

Moving on the Edge: Gender and Mobility in Feridun Zaimoğlu's  
Protocols 'vom Rande der Gesellschaft'

GUIDO SCHENKEL

*Also, ich bin nicht ne brave  
Türkenmutter hinterm Herd ...*  
(Gül, 21, *Anarchistin; Kopfstoff* 31)<sup>1</sup>

In 1995, Feridun Zaimoğlu rose to fame as the newest 'enfant terrible' of the contemporary German literary community with the publication of *Kanak Sprak*, a collection of allegedly authentic interviews with young Germans of Turkish descent, whose controversial musings on Turkishness, Germanness and the spaces in between temporarily shook the very foundations of German cultural politics and re-ignited a plethora of discussions on integration, multiculturalism, and the politics of language. In these interviews, Zaimoğlu's young, all-male 'Kanak' protagonists 'confidently, at times even aggressively, debate their own identities between traditional concepts of both German and Turkish norms, taking their exclusion from both pseudo-homogeneous collectives as a starting point for a self-definition in a Bhabha-ite 'third space', in which "[t]he process of cultural hybridity gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognisable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation. (Bhabha in Rutherford 211).

The manifold discussions regarding the actual authenticity of the interviews notwithstanding<sup>2</sup>, Zaimoğlu's protocols effectively constituted an attempt of lending a strong, subversive voice to a social subaltern in the context of contemporary Germany, "Kanak Sprak [kann] verstanden werden als Wider-Rede, welche aus der Position des moralisch und persönlich nicht integer stigmatisierten, ausgeschlossenen und damit marginalisierten heraus spricht" (Keck 108). However, the organization of *Kanak Sprak* in and by itself represents another case of a more explicitly Spivakian subalternation within this now so articulate margin. In „Can the Subaltern speak?“, her seminal discussion of the position of women between colonial oppression and postcolonial appropriation, Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak contends that "[b]etween patriarchy and imperialism, subject-constitution and object-formation, the figure of the woman disappears, not into a pristine nothingness, but into a violent shuttling which is the displaced figuration of the 'third-world woman' caught between tradition and modernization" (Spivak

102). This problematic is reproduced in *Kanak Sprak*. The preface to the interviews establishes: “Am öffentlichen Leben [...] nimmt hauptsächlich der Mann teil, der Frau dagegen wird bedeutet, sie habe sich aus der männlichen Welt herauszuhalten” (KS 15). In this setup, which is reinforced by the masculinity of all interviewees in *Kanak Sprak*, there is literally “no space from which the sexed subaltern subject can speak” (Spivak 103). However, in *Koppstoff* (1998), the all-female follow-up to *Kanak Sprak*, published three years later, Zaimoğlu presents a very different, in some key aspects contradictory, image of the gender structures within the previously specified post-migrant milieu. Here, the “historically muted subject of the subaltern woman” (Spivak 91), doubly excluded on the grounds of her race and her gender, is not only given the voice which was denied in the initial set of protocols; more importantly, the alleged dictum of the social and spatial constraint of women established in the preface to *Kanak Sprak* is thoroughly subverted.

In the following, I will show on a number of examples from both texts the considerable differences in the inherent constructions of gender with regard to spatial, social and linguistic mobility. These specific differences suggest, as I will argue, that this contradictory play with gender roles serves as one of the main tools of subversion of an assumed authenticity ascribed to Zaimoğlu’s texts. By building up stereotypes on several different levels and subsequently subtly undermining them, which becomes evident especially in a comparison of the ‘male’ and ‘female’ protocols and their discursive contextualizations, Zaimoğlu effectively deconstructs essentialist preconceptions in both popular and academic discussions of Otherness in Germany at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century by not merely mocking xenophobic ideology, but also “[d]efiantly rejecting the liberal xenophilic myth of the loveable oppressed Turk” (Adelson 2000: 115).

The editorial preface to *Kanak Sprak* begins with the construction of a seemingly hermetic milieu, which the interviewer claims to have initially had considerable difficulty penetrating.

