

Hybridity and Negotiated Boundaries Even in Germany: Reflections on the Reception of Postcolonial Theory and Theology

Michael Nausner
Reutlingen School of Theology
michael.nausner@gmx.de

To formulate reflections on postcolonial issues in Germany in 2011, that is, in times when the so-called Orient is erupting with protest movements against dictatorships oftentimes backed by the Occident, proves to be a task worthwhile pursuing. Once again, the countless levels of intimate interrelations between the discursively separated worlds of the Orient and the Occident can be experienced not only by those immediately affected, but also by all perceptive participants in the global media society. Once again, the long shadows of colonialism find expression in violent protests against structures put in place by former colonial powers, illustrating that indeed the “post” in postcolonial theory (and theology) cannot be understood as a chronological description of a new time span but rather needs to be seen as a prefix qualifying a cultural atmosphere shot through with subtle power mechanisms that are a legacy of old style colonialism. I find courage to participate in postcolonial discourse not because I am a (disadvantaged) “postcolonial subject,” but because I am convinced that the subtleties of cultural analysis in postcolonial theory can shed light on any subject position, including on my subject position as an Austrian-Swedish hybrid teaching theology in Germany. After six years of teaching in the German context it is my contention that the oblivion of colonial dynamics and their lasting effects are significantly stronger in Germany, which has started and lost two World Wars in the last century, than in other former colonial powers of the West. In this article I share my insights¹ on colonial awareness in Germany, how the cultural analysis of postcolonial

theory is received in this country, and how this very theory is slowly starting to be noticed in religious studies and theology as well. I do this by providing a rough overview of public and theological instances of the colonial legacy of German culture.

I first reflect on the repression of the colonial past in Germany and how this repression at times becomes obvious, for instance in 2004 at the centennial of the Herero genocide. I then highlight recent examples of organized reflection and activism around issues of Germany's colonial legacy and finally review two texts reflecting critical cultural analysis in the German literary and academic worlds. In a second section I list a few examples of the different ways in which cultural studies in general and postcolonial theory in particular have started to make inroads into religious studies and theology, which on the one hand is indicated by the inception of a new book series and the renaming of a theological journal and on the other hand by the topics treated in the emerging and contested field of *intercultural theology*. My focus in this second section is on the recurring issues of cultural *boundary dynamics* and *hybridity*.

1. Postcolonialism in Germany

The oblivion of colonial dynamics in Germany is mirrored in the tardy reception of postcolonial theory in Germany. The key writings of the "postcolonial trinity,"² that is, Edward W. Said, Gayatri Charkavorty Spivak, and Homi K. Bhabha, for example, have been translated with quite a delay. Even if Edward W. Said's *Orientalism* was available in German already a year after its publication in English, in 1979, it took an additional thirty years for the second edition to be published,³ despite the enormous body of literature that this text has triggered in the English-speaking world. Homi K. Bhabha's *The Location of Culture*, first published in English in 1994, was not available in German before 2000.⁴ And the

translation of Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak's 1999 magnum opus *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*—probably most relevant for the German context—after twelve years is still not in print in German,⁵ although a translation is under way, and a group of scholars has started a public discussion regarding the complexities of translation,⁶ referring to Spivak's own reflections on the matter in her article "The Politics of Translation."⁷

An art exhibition in early 2011 in one of the renowned art galleries in Munich can serve as a telling example of such oblivion. The exhibition with the title *Orientalism in Europe* feasts on the exotic beauty of Western depictions of the Orient, implicitly defending the seeming innocence of such purely aesthetic endeavours. In the catalogue published for the exhibition, Edward W. Said's work *Orientalism*⁸ is characterized as "polemical writing"⁹ and therefore obviously judged irrelevant for the evaluation of public presentation of depictions of the Orient. The art historian Burcu Dogramaci in an article in *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, one of the largest daily newspapers in Germany, criticizes such neglect of ideological issues.¹⁰ Depictions of negotiations between Turkish and German merchants are not accompanied with any comment on the difficult relations between the German and the Ottoman Empire at the end of the nineteenth century, when tons of archaeological treasures were shipped from the Orient to Germany. And Jean-Léon Gerôme, who in postcolonial studies is seen as one of the typical representatives of the "genuinely male gaze on erotic subjects" who "celebrated the fantasies of their time,"¹¹ figures prominently in the gathered collection of art works. Unfortunately, the exhibition does not address "the interesting question of trans-cultural exchange,"¹² that is, the question of whether the "oriental" people are looking back at the "occidentals."

This contemporary art exhibition is but one example of Germany's repeatedly diagnosed suppression of its colonial past. The common sense in Germany still seems to be that, due to the loss of all its colonies by the end of World War I, the effort to deal with colonial history and postcolonial effects can be left to the "real" colonial powers such as England, France, and the United States. Besides that, as mentioned earlier, the effects of the two World Wars in the twentieth century, and above all the horrendous reverberations of the Holocaust, seem to occupy the public consciousness to an extent that eclipses the awareness of Germany's fundamental complicity in the development of a colonial mindset in the nineteenth century.

Germany – A Forgotten Cradle of Colonial Ideology

In 2005 the first critical introduction to postcolonial studies was published in German and for a German public with the title *Postkoloniale Kritik – Eine kritische Einführung*. The book contains a comprehensive summary of the writings of the "postcolonial trinity" of Said, Bhabha, and Spivak, as well as a discussion of the critical reception of their works. The authors, María do Mar Castro Varela (political scientist at Alice Salomon University, Berlin) and Nikita Dhawan (professor of gender and postcolonial studies at Frankfurt University), feel compelled to argue in the preface against the "prejudice that postcolonial theory has no relevance in the German speaking context."¹³ This prejudice was nourished already by Said himself who considered German Orientalism as significantly less important than the Anglo-French-American experience of the Orient. Spivak, however, describes Germany culturally and intellectually as "one of the main sources of meticulous oriental erudition"¹⁴ in the nineteenth century, which is exemplified vividly by Max Müller's publication of his lectures on India in 1883 with the title *India, What Can it Teach Us?*¹⁵ But the German intellectual

legacy is not least evident in the circumstance that postcolonial theory as a school of thought can be summarized as a negotiation between Marxist (German origin) and post-structural (French origin) discourses,¹⁶ which comes to the fore in Spivak's oeuvre. In *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*,¹⁷ one of her major books on postcolonial theory, she is taking her starting point with some of the main figures of German philosophical idealism: Kant, Hegel, and Marx. After all, they are all thinkers whose profound universal ambitions in conjunction with their lack of sensitivity for culturally specific "subject positions" have inadvertently influenced the Western colonial project. While Kant in his great *Critique of Practical Reason* developed vastly influential criteria for a global ethics for centuries to come, he was blind to his own cultural bias toward "lower races." In his late manuscript *Physical Geography*, for example, the great universal ethicist of the Enlightenment proves convinced that humankind "is in its greatest perfection in the white race. The yellow Indians have less talent. The negro is much lower still and on the lowest level are some of the Native American tribes."¹⁸ One wonders how the categorical imperative is supposed to work in the context of such a hierarchical worldview that abstracts from its own culturally contingent subject position. Wolfgang Schoberth in his introduction to theological anthropology concludes that "Kant's practical philosophy . . . abstracts from concrete individual human existence. Against its own claim, it does not operate 'categorically,' i.e. independent of all individual circumstances." It assumes an "objective standpoint," a standpoint that "from an anthropological perspective proves fictitious."¹⁹ Spivak finds the cradle of this dubiously objective standpoint of Enlightenment philosophy in the writings of the three mentioned German philosophers. "Germany," Spivak writes, "produced authoritative 'universal' narratives—Kant's *cosmopolitheia*, Hegel's itinerary of the Idea,

