Kultur” which was based on Hegelian philosophy and ‘democratized’ it, so to speak, by shifting its meaning from the purely ‘spiritual sphere’ into social and practical domains, including tools and weapons, dress and food production, as well as beliefs, art, morals, and the laws and customs of any human society. However, Tylor spoke of “culture” in the singular and had an evolutionary view of a comprehensive human culture or civilization according to which differences were due to different stages of development (Tylor 1873; also see Wax 1993).

The notion of culture on which the political and educational multiculturalism of the 1970s was based goes back to the ‘Boas-Benedict’-concept of culture

(Boas 1911, Benedict 1934). These anthropologists promoted the idea of a plurality of ‘cultures’, and their approach laid the foundation for so-called ‘cultural relativism’, or the claim that each ‘culture’ is organized according to a unique pattern profoundly distinct from other cultural collectives, thereby negating a universalistic socio-cultural development culminating in (Western style) modernity. Murray Wax, the first president of the “Centre of Anthropology and Education” in Washington (D.C.), speaks of the “irony” that this notion of culture started to become the central concept of debates in pedagogy and educational policy in the U.S. (as well as in other Western immigrant countries) at precisely the time when influential cultural anthropologists began to question the validity of this concept (Wax 1993: 99). As Carrither argues in the section “Culture” in the *Dictionary of Anthropology* (1997), the concept of culture – regardless of its theoretical and empirical merits – has promoted a number of problematic views, such as the perception that the world is segmented into relatively autonomous societies with homogeneous ‘cultures’, each rooted in their own traditions: “Yet societies are hardly autonomous; they exist in relations of commerce, of mutual dependence and (above all) in relationships of dominance and subjections with others” (Carrither 1997: 101).

And indeed, most of the recent contributors to the field of “intercultural education” agree about the dangers of an essentialist concept of culture, and tend to adopt a constructivist approach when dealing with issues of ‘culture’, taking into account the “relationships of dominance and subjection”. This view may be called one of the ‘common denominators’ of the contributions to this anthology, even though the implications of this view are spelled out in decidedly different ways.

4. Pioneer research into the pre-history of educational research

Susanne Spieker, one of the original convenors of the symposium (see preface), who is currently writing her Ph.D. dissertation examining the influence of the ‘discovery of America’ on European educational thought, has presented pioneering historical work on the issues we wish to address in this volume. In her article, “An early researcher in the field of education: Bernardino de Sahagún in sixteenth-century Mexico” (Spieker 2008), she writes about the life and work of the Franciscan friar Sahagún (1499/1500 – 1590) who travelled to New Spain [Mexico] in 1529 to work as a missionary amongst the Nahuatl, and has since become famous for his ethnographic work on the late Aztec Empire before 1519 and his historiography of Meso-American pre-Columbian cultures (*General History of the Things of New Spain*; 1578/79). In her final comments, Spieker fo-

cuses on the fact that Sahagún's work, which was undertaken in the service of the Catholic mission in New Spain, can be perceived as an example of early educational research practice:

Though Sahagún is rooted in Renaissance humanism, his methods of research are surprisingly valid in today's empirical educational research; for example using questionnaires, expert interviews, representative surveys. Like many researchers even today, he retained his own and his former pupils' bias – the language of the upper classes was adopted by the priests as model for their own use; common people, on the other hand, were not questioned (ibid. 771).

Spieker also concludes, based on Dussel's philosophical approach, that Sahagún's educational research is "part of a process of simplification in which the mainly Spanish missionaries of sixteenth-century New Spain managed centrality through hegemony of an integrating culture", and that therefore, "Sahagún stands at the beginning of a very ambiguous process which led to the integration of the Indians into the (European) story of mankind" (ibid.).

Another insight, however, emerges from Spieker's account of Sahagún's research motivation, which we consider of great importance for a postcolonial historiography of "intercultural educational research", but which is not taken up in the conclusion to the text. Spieker recurrently refers to Sahagún's research motives: In one instance, his conclusion that it was necessary to explore pre-Hispanic Aztec culture because "'idolatrous things' happened in the presence of priests without their understanding" (ibid. 761); in another instance, Sahagún's observation "how metaphorical language was openly mixed into Christian song texts without the priests even realising it" (ibid. 762); and yet in another example, "Sahagún cites several examples [...] how Aztec festivities continued under the guise of Catholic Saints" (ibid. 763). "The knowledge of Aztec gods is explained as important in combating the Nahua's religious beliefs" (ibid. 764), as Spieker notes, and from this follows the "necessity to understand the 'exact and metaphorical meanings', 'their way of speaking, and most of their [the Nahua's] ancient practices, the good and evil'" (ibid. 765).

Apparently, the perceived need for an "improvement of intercultural understanding" (ibid. 771), which in terms of research practice meant to embark on an endeavour to better *understand the cultural 'Others'*, arose as the need to better *control these colonized Others* as objects of missionary zeal.

5. A postcolonial perspective on “intercultural education”

A notable change of the original symposium title in naming this anthology is the insertion of the term “postcolonial”. We suggest that an explicitly postcolonial perspective in retracing the pre-history of the current debates about “interculturality” is needed to decentre the hegemonic accounts in order to focus on issues that tend to be sidelined (see also Nóvoa 1995). This view can be spelled out with respect to the three central terms of this anthology:

First, we wish to point out the specific historical contexts in which the anthropological concept of *culture* has been conceived and developed. European anthropology is rooted in European exploration, expansion and colonialism. As Spieker’s historical research has made visible, the desire for ethnological knowledge about the ‘culture’ of the ‘others’ cannot be separated from the context of colonial domination and subjection. Postcolonial theorists, therefore, understand knowledge production about the colonized Others as part of a power-knowledge-complex (e.g. Spivak 1984).