Es war nicht einfach, gegen das anfängliche Mißtrauen anzukämpfen, das der Kanake »dem Studierenden« gegenüber empfindet. [...] Erst nach Tagen und Wochen vorsichtigen Kennenlernens traf man sich zum ersten persönlichen Gespräch. (KS 15)

Furthermore, it is already explicitly established at this point that this milieu is, in fact, an entirely male space or, more importantly, one of male domination, in which women are restricted to the home and cannot navigate, let alone leave, the clearly defined space of the men at their own volition, as evidenced by both the aforementioned quote from the preface and the complete absence of female interview partners following it. It is the interviewers claim that *Kanak Sprak* is solely made up of interviews with male protagonists, because, even after his penetration of the male milieu, the women were kept out of his, the relative outsider's, reach: powerless, domesticated and effectively muted by the men.

This explanation inevitably raises the question of how, according to the interviewer/narrator, the protocols of *Koppstoff* came to be three years later. In the preface to this text now, the same interviewer contends that, following the popularity of *Kanak Sprak* and the novel *Abschaum* (1997), also presented by its narrator as an authentic biographical account (see Hüttmann 2000), women now actively demanded "die weibliche Sichtweise" (KO 9). The fact that the female protocols were a result of the alleged initiative of young Turkish women themselves, regardless of the claim that the interviewer supposedly had the "Vorsatz, diesen »männlichen« Positionsprotokollen ein Buch mit »weiblichen« Statements folgen zu lassen" (ibid.), constitutes an immediate contradiction of the image of a categorical non-agency of women in the preface to *Kanak Sprak*. Instead of being confined to the domestic space, here women navigate public spaces freely and confidently, they attend readings, travel the country and assertively contact the interviewer's publisher to demand that their voices be heard (KO 9).

An additional difference in the depiction of the male and female interviewees in the context of the two prefaces can be identified in their collective characterization – or absence thereof. In the preface to *Kanak Sprak*, the interviewer purports a number of unifying traits and customs that define the milieu of his male interview partners as a whole.

Die reiche Gebärdensprache des Kanaken geht dabei von einer Grundpose aus, der sogenannten »Ankerstellung«: Die weit ausholenden Arme, das geerdete linke Standbein und das mit der Schuhspitze scharrende rechte Spielbein bedeuten dem Gegenüber, daß der Kanake in diesem Augenblick auf eine rege Unterhaltung großen Wert legt. (KS 13)

Despite the obviously satirical use of what is perhaps best described as zoological jargon – a prime example for another means of the subversive play with stereotypes in the text and doubtlessly a parody of the kind of ethnological attitude which even many well-meaning members of the German mainstream adopt towards anything ‘foreign’ –, it remains noteworthy that this passage has no equivalent in the much shorter preface to *Koppstoff*. Here, there is no overarching definition of a collective of women – neither satirical nor otherwise. Rather, the colportage of the many different ways in which the female interviewees insist on telling their stories, like the diverse spaces in which they approach the interviewer to do so, suggests that, in contrast to the men, there is no such thing as an exemplary ‘Kanaka’.

An examination of the interviews contained in *Kanak Sprak* themselves reveals that the clearly delimited male milieu that was established in the preface can be found here as well. Virtually all of the interviewed men are consistent with the previously invoked stereotype of the ‘Kanake’, with regard to both the physical and the social spaces they inhabit.<sup>3</sup> The interviewees are introduced as rappers, junkies, unemployed and other similarly marginalized types. The evident leitmotif is their social ostracization: the fact that ‘Kanaken’ reside exclusively at the margins of the hegemonic bourgeois German society, if not entirely outside it. The borders are clearly drawn and cannot be traversed from either side. The male ‘Kanake’ is shown as performing an act of self-confinement – part necessity, part defiance – and, in the same motion, confining the female ‘Kanaka’ in a kind of sub-milieu within this male space from which there is supposedly no escape.<sup>4</sup> And while there are still various types of ‘Kanaken’ in this alternative society, of whom some even seem utterly incompatible with each other, they are all united in their assertive dissociation from the seemingly homogeneous German mainstream.<sup>5</sup>

