

# Conviviality in Unequal Societies: Perspectives from Latin America

## Proposal for the Creation of a Maria Sibylla Merian International Centre for Advanced Studies in the Humanities and Social Sciences in Latin America and the Caribbean

### Research Programme for the Preliminary Phase (2017-2020)

#### Consortium Members

Berlin, Germany



Cologne, Germany



São Paulo, Brazil



La Plata, Argentina



Mexico City, Mexico



f

## Summary

The proposed *Centre* will study past and present forms of social, political, religious and cultural conviviality, above all in Latin America and the Caribbean while also considering comparisons and interdependencies between this region and other parts of the world. Conviviality, for the purpose of the *Centre*, is an analytical concept to circumscribe ways of living together in concrete contexts. Therefore, conviviality admits gradations – from more horizontal forms to highly asymmetrical convivial models. By linking studies about interclass, interethnic, intercultural, interreligious and gender relations in Latin America and the Caribbean with international studies about conviviality, the proposed *Centre* strives to establish an innovative exchange with evident benefits for both European and Latin American research. The focus on convivial contexts in Latin America and the Caribbean broadens the horizon of conviviality research, which is often limited to the contemporary European context. By establishing a link to research on conviviality, studies related to Latin America gain visibility, influence and impact given the political and analytical urgency that accompanies discussions about coexistence with differences in European and North American societies, which are currently confronted with increasing socio-economic and power inequalities and intercultural and interreligious conflicts.

The *Centre* is based on a consortium consisting of three German partners (Freie Universität Berlin, Universität zu Köln and Ibero-Amerikanisches Institut) and four Latin American partners (Universidade de São Paulo (USP) and Centro Brasileiro de Análise e Planejamento (CEBRAP), Instituto de Investigaciones en Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales (IdIHCS of CONICET/Universidad Nacional de La Plata) and El Colegio de México (COLMEX)). The *Centre* will be located in São Paulo where its main activities will take place supported by USP and CEBRAP. The partners in Argentina (IdIHCS of (CONICET/UNLP)) and Mexico (CCOLMEX) will contribute to a regionwide presence of the *Centre* and the dissemination of its results.

In order to create a vivid space for transnational knowledge production and circulation marked by a symmetric cooperation between institutions and researchers from different disciplines, countries and career steps, the *Centre's* activities will include: fellowships awarded in a competitive application process to outstanding junior and senior researchers from Latin America, Germany and worldwide; resident postdoctoral scholars; a research training programme for doctoral scholars; highly visible publications; regular workshops, conferences and summer schools as well as the development of an information infrastructure and a data management system.

## **Thematic Scope and Research Programme**

### **1. Research Issue and Theoretical-analytical Framework**

#### *The challenge of coexistence in diverse and unequal societies*

Since the emergence of modern nation states, most interethnic, cultural and religious conflicts have tended to be circumscribed and regulated within national territorial borders, notwithstanding the fact that since the beginning of European colonial expansion, the challenges of diversity came to have a global dimension. Today, however, the compression of space-time relations has made new conflicts ubiquitous and impossible to understand and manage considering only their local or national configurations.

Diversity itself has assumed more complex configurations to the extent that cultural life-forms and categories of ascription and self-identification multiply and intersect, as the debate on intersectionality has shown (Céleri et al. 2013). Accordingly, individual or group self-representations following gender, ethnic, religious and other categories become more and more intertwined with positions occupied by individuals or groups of individuals in social and power structures. This logical and structural coupling between processes of production and reproduction of inequalities and processes of construction and reproduction of differences represents a current analytical challenge since traditionally the spheres of recognition (of differences) have been studied in a separate way from redistributive struggles (Fraser/Honneth 2003).

In order to overcome this analytical blind spot, it is necessary to link two different fields of research which have been so far disconnected: inequality research, which focuses on distances between groups or individuals concerning the possession of socially valuable goods and power resources (Kreckel 2004), and diversity research dedicated to analyzing the construction of ascriptions and self-representations in terms of gender, culture, ethnicity, etc. (Vertovec 2015). This implies, on the one hand, deconstructing the ontological concept of (national, ethnic, cultural, etc.) identity still dominant in diversity research, as different studies developed within the *Research Network for Latin America. Ethnicity, Citizenship, Belonging* have highlighted (e.g. Potthast et al. 2015, Youkhana 2015). On the other hand, it is indispensable to open inequality research for the analysis of everyday interactions, as the research undertaken in the frame of the *Research Network on Interdependent Inequalities in Latin America* has shown (e.g. Braig/Costa/Göbel 2015, Skornia 2014).

However, what is still missing is a more encompassing connection between the de-ontologization of identities in diversity studies and the inclusion of everyday interactions in inequality research. Some recent studies within research of migration - especially in Europe - offer first insights on how to bridge these fields: Starting from the concept of conviviality, they show how everyday interactions constitute contexts of negotiation and resignification of both social positions and cultural identifications (for an overview: Nowicka/Vertovec 2014).

The present proposal builds on the findings of conviviality research and seeks to broaden them at

different levels. Its theoretical-analytical goal is to investigate the interpenetrations of processes of negotiation of differences and disputes concerning social inequalities in a more systematic way than research on conviviality has hitherto done. This requires linking different disciplinary fields including, on the one hand, anthropology, cultural studies, literature studies, and history particularly specialized in understanding processes of construction and negotiations of differences and, on the other hand, sociology, political sciences, and legal studies more directly engaged in researching structures and dynamics of inequalities from a macro-analytical perspective.

Empirically, this proposal broadens the regional scope of research about conviviality that remains concentrated on the contemporary European context by studying forms of living together in contexts characterized by profound inequalities as well as persistent intercultural, interreligious, interethnic and gender tensions. Thus, as postcolonial, post-slavery and (post-) immigration societies, Latin America and the Caribbean societies have been confronted since their violent integration into the colonial system with the global dimension of questions concerning diversity and inequality. Through history, they have also developed a broad repertoire of political and scholarly responses to these challenges. This constitutes a powerful resource for transnational academic cooperation.

#### *State of the art: from ontological identities to articulations of inequalities and differences*

From a political, historical and normative perspective, reactions to diversity can be divided into at least two large groups according to the type of solution indicated: a) *differentialist responses* and b) *integrationist responses*.