Second, postcolonial theory is a decentred approach to *history*, undermining the European master narrative. As Stuart Hall points out, the postcolonial retelling of the past offers an alternative narrative, which presents colonialism not as a local or marginal sub-plot within a ‘greater history’, but as a central, comprehensive world-historical event that fundamentally altered all existing structures. Postcolonialism perceives ‘colonisation’ as a global transformative process; and the globalised world, including the current global migration movements, is, basically, a postcolonial phenomenon. Since 1492, European explorations, ‘discoveries’, expansion and colonisation processes have transformed the world irrevocably, and ethnic essentialism has become an increasingly impossible strategy (Hall 2006: 249f.).

Third, *education* as a science is part of the development of the modern Human Sciences (such as sociology, history, anthropology, psychology, pedagogy, human biology and medicine etc.), which is closely connected to the development of natural sciences and their quest for classification as well as scientific race theories of 18th and 19th century, particularly in the era called “Enlightenment”. Much has been said and debated regarding the question of the extent to which the prominent philosophers of the Enlightenment, such as Immanuel Kant and Georg F. W. Hegel, and their philosophical world views and views of humankind can be called “racist”, e.g., Kant’s lecture (1775) “*Von den verschiedenen Racen der Menschen: Von der Verschiedenheit der Racen überhaupt*” (On the different races of men: On the diversity of races in general). By introducing the concept of ‘race’ into the German discourse of Enlightenment, Kant laid the foundation for the concept of racial hierarchy, in spite of assertions

that his race concept was actually ‘neutral’ or even ‘progressive’ because he proclaimed an equality of the human origin, regardless of the diversity of ‘races’ (Piesche 2005: 31f.). A similar debate revolves around the question whether it is possible to dismiss openly racist assessments of “the Africans” in Hegel’s writings as irrelevant for the truth of his universalist philosophy of history (Farr 2005: 147ff.). From a postcolonial perspective, the essential point, however, is the observation that like other European intellectuals, Kant and Hegel wrote about the world and about ‘mankind’ from a White European male perspective, and that the discourses of European Enlightenment constructed “women” as the emotional or irrational Other of male rationality and “savages” as the primitive antithetical Other of European progress (Weigel 1987). The concept of “Othering” is probably one of the most powerful analytical tools of postcolonial criticism. Therefore, we have dedicated the first contribution to this anthology to an exploration of this term and its theoretical history (Thomas-Olalde & Velho).

From the point of view of educational research, equally important as explicit race theories are the implicit allusions and influences of the colonial context on pedagogical thinking and writing. Of all ‘human sciences’, pedagogy, in particular, is a project of European Enlightenment in the service of human and social progress. In fact, even contemporary writers have spoken of the 18th century as the “pedagogical century” (Tenorth 2000: 79). In his lectures “On Pedagogy” at the University of Königsberg in the semester 1776/77 (published 1803), Kant proposed to establish pedagogy as a science based on knowledge and reflection with the objective to improve ‘humanity’. In the course of his arguments he describes four stages of education: 1) disciplining or “taming of wildness/savagery”, 2) cultivation, 3) civilisation, and finally 4) moralisation. The crucial question arises of how to balance freedom and constraint in an educational process that aims at ‘autonomy’ and the acceptance of moral principles based on free will; and Kant pleads for utmost freedom in education, only to be constrained within certain limits, which he outlines and justifies. Morality, he argues, cannot be imposed or enforced by means of punishment and reward, but can only be instilled by addressing the pupil as a reasonable being. What is notably lacking in Kant’s idealist proposition of enlightened pedagogy, however, is any reflection on the power differential between educator and pupil, as well as the emotional dependency of the child on her/his caregiver (for a detailed discussion cp. Koller 2004: 25-47).

But power is, of course, at the centre of any educational situation; in the context of ‘multicultural’ or ‘intercultural education’, in educational contexts where historically ingrained majority-minority-relations are at stake, the relevance and merit of a postcolonial perspective of analysis is evident. As postcolonial thinkers assert, the ‘European history’ of Enlightenment and its ideals

of progress and perfection of humanity cannot be separated from the history of exploration, ‘discoveries’ and colonialism. Referencing Godinho (1992), Nóvoa explains that “the Portuguese and the Spanish discoveries brought the consciousness of humankind its unity, thus making both the knowledge of the world and the knowledge of oneself possible” (Nóvoa 1995: 24); they are at the same time at the origin of master narratives that place Europe at the centre of history and ‘civilisation’. In a similar way, Spieker argues that Sahagún’s ethnographical and historiographical work in the 16th century integrated the Nahua into the story of mankind – from the point of view of the Spanish Empire, that is, to use a postcolonial turn of phrase, he fixated them in the “imperial gaze” (Spieker 2008: 759). He thus took part in preparing the grounds for discourses of Enlightenment philosophy referred to above: “Later in the eighteenth century, when evolutionary anthropology and universal conceptions of history developed, this seemingly benevolent integration led to the perception of the indigenous Americans as in a state of childhood compared to the civilized Europeans” (ibid.). To transform children, “little savages”, into civil, cultivated adults whose actions are guided by sound moral judgements based on universally acceptable principles can be and has been described as a colonial project; just as colonialism has always been perceived and legitimised as an educational project.

6. Writing Postcolonial Histories of Intercultural Education

To sum up our editorial perspectives and the framework of this anthology, we refer to the different terms assembled in the anthology’s title which starts with the verb *writing*: The “history of intercultural education” can be written from different perspectives. Therefore we do not presume that this anthology could present “the” history of intercultural education; rather we wish to underscore that these *histories* – in the plural – are produced in the process of writing. As our readers will find, there are many different angles from which to embark on such a writing process.