In contrast, the interviews presented in *Koppstoff*, like the book’s preface, break with the clichés of both the clear-cut confinement to the margins of society and the role of ‘Kanak’ women as twice-restrained captives within a male-dominated milieu. Not only do women inhabit spaces which, in *Kanak Sprak*, were portrayed to be exclusive to men;<sup>6</sup> it appears like none of the previously invoked borders apply to them at all, but that they can rather move freely both within the limited male milieu and within mainstream society. Most notably, none of the interviewed women are restricted to domestic life which, in the preface to *Kanak Sprak*, was portrayed as their sole domain.<sup>7</sup> Instead, on the whole, they are shown to traverse various physical and social spaces and, in doing so,

prove to be considerably more mobile than the men, the vast majority of whom never leave their 'habitat' at the margins.<sup>8</sup>

The "inbetween' spaces" (Bhabha 1994: 1) that Homi Bhabha identifies as the location of post-migrant existence, which in the case of Zaimoğlu's 'Kanaken' are the result of a double exclusion from the German as well as the traditional Turkish collectives, are male spaces also in thus far as they serve as the location in which a specifically masculine identity building occurs. The 'Kanak' men have made themselves at home in their 'homelessness' and try to re-construct their identities in an act of aggressive distancing from both communities (KS 13-14), rather than demanding their integration into them. Instead of continuously defending themselves against external definitions, Zaimoğlu's 'Kanaken' utilize them, naming and defining themselves in an act of defiant re-appropriation, a conscious misquoting of German 'hate speech' "against its original purposes and [thus] perform a reversal of [its] effects" (Butler 14).

The possibility for a speech act to resignify a prior context depends, in part, upon the gap between the originating context or intention by which an utterance is animated and the effect it produces. For the threat, for instance, to have a future it never intended, for it to be returned to its speaker in a different form, and defused through that return, the meanings the speech act acquires and the effects it performs must exceed those by which it was intended, and the contexts it assumes must not be quite the same as the ones in which it originates [...]. (ibid.)

It is through such deviant citation that Zaimoğlu's 'Kanaken' create for themselves the space which becomes their milieu, a place originally conditioned by their exclusion from the hegemonic German community, but determined by their own rules, filled with their own language, in which they form their own alternative society.

The difference to the female interviewees lies in the fact that there is no unified approach to dealing with the same racially motivated exclusion, which the women most certainly experience as well (KO 34-35). However, the women in Koppstoff do not inhabit the same interstice as the men in Kanak Sprak, nor do they rely on a similar construction as a means of negotiating their individual identities. Their reactions to discriminatory external definitions are varied and arguably

more subversive, since, as Manuela Günter observes, the collective strategy of the men always still subconsciously relies on a certain amount of stereotypes in itself (see Günter 26).

That is not to say that there are no unifying aspects to the 'female' approach. Their exclusion from pre-existing collectives, in their case based not only on race but also on gender, can still be identified as the universal starting point for their self-definition. As Frauke Matthes puts it, they are "all united in the struggle against cultural hegemony" (22). However, the routes they take from this common point of departure are considerably more diverse than in the case of the men. Whereas the latter positively appropriate and resignify the stereotypes produced by mainstream discourses and thus do not break categorically with the inherent practice of such discourses of "reducing all Otherness to a single signifier" (Adelson 1990: 384), the former effectively escape this vicious ideological circle entirely by pursuing singular paths. They represent no 'female' milieu, no 'Kanakan' collective, but rather a free association of individuals. In this way, *Koppstoff* avoids the risk of evoking a hybrid collective identity which is ultimately "just as exclusive and static as the German national identity was exposed as being" (Minnaard 5).