(1) *Differentialist responses* dominated European and North American theoretical and political debates of the late 20th century. They lost influence thereafter due to the proliferation of attempts to improve the “integration” of migrants. In Latin America, these responses have become more influential in recent years. They involve various positions, ranging from liberal (Kymlicka 2007) and communitarian (Taylor 1994) multiculturalists, who defend the creation of special rights for minorities in the realm of law centralized by the state (for the Latin American reception see among others: Stavenhagen 2011, García Peters 2016), to more emphatic legal pluralists, who believe that it is necessary to concede to the multiplicity of existing normative orders (indigenous justice, “traditional” practices, etc.) autonomous institutional spaces suitable for their legal and political expression (Santos 1995, Glenn 2007, Albó/Romero 2009, Berman 2012). At the political level, emphatic legal pluralists have become especially influential within discussions concerning the constitution of plurinational states in Bolivia and Ecuador since the 1990s. In these cases, plurinationalism assumes a twofold meaning. On the one hand, it implies a substantial expansion of territorial autonomy of indigenous people leading different authors to identify, in these countries, new forms (or a restoration) of indigenous sovereignties (see Sieder 2011). On the other hand,

plurinationalism refers to “decolonization” of national states in order to overcome their ethnoracial bias in favour of creole or white populations. Accordingly, the Bolivian or the Ecuadorian independent state has historically functioned as an extension of the colonial state inasmuch as it has reproduced the European model of organization ignoring local values and local forms of political organization: “The plurinationality is insofar decolonial as it seeks to re-think the national state as multi-identitarian, participatory, and fundamentally democratic.” (Altmann 2013: 300)

(2) *Integrationist responses*, in their different theoretical and political hues, explicitly or implicitly indicate the need to incorporate minorities in a common cultural and legal framework which ranges from national belonging and citizenship to the global regime of human rights. The types of integration proposed vary from neo-assimilationist models to neo-Kantian cosmopolitanism.<sup>1</sup> Although criticizing the forced “nationalization” of large demographic groups as it took place in Latin America and Europe in different historical periods, the neo-assimilationists emphasize the political advantages of absorbing minorities and immigrants into national “mainstream cultures” (Alba/Nee 2003).<sup>2</sup> Neo-Kantian cosmopolitans, in turn, argue that the conditions for coexistence in diverse national societies are generated by the normative power which is inherent to the formation of opinion and political will, and materialized in positive law (Habermas 1992, 1996).

Beyond the widespread criticisms made at the *normative-political level* that each one of the approaches classified here as differentialist and integrationist has received (Braidotti et al. 2013, Gilroy 2013, Gonçalves/Costa 2016), it is necessary to highlight *analytical insufficiencies* that are common to both approaches and that strongly limit their ability to interpret the challenges triggered by coexistence in highly diverse societies. This type of critique mainly refers to the static concepts of identity and diversity used by both sets of contributions. Both lines treat cultural, ethnic and religious groups as fixed unities that are constituted in the realm of a closed and homogeneous primary cultural system.

This ontological concept of identity ignores key anthropological and sociological findings that have been gathered since Barth’s seminal work (1969), according to which differences are not constituted and reproduced through isolation and self-reference, but on the contrary, by means of interchanges between different groups, that is, in the realm of interethnic, inter-cultural or interreligious relations. Since Barth’s pioneer study, this dynamic concept of group identity has been developed and elaborated within anthropology itself as well as in various other disciplinary and interdisciplinary fields, from literary theory and ethnic studies to gender, intersectionality and queer studies (e.g. Pratt 2008 [1992],

---

<sup>1</sup> The neo-Kantian qualification is needed to distinguish the model referred to here from that cosmopolitanism anchored in daily experiences as expressed in terms like “cosmopolitanism from below” (Gilroy 2004, Appadurai 2011), “cosmopolitanism of the poor” (Santiago 2004), “rooted cosmopolitanism” (Appiah 1997).

<sup>2</sup> The defense of classic forms of assimilation based on the cultural conversion of minorities has recently disappeared from the Latin American political debate after having had accompanied the whole process of modernization in the region (Costa 2015). In Europe and the United States, this type of position was rehabilitated in the realm of the fears of new attacks motivated by religious fundamentalism as is reported in the debate about the “securitization” of migration (Jacobsen/Durden 2014).

Glick Schiller 1977, Escobar 2008, Haritaworn 2015).

These different analytical developments reveal that the articulation of identities – here understood as dynamic identifications – of both minorities and majority groups, is always a political act, “a complex, on-going negotiation” (Bhabha 1994: 2) linking symbolic, material and power disputes. This involves seeking to analyse intercultural, interethnic, and interreligious interactions as an expression of circumstantial and contingent positions or positionalities assumed by social actors, according to existing political constraints and opportunities (Anthias 2013, 2016). Following this interpretation, the quality and character of the interethnic, intercultural or interreligious relations depend less on the degree of difference or similarity between the cultural repertoires of each one of the groups in question than on the context in which the interaction and negotiation of their positionalities take place. That is, since markers of difference are articulated and mobilized at the very moment of interaction, these features can be minimized or emphasized, according to their effectiveness for validating, in a given context, “claims for justice” (Canessa 2007).<sup>3</sup>

At this point, diversity studies converge with some recent studies in the field of inequality research which search for coining a broader definition of inequality (Kreckel 2004), including socio-economic, socio-ecological and power asymmetries. These studies have broadened up the classical focus on class and strata, placing a reinforced emphasis on factors such as gender or ethnicity, and accentuating the complementary and interdependent nature between different axes of constitution of inequalities (Braig/Costa/Göbel 2015).<sup>4</sup> Also the previous exclusive interest for inequalities within national states has changed to the extent that new contributions have increasingly highlighted the entanglements between national and global structures of inequalities (Boatcă 2015). However, inequality researchers, rather concentrated on studying social structures, still dedicate very little attention to the role of social inequalities for configuring everyday interactions (for a critique: Skornia 2014).

### *Diversity, Difference, Interculturality, Conviviality*

In order to clarify the connotation attributed to conviviality in this proposal, we distinguish this concept from other (more or less) similar terms: diversity, difference, and interculturality.

*Diversity* is used in this proposal to refer to both an encompassing research area (diversity studies) and to empiric contexts characterized by social and cultural plurality. Although specificities that may

---

<sup>3</sup> Different contributions examine the dissemination of (neo)liberal multicultural policies in Latin America revealing some unintended consequences of applying an essentialist concept of identity. Shaped to supposedly protect threatened minorities, these policies, in several cases, actually created the identities they were designed to preserve. Accordingly, groups previously self-identified as landless peasants or rural workers re-signify themselves as indigenous or Afro-descendants in order to claim for land or other “cultural” rights not available for other poor peasants (e.g. Sieder 2002, Hale 2006, French 2009, Bocarejo 2014).