Marx's socialist homeopathy—neither inaugurated nor consolidated a specifically scholarly control of the matter of imperialism.”²⁰ In other words, according to Spivak the imperialistic mindset that has brought about unending strife to countless people throughout the nineteenth and twentieth centuries rests comfortably on the philosophical tradition of German idealism. Hegel's view of Africa in his *Philosophy of History* can serve as an instance for such a developing mindset: “As far as history goes back, the real Africa has remained closed for connections with the rest of the world; it is the compact country of gold, the children's land, which beyond the day(light) of self-conscious history is wrapped in the black color of the night.”²¹ No wonder that the voices from such a continent, wrapped in black and beyond the reaches of self-conscious history, cannot be heard. Or, to use Spivak's term, the *native informant* has no chance of being heard in a culture that is built on the premise that nothing *mature* can be expected from the “Dark Continent(s).” Spivak reads Kant and Hegel with the intention “to disclose how the native informant perspective is foreclosed in some of the backbone thinking of the modern Atlantic tradition, in the figuration of ethics and history.”²² While the Kantian foreclosure in this reading happens within the figuration of ethics, the Hegelian one takes place in the figuration of history.

Andreas Nehring, one of the few German scholars of religion engaging postcolonial theory, in his reading of Spivak's critique of Hegel, has conveniently summarized a version of Hegel's hegemonic discourse. Influenced by the *Bhagavadgītā* (translated into German by August Wilhelm Schlegel in 1825), a text he considered “the peak of Indian philosophy,”²³ Hegel thought that “India has to remain in a static position because neither Indian art nor Indian philosophy permits a dialectical process The essence of Indian art is that it restlessly moves back and forth.”²⁴ This, of course, is in contrast to the Hegelian

Spirit restlessly moving forward from sublation to sublation toward higher levels. Now, it would not be “postcolonial” criticism, if Spivak were content with highlighting Hegel’s hegemonic discourse. Matters are more complicated. Instead she is deconstructing the constructed opposition between Hegel and the *Bhagavadgītā* by showing that “‘Hegel’ and the ‘Gītā’ can be read as two rather different versions of the manipulation of the question of history in a political interest.” The *Bhagavadgītā* manipulates through its “exceptionalism” and Hegel through his “Euro-teleological normativity.”²⁵ As so often in postcolonial discourse analysis, the flawed attempt at polarization between texts is unveiled, in this case the German teleological attempt to steer free from Indian repetition. Nehring ends his analysis of Spivak’s comparison by revisiting some Indian reactions to Western interpretations of the *Bhagavadgītā* and comes to the conclusion that “today’s encounters with the *Bhagavadgītā* by Indians and others are embedded in discursive formations that are genealogically linked to colonial representations of Indian culture.”²⁶ Indeed, this is the messy state of affairs that postcolonial theory with its interdisciplinary approach attempts to analyze. Suffice it here to say that the colonial representations of Indian culture cannot be limited to British efforts, but have important roots in the philosophical tradition of German idealism as well.

Public Debates on Germany’s Colonial Legacy

The centennial of the genocide against the Hereros in former *Deutsch-Südwestafrika* (today Namibia) in 2004 seems to have brought about a certain change in public awareness. For a short time Germany’s colonial past figured prominently in the media world. It was in 1904 that general lieutenant Lothar von Trotha crushed the uprising of the Hereros with an army of roughly 15,000 men. Von Trotha was convinced that the only “solution” to the unrest in

the colony was the total extinction of the Hereros, which was a policy (reminiscent of later Nazi ideology entitled *Rassenkampf*, i.e. “racial war”²⁷) publicly sanctioned by emperor Wilhelm II. The result was the first genocide of the twentieth century with an estimated death count of 80,000 people.²⁸ In 2004 for the first time a German politician (Heidemarie Wieczorek-Zeul, minister of development) went to the surviving Hereros in Namibia to pronounce a formal apology on behalf of the German government for the atrocities committed a hundred years earlier.²⁹

As the memory of the crushing of the Herero uprising painfully reminds us, Germany was not only *culturally* and *intellectually* creating colonial representations, but it was itself a formidable colonial power for almost four decades (1884-1918). Historian Katharina Ruhland writes: “It has been forgotten that Germany periodically has been the world’s third largest colonial power.”³⁰ It was in 1884-85 that the German chancellor Bismarck invited the world’s most powerful nations to the Berlin Africa Conference where the division of the entire African continent into colonies was prepared and Germany joined the group of colonial powers for good. Thomas Pakenham’s book *The Scramble for Africa* is an impressive documentation of Germany’s key role in the final colonization of Africa.³¹ When “Africa was sliced up like a cake,” Pakenham writes, “the pieces were swallowed up by five rival nations,”³² among which Germany was a major player. The creation of colonies “would bolster the pride of the political parvenus of Europe, Germany’s Second Reich and a newly united Italy.”³³ It is only during the last few years that a public awareness of the material consequences of German colonialism has been slowly developing, which partly may be because of the centennial of the Herero genocide.

The 125th Anniversary of the Berlin Africa Conference in 2009-2010 was an occasion for commemoration and reappraisal. A campaign was started in connection with this commemoration, and a campaign document from September of 2009 pointed out that

the German colonial history is today perceived as harmless, as not relevant, as something that happened in the past. . . . 125 years after the Berlin Conference, a comprehensive and critical reappraisal of the colonial period is still outstanding. The colonial heritage has not been overcome, neither here nor in the formerly colonized states.³⁴

It is telling, however, that the list of organizations supporting this campaign largely consists of rather small NGOs and cultural organizations. The circumstance that mainstream political parties and mainstream churches are missing in the list certainly is an indication that the issue of revisiting the German colonial legacy is still not high on the agenda of the general public.