This individualism is apparent throughout the text with the female interviewees being portrayed as much more multi-faceted than their male counterparts.<sup>9</sup> Not only are they more flexible in their movements through physical and social spaces on the whole, but, while the men mostly represent specific types, the descriptions of the women's personalities are highly differentiated. The "Verkäuferin in einer Edelboutique", for instance, is at the same time fascinated with a "Slipdress mit Spaghettiträgern" (KO 20) and an avid reader of Ernst Jünger (KO 22). Generally speaking, the degree of intellectualism is much higher among the women. While there are only two interviewees in *Kanakan Sprak* inhabiting positions of academic or 'high-brow' creative acclaim, *Koppstoff* features an array of students, teachers, academics, artists and professionals. The women are thus not only physically, but evidently also socially more mobile than the men, with associations to a variety of backgrounds and subscriptions to diverse philosophies.

The impression of a heightened 'feminine' mobility is, however, not only realized in the construction and subversion of physical and social borders, but in gender-specific linguistic differences as well. Like space, language serves as a key component in the subversive strategies employed by both the male and the female interview partners. While the interviewer makes no secret of having (re-)constructed the actual

wording of the individual protocols (KS 18), it nonetheless figures prominently as a means of dissociation as well as association, in both socio-cultural and gender terms, within the context of the protocols' fictional logic: "Wider die Zuweisungen von Identität bestimmt die hybride Kunstsprache der Kanak Sprak die 'Kanaken-Existenz' als Präsenz" (Röttger 292). The interviewer himself describes the artificial 'Kanak Sprak' as an "Untergrund-Kodex" (KS 13) making use of "geheime Codes und Zeichen" (ibid.) in order to serve as a unique communicative tool for the marginalized speakers. It is in itself product and representation of their fundamental in-betweenness, which the interviewer acknowledges by stating that the "Kanake spricht seine Muttersprache nur fehlerhaft, auch das »Alemannisch« ist ihm nur bedingt geläufig" (ibid.). It is the resulting linguistic amalgam which creates the 'Kanake', as it positions him, more than any ethnic categorization, between the German and the Turkish mainstream, while at the same time not allowing him an ultimate association with either. This specific function, however, only applies to the male interviewees. 'Kanak Sprak' is universal only in a gendered perspective. The question is therefore whether there is a specific 'female' equivalent – a Kanaka Sprak, as the subtitle of *Koppstoff* implies – or whether the linguistic strategies of the women work differently altogether.

At first glance, the language of many of the female interviewees appears to bear distinct similarities to that of the men in so far as their monologues frequently consist of a seemingly unmediated word-flow made up of a "herausgepreßten, kurzatmigen und hybriden Gestammel ohne Punkt und Komma, mit willkürlich gesetzten Pausen und improvisierten Wendungen" (KS 13).

Und bis dahin: n Outfit und ne Meinung darüber, Film und  
Platte und Buch, und n Statement darüber, und Fickpint  
und Fickpussi, und Männerfrust und Weiberhaß darüber.  
(KO 17)

But even the women who employ this mode of speaking do not do it to the same extent as the men. Although their sentences are composed of improvised vocabulary and unorthodox syntax, on the whole they seem less elliptical and more structured. Overall, it can be observed that the interviews in *Koppstoff* consist of a far greater linguistic diversity than those in *Kanak Sprak*. Between the rapper, whose diction and communicative habitus are most similar to that of the majority of male interviewees, and the German teacher, who speaks 'regular' German

with an 'ordinary' syntactic structure, there are various degrees of hybridity in the way the women speak. No universal form of communication appears to exist between the individual women and while some of them could potentially form associations on the basis of language, for them it does not seem to function as the same rigid tool of dissociation from the mainstream cultures surrounding them which it is for the male interviewees.