<sup>4</sup> Since the 1950s, Latin American scholars have systematically studied how class and race (Fernandes 1965), class and ethnicity (Stavenhagen 1969) and class and gender (Saffioti 1969) have shaped structures of inequalities in the region. This field of studies remains one of the most productive and innovative of Latin American social sciences (for an overview: Jelin 2017). However, studies developed in this context have another focus and do not serve for developing and articulating diversity and inequality research to the extent this proposal does. In particular, these studies do not focus on the construction, articulation and negotiation of social categorizations in institutions, public sphere, everyday life etc. To the contrary: they understand classifications concerning gender, race and ethnicity solely as structural categories which together with class articulate existing hierarchies. In this way, our project goes far beyond previous work on topics that are in (rather limited) ways related to conviviality.

accompany each particular form of plural coexistence are not ignored here, the general term diversity allows capturing similar processes present in the constitution of groups, no matter whether they articulate ethnic, gender, religious or cultural claims. It also encompasses a broad range of contexts characterized by a dense presence of multiple (self-)representations, including as those described by other authors with neologisms such as multicultural (Gilroy 2004, Pieterse 2007) or super-diversity (Vertovec 2007).

In contrast, *difference* refers not to contexts but to features which individuals or groups can contingently articulate for describing themselves or others. Theoretically, the term difference, as generally used in current debates, goes back to post-structuralism and more specific to the work of Jacques Derrida (1967: 44ff). Accordingly, difference is not an ontological, pre-linguistic property of individuals or groups, it is articulated and modified ad hoc within social interactions.

In recent political and academic debates, the concept of *interculturality* has assumed two central connotations. The first is mostly found in the context of development aid and diversity policies as well as in management studies, applied pedagogy and applied social psychology. Interculturality, in this understanding, refers to encounters of individuals or groups which allegedly have different “cultural backgrounds”, that is, which come from different territorial or national origins (see for instance Kaldschmidt 2012). The second connotation has emerged in the context of indigenous movements and their organizations in Ecuador and Bolivia. In this case, interculturality condensates aspirations for a profound social transformation, as Walsh (2009:79-80) argues: “It allows imagining and opening of pathways towards a different society based on respect, mutual legitimacy, equity, symmetry and equality where difference is the constitutive element and not merely a simple addition. Interculturality also requires an understanding that behind the relations to be constructed — among group and between the structures, institutions and rights that the state might propose — are distinct logics, rationalities, customs and knowledges. For these reasons interculturality is central to state re-founding.”

The expression *conviviality*<sup>5</sup> has a quite generalized and diffuse usage both in English and in its variations in the neo-Latin languages. In the realm of contemporary humanities and social sciences, the term became influential after the publication of the book *Tools for Conviviality*, written by the Viennese theologian Ivan Illich (1973) and based on discussions at the *Intercultural Documentation Center*, an institution Illich headed in Cuernavaca, Mexico. In Illich’s pioneering contribution on the subject, *conviviality* assumes a programmatic connotation, in the realm of a radical criticism of industrial capitalism and of human alienation and the environmental degradation that derives from it. In opposition to this, “conviviality is intended to mean autonomous and creative intercourse among persons and the intercourse of persons with their environment [...]” (Illich 1973: 11). The term *conviviality* and variations of it continue to be applied with this normative meaning as shown by its

---

<sup>5</sup> In the Spanish and Portuguese languages, the terms *convivencia* and *convivência* respectively, beyond their colloquial uses, are applied to refer to the period in which regions of the Iberian Peninsula were occupied from the 8th century by Arabs, while Christians and Jews were allowed to maintain their religions. In this way, the three large monotheist religions, Islam, Judaism and Christianity, coexisted for various centuries until the expulsion or forced conversion of the Jews and Arabs in the late 15th century (Viguera Molins 2000: 31).

uses in theology (Sundermeier 1995) and in the influential manifesto led by French sociologist Alain Caillé (*Les Convivialistes* 2013)<sup>5</sup>.

Among some scholars specialized in Latin American Studies, the term “conviviality” or “convivencia” has been recently rediscovered (Schwartz 2016). In Germany, the term “Konvivenz” has recently gained application and appreciation in the context of the research programme initiated by Ottmar Ette (Ette 2010; Ette 2012; Ette/Müller 2011). Ette's idea of conviviality, or rather Konvivenz, is based on the premise that the main challenge in the current phase of globalization lies in the creation of conditions that will allow peaceful conviviality on a global scale beyond any cultural differences. Ette concentrates on the literatures of the world, which constitute both the basis and the demonstration of his ideas. This proposal, however, aspires to investigate existing social interactions both contemporarily and also historically. It does not limit itself to literature.

In the definition adopted in this proposal, conviviality does not carry any normative or programmatic claim. It has an analytical-empiric function in order to describe coexistence as an open field of discursive and non-discursive negotiation. It thus seeks to expand the meaning coined by Gilroy (2004) to other regions and contexts. Considering developments in the field of cultural studies since the last decades of the twentieth century, the author reconstructed the concept of conviviality in order to overcome analytical and political insufficiencies of multiculturalism. Accordingly, conviviality designates “process[es] of cohabitation and interaction that have made multiculture an ordinary feature of social life in Britain’s urban areas and in postcolonial cities elsewhere [...] It introduces a measure of distance from the pivotal term “identity”, which has proved to be such an ambiguous resource in the analysis of race, ethnicity, and politics” (Gilroy 2004: ix). Although our perspective presents some affinities with Gilroy’s work, we aim at developing a systematic research programme on conviviality, which is not the intention of Gilroy. He set the concept of conviviality in the debate as an epistemological contribution to overcome certain limits of the concept of multiculturalism, yet did not intend to create an international research programme around the concept conviviality like this proposal does.

The term conviviality that inspires this proposal refers to everyday interactions in contexts characterized by inequality and diversity. Therefore, our approach allows for the integration of the micro-level, i.e. daily relations, into inequality research usually restricted to the analysis of macro-structures. At the same time, the emphasis on economic, ecological and power inequalities represents an improvement of diversity research and even existing conviviality studies inasmuch as researchers in this field tend to overlook economic and power asymmetries involved in daily interactions.