By adding the *postcolonial* perspective, we have tried to emphasize that the three central notions – history, culture, education – are not ‘neutral’ concepts: They can and, in our view, should be discussed with respect to postcolonial power-knowledge-complexes. As Nóvoa points out, more than three-quarters of the people living today have had their lives shaped by the experience of colonialism (Nóvoa 1995: 26, cp. Ashcroft et al. 1989). Yet critical voices have challenged the idea of “postcoloniality” on the grounds that it was a “homogenizing” and a-historical concept in so far as this label is conferred to regions and nations with vastly different historical backgrounds and contexts (e.g. Shohat 1992,

McClintock 1992): Are Britain, Canada, Nigeria and Jamaica equally postcolonial? Is Britain postcolonial in the same sense as the U.S.? Is it useful at all to think of the U.S. as ‘postcolonial’? Stuart Hall accedes that it is indeed important to carefully observe the different social and ethnical contexts: “Australia and Canada, on the one hand, Nigeria, India and Jamaica on the other, are certainly not ‘post-colonial’ *in the same way*. But this does not mean that they are not ‘post-colonial’ *in any way*” (Hall 2006: 246). This observation includes the quarter of the people whose lives might not have been *directly* shaped by colonial experiences. In order to challenge a simplifying binary view of the global condition of postcoloniality, we have included a number of studies that do not fit into the traditional perspective of ‘Europe’ vs. ‘its colonies’, e.g., the cases of Japan (Frey) and Turkey (Çapar) and their ‘internal others’.

Some of the contributions expressly deal with the concept of *history*: Messerschmidt, for instance, refers to Walter Benjamin in outlining her understanding of history, which assumes the lack of closure of historical experiences of violence. “In the practice of remembrance we attempt to enter into a relation with history in order to understand ourselves [...] and in order to become aware of our own involvement in the effects of this history” (Messerschmidt in this volume, p. 76). Therefore the term postcoloniality should not be interpreted as indicating a successful break with colonialism and neither as a mere descriptive term of chronological succession, but rather as a marker of the present-day effects of colonial history. Other contributions also emphasize the ambiguity which the post-terminology is meant to convey: The terms post-colonial, post-National-Socialist, post-Apartheid all imply that what is considered ‘past’ is not past in the sense of ‘done with’ and concluded, that there is never just a historical rupture, but continuity, even though it proceeds in different forms. While many contributions in this volume focus on the underlying continuities of the experiences of violence and oppression, there are also more optimistic perspectives on ‘historical heritages’ and their empowering potentials (e.g., Dei’s contribution on moral education in Ghana and Nigeria, Jakobsen on the recognition of indigenous Sami culture in Norway).

The term *education*, finally, is also filled with different meanings in the various contributions. When we conceived the idea of this anthology, we had in mind that “intercultural education” was a field of discourse, theory and practice with respect to formal and to some extent non-formal educational settings. But several of the contributions (most notably those of Frey and Lawrence) made us aware that what qualifies as ‘education’ in general, and in the context of (post)-colonialism in particular, goes far beyond that which happens inside of schools and even that which happens outside of schools in a planned manner as Kant’s concept of pedagogy implies.

So editing this anthology was, in itself, an educational project, in terms of interdisciplinarity, but also in terms of international or maybe even ‘intercultural’ exchange. Writing about colonialism, racism and education is always embedded in specific (post)-colonial contexts that are structured by racism (and other relations of power) and shaped by particular educational experiences in and outside of institutions. The contributions in this anthology are therefore heterogeneous in their perspectives and approaches; they are also clearly *written from different subject positions* within social structures, which became particularly evident in the use of the collective pronouns “we” and “our” in some of the contributions, e.g., one of the texts written about Germany (Messerschmidt), on the one hand, and the contribution about Ghana/Nigeria (Dei), on the other hand. These pronouns and the identification of the authors they implied were challenged by our two U.S.-American proofreaders and accordingly amended or clarified. On closer observation, it is interesting to note that these pronouns have different functions in the different contexts: The “we/our” in the text by Messerschmidt express a self-reflective, critical reference to the constructed White German hegemonic collective; for instance, when she explains that anti-Semitic projections are used to “avoid dealing with our own (German) racism and our own (German) colonial history”. Dei, on the other hand, uses these pronouns as an affirmative reference to a collective postcolonial Black African identity he shares, e.g., when he refers to an African history of struggles and resistances to design “our own futures“, when he demands that the African learner must be strengthened in order to design new futures “of which we can collectively be proud“, or that African culture and knowledge must be included in formal education as “essential aspects of our African identity and personality.”

As Laclau (1990) points out, there is no *outside* of power discourse structures; even the grammar of writing indicates that the authors of this anthology are all part of the hegemonic discourses and corresponding power-knowledge-complexes, which each of us tries to analytically dissect, undermine and shift, if only a little, from our different subject positions *within* these very structures.

7. About the contributions

Our first contribution by *Oscar Thomas-Olalde & Astride Velho* provides a theoretical introduction into the concept “Othering” as a key concept of post-colonial theory and as an important conceptual tool of critical analyses of racism, which informs a number of the analytical approaches combined in this anthology. The authors outline the complex theoretical history of the concept, from psychoanalytical concepts developed by the French poststructuralist Jacques La-

can via Edward Said's Orientalism to the re-coining of the term Othering by the postcolonial Indian thinker Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak. The theoretical explorations include postcolonial writings by Stuart Hall and Homi K. Bhabha as well as discourse analytical approaches by Michel Foucault, Ernesto Laclau, Chantal Mouffe and Judith Butler. Based on an analysis of Othering as a discourse and as a dispositive, the authors finally look into experiences and strategies of those who are forcefully 'Othered' in racist contexts. With Laclau they conclude that there is no *outside* of hegemonic discourse structures. The *inside* of these powerful social structures that all of us are part of, however, is not monolithic and unchangeable, but dependent on discursively-constructed, antagonistic divisions, and it is precisely here that anti-hegemonic practices can take effect – by blurring dichotomous distinctions.

The next three chapters deal with the history and controversies around Intercultural Education in Germany. A postcolonial perspective on German history in general is very recent and rather tenuous, and for decades the notion of 'racism' has been almost taboo in German political discourse and social analysis alike. Even critical German social researchers have tended to avoid the term 'racism', and phenomena which would be defined as cases of racism in any other national context, were usually labelled as "hostility to foreigners" (*Ausländerfeindlichkeit*) in Germany until the 1990s and even beyond (see footnote 5 in the Messerschmidt contribution). The fact that overt German involvement in colonialism was cut short due to the defeat of the German Empire in World War I and the subsequent losses of all colonies in 1918, on the one hand, the close association of 'racism' with the atrocities of the National-Socialist regime (1933-1945) in the German historical consciousness, on the other hand, are two explanations for the peculiarities of the German discourse. Those educational researchers who have started to apply postcolonial and racist-critical perspectives to analyse German issues of "Intercultural Education" are still met with a lot of scepticism and resistance.