There are, however, signs that this is changing, especially in urban areas. February 2011, for example, was declared “Black History Month” by *Werkstatt der Kulturen*, an NGO in Berlin. Under the heading “Colonialism and Postcolonialism” a host of concerts and public cultural events were organized.³⁵ Another example of such growing awareness of the remaining force of Germany’s colonial heritage is the plenary discussion in Leipzig on postcolonial activism in Germany, held on February 24, 2011, when “colonial continuities in German cities” were debated. The invitation text highlighted the rising awareness “that colonialism has influenced German society significantly and that its consequences are manifest in German cities and thus politically relevant. This becomes evident in racist imaginations and stereotypical depictions of the ‘exotic other’ in anthropological and historical museums or ‘Africa days’ in zoos.”³⁶ These formulations also show what generally seems to be the case in the German context: the postcolonial perspective to a

large extent serves the purpose to raise awareness for Germany's colonial past and its continuing ideological and material consequences, whereas the sophisticated culture analysis of postcolonial theory does not come into play to the same extent.

This is the case with the project of a "postcolonial mapping" of the city of Munich. In their article *Mapping Postcolonial Positions* Zara Pfeiffer and Philip Zölls describe the strategy of such mapping as 1) making those places visible, which have obvious connections to Germany's colonial past, 2) focusing on the ongoing commercialization of the 'alien' as part of colonial legitimization, and 3) scrutinizing the power dynamics behind strategies and mechanisms of visualization.³⁷ A practical consequence of what occasionally is called "postcolonial activism"³⁸ is the successful renaming of a street in Munich from "Von-Trotha-Straße"³⁹ into "Hererostraße" in 2006, which caused quite a controversy among the local population.⁴⁰ So, a rising awareness in Germany not only of the involvement in the great wars of the twentieth century but also in the colonial legacy of the nineteenth century can be identified in certain larger urban areas in Germany.

Postcolonial Analysis in German Literature and Academia

There are, however, also more sophisticated texts of postmodern cultural analysis to be found in the German context. Here I want to review just two examples of postcolonial thinking in German literature and academia as examples for not only highlighting Germany's (and other countries) *historical* role in colonization, but for using postcolonial knowledge for a more subtle analysis of the complexities of the *current* cultural situation in Germany. The connecting link between the two texts is that they both are counter narratives to Samuel P. Huntington's *The Clash of Civilizations*.⁴¹

The example from German literature does not refer explicitly to postcolonial theory, but it is rife with descriptions of cultural processes in Germany and Europe at large that are analogous to a postcolonial approach. Already the title reveals the polemics against Huntington: *Cancellation of the Clash: Cultures Do Not Fight Each Other – They Converge* (2007).⁴² It is co-written by the cosmopolitan writer Ilija Trojanow, who at one point called himself a Kenyan-Indian-Bulgarian-German, and Ranjit Hoskote, a cultural critic from India.⁴³ The book is a witty and humorous account of the hybrid nature of European culture in general and German culture in particular. It starts with a reflection on something so paradigmatically German as shouting crowds of enthusiastic fans in the soccer arenas. Do these at times nationalistically minded fans know, the authors wonder, that the typical exclamation “Olé” has its etymological roots in the Arabic word for God “Allah”?⁴⁴ The authors see this as an exemplification of the general insight that a convergence of cultures lies at the root of any particular culture. The tricky thing is, “The convergences of every culture are hidden, homogenizing founding myths are put in their place. . . . Instead of considering the many ‘pasts’ that have produced our present, we only see one single past.”⁴⁵ In keeping with postcolonial analysis they move on to trace the problem with the “essentialistic vision of a homogeneous culture” and history back to Hegel’s theory of the Spirit. “The nation state . . . eclipses . . . all other, differing narrations.”⁴⁶ Different from most academic accounts of cultural hybridity in Germany, Hoskote and Trojanow pay close attention to the historical convergences of the great religious traditions and to their significance for cultural processes as well. They recount, for example, Babylonian influences on Judaism, influences of Parsism on later religions, mutual influences between the three monotheistic religions throughout the Golden Age in Spain, and not least the

analogies between current fundamentalisms on different continents and in different religious settings. They conclude: "What we consider as belonging to the canon and as classical, is based on hybridities, which we have forgotten—or which have been pushed into oblivion."⁴⁷ Here a bridge is built between cultural and religious analyses that in German mainstream theology are still largely neglected. In other words, the connections between postcolonial theory and postcolonial theology/religious studies that are drawn here, literally and implicitly, are still lacking to a large extent in interdisciplinary academic discourse. Indeed, it has to be asked how much theology is still influenced by such sentiments as those of Hugo Rahner who claimed: "Christianity is entirely *sui generis*. It is unique and is not derived from any other cult or any human institutions, and in its basic character has not been changed by any such influence."⁴⁸ If postcolonial cultural analysis is applicable to religious studies and theology, such claims to absolute purity and independence have to be criticized and identified as potentially dangerous. Instead, theology is well advised to ask critically, together with Trojanow and Hoskoté, whether canonization is not tempting religion to form its "identity through demarcation" and whether the resulting artificial stability of the religious system does not lead to a denial of the "gifts of convergence."⁴⁹ Cultural and religious convergence to the authors is a basic ingredient in human social life and therefore beyond any moral evaluation. Their alarming claim is that "if convergence is cut off, genocide occurs."⁵⁰ Even if the necessity of such an outcome can be questioned, the general insight is still valid, namely that the attempted construction of clear-cut division lines is counterproductive to any cultural process and in the long run destructive: "If one pushes others into a ghetto, one builds a ghetto for oneself as well, even if the one ghetto is as large as a country or an entire continent."⁵¹

Two topics that run through the entire book are 1) the unavoidable *hybridity* of any culture (or religion) understood as dynamic process and 2) the accompanying necessity of revisiting and re-evaluating cultural and religious *boundaries*. The intimate connection that the authors show between cultural and religious developments seem to me to be an important challenge to theological reflection. It is my contention that theologians and religious scholars alike can borrow some tools from postcolonial theory for a better analysis of religious boundaries. They might thereby shed new light on the intuition Hoskoté and Trojanow are finding already in the writings of the medieval philosopher Abelard, who refused “to understand Christian revelation as a demarcation line between the blessed and the cursed.”⁵² To my mind it is of decisive importance for Christianity in the twenty-first century to come to terms with how it constructs and understands its own boundaries.⁵³ I think that what Trojanow and Hoskoté write on cultural boundaries has great significance even for a sound understanding of the boundaries of Christianity in an increasingly plural surrounding: “If we want to be prepared for the future, we need to understand boundaries as convergences that have enriched us in the past, as playgrounds of mixed cultures that have been decisive for the development of the (European) continent. The division is always only a momentary difference, a historical volatility.”⁵⁴ That division is always only a momentary difference can be said for the shifting formulation of Christian identity through the ages and in different cultures as well. The discourse of sharp and confrontational division from other religions emerges in situations of cultural and/or political crisis.