Thus, the novelty of this proposal lies in analyzing intercultural, interethnic and interreligious or gender relations not as epiphenomena of pre-political processes, but as “cooperative and conflictual” arenas of disputing the very frontiers that define and distinguish different groups (Heil 2015: 317). Obviously, these arenas are not autonomous or isolated; they reflect constraints imposed by their social

---

<sup>5</sup> Alain Caillé’s position in “*Les Convivialistes*” (2013) focuses very particularly on France and has a clearly normative, political bias. This means that the idea of “convivialisme” represents a vision for a political future characterized by less consumerism and post-utilitarian human relations. This body of Caillé’s work has produced interesting insights, but it cannot be translated into general terms (for a more extensive discussion on conviviality, Konvivenz, Convivialisme, see Costa 2016)

surroundings, political institutions and legal frameworks as well as by available cultural imaginaries. This circumstance explains the methodological urge to reconstruct, from both a current and historical perspective, the structures in which the convivial interactions to be investigated are inserted. Equally relevant is the investigation of symbolic and cultural repertoires which may inform existing conviviality.

### *Dimensions of Analysis*

In order to encompass the variety of variables involved, conviviality will be looked at from three interdependent analytical dimensions:

*Structures - Shaping Conviviality:* this involves analyzing, at a theoretical-analytical level as well as by researching an illustrative sample of convivial contexts, relevant structures which constitute and configure conviviality, including social structures, legal, political and institutional frameworks, but also, as a burgeoning literature has emphasized (Clayton 2009, Neal et al. 2013), physical spaces and “infrastructures” in which interactions take place. Urban spatial design and architecture, unequal access to natural resources and to protection against risks, control of territories, violence, legal frames or the specific configuration of knowledge infrastructures, for instance, have immediate effects on modes of conviviality.

*Negotiations - Articulating Conviviality:* this dimension examines processes of disputing, negotiating and regulating conviviality in diverse spheres including public space, political and legal arenas and everyday interactions as well as at different levels: local, national, international and also the entanglements between them. Thus, the dimension focuses on how societies dispute relevant issues such as symbolic belonging, political participation, distribution of resources and risks, rights for nationals, minorities, foreigners, etc. in forums as diverse as the media, political institutions, social movements, or academic conferences.

*Representations - Imagining Conviviality:* this dimension studies the heterogeneous - often conflictive ways in which individuals and social groups represent conviviality in their respective social spaces. Imagining conviviality involves looking closely at discursive (mythical, cultural, literary and other narrations) and non-discursive expressions (iconicity, material culture, etc.) in order to understand reflections on and concepts of conviviality in specific historical and contemporary contexts. Researchers will also examine how different ways and practices of knowing constitute, ground and affect conviviality and how knowledge is produced, translated and transformed in and through convivial contexts. As such, the *Centre* will also provide a space for reflections on how knowledge constitutes, and is constituted through, the interaction and interdependence of social actors with one another as well as with non-human entities, including artefacts, books, commodities, plants or animals.

When combined, these three analytical dimensions define the leading research questions to be addressed by the *Centre*, i.e.: *How is conviviality structured, disputed, negotiated and represented in diverse and unequal societies?*

## 2. Perspectives from Latin American and the Caribbean

Through its integration into the global context, in the realm of European colonial expansion and the trafficking of enslaved Africans, the region referred to today as Latin America and the Caribbean is a space marked by deep asymmetries and complex gender, interethnic, intercultural and interreligious relations. Given the diversity of its autochthonous peoples, this was also true even prior to European conquest and occupation. With the independence of the former colonies and the formation of nation states during the nineteenth century, questions related to intercultural, interethnic and interreligious coexistence did not disappear. On the contrary, social disparities deepened and nationalisms crystallized, but at the same time large-scale immigration, particularly from Europe, and also from the Middle East and Asia and other Latin American countries, heightened diversity.

During the 20th century, various nationalist strategies led to the construction of discursively stable nations. In the most recent decades, however, new forms of politicization of ethnicity and the diversification of ways of life including new life styles and sexuality patterns as well as a growing multireligiosity led to important reconfigurations of the symbolic ties that shape most Latin American nations, conferring a new visibility to questions related to diversity (Büschges/Pfaff-Czarnecka 2007, Costa 2012, Potthast et al. 2015). The elaboration of new constitutions in different countries of the region during the last decades of the 20th century reflects and feeds this new diversity (Gargarella 2013).

Over time, the challenges of dealing with diversity in contexts of odd inequality also led to an accumulation of a significant number of ideological constructions in each of the countries and regions of Latin America and the Caribbean, including a broad variety of positions, from assimilationist models – as paradigmatically represented by *mestizaje* – to conceptions (supposedly) anchored in indigenous and local experiences - e.g. *comunalidad* (i.e. commonality, Aquino 2013); *buen vivir* (i.e. good living, Acosta 2015); *la brega* (i.e. a never-ending negotiation, Díaz Quiñones 2000).

The academic production dedicated to this issue in various disciplines is equally varied. In fact, intellectual reflections and debates about this topic date back to the 16th century, when theologians formulated the first legal arguments to justify colonization and legitimate race-based inequalities while others object to it (Góngora-Mera 2012: 13). Since the formation of the nation states, the theological literature ceded space to reflections about the construction of nationality, which – influenced by the reception of European scientific racism – developed formulas to make disappear or to physically and/or discursively absorb the indigenous and African legacies (e.g. Sarmiento 1845, Romero 1878).

Latin American contributions that influenced the international debate arose in the first decades of the 20th century, when conceptual frameworks to study interethnic relations were developed, which are still underlying current debates (e.g. Vasconcelos 1927, Freyre 1933, Ortiz 1940). Since then, studies exploring the nexus between social inequalities and gender, intercultural and interethnic relations

have become one of the most productive and internationalized fields of Latin American research (e.g. Sieder 2002, Briones 2005, Walsh 2009, Bocarejo 2014, Gravito 2015). This literature-rich region has also evolved in recent decades into one of the most privileged spaces of theory formation. Theories of *Négritude*, *Créolité*, *Relationnalité* – in this chronological order – have attempted to take stock of conviviality in Latin America and the Caribbean and from there to develop universal categories, such as Édouard Glissant (1990) has done in *Poétique de la relation* and Benitez Rojo (1998) in *La isla que se repite*.

By linking studies about interclass, interethnic, intercultural, interreligious and gender relations in Latin America and the Caribbean with international studies about conviviality, the proposed *Centre* strives to establish an innovative exchange with evident benefits for both European and Latin American academic communities. The focus on conviviality in Latin America and the Caribbean in the context of their translocal and transregional entanglements broadens the horizon of European studies on conviviality as they focus mainly on the contemporary European context. By establishing a link to research on conviviality, studies related to Latin America gain visibility, influence and repercussions given the political and analytical urgency that accompanies similar discussions in European and North American societies, which are currently confronted with increasing socio-economic and power inequalities (Mau 2015) and intercultural and interreligious conflicts (Göle 2014).