Against this background, *Patricia Baquero Torres* presents us with new insights into the *long past* of the *short history* of Intercultural Education in Germany by examining how basic discourse structures and racist perceptions that were developed in the context of German colonialism have survived the official end of colonialism and continue to impact the construction of the "migrant-Others" in the context of post-war labour immigration to Germany. In addition, Baquero Torres strongly promotes an approach known as 'intersectionality' to do justice to the complex issues at stake in 'intercultural' negotiations of subject positions such as taking into account the interplay of social categories like 'race', 'class' and 'gender' in the critical analysis of hegemonic discourse and political practices. In particular the category 'gender' is, in her view, indispen-

sable for an adequate understanding of the multi-layered processes of Othering in the German colonial and post-war-migration contexts.

The two contributions by *Astrid Messerschmidt* and by *Rosa Fava* share an approach to the question of “Intercultural Education” in Germany by focussing on the fact that the Federal Republic of Germany is a post-National-Socialist and post-Holocaust society. *Messerschmidt*’s text dissects the issues of postcoloniality and post-National-Socialism in present-day Germany, the different forms of Othering involved in colonial racism and in anti-Semitism, and how they relate to each other. She analyses the variety of defence mechanisms which structure the processes of remembrance in Germany and demonstrates how the hegemonic collective of ‘ethnic Germans’ manages to consolidate a self-image as an enlightened people who have come to terms with their history by accusing migrant-Others (in particular, “Muslim immigrants”) in Germany of anti-Semitic tendencies and of being unable to deal appropriately with ‘German history’. *Messerschmidt* concludes with a brief outline of how to structure historical education with a multi-perspectival approach, which targets a heterogeneous student group without being based on the binary distinction between “Germans” and “migrant-Others.”

While *Messerschmidt* provides us with a bird’s eye view of the theoretical issues at stake, *Fava*’s contribution deals with a case study based on the report of an incident of verbal aggression among a student group visiting a Holocaust memorial and the subsequent educational interventions by the school administration and by mediators from the educational unit of the memorial. Though *Fava* is not so much interested in the individual case as in general discourse structures, her discourse analytical approach can only be performed on concrete discourse material; and she chooses to illustrate her analysis using an article by Bernhard Fechner, who produced an article from his position as an educator of the Anne Frank Community Youth Centre where the case study incident occurred. Fechner’s objective was to present the mediation programme he had developed in the service of the Youth Centre, recommending a new, less morally-laden approach to “Education after Auschwitz.” In so doing, however, he uses a conflict between a group of politically right-wing boys of (ethnic) German descent and their classmates, who have an immigrant background; Fechner interprets this conflict as a case of “intercultural conflict” rather than as a case of racism, as *Fava* would deem far more appropriate. Her detailed analysis of Fechner’s line of argumentation shows how the definition of the conflict as a “multicultural” issue combined with the ingrained perception of a ‘cultural’ division between “Germans” and “non-Germans” form a substructure in Fechner’s analysis, which leads to highly problematic interpretations and ascriptions of motives. In fact, *Fava* is able to show how Fechner’s article, inadvertently, re-

produces a number of the “rejection of guilt”-mechanisms which Fechler himself outlines and criticizes elsewhere. Fava concludes that the “multicultural” perspective is not the most adequate to analyse educational conflicts in racist contexts.

The next two contributions, dealing with relations of dominance and subjection in Northern Japan and in the Southwest of the United States, provide a very different approach to the connection between history, colonialism and education and challenge a more conventional understanding of education. Colonialism has educational effects far beyond the school house and official curricula.

Christopher Frey interprets the development, deployment and reception of a popular medieval Japanese legend as an example of “intercultural education”, dealing with the history of the colonial expansion of Japan and justifying the dominance of the majority-Japanese over the Ainu minority and their core area on Japan’s now northernmost island of Hokkaidō. He introduces us to the mythic hero Minamoto no Yoshitsune (1159 – 1189 CE), an exceptionally famous Japanese prince, who according to the legend, overcame a tragic death and escaped to live among the Ainu. Analysing different versions, transformations, adaptations, and re-interpretations of this legend, Frey takes us on a fascinating journey through 800 years of Japanese colonial history. In the quest for legitimacy as (dominant) residents of the Ainu lands of Ezo, Japanese officials and other agents planted and cultivated the legend of “Yoshitsune in Ezo” among the Ainu, even appropriating the Ainu legend of Okikurumi, an Indigenous mythic hero, in order to fuse these heroes and make Yoshitsune appear indigenous to the Ainu island. What little is known about the (reticent) reception of the Yoshitsune legends among the Ainu, however, seems to suggest that the legend’s success in shaping the popular imagination was largely limited to the colonizing majority who readily identified with the hero. The legend of “Yoshitsune in Ezo” is, in essence, the story of the colonizers.

In contrast, *Adrea Lawrence* shows how colonialism functioned as an ‘educational project’ amongst Pueblo Indian communities and influenced their strategies vis-à-vis representatives of (post)-colonial authorities, as the representatives of the colonial order, with few exceptions, resisted ‘intercultural learning’. Her source material consists of documents and letters produced by a number of officials, teachers and superintendents, in the service of the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) in the Rio Grande Valley of New Mexico between 1902 and 1912. On first view, surprisingly, the documentary record of the BIA tells us little about what went on inside the schoolhouse of the reservation day schools. Instead the documented correspondence and reports indicate which issues were apparently of importance to the writers and to their host communities. Using two ongoing conflicts – one around land use and management on the reservation, the

other around liquor sale to members of the Pueblo communities – Lawrence illustrates the strategies of Pueblo community representatives, who, instead of fighting the colonial system in ongoing opposition, used to learn the hegemonic parameters of previous colonial regimes since the late 17th century and the legal structures of the U.S. colonial regime. As the documentary evidence reveals, Pueblo Indian communities were able to use their learning to advance their own objectives; however, many of the U.S. colonial officials who were new to the region were unable to take into account the experiences of the colonized groups they were in charge of, thus potential lessons were “lost” on them.