If *Kampfabsage (The Cancellation of the Clash)* is an instance of the arrival of a cultural analysis akin to postcolonial theory in German *literature*, Kien Nghi Ha’s work can

be seen as a great example of the explicit arrival of postcolonial theory in German *academia*. Comparable to Said, Spivak, and Bhabha, to whom he refers frequently, Ha is a Third World intellectual working in Western academia. Unlike his famous peers, however, he is much less recognized as part of the academic community in Germany. And comparable to Trojanow and Hoskoté, he writes a counter-narrative to Huntington's epos. Even though he is not taking on Huntington directly, Ha contends that his entire book with its close attention to the locality of culture could be read as an "alternative draft" to Samuel Huntington's *Clash of Civilizations* (1996) and its essentialistic understanding of culture and ethnicity. Very much influenced by postcolonial theory, Ha senses an "urgency to look for alternatives that undermine the totalitarian system of binary (cultural) demarcations."⁵⁵ In his book *Ethnizität und Migration Reloaded* (2004), Ha, a German scholar of political science with Chinese-Vietnamese background, analyzes Germany as a "migration society whose borders in a globalized world paradoxically become stronger and weaker simultaneously." This to him is because of the fact that, "surprisingly for many, immigrants and their offspring from the societal periphery show up in the center." The habitual ethnic categorization of *us* and *them* is more and more challenged by the new Germans whose presence demonstrates a "process of cultural hybridization."⁵⁶ According to Ha, however, this process has not lead to recognition of migrants in academia yet. Instead, migrants in German academia almost never are allowed to "appear as competent conversation partners."⁵⁷ Ha introduces his analysis by quoting Theodor Adorno's political vision in *Minima Moralia* (1951) of a situation "in which one can be different without fear."⁵⁸ Sharing this vision with Adorno, Ha decides to make the "stories, environments, and observations" of Turkish immigrants his starting point, highlighting their "right to cultural

self-construction.”⁵⁹ Thus he reverses the theoretical perspective, that is, not looking at the other, but taking the starting point with the other. In studying the cultural processes among Turkish immigrants, Ha is keen on highlighting the complex differentiations within their multilayered communities. The result is that despite the deconstruction of the “we on part of the migrants” a vision of cultural “border-crossing and hybridizing” emerges. “Such cultural representations of difference and their changing identities,” Ha writes, “can become meaningful for a *culture of resistance* in discourse and everyday life.”⁶⁰ Here Ha’s ethical intentions come to the fore. By giving voice to the everyday stories of Turkish migrants (akin to Spivak’s *native informant*) with their spontaneous character he hopes to contribute to the right of the marginalized to talk for themselves. This he accomplishes by “bringing postcolonial theory and everyday praxis of their subjects together and to translate them into the ‘German’ context.”⁶¹ The second chapter in his book, which analyzes the everyday life of Turkish immigrants with the help of postcolonial theory, seems to me to be one of the best examples of a postcolonial analysis of German society.⁶² Ha’s conclusion is that postcolonial theory is highly applicable to the German context and that the *reconstructed historiography*, which he tries to accomplish by recounting the stories of Turkish immigrants, deconstructs the “imagination of a homogeneous Turkish community of migrants” and therefore unveils “any story of essential homogeneity as *fictitious*,”⁶³ not least the homogeneity of German culture. The resulting *recognition of inner difference* and *hybrid identities* has liberatory potential but should not be celebrated as necessarily liberatory. Ha’s hope is that the detection of cultural hybridity carries the possibility for a “cultural identity politics . . . that tries to trace a middle way between postmodern absence of subjectivity and irreconcilable opposing nationalism.”⁶⁴ In this way the often-uneasy

migrant identity as border dweller can become a site of constructive reconfiguration of identity, since it can mean “not to stand in the imperial center, which hitherto has been unable not to misunderstand the encounter with the other as a chance of conquest, subjection, and colonization.”⁶⁵

While there is much complexity in Ha’s analysis of the boundary situation of migrants in Germany (and therefore also for “real” Germans), religious aspects are almost entirely missing in his account. In stark contrast to Trojanow and Hoskoté’s description of the convergence of cultures *and* religions, Ha mentions religion only in passing as an aspect of the cultural process not worth commenting on in detail. One interesting instance of such a passing reference to religion occurs where Ha reinforces Bhabha’s insistence that it is the colonial discourse itself that produces the uncertainty of colonial authority. “Hybridity in the colonial discourse,” Ha writes, “indicates a process in which through pedagogical, *proselytization*, and civilization praxis a tendency is inherent that produces its own version of the uncertainty of colonial authority.” The acceptance of the Christian God on part of the colonized therefore must not be misunderstood as a clean victory of the religion of the colonizer, but oftentimes proves to be “a mimetic form of resistance.”⁶⁶ One could get the impression from these exceedingly rare references to religion in a key text on postcolonial theory that religion is a small and almost random aspect of cultural processes, and that religious or theological discourse itself is of interest for analysis only inasmuch as it proves to be an instance of colonial discourse in general. A brief look into the reception of postcolonial discourse in theological and religious studies might help to see that this is not “the whole truth.”

2. Postcolonial Theory in Religious and Theological Studies in Germany

While I am in no position to give a comprehensive overview of the engagement of postcolonial theory by German-speaking theologians and scholars of religious studies at large, I want to refer to a few seemingly rare instances where I have encountered such engagement in German speaking academia. I detect a recurring preoccupation among theologians and scholars of religion with issues of cultural *boundary dynamics* in general and cultural *hybridity* in particular. And I believe that given the ongoing debates about migration⁶⁷ and the intensifying confrontations at the borders of the EU⁶⁸ these are two of the key postcolonial analytical perspectives theologians and scholars of religion in Germany and Europe at large *need* to integrate in their discourses on religion.

It does not come as a surprise that it was feminists who first noted the relevance of postcolonial studies for theology in German-speaking Europe. Feminist theology as a liberatory discourse registered the potential of postcolonial theory to destabilize hegemonic discourses and circumstances. In a different but related way it can be said that feminist as well as postcolonial theology feeds on the legacy of liberation theology. This has been noted in *Postcolonial Theologies* (2004), one of the first English-language volumes on postcolonial theology: “The engagement of postcolonial theory by theology is incoherent outside of the effects of liberation theology.”⁶⁹ At a conference in Lucerne/Switzerland on theology and gender in 2006, Swiss theologian Doris Strahm gave a presentation entitled “Über Grenzen hinaus denken” (“Thinking Beyond Borders”),⁷⁰ where she highlighted the growing complexity of a feminist analysis of patriarchy. Due to the growing number of voices from very different cultural contexts within feminist theology, oppressive structures need to be analyzed ever more carefully. The many varieties of ethnicity, race, and culture

make it impossible to talk about “female experience” in general, an insight that is thoroughly analyzed by postcolonial criticism. “Postcolonial feminism,” Strahm writes, “thematizes socio-cultural differences regarding women and gender relations caused by colonial history and current neo-colonial mechanisms.”⁷¹ Referring to the writings of Musa W. Dube and Kwok-Pui Lan, Strahm describes the fruit of postcolonial analysis for feminist theology as enabling “a thinking that makes it possible to take the positive challenges of cultural and religious difference seriously. To get there, a process of decolonizing one’s own thinking is necessary.”⁷² Strahm’s presentation seems to be one of the early hints in German-speaking theological academia of the potential of postcolonial theory for theology. However, while reference is made to English-speaking theologians actively employing postcolonial theory, there is no indication yet that German-speaking theologians employ postcolonial discourse as a resource on a larger scale.

