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American Studies as Interdisciplinary Area Studies

I. Introduction

It might be a cliche to bemoan the crisis of a field. The jeremiad is certainly a genre familiar to academics and to scholars in American Studies in particular. Research fields are contested, researchers compete with one another on funds and visibility, while methodological perspectives and normative horizons diverge. It is hardly surprising, under these conditions, that disagreement over a field’s direction breeds contention and proposals for reform and rejuvenation. In that sense, the recurring question of whether a given field has gone astray arises from an internal tension that may provide little cause for concern.¹

American Studies is a field in crisis, but these introspective quarrels are not what I am referring to. While this type of interrogation and potential rupture can be healthy and productive—and is very much part of the research process—my essay addresses a more fundamental predicament. This dilemma has no generative surplus value but is slowly hollowing out the field. It is a crisis more general to American Studies as a transnational research tradition, which I examine by looking in more detail at the specific case of American Studies in Germany. While this impasse has much to do with institutional shifts outside the field, its essence lies in decisions taken within it. My argument implies an agenda for cooperation across disciplinary divides that clearly transcends the specific case of American Studies in Germany. Ultimately, I contend that American Studies needs to be reinvented as interdisciplinary area studies in order to address the challenges it faces.

Interdisciplinarity, as the collaboration of scholars across disciplines from the humanities and the social sciences, has been a guiding principle of American Studies in Germany from the outset. A wide range of institutions have dedicated their research and teaching to the interdisciplinary analysis of US society since the first half of the twentieth century—at least nominally. Today, it is difficult to find an American Studies department in Germany that

¹ I would like to thank Curd Knüpfer, Frank Kelleter and Alexander Starre for their very helpful comments on earlier versions of this essay.
does not emphasize that its work transcends disciplinary traditions. However, upon closer inspection interdisciplinary work in American Studies too often remains but a lip service to earlier (sometimes problematic) ideals. Distinct vocabularies and research traditions as well as administrative path dependencies and extra-academic pressures seem to thwart much fruitful collaboration between researchers from different disciplines in the humanities and the social sciences.

This failure to realize the full potential of interdisciplinary research and teaching in American Studies threatens to compromise the importance of the field. In turn, a re-thinking of interdisciplinarity is part of the answer for its potential invigoration. As I contend in this essay, the crisis of German American Studies is not a sudden rupture but the result of a slow decline that, since the turn of the twenty-first century, has been precipitated by three factors: (1) the drying up of its funding sources, (2) changes in the German university system, and (3) the assumed unbundling of the field’s traditional research subject. All of these factors are more or less immediately linked to a lack of truly interdisciplinary work—and can be addressed by bridging the field’s disciplinary rifts. I suggest that German American Studies can be reanimated by rethinking the analytical, disciplinary, and strategic orientation of the field.

As such, this essay holds broader implications for new collaborations between fields and disciplines. The questions raised here also contribute to wider debates about the need for new forms of knowledge and about the role of academia in society at a moment when nationalism is again on the rise and Western democracies seem frail. Countering widespread tendencies of fragmentation and social splintering, interdisciplinary area studies can help reverse the trend of universities becoming increasingly focused on individualized vocational training and instead articulate questions pertaining to the greater public good.2

II. The Crisis of American Studies in Germany

Funding problems
Although the purpose of the field in its German pre-1945 beginnings might have been highly questionable—American Studies was used as a geopolitical tool and resonated with the political objectives of the Nazi state (Gassert, "Political Reconnaissance" 43-44)—funding was not a problem. Aimed at procuring essential geopolitical knowledge for decision-makers, the analysis

2 While this theme cannot be fully explored in this short essay, Wendy Brown’s excellent monograph Undoing the Demos (2015) tackles the central questions pertaining to the rise of a neoliberal governing rationality in different social fields including the education system and the functioning of democracies.
of US society was decidedly interdisciplinary, integrating philology with social sciences. Work cut across disciplinary divisions, because it sought to provide a strategic image of the enemy. This explains why the literary scholar and Americanist Friedrich Schönemann also analyzed US economic policy, culture, and society.3 State support for this research was a function of its perceived relevance.

Funding flows remained steady after the end of the war, although the sources of revenue changed. In the Cold War, American Studies in Germany was financed in large part by American donors such as the Rockefeller Foundation and the Ford Foundation (Jahr). These efforts were one aspect of the larger soft-power strategies of the US government to win the battle over ideologies as one of the two remaining superpowers (Saunders). Also, they complemented reeducation efforts and the reorientation of political science after 1945, which examined the US as a beacon of democracy. This explains in part why many early Americanists were political scientists (Dreyer). American Studies served as a means to educate the West-German population about the values of liberty and freedom, while at the same time creating forums of exchange, allowing US policy-makers to attain a clear picture of changing attitudes in German academia. Teacher education, closely bound to American Studies in the German university context, became one important channel through which notions of American exceptionalism could trickle down to the German population.4