Such a conclusion, however, would fail to take into account the correlation between spatial mobility and linguistic mobility, which manifests itself in the linguistic individualism of the women. The apparent lack of a collective vernacular is less a break with the original characterization of 'Kanak Sprak' but, rather, the logical continuation of the previously emphasized differences in the constructions of gender between the first and the second set of protocols. There is a clear break that can be observed between the two texts, but, as stated above, this is manifested mainly in the fact that the women of *Koppstoff* occupy more diverse spaces – physically as well as socially – than their male counterparts in *Kanak Sprak* do, that they are more freely traversing the manifold borders identified by or, rather, for the men. It is therefore only a logical consequence that this spatial mobility in turn results in a greater linguistic variety. The women are excluded not only from German and Turkish mainstream cultures in the way the men are, but they are mostly also barred from participating in the collective milieu established by the men and this absence of spatial and social collectiveness engenders the lack of a collective language, creating a much more distinct impression of a discontinuity of individual voices than that which Julia Abel already sees realized in *Kanak Sprak* (Abel 2006). In this way, the 'female' linguistic diversity can be interpreted as emancipative in itself, in so far as it transcends the limits of a prescribed hybridity of conflicting stereotypes, as opposed to harnessing it as a means of identity formation. Or, as Kristin Dickinson, Robin Ellis and Priscilla D. Layne put it in a recent article, "*Koppstoff*, which includes much more diverse registers [...], may more successfully resist oversimplified conceptions of a unified community of Turkish women" (7).

The gendered differences in the realm of language also manifest themselves on another level. A key component of the subversiveness of the male 'Kanak Sprak' is aggression. The interviewed men express unabated violence by means of a terminology which refers largely to the body, both their own – individually and collectively – and those of the members of the communities that exclude them, adding another level of

---



meaning to what has previously been described as the “lustvolle Körpersprache” (Bodenburg 135) of the ‘Kanakén’.

[...]unser schweiß ist nigger, unser leben ist nigger, die goldketten sind nigger, unsere zinken und unsere fressen und unser eigner stil ist so verdammt nigger, daß wir wie blöde an unsrer haut kratzen, und dabei kapieren wir, daß zum nigger nicht die olle pechhaut gehört, aber zum nigger gehört ne ganze menge anderssein und andres leben. [...] was auch immer du anstellen magst, den fremdländer kannst du nimmer aus der fresse wischen.  
(KS 25-26)

The above passage is an example of the auto-aggressive force which pervades the male ‘Kanak Sprak’. On the other hand, linguistic attacks against those outside their own milieu, the ‘Alemannen’ and the assimilated Turks, are often defined by parodies and caricatures of hyperbolized mainstream customs and characteristics and frequently make use of a derogatory imagery, invoking mainly animal metaphors in order to ridicule.

Nem schlappohr kannst du schlecht beibiegen, daß er man bitteschön die lauscher aufstellen mag, der hat doch zeitlebens nur hirnfauls hundeleben satt geübt, er bleibt’n zotteliger hausdackel, und wenn du so ner kreatur die olle leine abnimmst, fängt die an zu winseln.  
(KS 20)

This correlation of language and the body can here once more be seen as both a representation and an inversion of Judith Butler’s concept of “hate speech”, which denotes, as Manuela Günter puts it, the “diskriminierende rassistische Diskurs [whose power lies] in der Beschaffenheit des Sprechens als körperliche Handlung” (Günter 19). While many scholars have acknowledged the fundamental performativity of Zaimoğlu’s ‘Kanak Sprak’ (see Günter 1999; Minnaard 2003; Bodenburg 2006; Matthes 2007), few have commented on the fact that it is not merely a means of defense, in the sense of the positive re-appropriation of originally hurtful terms like ‘Kanake’. It is also, in the same mood as the initial ‘hate speech’, an attack in its own right, namely on those to blame for the speakers’ marginalization, those who, by classifying them as Other, made them into ‘Kanakén’ in the first place.