A Religious Turn

This is changing slowly, partly thanks to a new series that was started by the publishing house Kohlhammer in Stuttgart in 2008. The new series “ReligionsKulturen” (*Cultures of Religion*) is edited by an ecumenical group of six theologians and has an explicitly interdisciplinary approach. It feeds on cultural studies, gender studies, postcolonial studies, ex cetera, and “aims to transgress the boundaries of disciplinary enclosures of knowledge and to make ‘disciplined’ thinking more fluid,” as the introduction of the first volume entitled *Religious Turns – Turning Religion* proclaims.⁷³ In the first essay of the first volume, missiologist Andreas Nehring reflects on the complex relation between culture and religion.⁷⁴ He starts with the text *Above All, No Journalists!* by Jacques Derrida, one of the “background figures” of postcolonial theory. One of the issues behind this somewhat

humoristic exclamation is the question of the possibility of public identification of “religion.” Nehring contends that according to the almost “unanimous common sense in religious studies” there is no way that “leads back to the phenomenological description of the holy and the numinous.”⁷⁵ Therefore ambivalences in the positions in religious studies remain. These “ambivalences in the treatment of the term religion stem from the complex relations between the tradition of the European Enlightenment and the colonial spread and conquest of big parts of the world by the West.”⁷⁶ For Nehring it would be too easy a solution to do away with religion as a Eurocentric construct just because it was invented as a category in Enlightenment Europe. Instead he points to the fact that “religion even in discourses on the cultural character of post-secular societies is established anew as category *sui generis*,”⁷⁷ which recently has been acknowledged again by secular thinkers such as Jürgen Habermas. Nehring therefore laments that “in the area of cultural studies the aspect of religion so far is more or less eclipsed.”⁷⁸ Accordingly he suggests a *religious turn* in analogy to the *cultural turn* due to the fact that “in ‘cultural’ processes the ‘religious’ seems to play an increasingly important role.”⁷⁹ Of course, this does not mean to establish religion as an easily identifiable “object.” Following Derrida, who treats religion as a power “inherent to the project of deconstruction itself,” Nehring traces religion as beginning at a boundary position, a place of transition between inside and outside, faith and reason, that cannot be determined once and for all. Such a position has a certain analogy to Plato’s *chora* or *triton genos*.⁸⁰ Such a “third space” location of religion implies that “obviously ‘religion’ resists any direct terminological grasp.”⁸¹ Consequently “representation in religious studies . . . cannot claim to grasp any essence of religion beyond the performance of culture.”⁸² Still it cannot simply be collapsed into the wide spectrum of cultural

phenomena, because it does have a rather unique positionality differing from other cultural phenomena. Again with Derrida, Nehring describes it as a “non-place, in which an endless exchange of signs is occurring.”⁸³ The resulting impossibility of grasping the meaning of religion that Clifford Geertz has diagnosed does not leave religious studies without any hope, because there still is something to be described, namely “the mingling of common sense and religious symbolic systems in a given culture.”⁸⁴

A Pneumatological Turn

The very terminology of Nehring’s suggestion of a *religious turn* indicates that even in German-speaking Europe it is time to apply cultural theories seriously to the field of theological and religious studies. The new series *ReligionsKulturen* is one sign that this is starting to happen at least in the field of religious studies. Within theology it is not in systematic/constructive theology but rather in the field of mission studies that such awareness is growing. One indication for this growing awareness is the renaming of the old journal of mission theology—from *Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft* to *Interkulturelle Theologie*.⁸⁵ It seems significant that the first article in the renamed journal is also the first article in German academia overall, to my knowledge, that explicitly applies the analytical terminology of postcolonial theory to theology, that is, it not only thematizes the remaining colonial effects on German culture, but it actively engages postcolonial concepts. In this first and (hopefully) programmatic article entitled “Vernacular Ecumenism in Transcultural Unity: Ecumenical Theology After the Cultural Turn,” Claudia Jahnel, who today is leading the department for intercultural mission (“Mission Interkulturell”) in the mission agency of the Bavarian Lutheran Church, applies postcolonial theory to Christian theology. Following Sandra Harding she is attempting here to counter an “orientalising of

faith convictions and practices of other cultures.”⁸⁶ Jahnel argues that Bhabha’s “third space” should be attended to not only in cultural analysis, but also in the encounter of differences of faith. Accordingly she understands ecumenical encounters as “contact zones,” that is, “zones of negotiating differences.”⁸⁷ With reference to different African female theologians such as Maluleke, Oduyoye, and Sannah, she points out that the biblical canon is anything but a guarantee for Christian homogeneity. Therefore the Bible should not be stylized as an absolute point of reference. Instead it is true of all Christian symbols that they are “mixed with the immanent and contingent.”⁸⁸ No doubt the African and postcolonial perspectives make evident to Jahnel that any attempt at creating a homogeneous Christian culture or identity is doomed to fail, since identities are increasingly nomadic and flexibly fragmented.⁸⁹ Reminiscent of what Nehring calls the *religious turn* (see above) Jahnel goes on to argue for a *pneumatological turn* in the ecumenical movement. To her it is a turn that has started already and that opens up “new possibilities for interpreting uncontrollable, rhizomatic-transcultural processes of change, intermingling, and differentiation.”⁹⁰ In this process of interpretation it is important to carefully observe the local cultural circumstances, where unity is not imposed from above, but emerges as “lived, concrete, decentralized unity.” Such unity mostly occurs in the institutional periphery where Christian identity is negotiated in a decisive way.⁹¹ The term *vernacular ecumenism* is directly inspired by Bhabha’s expression *vernacular cosmopolitanism*, with which he describes the kind of cosmopolitan community that can be encountered in the cultural life of the margins (local dialect—global connectedness). Jahnel applies this understanding to ecumenism and analyzes a vernacular ecumenism that triggers “a new discussion about the relation between ‘center’ and ‘periphery’ as well as

between 'general' and 'concrete' other."⁹² She argues in other words for the need for a careful look at Christian life and faith in the margin, at the boundary.⁹³ In this way Jahnel is joining, as theologian, the group of thinkers who are resisting an understanding of the cultural boundary as 'a given,' and instead see it as a contact zone that needs to be continuously negotiated.