If American Studies did not face serious funding problems until the end of the Cold War for these geostrategic reasons, the fall of the Berlin wall meant the end of such rationales. The shift of political interests from the transatlantic to the transpacific and the weakening of US-European alliances during the 2000s were paralleled by the defunding of American Studies-related programs. The closing of Amerika-Häuser and the thirty-million-dollar budget cuts to the Fulbright program proposed in 2014—if ultimately not carried through—, as well as the slashing of the “Understanding Canada” program in 2012 reflect only the latest bout of disinvestment. The question of funding, in short, has always been intricately linked to the importance attributed to the field from the outside. The ideological reasons for funding American Studies during the periods of the World War and the Cold War might have differed starkly, but regardless of political objectives the field

3 This holistic approach was so generally acknowledged that it was also used by those not directly coopted by the state. Even economists such as Moritz Julius Bonn, himself a critic of the national socialists, engaged an interdisciplinary view of the United States that did not decouple political and economic from cultural analysis, for example in his study Die Kultur der Vereinigten Staaten von Amerika (1930).

4 In East Germany, by contrast, the ideological tensions with Marxist ideologies and university administrations led to the limitation of American Studies to research on nineteenth- and twentieth-century literature and a shifting perspective focusing on its proletarian traditions (Schnoor 229).
was deemed pivotal in either case. The latest cuts indicate that North Ameri­
can and European decision-makers no longer seem to regard American
Studies as geostrategically important—and that American Studies scholars
are no longer successfully trying to make that case.

University restructuring and deepening divides
A second crisis dynamic that aggravates the drying up of external funding
sources and that also appears to be external to the field is a fundamental
transition in the German university system. The Bologna reforms are just one
symptom of a much more radical rethinking of the social use of higher educa­
tion that has been under way over the past three decades. That shift is not
just one of quantification and mathematization, as one might assume at first
glance, but its causes run deeper.

During the Cold War, institutions of higher education were viewed by
North Atlantic states as essential elements of universal social citizenship
rights. These institutions were supposed to instill citizenship values and pro­
vide social cohesion.5 What we witness in contrast to that broader mission of
higher education is the loss of the university’s public good character over the
course of the past decades and the reinterpretation of university degrees, in­
stead, as positional goods (Calhoun, “University”). This is true for the US as
much as for the European education system and couples with the ideology
of austerity politics and its emphasis on individual achievement and
responsibility (Blyth). The university has increasingly become an institution
designed to provide its graduates with vocational skills and institutional pres­
tige. As such, curricula have shifted from broader goals (general knowledge,
critical thinking, etc.) to applicability and usability. The quantification
of knowledge and the reorientation toward the hard sciences is just an expres­
sion of these underlying shifts in the expectations societies in North Atlantic
states seem to hold vis-à-vis their university systems.

The split provoked by this realignment between the social sciences and
the humanities—and between more quantitative and more qualitative ap­
proaches within the individual disciplines—threatens American Studies. It
has stoked animosities between the disciplines, with scholars who use more
qualitative approaches resenting purportedly ‘harder’ disciplines and seeing

5 Even as central a thinker of neoliberalism as Milton Friedman acknowledged that
education can incur positive externalities which yield social benefits beyond private
returns (98-107). The relation between private and social benefits from education is
usually seen to differ along the distinction between lower and higher education. In
primary and secondary education social benefits, such as the promotion of social
cohesion, are generally accepted among economists to be of more importance than
private ones. As, in higher education, private benefits tend to be seen in economics
text books as relatively more important, a lower level of public funding seems justified
from this perspective. But the line between the two is blurred and differs according to
historical and national contexts. For extended arguments on education as potential
market failures see PüscheI and Vormann as well as Vormann, “Three Blind Men.”
their approaches and methodologies on the defense (Ickstadt). In this paradigm shift toward the quantifiable, method has become more important than argument. Positivist understandings of science have become the dominant way of carrying out legitimate research in many of the social sciences, while research in the humanities often seems to overemphasize discourse and to downplay political and economic logics and institutions.

These specializing tendencies and rationalizations have served as a divide-and-conquer mechanism through which interdisciplinary fields such as American Studies have gradually been fragmented and dissolved (often with little resistance from those remaining). Consequently, American Studies today consists mostly of literary studies and cultural studies. All social science research in the field is considered a nice-to-have, but by no means an essential aspect of the field of American Studies. Recruitment strategies in the individual disciplines have exacerbated this situation, making interdisciplinary mobility for scholars from different disciplines within the field of American Studies nearly impossible. Formal requirements are based on disciplinary structures, not oriented toward the logics of the field.

These, I think, are the central reason why the defunding of American Studies programs and the commodification of the university look like external limitations, while in effect they are not. To anticipate an important aspect of my conclusion: If interdisciplinarity were taken at face value in American Studies, divide-and-conquer mechanisms along the fault lines of disciplinary specializations would be less feasible and the field would gain legitimacy even in the post-Cold War twenty-first century. In other words, actors in the field do have a choice, as inexorable and external as these certainly forceful dynamics might seem. But researchers in the field need to reassert a common research subject.

Whatever happened to the research subject?

In the slow decline of American Studies, content has not been divorced from form. The changing research subject has provoked a third crisis dimension. In the US, American Studies, from its inception in the 1930s, has been intricately linked to the US national project—and has had difficulties separating itself from it ever since. The notion that the United States were an exceptional society was one of the tenets of the field’s founders, equipping researchers on both sides of the Atlantic with a common ground and an overarching “horizon of intelligibility” (Pease, “Exceptionalism” 108).