The following article by *Catriona Ellis* deals again with discourse in the arena of formal education in the colonial setting of Southern India in the 1930s; her interpretation specifically highlights the particular interests of the colonized elite. In accordance with global trends in educational philosophy of the time, a small group of Indian educational experts propagated “New Education” in opposition to both pre-colonial Indian and colonial education, both of which were criticised as authoritarian and teacher-centred educational approaches. This educational initiative was accompanied by a call for a “more scientific” and simultaneously “more socially and culturally effective” curriculum and way of teaching. From Ellis’ analysis of these discourses around progressive and child-centred education emerge certain normative assumptions about the ‘normal’ child and childhood development. Of particular interest in this context is the construct of the ‘Indian child’ as simultaneously ‘modern’ (like the ‘Western child’) and in need of a ‘culturally specific’ education. The reference to ‘culture’ in these discourses turns out to be linked to social stratification as well as gender constructs. While the (urban) Indian elite positioned themselves through these expert discourses as on a par with educational experts internationally, the rural poor were ‘culturalised’ (presented as ‘culturally different’) and perceived as deviating from (masculine) ‘normality’. By Othering the non-elite children, Indian pedagogues staked their own claims to modernity and universalism.

Mustafa Çapar provides us with insights into the historical backgrounds of present-day educational policy, curricula and textbook content in the Turkish national education system and how these different types of educational texts construct the “Turkish norm(ality)” in contrast to the internal minoritized Others of Turkey. The particular historical background for minority policies in Turkey is the *millet* system of the Ottoman Empire, a system based on religiously defined ‘confessional nations’. Thus, Turkish nationality is conflated with religious Muslim identity in spite of the paradox it produces in a nation-state that avows secularism. Çapar’s analysis reveals many more contradictions and complexities in the official perception of minorities who are either supposed to be non-existent or else dangerous elements threatening the national collective from

within, the latter perception being bolstered by historical narratives of hostility and treason. Çapar argues that the nationalist system of education in Turkey leaves little, if any, room for alternative views of minority issues and fosters ignorance, on the one hand, and hostile and fearful attitudes amongst the ethnic and religious majority on the other hand. Such an attitude often turned into open violence on little provocation in the past.

The following two contributions deal with minority education policies in Scandinavia. *Jonas Jakobsen's* article is probably the most optimistic in outlook within our collection, particularly when contrasted with the assessment of the Turkish minorities' situation outlined above. Jakobsen describes the history of Sami minority policy in the North of Norway as a "success story." He analyzes the postcolonial struggle of the Sami to overcome 300 years of forced assimilation in favour of rights, influence and a positive self-image by drawing on the German philosopher Axel Honneth's concept of recognition. Against a more critical view of postcolonial thinkers like Talal Asad, who have examined the 'Western project' of modernity and the according human rights discourse, Jakobsen affirms Honneth's assertion that there is a universalistic potential in the very idea of equal rights with the Sami case. In order to achieve equal opportunities, however, special provisions might be necessary, particularly in education, and Jakobsen briefly sketches the tension between the ideal of equality and the right to cultural recognition since "culture" is a vague, shifting and contested issue as can be illustrated with respect to the question what "Saminess" implies.

Christian Ydesen presents results of a historical comparative analysis of Danish educational policy towards two rather different minority communities: the Inuit of Greenland, a former Danish colony and later part of the Danish Commonwealth, and the Germans in Southern Jutland, a border territory between Denmark and Germany. Danish educational policies in both cases aimed at assimilation. But the different historical and political contexts resulted in rather different educational provisions and controversies from 1945 – 1970. The comparative perspective highlights the specificity of each of these 'intercultural relations': On the one hand, Greenland is a neo-colonial setting where assimilation aimed at granting Inuit children access to 'modernity', and the policy was, to a considerable extent, endorsed by the colonized subjects themselves, while assimilative ends were, in fact, contradicted by a racialised identification of the Inuit. On the other hand, southern Jutland is a context marked by the recent occupation of Denmark by NS-Germany, where assimilation aimed at neutralising a potentially powerful minority; here, German identity was a matter of choice and self-identification. Danishness was constructed in relation to both alterities – as White modern universal identity in relation to the colonised Others; as democratic, creative, liberal in relation to a post-fascist national minority.

The last two contributions dealing with African educational contexts discuss the role of ‘traditional African culture’ in education from very different perspectives. *George J. Sefa Dei* argues for the adoption of local cultural resource knowledge, such as proverbs, folktales and other forms of folkloric production, into formal teaching contexts as an important educational tool to advance moral education in African contexts. His suggestions are firstly supported by an extensive literature review of the role of indigenous education in moral education and violence prevention. Secondly, results from a qualitative study in Ghana and Nigeria, involving interviews with African educators and elders, demonstrate that proverbs do, indeed, play a substantial role in different teaching contexts inside and outside of schools. Dei argues that resuming cultural knowledge handed-down from past generations does not imply taking recourse to a romanticised past, as no tradition is immune to criticism. In fact, from the narratives of the interviewed teachers emerge a number of contested issues in the employment of traditional proverbs in modern, postcolonial contexts, as Dei illustrates using the example of gender issues. Dei understands (re)claiming African identities and cultural knowledge as an exercise in decolonization that recognizes the authenticity of African identity and experience; and though “authentic“, in his reading, he does not imply that they are “pure” or “uncontaminated”; rather, he suggests that such identities should be seen as authentic and valid in their own right.