The Chances of Theology as Hybrid Discourse

If Jahnel employs Bhabha's concept of *vernacular cosmopolitanism* to (intercultural) theology, Moritz Fischer, a missiologist at the Augustana University at Neuendettelsau, in the same journal *Interkulturelle Theologie* attempts a similar application of a postcolonial term to theology. In his article "Hybridity/Hybridizing: On the Heuristic Value of a Cultural Concept for Intercultural Theology"⁹⁴ Fischer applies postcolonial analysis to intercultural theology. Taking his point of departure from Friedrich Nietzsche, whose use of the term *hybridity* has been influential for later cultural theory, he finds in the field of discourse in the concept of hybridity "a heuristic way of thinking that hosts many possibilities for the analysis of cultural exchanges."⁹⁵ This to him is relevant to intercultural theology since it deals not only with mission history or Christianity in other cultures, but has a threefold task: 1) investigation of the mutual relations between one's own and others' culture- and religion, 2) use of cultural terms to comprehend interactive religious processes, and 3) dealing with religions as open systems of orientation and discursive fields.⁹⁶ Religions, according to Fischer, "are not static 'systems', but 'discursive fields' based on mutual processes, in which norms, values and interpretations are negotiated."⁹⁷ Based on such an understanding of the main tasks of intercultural theology, Fischer formulates as one of his key interests "questions of cultural flow, of hybridity and of the translation of religiously

defined patterns of interpretation.”⁹⁸ He contends that the term *hybridity* is better suited than *syncretism* to account for the dynamics in the “encounter between ‘living religions’ for example the religiosity of migrants.”⁹⁹ Last but not least, Fischer brings together the two themes I have identified as key issues for postcolonial theology in Germany: *hybridity* and *boundary dynamics*. “By means of the thinking in terms of hybridity,” Fischer asserts, “the relativity of alleged ‘boundaries’ becomes apparent. The tensions and transferences become visible, which can be localized as so-called *phenomena of religious contact* (Religionskontaktphänomene).”¹⁰⁰ Such destabilization of cultural boundaries he finds fruitful especially for the analysis of Christian encounter with other religions. Akin to John B. Cobb Jr.’s approach of mutual transformation in the contact between religions, Fischer detects a *surplus* (*heterosis*) in such encounters. “Both religious systems have changed. Conversions may occur, which have to be described as hybrids.”¹⁰¹ With reference to Jahnke’s emphasis on the concrete locality of religious encounters, Fischer concludes that “we have to practice a ‘rereading’ of our entire Christian religious system of symbols . . . in the context of an intercultural theological hybridity discourse.”¹⁰² Christian faith after all does not simply develop side by side with other ways of believing, “but *together with* them and in the interstices.”¹⁰³ This understanding of a Christian way of life as continuously in negotiation with its surroundings has a lot of potential for a constructive and peaceful co-existence with the increasing number of people from other faith traditions living in Germany. In addition it counters an understanding of Germany and Europe frequently voiced in public according to which a more or less homogenous *Christian Occident* is threatened by the increased presence of people from the *Muslim Orient*. In a related way, Robert Schreier, influenced by cultural theorists, warns theologians about buying into a

romantic understanding of culture as unitary. I mention one of the more recent articles of this American theologian below because its publication in the above-mentioned journal *Interkulturelle Theologie* is a sign of a rising awareness in Germany of the relevance of cultural theory in general and postcolonial theory in particular for theology.

Theology Promoting a Performative Notion of Truth in the Interstices

Schreiter's article "Spreading the Truth or Intercultural Theology: What Do We Mean When We Talk About Mission Today?" contains reflections on the centennial of the Edinburgh Mission Conference in 2010. Schreiter is Vatican II professor of theology at Catholic Theological Union in Chicago. He starts by reflecting on the fact that many universities worldwide have opted to do away with "mission departments" in favour of institutes for "intercultural studies" or "worldwide Christianity." He credits mission theology with having moved away from the dynamics in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries that incorporated mission into the universalizing perspective of the Empire.¹⁰⁴ But at the same time he critiques the fact that much of intercultural theology still "is based on a romantic understanding of culture as unity of language, custom, and territory."¹⁰⁵ Schreiter is convinced that postcolonial analysis with its insistence on the connections between globalization and imperialism can contribute to the development of a constructive intercultural theology with a sound analysis of culture. The *hyper-differentiating* and *deterritorializing* effects of globalization cannot be grasped by traditional concepts of culture, but need postcolonial analyses such as Bhabha's, but also an application of other cultural discourses to theology such as Kathryn Tanner's suggestion that we understand postmodern cultural anthropology (which interlaces with postcolonial theory quite a bit) as an important new agenda for theology.¹⁰⁶ Getting back to the central question of his

article, the question of truth, Schreiter concludes that if intercultural theology learns from theories of culture about the complexity of cultural processes, it needs to become an advocate of a performative understanding of truth,¹⁰⁷ that is, truth that does not rest comfortably in the realm of one group or religion but that shows itself in the encounter, in the interstices, “in the moments of weakness in a certain culture rather than in the moments of strength.”¹⁰⁸ In such a process understanding of truth I identify again a specific interest and insight in the hybrid character of all (religious) culture and the resulting necessity of paying close attention to the dynamics at the boundaries, in Schreiter’s words the *interstices*, between cultures as the zones where meaning emerges and identity is negotiated.

I believe that in the context of intensifying migration and the accompanying stiffening of the European border regime, attention to the two tropes of *hybridity* and *boundary dynamics* is of decisive importance for a culturally sensitive theological reflection. Heeding these perspectives would prevent many theological approaches from buying into the varying ideological proposals (oftentimes with the pretence of “saving the *Christian* Occident”) aimed at an encapsulation and purification of *Fortress Europe*.