### **3. Preliminary Research Programme and Methodology**

As a global reference for studies of how unequal societies constitute their modes of living together, the *Centre* will generate substantive *epistemological, theoretical, methodological* and *analytical-empirical* results. It will also engage in advancing discussions about concrete challenges societies in Latin America, Europe, and elsewhere are facing in response to increasing interethnic, intercultural and interreligious conflicts. While Latin America will be the central focus of empirical work, the region will also be studied comparatively and based on its interdependencies with other regions of the world.

#### *Epistemic, theoretical-analytical, and methodological perspective*

At the *epistemic level*, the *Centre* will be an innovative forum for transnational academic production marked by a symmetric cooperation between institutions and researchers from different countries, disciplines and career stages. It involves reflecting on the very role of the *Centre* in promoting a more symmetrical transnational production of scientific knowledge. In order to achieve this objective, three realms of epistemological reflection will accompany all the project's activities:

*Transference/translation*: this involves the analysis of historical and contemporary tensions, transformations and negotiations inherent to the processes of circulation of knowledge, ideas, norms as

well as practices and their materiality (objects) (e.g. Venuti 2008, Bachmann-Medick 2012).

*Positionality/multiperspectivity*: since all knowledge is “situated” (Haraway 1988, see also Mignolo 2000) – that is, non-universal – it is necessary to reflect on the multiple locations of the production of knowledge and the position of each of them in the realm of academic and non-academic networks of power.

*Transregionality*: the emphasis here is on both comparison – in the sense of understanding past and present interactions and interpenetrations between Latin America, Europe, and other regions of the world – and the promotion of the international circulation of knowledge and experiences.

On the *theoretical-analytical level*, the research programme involves developing, based on a broad critical review of the relevant literature, a *situational and relational approach* that can be applied to the study of conviviality in different contexts in unequal societies. The studies and methodological resources available until now refer basically to contexts of recent migration, mostly based on Europe. Evidence exists, however, as shown by Mbembe (2001: 128f), that conviviality has a constitutive importance to power relations in colonial societies and in “postcolonies”. What we seek to do, therefore, is to develop tools for the analysis of conviviality in these contexts, particularly in Latin America, that take into consideration historiography on early modern and modern societies which contribute to these discussions on the basis of historical empirical research (e.g. Rappaport 2014). Due to the deep social and power asymmetries observed in Latin American and Caribbean societies, systematic research on conviviality in this region will contribute, “to reconnect structural sources of inequality with cultural dimensions of difference” (Brubaker 2015: 3).

From a *methodological perspective*, this involves systematizing existing findings, linking discussions so far disconnected (e.g. in Germany and Latin America), as well as conducting new empirical studies in order to establish a comprehensive overview of the broad repertoire of doctrines and concrete forms of conviviality observed in Latin America since the colonial period, reaching up to our present. The studies to be conducted at the *Centre* will significantly contribute for extending the methodological repertoire of existing studies on conviviality. While the available studies, mostly conducted by anthropologists, are based on ethnographic methods (ethnographies, interviews, participative observation), being circumscribed to the study of negotiations of conviviality in contemporary societies, the interdisciplinary cooperation within the *Centre* will allow us to combine multiple methods and mobilize different sources, including also historiographical archives, in order to study not only contemporary, but also past conviviality along the three dimensions mentioned above: structures, negotiations, representations. This innovative combination of methods is represented in the table below:

### Researching Conviviality

| <b>Methodology<br/>Dimension</b> | <b>Main disciplines</b>  | <b>Main Methods</b>   | <b>Main Materials</b>  |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>Structures</b>                | Economy, Sociology, History, Urban Studies, Geography, Environmental Studies | Social structure analysis, urban and environmental analysis   | Statistics, maps, secondary literature                                       |
| <b>Negotiations</b>              | Anthropology, Sociology, Political Scientists, Law                           | Ethnography, participative observation, analysis of documents | Historiographic and parliamentary archives, newspapers, secondary literature |
| <b>Representations</b>           | History, Law, Literary and Cultural Studies                                  | Discourse analysis, visual analysis, interviews               | Archives, newspapers, secondary literature, novels, art objects.             |

#### *Convivial Contexts*

In order to allow for an accumulation of knowledge and to foster comparisons between different cases, research will focus on *convivial contexts*, which will be examined through the history of their constitution and their interdependencies at local, regional, national and global levels.

Convivial contexts do not have an automatic spatial configuration. For this reason, the convivial context may correspond to a neighbourhood, a municipality, a country or to global or transnational spaces such as diaspora and “translocal social spaces” constituted in the realm of transnational migrations (Pries 2008) as well as to virtual contexts of interaction (Castells 2009). Different convivial contexts will be studied within the *Centre* through the three dimensions of analysis outlined above: structures, negotiations and representations.

Given its international, inter-institutional and interdisciplinary character and the long-term nature of the *Centre* to be created, this proposal does not confine its research agenda to a single sample of concrete past and present convivial contexts. During the preliminary phase, participating researchers will define the research plan based on concrete convivial contexts which they identify together following the *Centre*’s organizational plan as explained further below.

Examples of convivial contexts partially examined in the existing literature on Latin America include conviviality in the Amazonian region as described by Overing/Passes (2000), contexts characterized by an important presence of transnational migrants (Grimson 1999), as well as the Caribbean islands in the 19<sup>th</sup> century as studied by Müller (2011) among others. Beyond the observation of everyday interaction in ordinary situations, a special insight into the quality and character of conviviality can be gained by taking a closer look at extreme processes and unequal distribution of socially construed

risks. During catastrophes, social asymmetrical conflicts become evident and social structuring principles (i.e. emotions, options for action, conflicts, and power relations) of conviviality appear in a nutshell (Voss 2008, Lorenz 2013). Similarly, cases characterized by the systematic use of violence (land conflicts, drug markets etc.) can be seen as exceptional situations for examining the dynamics of conviviality. Specifically relevant to our analysis is the way individuals and groups are influenced by conflict-related violence regarding their perception of conviviality as well as their disposition to interactions (e.g. Baquero 2015).

As mentioned before, an example of such convivial contexts is the Caribbean in the nineteenth century – roughly, from the beginning of the Revolutionary Age (1792) to the Spanish-American War (1898) – where men and women of the most diverse provenance and ancestry lived together: enslaved African men and women from Senegambia, the Gulf of Guinea, the kingdoms of Congo and Angola, labour migrants from South Asia, indigenous groups – Jíbaro, Taino or Kalinago, many of whom, contrary to the myth of indigenous Caribbean extinction, persisted through colonization – as well as the kaleidoscope of settlers, colonial officials, and missionaries pertaining to the period’s Dutch, British, Spanish and French colonial powers.