Compared to that of the men, the language of the women in *Koppstoff* at first glance seems to contain a considerably lesser potential for violence. Even the monologues of those female interviewees who are closest to the vernacular of the men comprise a much less vulgar vocabulary and a distinctly more reserved form of aggressive ‘hate speech’ attacks. That, however, can by no means be taken to suggest that the subversive potential in the language of the women should be seen as inferior to that of the men. In the ‘female’ interviews, defiance manifests itself more in that which is expressed than through the expression itself. Much more than those in *Kanak Sprak*, in which the men mainly produce universal tirades against entire cultures, the protocols in *Koppstoff* usually have much more concrete addressees.

Was ich rede, Meister, das ist nicht reden gegen  
irgendwas, gegen ne ganz bestimmte Adresse isses, [...] gegen das Liberalultramild, gegen sein Schickimicki, sein Jet-set, gegen sosyete-bebe, gegen sein Kopfzerbrechen, wie er den Mohr vom letzten Dreck waschen kann [...].  
(KO 11)

Although the female rapper quoted here represents the one interview that is closest to those of the men in terms of diction and syntax, her choice of words can arguably be said to evoke less aggression than some of the examples from *Kanak Sprak* above, seeing as it does not contain any symbolic corporeal attacks. However, through the much greater focus, the clearer sense of direction of her complaint, her speech act achieves a level of agency that none of the men ever reach. While their monologues more often than not seem more like general musings on exclusion and identity, the women actually raise an expectancy of subversive acts beyond the spoken word and their deliberations can be taken “als Ausdruck der Aporie einer Avantgarde ohne Utopie” (Tuschick 113). Even those protocols in *Koppstoff* that are composed mainly of ‘ordinary’ German and employ none of the immediate linguistic force of the men’s ‘hate speech’ can, in this way, produce a higher level of aggression and a greater threat of action than the crassest male flood of words.

Ja, die Bastarde kommen, aber nicht mit [...] tränenreicher »In der Fremde«-Literatur und schlechtem Rap [...], wie’s der Deutsche gern hätt, wenn überhaupt, sondern mit Qualität, erlernter preußischer Disziplin,

---

---

angeborenem Feuer unterm Arsch, mitgebrachtem  
Kulturkoffer, nicht loszuwerdender Sentimentalität und  
erworbener Widerstandsfähigkeit, denn was nicht tötet,  
härtet angeblich ab, und es hat uns nicht umgebracht.  
(KO 61)

The threat that speaks out of these examples is the specific product of the linguistic diversity of the women of *Koppstoff*, in contrast to the relative uniformity of the male ‘Kanak Sprak’, which counteracts the “reduction of these narratives to a static notion of Muslim culture” (Weber 28). This diversity represents the linguistic equivalent of the physical and social mobility discussed above, an aspect which is particularly noteworthy in the light of Spivak’s contention that, historically, women could subvert their twofold subalternation through action alone, since, much like in Kanak Sprak, “the subaltern as female cannot be heard or read” (Spivak 104). Conversely, femininity in *Koppstoff* is tied directly to a specific freedom of movement within space and language, which effectively undermines both intra- and intercultural restraints of external definitions.

This subversive potential, however, is not limited to the immediate inner logic of these two texts. In fact, the relative obviousness of the breaks and contradictions within and especially between *Kanak Sprak* and *Koppstoff* constitute a play with authenticity that is subversive in its own right. Several critics have acknowledged a connection to Bakhtin in the dialogical construction of the texts (Günter 1999). At the same time, what Zaimoğlu is staging here is nothing short of a postcolonial carnival.