The last text by *Heike Niedrig* provides insights into educational conflicts in South Africa after the end of Apartheid. Due to the cultural and educational policies and discourses of the Apartheid-regime, in the South African context “multicultural education” is strongly associated with Apartheid ideology and its essentialist and racialised notions of “culture” and “language”. Based on two different case studies involving different issues of “culture” – the protection of “White Afrikaner culture” on the one hand and the adoption of elements from “traditional African culture” into the school context on the other – the author discusses the multi-layered and contradictory South African discourse on “multicultural education” in order to explore ambivalences in this discourse which are particularly obvious in the South African context, but most likely just as relevant in other contexts as well.

The discourse of “Intercultural Education” can serve to bolster and legitimise hegemonic power relations as not only the Afrikaans-school-conflict in Niedrig’s presentation demonstrates, but also many of the other contributors to this anthology argue. At the same time, acknowledging cultural resources of disempowered communities has an empowering potential, as the Sami-case in Jakobsen’s presentation appears to confirm and as Dei firmly argues. The quest for “Africanising” the South African curriculum, however, is a controversial issue as the concrete case study illustrates. Niedrig’s analysis of this conflict is based

on Stuart Hall's claim that it is not possible to resume a pre-colonial African identity untarnished by colonial oppression. Educators working in "multicultural contexts", therefore, need to be aware of the ambivalences involved in "understanding the Others", and to explore educational strategies to address the histories of power relations and to deconstruct hegemonic subject formations.

Literature

- Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G. & Tiffin, H. (1989): *The Empire Writes Back – Theory and practice in post-colonial literatures*. London/New York.
- Auernheimer, G. (1990): *Einführung in die Interkulturelle Erziehung*. Darmstadt.
- Auernheimer, G. (2007, 5th ed.): *Einführung in die Interkulturelle Pädagogik*. Darmstadt.
- Benedict, R. (1934): *Patterns of culture*. Boston, MA.
- Boas, F. (1911): *The mind of primitive man*. New York.
- Carrither, M. (1997): Article »Culture«. In: Barfield, T. (ed.): *The Dictionary of Anthropology*, 98 – 101.
- Farr, A. (2004): *Whiteness Visible: Enlightenment Racism and the Structure of Racialized Consciousness*. In: Yancy, G. (ed.): *What white looks like: African-American philosophers on the whiteness question*. New York/London, 143 – 158.
- Godinho, V. M. (1992): *L'essor de l'Europe aux XV^e et XVI^e siècles – Les grandes découvertes et la formation d'une civilisation plurielle*. In: *Cadmos*, Vol. 58-59, 89 – 125.
- Goodman, J., McCulloch, G. & Richardson, W. (2009): 'Empires overseas' and 'empires at home': postcolonial and transnational perspectives on social change in the history of education. In: *Paedagogica Historica*, 45: 6, 695 – 706.
- Hall, S. (2006): When was 'the postcolonial'? Thinking at the limit (orig. 1996). In: Chambers, I. & Curti, L. (eds.): *The Postcolonial Question: Common Skies, Divided Horizons*. London, 242 – 260.
- Kant, I. (1803/1983): *Über Pädagogik*. In: Kant, I.: *Werke in 10 Bänden*, ed. by W. Weischedel. Vol. 10 (5th ed.), Darmstadt, 693 – 761.
- Kasinitz, P., Waters, M. C. & Mollenkopf, J. H. & Anil, M. (2002): *Transnationalism and the Children of Immigrants in Contemporary New York*. In: Levitt, P. & Waters, M.C. (eds.): *The Changing Face of Home. The Transnational Lives of the Second Generation*. New York, 96 – 122.
- Knabe, F. (2000): *Sprachliche Minderheiten und nationale Schule in Preußen zwischen 1871 und 1933. Eine bildungspolitische Analyse*. Münster/New York.
- Koller, H.-C. (2004): *Grundbegriffe, Theorien und Methoden der Erziehungswissenschaft. Eine Einführung*. Stuttgart.
- Krüger-Potratz, M. (1989): *Die Ausländerpädagogik versichert sich ihrer Geschichte: Plädoyer für eine historische Minderheitenbildungsforschung*. In: *Unterrichtswissenschaft* 17: 3, 223 – 242.
- Krüger-Potratz, M. (2005): *Interkulturelle Bildung. Eine Einführung*. Münster.
- Krüger-Potratz, M., Jasper, D. & Knabe F. (1998): 'Fremdsprachige Volksteile' und deutsche Schule. *Schulpolitik für die Kinder der autochthonen Minderheiten in der Weimarer Republik*. Münster/New York.

- Laclau, E. (1990): *New Reflections on the Revolution of Our Time*. London.
- Levitt, P. & Waters, M. C. (eds. 2002): *The Changing Face of Home. The Transnational Lives of the Second Generation*. New York.
- McClintock, A. (1992): *The Myth of Progress: Pitfalls of the Term Post-colonialism*. In: *Social Text*, No. 31/32, 281 – 298.
- Myers, K. (2009): *Immigrants and ethnic minorities in the history of education*. In: *Paedagogica Historica*, 45: 6, 801 – 816.
- Nóvoa, A. (1995): *On History, History of Education, and History of Colonial Education*. In: Nóvoa, A., Depaepe, M. & Johanningmeier, E. V. (eds.): *The Colonial Experience in Education: Historical Issues and Perspectives*, Vol. 1 of *Paedagogica Historica Supplementary Series*, 23 – 61.
- Piesche, P. (2005): *Der 'Fortschritt' der Aufklärung – Kants 'Race' und die Zentrierung des weißen Subjekts*. In: Eggers, M. M., Kilomba, G., Piesche, P. & Arndt, S. (eds.): *Mythen, Masken und Subjekte. Kritische Weißseinsforschung in Deutschland*. Münster, 30 – 39.
- Shohat, E. (1992): *Notes on the Postcolonial*. In: *Social Text*, No. 31/32, S. 101 – 109.
- Spieker, S. (2008): *"An early researcher in the field of education: Bernardino de Sahagún in sixteenth-century Mexico"*, in: *History of Education*, Vol. 37, No. 6, 757 – 772
- Spivak, G. C. (1984): *The Rani Of Sirmur*. In: Barker, F. et al. (1985): *Europe and its others*. Vol. 1: *Proceedings of the Essex Conference on the Sociology of Literature July 1984*. Essex.
- Steiner-Khamisi, G. (1992): *Multikulturelle Bildungspolitik in der Postmoderne*. Opladen.
- Tenorth, H.-E. (2000): *Geschichte der Erziehung. Einführung in die Grundzüge ihrer neuzeitlichen Entwicklung* (3rd ed.). München.
- Tylor, E. (1873/1958): *Primitive Culture*. New York: Harper.
- Wax, M. (1993): *How Culture Misdirects Multiculturalism*. In: *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 24: 2, 99 – 115.
- Weigel, S. (1987): *Die nahe Fremde – das Territorium des 'Weiblichen'. Zum Verhältnis von 'Wilden' und 'Frauen' im Diskurs der Aufklärung*. In: Koebner, T. & Pickerodt, G. (eds.): *Die andere Welt. Studien zum Exotismus*. Frankfurt/M., 171 – 199.
- West, C. (1990): *The New Cultural Politics of Difference*. October, 53, 93 – 109.