Researchers involved will examine the **structures** grounding the Caribbean as a convivial context: the “racial”, political and legal hierarchies that underlay colonial societies and plantation complexes, but also, epidemiological structural differences – Europeans’ greater vulnerability to “tropical” diseases like malaria and yellow fever – that potentially undercut colonial hierarchies (Curtin 1989). Other researchers will be concerned with how Caribbean societies **negotiated** the grounds of their living-together – how they disputed ideas of “race” or “nation”, confederationist projects, or plans for abolition. Scholars involved in the third dimension will study how Caribbean intellectuals imagined their societies, for instance, in literary **representations** – of “race”, or after 1860, utopian projects of *Caribbeanidad* or *Créolité* – and through theoretical concepts – of *Négritude* or *Relationalité* (Müller 2011).

#### 4. Bibliography

- Acosta, Alberto (2015): *Buen vivir: vom Recht auf ein gutes Leben - das Wissen der Anden für eine Welt jenseits des Wachstums*, Munich: Oekom-Verlag.
- Alba, Richard D./Nee, Victor (2003): *Remaking the American Mainstream: Assimilation and the New Immigration*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Albó, Xavier/Romero, Carlos (2009): *Autonomías indígenas en la realidad boliviana y su nueva constitución*, La Paz: Vicepresidencia del Estado Plurinacional de Bolivia and GTZ.
- Altmann, Philip (2013): *Die Indigenenbewegung in Ecuador: Diskurs und Dekolonialität*. Bielefeld: Transcript.
- Anthias, Floya (2016): Interconnecting boundaries of identity and belonging and hierarchy-making within transnational mobility studies: Framing inequalities. In: *Current Sociology*, 64: 172-190.
- Anthias, Floya (2013): Social Categories, Embodied Practices, Intersectionality: Towards a Translocational Approach. In: Célieri, Daniela/Schwarz, Tobias/Wittger, Bea (eds.): *Interdependencies of Social Categorisations*. Frankfurt/Madrid: Iberoamericana/Vervuert, 24-40.

- Appadurai, Arjun (2011): Cosmopolitanism from Below. Some Ethical Lessons from the Slums of Mumbai. In: *The Salon*, No 4. [http://www.jwtc.org.za/volume\\_4.htm](http://www.jwtc.org.za/volume_4.htm)
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony (1997): Cosmopolitan Patriots. In: *Critical Inquiry*, 23(3): 617-639.
- Bachmann-Medick, Doris (2012): Menschenrechte als Übersetzungsproblem. In: *Geschichte und Gesellschaft*, 28: 331-359.
- Baquero, Jairo M. (2015): *Layered Inequalities. Land Grabbing, Collective Land Rights and Afro-descendant Resistance in Colombia*. Berlin: LIT.
- Barth, Fredrik (1969): *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries. The Social Organization of Cultural Difference*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Benítez Rojo, Antonio (1998). *La isla que se repite*. Edición definitiva. Barcelona: Editorial Casiopea.
- Berman, Paul Schiff (2012): *Global Legal Pluralism. A Jurisprudence of Law Beyond Borders*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bhabha, Homi (1994): *The Location of Culture*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Boatcă, Manuela (2015): *Global Inequalities Beyond Occidentalism*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Bocarejo, Diana (2014): Legal Typologies and Topologies: The Construction of Indigenous Alterity and Its Spatialization Within the Colombian Constitutional Court. In: *Law & Social Inquiry*, 39(2): 334–360.
- Braidotti, Rosi/Hanafin, Patrick /Blaagaard, Bolette B. (2013): Introduction. In: Braidotti, Rosi et al. (eds.): *After Cosmopolitanism*, 1-8.
- Braig, Marianne/Costa, Sérgio/Göbel, Barbara (2015): Desigualdades sociales e interdependencias globales en América Latina: una valoración provisional. In: *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Políticas y Sociales*, 60(223): 209-236.
- Braig, Marianne/Costa, Sérgio/Kron, Stefanie (eds.) (2012): *Democracia y reconfiguraciones contemporáneas del derecho en América Latina*. Frankfurt/Madrid: Iberoamericana/Vervuert.
- Briones, Claudia (2005): Formaciones de alteridad: contextos globales, procesos nacionales y provinciales. In: Briones, Claudia (ed.): *Cartografías argentinas: políticas indigenistas y formaciones provinciales de alteridad*. Buenos Aires: Geaprona, 11-44.
- Brubaker, Rogers (2015): *Grounds for Difference*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Büschges, Christian/Pfaff-Czarnecka, Joana (eds.) (2007): Die Ethnisierung des Politischen: Identitätspolitik in Lateinamerika, Asien und den USA. Frankfurt: Campus.
- Canessa, Andrew (2007): Who is indigenous? Self-identification, Indigeneity, and Claims to Justice in Contemporary Bolivia. In: *Urban Anthropology* 36(3): 14-48.
- Castells, Manuel (2009): *Communication Power*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Céleri, Daniela/Schwarz, Tobias/Wittger, Bea (eds.) (2013): *Interdependencias of Social Categorisations*. Frankfurt/Madrid: Vervuert/Iberoamericana.
- Clayton, John (2009): Thinking Spatially: Towards an Everyday Understanding of Inter-ethnic Relations. In: *Social and Cultural Geography*, 10: 481–498.
- Costa, Sérgio/Alonso, Angela/Tomioka, Sérgio (2001): *A modernização negociada: transporte e riscos ambientais*. São Paulo/Brasília: CEBRAP/IBAMA.
- Costa, Sérgio (2007): De la asimilación a la convivencia: conceptos y contextos de la política inmigratoria. In: Yepez, Isabel/Herrera, Gioconda (eds.): *Nuevas migraciones latinoamericanas a Europa. Balances y desafíos*. Quito: FLACSO, 269-286.
- Costa, Sérgio (2012): Freezing Differences. Law, Politics, and the Invention of Cultural Diversity in Latin America. In: Araujo, Katja/Mascareño, Aldo (eds.): *Legitimization in World Society*. Farnham: Ashgate, 139-156.
- Costa, Sérgio (2015): Konfigurationen der Moderne in Lateinamerika. In: Jaeger, Friedrich/Knöbl, Wolfgang/Schneider, Ute (eds.): *Handbuch Modernforschung*. Stuttgart: Metzler, 143-153.
- Costa, Sérgio (2016): Convivialisme, Conviviality, Konvivenz: konvergierende Antworten auf die ‚Purists of Difference‘? In: Buschmann, A. et al. (Eds.): *Literatur leben. Festschrift für Ottmar Ette*. Frankfurt/M, Madrid: Iberoamericana, S. 211-220.
- Curtin, Philip D. (1989): *Death by Migration: Europe's Encounter with the Tropical World in the Nineteenth Century*. Cambridge/New York/Port Chester: Cambridge University Press.
- Derrida, Jacques (1967): *L'Écriture et la différence*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Díaz Quiñones, Arcadio (2000): *El arte de bregar: ensayos*. San Juan: Ed. Callejón.
- Escobar, Arturo (2008): *Territories of Difference: Place, Movements, Life*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Ette, Ottmar/Müller, Gesine (eds.) (2011): *Paisajes vitales. Conflictos, catástrofes y convivencias en*