When asked in an interview with Patricia Persch in 2004 about the authenticity of the interviews and protagonists of *Kanak Sprak* and *Koppstoff*, he contended:

“Ich habe keinen Hehl darum gemacht, dass mich die Realität anödet und dass dieses Material, das ich darlege, sich verabschiedet hat, sich in Unterschied setzt zu dem, was man in der Wirklichkeit vorfindet. Das wirkliche Leben wollte ich nicht zeigen. Und ich wollte auf der Bühne tatsächlich nur unterhalten und zur Unterhaltung gehört, dass man sich auch als eine eindeutige Figur anbietet.“ (Persch 88)

---

There are two noteworthy contradictions in this short statement. For one, the confession that the material has no necessary correlation to reality stands in crass opposition not only to the prefaces of both texts and their explicit predication of authenticity but also to contrary statements in the very same interview. More important, however, is the exhibited rationale that the public demands stereotypes. And, at first glance, that is precisely what Zaimoğlu delivers: Typified 'Kanaken' as representatives of a clear-cut category in contrast to which the German mainstream can define itself, and which it can admire at the same time. Analogous to Bakhtin's notion of carnival, however, these embodied stereotypes are pervaded by an awareness of their fundamental Otherness; an awareness that, even in the eyes of most German multiculturalists, they have a strictly predetermined role to play, that their rebellious antics primarily serve the purpose of "Unterhaltung". The manifold contradictions in *Kanak Sprak* and *Koppstoffs*, especially in the construction of gender in both texts, represent a productively subversive utilization of this awareness by not only ridiculing the very stereotypes they reproduce, but by formulating the subtle threat that any radical deconstruction of hegemonic ideologies contains: that of their ultimate nullification.

*University of British Columbia, Vancouver*

---

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> *Kanak Sprak* and *Koppstoffs* will hereafter be cited as KS and KO, respectively.

<sup>2</sup> Some critics accept both *Kanak Sprak* and *Koppstoffs* as authentic, merely translated, interview protocols, as maintained by Zaimoğlu to this day (see Persch 2004). However, certain aspects of the texts, including the contradictory elements at the center of the examination at hand, as well as several inconsistencies in statements made by the author himself, give cause to question this proposition and to understand Zaimoğlu's works rather as "the invention of a pseudo-ethnicity [...] which disrupts the state-sanctioned dialogue between 'Germans' and 'Turks' (Cheesman 83). To pursue this question in its entirety, however, would exceed the scope of this paper.

<sup>3</sup> The only two exceptions are the "Soziologe" (KS 100-103) and the "Dichter" (KS 108-114).

<sup>4</sup> That this type of gender hierarchy is still rather common, especially in first-generation Muslim immigrant families, and by no means merely "a product of white male patriarchy" (27), as Frauke Matthes claims in recourse to bell hooks, can be seen as another play with authenticity on the author's part.

<sup>5</sup> The homophobic "Packer" (KS 43-48) and the "Transsexuelle" (KS 34-38) are the prime examples for such an incompatibility.

<sup>6</sup> Examples are the "Rapperin" (KO 11-15) and the "Prostituierte" (KO 111-113).

---

- <sup>7</sup> The interviewer meets his female interview partners in night clubs (KO 16), at demonstrations (KO 29), or at conferences (KO 62).
- <sup>8</sup> The women's professions are diverse, ranging from "Putzfrau" (KO 121-124) to "Studentin" (KO 16-19) and "Künstlerin" (KO 32-35); there is only one "Arbeitslose" (KO 131-135).
- <sup>9</sup> This is already evident in the fact that each 'female' interview is introduced with additional information elaborating on the context in which each interview took place. Conversely, the men appear to actually all inhabit the same space, making a similar commentary unnecessary.