Also in Germany discourses of cultural purification have been increasingly en vogue lately. One example of the new mainstream acceptance of a reactionary understanding of “German” culture is the success of the latest book of the social democrat and public thinker Thilo Sarazzin, a member of the board of directors of the German Federal Reserve. In his book entitled *Germany Does Away With Itself (Deutschland schafft sich ab)* he worries that Muslim immigration is threatening the survival of “German virtues”¹⁰⁹ and weakening the German nation’s will to self-assertion.¹¹⁰ Especially his frequent descriptions of culture as

territorially defined and characterized by demarcation betray his neglect of taking the analysis of contemporary cultural theory into account. Starting from the anthropological assumption that it belongs to human culture to be “territorial” and therefore necessarily demarcated from others,¹¹¹ he continuously polarizes indigenous (German: *autochthon*) Germans and “Muslim” immigrants. The former group, according to Sarrazin, is threatened by the higher “fertility rate” of the latter and therefore “German life style” as a whole is at risk.¹¹² Sarrazin’s conclusion is that the shutting down of the European borders toward its Muslim neighbors is an urgent necessity. In order not to mistake such and similar discourses for a valid defense of Christianity (or still worse: Christian territory), postcolonial analysis can play a vital role, but also listening to the countless German-Muslim voices whom Sarrazin treats as a homogenous group. *Fortunately* a rejoinder to Sarrazin was written entitled *Germany Reinvents Itself* (German: *Deutschland erfindet sich neu*),¹¹³ where texts from German immigrants (predominantly Muslim) are gathered to show that cultural hybridity is also a fact in Germany, that it needs to be dealt with constructively and not by an illusionary attempt of tearing up the intercultural fabric of German society. *Unfortunately* the success of the rejoinder is significantly smaller than the success of Sarrazin’s populist treatise. This is why it remains important that Christian theology continues to pay attention to the complex processes of cultural hybridization and boundary dynamics in an ever-changing Germany.

It is my hope that the engagement of postcolonial theory by theologians in Germany in the years ahead will contribute to a stronger position of intercultural theology in German academia and church life with important implications for life in general in a plural and global European society.

- ¹ It is more of what in Germany is called a *Sammelrezension* ("cumulative review" in English) of selected articles, books, and websites than an article crafting a specific argument.
- ² Stephen Moore and Fernando Segovia use this expression for three of the most productive postcolonial critics. See http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/4811_4981.pdf.
- ³ Edward W. Said, *Orientalismus*, 2nd ed. (Frankfurt: Fischer, 2009).
- ⁴ Homi K. Bhabha, *Die Verortung der Kultur* (Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2000).
- ⁵ It took almost twenty years for a translation of her doubtlessly most influential text *Can the Subaltern Speak?* to appear in German: Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *Can the Subaltern Speak? Postkolonialität und subalterne Artikulation* (Vienna, Berlin: Turia & Kant 2007).
- ⁶ Nadine Böhm, Barbara Gabel-Cunningham, Doris Feldmann, Christian Krug, Andreas Nehring, Sabine Nunius, "Postkoloniale Übersetzung als kulturhermeneutisches Projekt." Zur Übertragung von Spivaks 'A Critique of Postcolonial Reason' ins Deutsche, in: Christoph Ernst, Walter Sparr, Hedwig Wagner, eds. *Kulturhermeneutik. Interdisziplinäre Beiträge zum Umgang mit Kultureller Differenz* (Munich: Fink, 2008), 519-538.
- ⁷ Cf. Michelle Barrett, Anne Phillips, eds.. *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1992).
- ⁸ Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979).
- ⁹ Cf. Roger Diederer, Davy Depelchin, eds. *Orientalismus in Europa. Von Delacroix bis Kandinsky* (Munich: Hirmer, 2010).
- ¹⁰ Cf. "Burcu Dogramaci: Wie schön war die Alleinherrschaft: Eine Münchner Ausstellung zum Orientalismus schweigt in den kolonialen Bildwelten des 19. Jahrhunderts," *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, 29-30 January 29-30 2011, 13.
- ¹¹ Ibid.
- ¹² Ibid.
- ¹³ María do Mar Castro Varela, Nikita Dhawan, eds. *Postkoloniale Theorie: Eine kritische Einführung* (Frankfurt: transcript, 2005), 7. For a very compact and readable online introduction to postcolonial theory see Katrin Amelang and Oliver Schupp, "Postkoloniale Theorie und die 'Spurensuche' nach Widerstand", (b.w.g.t, Protestbewegungen im globalen Kapitalismus), http://www.copyriot.com/bewegt/postcolonial_theory.html#f19 (accessed November 16, 2011).
- ¹⁴ Quoted in Varela and Dhawan.
- ¹⁵ Cf. *ibid.*
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 8.
- ¹⁷ Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* (Boston, MA: Harvard University Press, 1999).
- ¹⁸ Immanuel Kant, *Physische Geographie* in *Kants Werke* Band IX (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1923), 316.
- ¹⁹ Wolfgang Schoberth, *Einführung in die theologische Anthropologie* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 2006) 51.
- ²⁰ Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*, 8-9.
- ²¹ Georg Friedrich Wilhelm Hegel, *Philosophie der Geschichte*, quoted in Kien Nghi Ha, *Ethnizität und Migration Reloaded: Kulturelle Identität, Differenz und Hybridität im postkolonialen Diskurs* (Berlin: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag, 2004), 120.
- ²² Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*, 110.
- ²³ Andreas Nehring, "Mistaken Readings" – Gayatri Spivak's Deconstruction of Hegel and the *Bhagavadgītā*," in *The Fuzzy Logic of Encounter: New Perspectives on Cultural Contact*, ed. Sünne Juterczenka and Gesa Mackenthun (Münster: Waxmann Verlag, 2009) 145-157 (147).
- ²⁴ *Ibid.*, 152.
- ²⁵ Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason*, 58.
- ²⁶ Nehring, "Mistaken Readings", 155.
- ²⁷ Cf. "Aufstand der Herero und Nama," http://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Aufstand_der_Herero_und_Nama (accessed November 16, 2011).
- ²⁸ For a documentation of this genocide see Medardus Brehl, "Der Völkermord an den Herero 1904 und seine zeitgenössische Legitimation," in *Völkermord und Kriegsverbrechen in der ersten Hälfte des 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Micha Brumlik and Irmtrud Wojak (Frankfurt: Campus, 2004), 77-98.

²⁹ “Es tut uns so leid,” <http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/historische-entschuldigungen-es-tut-uns-so-leid-1.275192-7> (accessed November 16, 2011). A grim reminder of the Herero genocide to this day is stored in the archaeological archives of German universities, where skulls of killed Hereros have been sent for “anthropological studies.” Cf. G. Etscheit “Makabres Erbe” *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, April 11, 2009, <http://www.sueddeutsche.de/karriere/universitaets-archiv-makabres-erbe-1.403489> (accessed November 16, 2011).

³⁰ Katharina Ruhland “Ein Platz an der Sonne,” *Hinterland: Das Vierteljahrmagazin für kein ruhiges. Ein Magazin vom Bayerischen Flüchtlingsrat*, vol. 15, December 2010, 41, <http://www.hinterland-magazin.de/pdf/15-40.pdf> (accessed November 16, 2011).

³¹ Cf. Thomas Pakenham, *The Scramble for Africa: White Man’s Conquest of the Dark Continent 1876-1912* (New York: Avon Books, 1992).

³² *Ibid.*, xxi.

³³ *Ibid.*, xxiii.