- Centroamérica y el Caribe. Un simposio transareal.* Berlin: Walter Frey.
- Ette, Ottmar (2012): *Konvivenz. Literatur und Leben nach dem Paradies.* Berlin: Kadmos.
- Ette, Ottmar (2010): *ZusammenLebensWissen. List, Last und Lust literarischer Konvivenz im globalen Maßstab.* Berlin: Kadmos.
- Fernandes, Florestan (1965): *A integração do negro na sociedade de classes.* São Paulo: Dominus/ USP, 2 Vols.
- Fraser, Nancy/Honneth, Axel (2003): *Umverteilung oder Anerkennung? Eine politisch-philosophische Kontroverse.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- French, Jan H. (2009): *Legalizing Identities. Becoming Black or Indian in Brazil's Northeast.* Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Freye, Gilberto (1933): *Casa-grande & senzala.* Recife: Global editora.
- Fritz, Barbara/Lavinas, Lena (2015): *A Moment of Equality for Latin America? Challenges and Limits for Redistributive Policies.* Farnham: Ashgate.
- Gänger, Stefanie (2014): Mikrogeschichten des Globalen. Chinarinde, der Andenraum und die Welt während der „globalen Sattelzeit“ (1770 – 1830). In: Barth, Boris/Gänger, Stefanie/Petersson, Niels P. (eds.): *Globalgeschichte. Bestandsaufnahme und Perspektiven.* Frankfurt/New York: Campus Verlag, 19-40.
- Gänger, Stefanie (2015): World Trade in Medicinal Plants from Spanish America, 1717– 1815. *Medical History* 59(1): 44-62.
- García Peters, Sabine (2016): La internacionalización del multiculturalismo liberal como estructura de posibilidad para su circulación en América Latina. *Revista de Estudios Sociales*, 57: 12-24.
- Gargarella, Roberto (2013): Dramas, conflictos y promesas del nuevo constitucionalismo latinoamericano. In: *Anacronismo e Irrupción* 3(4): 245-257.
- Gilroy, Paul (2004): *After Empire. Melancholia or Convivial Cultures.* London/New York: Routledge.
- Glenn, Patrick (2007): *Legal Traditions of the World: Sustainable Diversity in Law.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Glick Schiller, Nina (1977): Ethnic Groups Are Made Not Born. In: Hicks, George/Leis, Philip (eds.): *Ethnic Encounters: Identities and Contexts.* North Scituate: Duxbury Press, pp. 23–35.
- Glissant, Edouard (1990): *Poétique de la Relation.* Paris: Gallimard.
- Göbel, Barbara/Ulloa, Astrid (eds.) (2014): *Extractivismo minero en Colombia y América Latina.* Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Biblioteca Abierta, Colección General.
- Göbel, Barbara/Góngora, Manuel/Ulloa, Astrid (eds.) (2014): *Desigualdades socio-ambientales* Bogotá: Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Biblioteca Abierta, Colección General.
- Göle, Nilüfer (2014): *Islam and Public Controversy in Europe.* London/New York: Routledge.
- Gonçalves, Guilherme L./Costa, Sérgio (2016): The Global Constitutionalization of Human Rights: Overcoming Contemporary Injustices or Juridifying Old Asymmetries? In: *Current Sociology* 64: 311-331.
- Góngora-Mera, Manuel (2012): Transnational Articulations of Law and Race in Latin America: A Legal Genealogy of Inequality, *desiguALdades.net Working Paper Series*, No. 18.
- Gravito, César R. (ed.) (2015): *Law and Society in Latin America: A New Map.* London/New York: Routledge.
- Grimson, Alejandro (1999): *Relatos de la diferencia y la igualdad: los bolivianos en Buenos Aires.* Buenos Aires: EUDEBA/FELAFACS.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1992): *Faktizität und Geltung. Beiträge zur Diskurstheorie des Rechts und des demokratischen Rechtsstaates.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Habermas, Jürgen (1996): *Die Einbeziehung des Anderen. Studien zur politischen Theorie.* Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.
- Hale, Charles (2006): *Más que un indio = More than an Indian: racial ambivalence and neoliberal multiculturalism in Guatemala.* Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Haraway, Donna (1988): Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective. In: *Feminist Studies* 14(3): 575-599.
- Haritaworn, Jin (2015): *Queer Lovers and Hateful Others: Regenerating Violent Times and Places.* London: Pluto Press.
- Heil, Tilmann (2015): Conviviality. (Re-)negotiating minimal consensus. In: Vertovec, Steven (ed.): *Routledge International Handbook of Diversity Studies.* Oxford: Routledge, 317-324.
- Illich, Ivan (1973): *Tools for Conviviality.* New York: Harper & Row.