Othering and its Effects – Exploring the Concept

*Oscar Thomas-Olalde and Astride Velho,
University of Innsbruck, Austria*

Othering has been established as key concept of postcolonial theory, and as such it has also found entry into critical analyses of racism. In this context, *Othering* is defined as a process in which, through discursive practices, different subjects are formed, hegemonic subjects – that is, subjects in powerful social positions as well as those subjugated to these powerful conditions. To arrive at such an analytic description, however, some measure of abstraction is required, because *Othering* denotes simultaneously both the features of discourse structures and processes, and the formation of subjectivity engendered by such discourse. Our contribution focuses on ways in which these two moments constitute each other.

In specialised discussions, but increasingly within everyday communication as well, the term *Othering* is used to refer to phenomena of stereotyping and racialisation. This incorporation of the term into everyday language runs the risk of diminishing the analytic precision of the concept. Therefore we have embarked on a quest for theoretical insights and connections that have been fundamental in the development of the concept *Othering*. Our objectives are, first, to delineate a number of relevant theoretical approaches, and second, to ponder the analytical potential and effects of the concept. Based on the psychoanalytical concepts of Jacques Lacan, the term *Othering* was re-coined by Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak in the context of postcolonial theory, and since then it has been widely applied, in particular within anthropology. Edward Said and Homi K. Bhabha are both prominent writers who have dealt with discursive and political practices that can be described as *Othering*. As to the analytical potential of the concept *Othering*, we will explore several questions: To what extent can the term *Othering* help us to better grasp and understand hegemonic practices and processes of subject formation in Western migration societies, where encounters and conflicts are labelled “intercultural” and where racialisation and ethnification are part of social normality? Further, we will discuss the structural and political effects of an analysis of ethnification and racialisation processes based on the concept of *Othering*. Are the insights which the concept of *Othering* inspires useful for a critical analysis of power structures in migration societies?

1. Theoretical references

1.1 *Being (constitutionally) dependent on others: Jacques Lacan*

At the 16th congress of psychoanalysis 1949 in Zurich, the French psychoanalyst Jacques Lacan presented for the last time his paper “Le stade de miroir” [The mirror stage]. This and other writings by Lacan contributed substantially to changing perspectives about the development of the subject and its identity, moving beyond a solipsist process of a (however-defined) Self, toward consideration of the self as a continuous “dynamic of reflection” in interaction with the environment. Lacan thus created a new reading of the unconscious which in his view was organised like a language – “as discourse of the Other” (Mertens 2000: 26 ff., translated by ed.). He postulated that there can be no a-social desire, but that any desire is engendered by the desire of an Other and thus also through social structures (ibid.).

His concept of the subject, the imaginary structure of the I or the Self, has become a leading concept in (poststructuralist anthropology of) postmodernism, in post-Freudian psychoanalysis, and also in postcolonial approaches which, among other things, deal with processes of *Othering*. The theoretical and analytical core of this concept consists in the constitutive “dependency” of the subject, since the construction of Self and non-Self is only possible via the reflection in the “Other”.

According to Lacan (1973), the mirror stage, which he theorises from the point of view of developmental psychology, is the stage in which a symbolical matrix of subjectivity is developed, an ontological structure of the human world, which remains of lifelong significance: Between the ages of six and 18 months, children first recognise their specular image as reflected in the mirror as a total form of the body, which elicits a jubilant response (ibid.: 63). The infant anticipates in this *Gestalt* (shape/form), in the mirror “outside” the maturation of her/his body and her/his agency, even though s/he is in fact still in a state of motor incapacity, lacking bodily control, completely dependent on the caregiver (ibid.: 64), and without yet the physical sensation of completeness as perceived in the mirror. The mirror stage, which in Lacan’s view is an indispensable stage in the development of the Self, thus fixates the Self in the area of the imaginary. That is to say, the self-image as whole and independent always remains, to some extent, an illusion:

This development is experienced as a temporal dialectic that decisively projects the formation of the individual into history. The *mirror stage* is a drama whose internal thrust is precipitated from insufficiency to anticipation – and which manufactures for the subject, caught up in the lure of spatial identification, the succession of phan-

ties that extends from a fragmented body-image to a form of its totality that I shall call orthopaedic – and, lastly, to the assumption of the armour of an alienating identity, which will mark with its rigid structure the subject’s entire mental development. Thus, to break out of the circle of the *Innenwelt* into the *Umwelt* generated the inexhaustible quadrature of the ego’s verifications (ibid.: 67).¹

Considered from an interaction theory perspective, the act of reflection described by Lacan takes place between the child and her/his caregiver or social environment. The image which is transported through facial expressions and other reactions of the person opposite at the sight of the child is transformed into the self-image of the child. A consciousness of the Self thus develops as one that is alienated, dependent on the opposite person. The images which are thus adopted create an illusion of wholeness, which the individuals as vulnerable beings can never achieve, and which must be defended in order to negate the actual imperfection of the Self.