---

## Works cited

---

- Abel, Julia. "Konstruktionen 'authentischer' Stimmen : zum Verhältnis von 'Stimme' und Identität in Feridun Zaimoğlu's 'Kanak Sprak'." *Stimme(n) im Text: Narratologische Positionsbestimmungen*. Eds. Andreas Bloßdorn, Daniela Langer and Michael Scheffel. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter, 2006. 297-320.
- Adelson, Leslie A. "Migrants' Literature Or German Literature? Torkan's 'Tufan: Brief an Einen Islamischen Bruder'." *German Quarterly* 63.3-4 (1990): 382-9.
- . "Touching Tales of Turks, Germans, and Jews: Cultural Alterity, Historical Narrative, and Literary Riddles for the 1990s." *New German Critique* 80 (2000): 93-124.
- Bodenburg, Julia. "Kanaken und andere Schauspieler: Performative Identitäten bei Feridun Zaimoğlu und Yadé Kara." *Voix étrangères en langue allemande*. Ed. Alfred Strasser. Villeneuve d'Ascq : Université Charles de Gaulle-Lille 3, 2006. 129-140.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London/New York: Routledge, 1994.
- Butler, Judith. *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Cheesman, Tom. "Talking 'Kanak': Zaimoğlu contra Leitkultur." *New German critique* 92 (2004): 82-99.
- Dickinson, Kristin, Robin Ellis, and Priscilla D. Layne. "Translating Communities: Rethinking the Collective in Feridun Zaimoğlu's 'Koppstoff'." *Transit* 4.1 (2008): 1-33.
- Günter, Manuela. "Wir sind bastarde, freund ...: Feridun Zaimoğlu's Kanak Sprak und die performative Struktur von Identität." *Sprache und Literatur* 30.1 (1999): 15-28.
- Hüttmann, Oliver. "Ich Bin Nicht Die Stiftung 'Türken-Warentest': Interview Mit Feridun Zaimoğlu." *Spiegel Online* 15 November 2000: <http://www.spiegel.de/kultur/kino/0,1518,102818,00.html>. 4 Dec 2008.
- Keck, Annette. "Pop is ne fatale Orgie': Zu Konstruktion und Produktivität der Figur des 'Kanaken' in Gegenwartsliteratur und Populärkultur." *Peter-Weiss-Jahrbuch für Literatur, Kunst und Politik im 20. und 21. Jahrhundert* 16 (2007): 103-118.
- Matthes, Frauke. "'Was deutsch ist, bestimmen wir': Definitions of (Turkish-)Germanness in Feridun Zaimoğlu's 'Kanak Sprak' and 'Koppstoff'." *Focus on German Studies* 14 (2007): 19-35.
- Minnaard, Liesbeth. "Playing Kanak Identity: Feridun Zaimoğlu's Rebellious Performances." *Trans: Internet-Zeitschrift für Kulturwissenschaften* 15 (2003).
- Persch, Patricia. "Identität ist Tofu für Lemminge': Interview mit dem Kieler Schriftsteller Feridun Zaimoğlu." *Der Deutschunterricht* 56.5 (2004): 87-89.
- Röttger, Kati. "Kanake sein oder Kanake sagen?: Die Entscheidungs-Gewalt von Sprache in der Inszenierung des Anderen und des Selbst." *Theater als Paradigma der Moderne?* Ed. Christopher Balme, et al. Tübingen: Francke, 2003. 289-299.
-

- Rutherford, Jonathan. "The Third Space: Interview with Homi K. Bhabha." *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*. Ed. Jonathan Rutherford. London : Lawrence & Wishart, 1990. 207-221.
- Spivak, Gayatri C. "Can the Subaltern Speak?" (1988). *Colonial Discourse and Postcolonial Theory: A Reader*. Ed. Patrick Williams and Laura Chrisman. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994. 66-111.
- Tuschick, Jamal. "Bruder, du bist meine Stimme": Feridun Zaimoğlu, Kombattant im Kulturkampf." *Aufgerissen: Zur Literatur der 90er*. Ed. Thomas Kraft. München: Piper, 2000. 105-116.
- Weber, Beverly M. "Beyond the Culture Trap: Immigrant Women in Germany, Planet-Talk, and a Politics of Listening." *Women in German Yearbook: Feminist Studies in German Literature and Culture* 21 (2005): 16-38.
- Zaimoğlu, Feridun. *Kanak Sprak: 24 Mißstöne vom Rande der Gesellschaft*. Hamburg: Rotbuch, 1995.
- . *Koppstoff: Kanaka Sprak vom Rande der Gesellschaft*. Hamburg: Rotbuch, 1998.