³⁴ “125th Anniversary of the Berlin Africa Conference: Commemoration – Reappraisal – Reparation,” <http://www.berliner-afrika-konferenz.de/appeal> (accessed November 16, 2011).

³⁵ “Karneval der Kulturen,” <http://www.werkstatt-der-kulturen.de/de/festivals/> (accessed November 16, 2011).

³⁶ “Veranstaltung: Wozu postkolonialer Aktivismus in Deutschland. Die Auseinandersetzung mit kolonialen Kontinuitäten in deutschen Städten,” <http://www.freiburg-postkolonial.de/Seiten/va.htm#leipzig2011> (accessed November 16, 2011). As late as 2010 German zoos in Augsburg, Berlin, and Eberswalde combined exhibitions of African animals with exhibitions of and charity collections for African tribes.

³⁷ Cf. Zara Pfeiffer and Philip Zöls, “Mapping Postcolonial Positions,” *Hinterland: Das Vierteljahrmagazin für kein ruhiges. Ein Magazin vom Bayerischen Flüchtlingsrat*, vol. 15, December 2010, 47, <http://www.hinterland-magazin.de/pdf/15-44.pdf> (accessed November 16, 2011).

³⁸ “freiburg-postkolonial.de,” <http://www.freiburg-postkolonial.de/index.htm> (accessed November 16, 2011).

³⁹ Lothar von Trotha was the commander of the troops committing the genocide against the Hereros (see above).

⁴⁰ “Stadt München benennt Von-Trotha-Straße um“ in *EPV – Evangelischer Presseverband für Bayern*, <http://www.epv.de/node/2680> (accessed November 16, 2011).

⁴¹ Cf. Samuel P. Huntington, *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order* (New York: Simon & Schuster Paperbacks, 1996).

⁴² Ilija Trojanow and Ranjit Hoskoté, *Kampfabgabe. Kulturen bekämpfen sich nicht – sie fließen zusammen* (Munich: Karl Blessing Verlag, 2007).

⁴³ That Trojanow is part and parcel of the German literary establishment is mirrored by the fact that he is writing in German, has published extensively with big German publishers, and has been writer-in-residence (*Stadtschreiber*) in Mainz in 2007.

⁴⁴ Trojanow/Hoskoté, *Kampfabgabe*, 11.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 15.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁴⁸ Quoted in *ibid.*, 158.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 168.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 192.

⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 205.

⁵² *Ibid.*, 102.

⁵³ Cf. my own work on this question: Michael Nausner, “Homeland as Borderland,” in *Postcolonial Theologies: Divinity and Empire*, ed. Catherine Keller, Michael Nausner, Mayra Rivera (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2004), 118-132; Michael Nausner, *Subjects In-between: A Theological Boundary Hermeneutics* (PhD dissertation, Drew University, 2005).

⁵⁴ Trojanow/Hoskoté, *Kampfabgabe*, 40.

⁵⁵ Kien Nghi Ha, *Ethnizität und Migration Reloaded*, 16.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 11.

⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁵⁸ Quoted in *ibid.*, 13.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 17.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 19.

⁶² Cf. *Differente Erfahrungen: Türkische MigrantInnen in der BRD* in *ibid.*, 23-76.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 203.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 206.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 207.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 209.

⁶⁷ The last big debate was spurred by a book of Thilo Sarrazin, a member of the board of directors of the German Federal Reserve. Thilo Sarrazin, *Deutschland schafft sich ab: Wie wir unser Land aufs Spiel setzen* (Munich: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 2010).

⁶⁸ See, e.g., an impressive volume gathering a wide range of voices from different disciplines analyzing the development of a new border regime in Europe. One focus of the volume is the problematic externalizing of the border regime into the neighboring countries by European migration policies. Cf. Sabine Hess and Bernd Kasperek, eds. *Grenzregime: Diskurse, Praktiken, Institutionen in Europa* (Berlin: Assoziation A, 2010).

⁶⁹ Catherine Keller, Michael Nausner, Mayra Rivera (eds.), *Postcolonial Theologies: Divinity and Empire* (St. Louis, MO: Chalice Press, 2004), 5. In the Catholic *Institut für Politik und Theologie* at the university of Münster connections between liberation theology and postcolonial theology are drawn as well with reference to the work of the Argentinian feminist theologian Marcella Althaus-Reid. Cf. *Institut für Theologie und Politik*, Rundbrief Nr. 34, January 3, 2011, <http://www.itpol.de/?p=385> (accessed November 16, 2011).

⁷⁰ Doris Strahm, "Über Grenzen hinaus denken: Anliegen und Entwicklungen feministischer Theologie," http://www.doris-strahm.ch/Strahm_1_01.pdf (accessed November 16, 2011).

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 7.

⁷³ Andreas Nehring, Joachim Valentin (ed.), *Religious Turns – Turning Religion. Veränderte kulturelle Diskurse – neue religiöse Wissensformen* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer 2008), 8.

⁷⁴ Andreas Nehring, "Religion und Kultur. Beschreibung einer Differenz," in *ibid.*, 11-31.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 16.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 21.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁸⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, 27.

⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 29.

⁸³ Quoted in *ibid.*

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 30.

⁸⁵ It started 1816 as *Evangelisches Missionsmagazin*.

⁸⁶ Claudia Jahnelt, "Vernakulare Ökumene in transkultureller Einheit: Ökumenische Theologie nach dem Cultural Turn." *Interkulturelle Theologie* (1/2008), 10-34 (11).

⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 14.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 24.

⁸⁹ Cf. *ibid.*, 25.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁹¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 29-30.

⁹² *Ibid.*, 32.

⁹³ Cf. *ibid.*, 33.

⁹⁴ Moritz Fischer, "'Hybridität/Hybridisierung': Über den heuristischen Wert eines kulturwissenschaftlichen Konzepts für die Interkulturelle Theologie." *Interkulturelle Theologie* (3/2008), 282-304.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 284.

⁹⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 285-6.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 286.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹⁹ Ibid., 299.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 300.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 301.

¹⁰² Ibid., 302.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 303.

¹⁰⁴ Cf. Robert Schreier, "Verbreitung der Wahrheit oder interkulturelle Theologie: Was meinen wir, wenn wir heute von Mission sprechen?" *Interkulturelle Theologie* (1/2010), 13-31 (20).

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 22.

¹⁰⁶ Cf. *ibid.*, 23.

¹⁰⁷ Cf. *ibid.*, 29.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 30.

¹⁰⁹ Cf. Thilo Sarrazin, *Deutschland schafft sich ab*, 11.

¹¹⁰ Cf. *ibid.*, 18.

¹¹¹ Cf. *ibid.*, 255.

¹¹² Cf. *ibid.*, 259, 266.

¹¹³ Hilal Sezgin, ed. *Deutschland erfindet sich neu: Manifest der vielen* (Berlin: Blumenbar Verlag, 2011).