Based on this concept of the subject as produced in Lacan’s writing (which we could only briefly sketch here), we will discuss in more depth the dynamics of subject formation in the context of *Othering* in the third section of our contribution. We will deal with the effects of constituting hegemonic subjectivity through practices of *Othering* as well as with the psychic form which power takes in the context of *Othering* and racism for those subjected to these experiences (Butler 1997).

1.2 *Othering or being made the “Other”: Edward Said’s Orientalism*²

Another scientific perspective deals with those discursive practices which render others into “Others” and thereby engender a *collective* self-image. This perspective became widely known through the influential work of Edward Said about the construction of the “orient” as the antithesis of the “occident”. In his oeuvre “Orientalism” (Said 2003, orig. 1978), which has been acknowledged as a founding document of postcolonial theory (Castro Varela & Dhawan 2005: 29), Said analyses the discursive practices which produce “the Orient” and “the Oriental” and positions them in a constitutive relationship with the self-image of the “West” – without actually using the term *Othering*; this term was coined as theoretical term by Spivak only in 1985.³

-
- 1 English translation: http://www.acsu.buffalo.edu/~erikconr/courses/DMS_259/readings/05_LacanMirrorStage.pdf, p. 4
 - 2 This part of the text is based on an article about religious Othering (co-authored with Paul Mecheril): Mecheril & Thomas-Olalde 2011.
 - 3 Said himself does not use the term Othering. In the postcolonial reception of his work, however, his analysis of “Orientalism” has been interpreted as an analysis of a paradigm.

According to Said, the mechanisms and the effectiveness of these practices need to be understood in the context of European imperialism and thus as practices of legitimisation and stabilisation of claims to power with respect to the constructed Others. From this perspective, *Othering* can be described as a double process: the “Others” are constructed through certain practices of knowledge production which legitimise domination; at the same time, however, this (political, economical and cultural) hegemonic intention makes the resulting epistemological practices appear “plausible” and “useful”.

Said analyses the practices of knowledge production which serve to orientalise the “Orient”⁴. Historically, the establishment of Oriental Studies as an officially recognised academic discipline correlates with the European policy of expansion into the so-called orient (the region labelled “Middle East”, but also Northern Africa and India) in the 19th century. Based on the administrative structures of colonialism, an “obsessive study of the Orient” (Castro Varela & Dhawan 2005: 33, translated by ed.) is nurtured in Europe which purports to strive to understand the ‘others’. With this attitude, European researchers set out to collect ‘information’ about ‘the others’ and to create a body of knowledge which explains ‘the others’, a process through which Europe seized epistemic possession and thus claimed the right of domination. Of course, this explanation requires that *the Others* be constructed, in an essentialising process, as a homogeneous group. Collectivisation (constructing a homogeneous collective) and essentialisation are the two moments of one and the same epistemological operation. From this point of view, epistemology (interpreted as the study of those knowledge formations which determine the development of world concepts) is never neutral, but always a social and political study. Therefore, Said claims that knowledge (which is always produced within a particular social position) and relations of power are closely interconnected.

Essentialising practices turn heterogeneous ‘bodies of knowledge’ into a compact ‘mantle of knowledge’ which makes it possible to turn socially produced ‘information’ into dominating and power-laden assertions about the ‘essentiality’ of the Others. This construed ‘essentiality’ is, according to Said, always characterised by an ambivalence, for it represents *the others* in the sense of

matic practice of Othering, and has been used as a starting-point for further theory development.

- 4 When Said speaks about the “Orient”, he does not refer to a geographical region, but to a European (colonial) imaginary construct. In Europe, the term “Orient” has been used to denote different regions such as the “Middle East”, Northern Africa and India, but also other Asian regions like China and Japan.

the Other as a-historical, quasi-metaphysical subjects, while at the same time arguing with the historicity of the own produced knowledge.⁵

When essentialising practices become dominant discourses, or in other words absolutely plausible discourses without any alternatives, they give rise to such epistemological practices that are able to abstract from individual traits in an absolute and unchallenged manner. That which is specific or unique, which belongs to the lifeworld and to individual biographies is negated and only acknowledged within the generalized discourse. The epistemological knowledge production, Said argues, legitimises that “no matter how deep the specific exception, no matter how much a single Oriental can escape the fences placed around him, he is first an Oriental, second a human being, and last again an Oriental” (Said 2003: 102).

Essentialism and homogenisation as discursive practices have one effect in particular: They produce a self-image via the construction of an antagonism. This formula contains the essence of Said’s theoretical assertions. By constructing a (negative, antagonistic) Other, a self-image emerges that contrasts with the ‘negative image’, and thus can be approved of. As Said claims, an equally homogenised image of the West emerges against the background of the construed image of the Orient. In the process of *Othering*, negative attributes are ascribed to the construed collective. Said sketches such attributions by quoting literary and scientific texts: “The Oriental is irrational, depraved (fallen), childlike, ‘different’...” (Said 2003: 40). This external attribution makes the construction of a particular self-image possible: “... thus the European is rational, virtuous, mature, normal” (ibid.).

It would be inadequate, however, to reduce the postcolonial theory concept of *Othering* to constructions of others and self. The formula of *constructing a positive self-image via the construction of a negative image of the other* could be used to explain most phenomena of stereotyping by means of a catchy terminology. Postcolonial theories, however, do not suggest that this is automatic either in terms of psychological or in terms of social processes. According to Said, the effectiveness of Orientalism (as a historically concrete and politically effective form of *Othering*) can only be understood in the context of formation and exercise of dominance. Dominance and essentialised knowledge depend on and con-

5 “According to the traditional orientalists, an essence should exist – sometimes even clearly described in metaphysical terms – which constitutes the inalienable and common basis of all the beings considered; this essence is both ‘historical’ since it goes back to the dawn of history, and fundamentally a-historical, since it transfixes the being, ‘the object’ of study, within its inalienable and non-evolutive specificity, instead of defining it as all other beings, states, nations, peoples, and cultures – as a product, a resultant of the vection of the forces operating in the field of historical evolution...” (Said 2003: 97).