- Jacobson, Robin D./Durden, Elizabeth T. (2014): Old Poison in New Security Bottles: Contemporary Immigration Restriction and the Detention Regime. In: *Migration Studies*, 2(2): 235-254.
- Jelin, Elizabeth (2017): Unequal Differences: Gender, Ethnicity/Race and Citizenship in Class Societies (Historical Realities, Analytical Approaches). In Jelin, E./Motta, R./Costa, S. (ed.): *Global entangled inequalities: conceptual debates and evidence from Latin America*. London/ New York: Routledge, forthcoming.
- Kaldschmidt, Susanne (2012): Interkulturalität als Bestandteil der Nachhaltigkeit von Vorhaben in der Entwicklungszusammenarbeit. In: Koch, Eckart/ Speiser, Sabine (Eds): *Interkulturalität in der internationalen Entwicklungszusammenarbeit*, pp. 73-96.
- Klengel, Susanne/Ortiz Wallner, Alexandra (eds.) (2016): *SUR/SOUTH: Poetics and Politics of Thinking Latin America – India*. Frankfurt/Madrid: Vervuert/Iberoamericana.
- Kreckel, Reinhard (2004): *Politische Soziologie der sozialen Ungleichheit*. Frankfurt: Campus, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed.
- Kymlicka, Will (2007): *Multicultural Odysseys*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Les Convivialistes (2013): *Manifeste convivialiste. Déclaration d'interdépendance*. Lormont: Le Bord de l'eau.
- Lorenz, Daniel F. (2013): The Diversity of Resilience. Contributions from Social Science Perspective. *Natural Hazards* 67(1): 7-24.
- Mau, Steffen (2015): *Inequality, Marketization and the Majority Class. Why did the European Middle Classes accept Neoliberalism?* Basingstoke: Palgrave.
- Mbembe, Achille (2001): *On the Postcolony*. Berkeley/Los Angeles/London: University of California Press.
- Mignolo, Walter (2000): *Local Histories/Global Designs: Coloniality, Subaltern Knowledges, and Border Thinking*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Müller, Gesine (2011): Convivencias pluri-étnicas y sus representaciones literarias en el Caribe del Siglo XIX o el concepto de ‚Caribbeanidad‘ como desafío. In: Ette, Ottmar et al. (eds.): *Trans(it)Areas. Convivencias en Centroamérica y el Caribe. Un simposio transareal*. Berlin: Edition Tranvía, 102-115.
- Neal, Sarah/Bennett, Katy/Cochrane, Allan/Mohan, Giles (2013): Living Multiculture: Understanding the New Spatial and Social Relations of Ethnicity and Multiculture in England. In: *Government and Policy* 31: 308-323.
- Nowicka, M. Magdalena/Vertovec, Steven (2014): Comparing Convivialities: Dreams and Realities of Living-with-difference. In: *European Journal of Cultural Studies* 17(4): 357-374.
- Ortiz, Fernando (1940): El fenómeno social de la transculturación y su importancia en Cuba. In: *Revista Bimestre Cubana* 46: 273–278.
- Overing, Joanna/Passes, Alan (eds.) (1998): *Anthropology of Love and Anger: the Aesthetics of Conviviality in Native South America*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Pieterse, Jan N. (2007): *Ethnicities and Global Multiculture: Pants for an Octopus*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Potthast, Barbara/Büschges, Christian/Gabbert, Wolfgang et al. (eds.) (2015): *Dinámicas de inclusión y exclusión en América Latina. Conceptos y prácticas de etnicidad, ciudadanía y pertenencia*. Frankfurt/Madrid: Vervuert/Iberoamericana.
- Pratt, Mary Louise (2008 [1992]): *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. London: Routledge.
- Pries, Ludger (2008): *Die Transnationalisierung der sozialen Welt. Sozialräume jenseits von Nationalgesellschaften*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp
- Rappaport, Joanne (2014): *The Disappearing Mestizo. Configuring Difference in the Colonial New Kingdom of Granada*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Romero, Sylvio (1878): *Apontamentos para a história da literatura brasileira no século XIX. A philosophia no Brasil*. Porto Alegre: Typographia da Deutsche Zeitung.
- Saffioti, Heleieth (1969): *A mulher na sociedade de classes: Mito e realidade*, São Paulo: Quatro Artes Universitária.
- Santiago, Silviano (2004): *O cosmopolitismo do pobre*. Belo Horizonte: Editora d UFMG.
- Santos, Boaventura de Souza (1995): *Towards a New Common Sense: Law, Science, and Politics in the Paradigmatic Transition*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Sarmiento, Domingo F. (1845): *Facundo o Civilización y Barbarie en las pampas argentinas*. Santiago de Chile: El Progreso de Chile.
- Schwartz, Marcy (2016): Reading on Wheels. Stories of Convivencia in the Latin American City. *Latin American Research Review*, 51(3): 181-201
- Sieder, Rachel (ed.) (2002): *Multiculturalism in Latin America: Indigenous Rights, Diversity and*

- Democracy*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Sieder, Rachel (2013): Subaltern Cosmopolitan Legalities and the Challenges of Engaged Ethnography. *Universitas humanística*, 75: 221-249.
- Skornia, Anna (2014): *Entangled Inequalities in Transnational Care Chains: Practices across the Borders of Peru and Italy*. Global Studies, Bielefeld: transcript.
- Stavenhagen, Rodolfo (1969): *Las clases sociales en las sociedades agrarias*, Mexico City: Siglo XXI.
- Sundermeier, Theo (1995): *Konvivenz und Differenz: Studien zu einer verstehenden Missionswissenschaft*. Erlangen: Erlanger Verlag für Mission und Ökumene.
- Taylor, Charles (1994): The Politics of Recognition. In: Godberg, David T. (ed.): *Multiculturalism: A Critical Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp. 75-196
- Ueckmann, Natascha/Müller, Gesine (eds.) (2013): *Kreolisierung revisited. Debatten um ein weltweites Kulturkonzept*. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Vasconcelos, José (1927): *A raza cósmica: misión de la raza iberoamericana; notas de viajes a la América del Sur*. Barcelona: Agencia Mundial de Libros.
- Venuti, Lawrence (2008): *The Translator's Invisibility. A History of Translation*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Vertovec, Steven (2007): Super-Diversity and its Implications. In: *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30(6): 1024-1054.
- Vertovec, Steven (ed.) (2015): *Routledge International Handbook of Diversity Studies*. London/New York: Routledge.
- Viguera Molíns, Maria J. (2000): Sobre la historia de los judíos en Al-Andalus. In: Saenz-Badillos, Angel (ed.): *Judíos entre árabes y cristianos. Luces y sombras de una convivencia*. Córdoba: El Almendro, 31-52.
- Voss, Martin (2008): *The Vulnerable can't Speak. An Integrative Vulnerability Approach to Disaster and Climate Change Research*. In: *Behemoth* 3: 39-71.
- Walsh, Catherine (2009): *Interculturalidad, estado, sociedad: luchas (de) coloniales de nuestra época*. Quito: Universidad Andina Simón Bolívar.
- Walsh, Cathrine (2009): The Plurinational and Intercultural State: Decolonization and State Re-founding in Ecuador. *Kult*, 6 (Special Issue): 65-84.
- Youkhana, Eva (2015): A Conceptual Shift in Studies of Belonging and the Politics of Belonging. *Social Inclusion* 3(4): 10-2