After World War II, American Studies scholars envisaged the United States as a role model of liberalism and social progress for the rest of the world, providing a sharp contrast to Europe’s history of class-conflict and warfare. The notion of a “New World,” where the social and political struggles of Europe seemed to be a relic of the past, served as a historiographical leitmotif that appeared as a promising alternative to socialism, and that
begged academic interrogation (Vormann, "Who Needs"). Throughout the Cold War this transatlantic tension bolstered American Studies, providing researchers with a legitimate cause—and American Studies in Germany with the requisite funding and support (Jahr). The United States seemed exceptional and worth emulating.

However, this idea of exceptionalism has increasingly come under attack after the Cold War. For one, scholars have argued that American exceptionalism is simply another form of nationalism: While the case of the US might be unique in its specific historical development, or so the argument goes, notions of superiority were misguided and very much strategies of national self-aggrandizement. Questioning American exceptionalism in this way was certainly an important step toward emancipation from the research subject. But arguably, it has put the field on a trajectory that might have taken deconstruction too far. Even if on a theoretical level this type of critical work on nationalism has been necessary and still is timely, it should not obscure the fact that nations and nation-states still do play an important role in structuring and guiding everyday lives, inter-state politics, and economic exchange.

The dilemma of deconstruction is obvious: If we assume, as many do, that the nation-state is evaporating, and if the field of American Studies was built on an analysis of precisely that entity's uniqueness and superiority, then what else is left for us to investigate? Working from the assumption that we have entered a postnational constellation, some insist that we should shift our view from national entities to transnational processes that cut across increasingly porous borders. Certainly, to relativize, nuance, and complicate the American experience is a path worth following. But as I would like to argue here, the analysis of the political, cultural, and economic dimensions of the United States should not be jettisoned too hastily with it.

Globalization processes do not disintegrate nations and nation-states. Whether we actually live in a postnational era is highly debatable—and we need interdisciplinary area studies more than ever if we want to understand and critique persistent notions of American exceptionalism in the current historical conjuncture. Indeed, the ascent of Donald Trump to power and the rise of structurally similar neo-nationalisms on both sides of the Atlantic give us very tangible reasons to believe that the cosmopolitan impulse that has been a strong driving force behind the transnational turn might have been honorable, but premature and based on wishful thinking.

---

6 See Bender; Kelleter.
7 See Beck; Fishkin; Elliott.
III. Rethinking Interdisciplinary Research

No doubt, interdisciplinarity is one of the most often used misnomers. It is constantly mentioned, but seldom applied. It is a buzzword that has been so overused and misappropriated, not just in American Studies, that it almost seems ludicrous to call for more of it. But there is a quality in interdisciplinary research that is very much worth defending—also because it could help American Studies find a way out of its crisis.

One of the most obvious advantages of interdisciplinarity, which holds true beyond the field of American Studies, is that it is a means to overcome the blind spots and limitations of individual disciplines. But it does more than just create cumulative knowledge. Piling up insights from different disciplines is not the goal. Rather, coming at a subject from multiple perspectives urges us to ask better questions and avoid the pitfalls of overspecialization. An example would be the field of genopolitics in political science which assumes that genes affect political behavior such as voting behavior or voter turnout at an election (e.g. Fowler and Dawes). It is almost certain that an interdisciplinary framework would not have led to this kind of research field. I can hardly imagine a cultural studies scholar who would have accepted the unspoken essentialisms that characterize this type of research.

There are many more reasons why we should care about interdisciplinarity in general. Among them is the need for an educated citizenry that can take informed decisions. Another is the potential for new research at the understudied intersections between research traditions. These broader reasons, of course, also hold in the context of American Studies. In the paragraphs that follow, however, I will point out, more specifically, why American Studies needs to become more interdisciplinary again—and how this return to former ideals paves a way out of its current predicament. My proposals are certainly no silver bullets. But the notion of qualitative interdisciplinarity that I suggest could serve as a starting point that can evolve from one project to an entire program of American Studies. Indeed, from this perspective, the quantitative-qualitative divide itself might be reconsidered as a transdisciplinary problem that could offer (perhaps counter-intuitive) opportunities for interdisciplinary interrogation.

For one, the area focus of American Studies can serve as a tool against the abstract universalizations prevalent in more quantitative and mathematically informed fields. Standing by these tenets and strengths of qualitative research is not a weakness. American Studies helps us to identify, examine, and understand locally distinct variants of structural phenomena, such as divergent globalization patterns, varieties of capitalism, and cultural heterogeneity. It thereby harbors the kernel of an emancipatory politics. It can present a way to argue that the actual does not equal the possible, that things at other times, in other places, can be different and more democratic.
In short, American Studies can serve as an incubator for arguments against notions of complete convergence and mechanical universality. In this scenario, historical and geographical specificity are pivotal, underlining the importance of conducting interdisciplinary area studies in a comparative perspective.

Of course, a call for more interdisciplinarity does not have to be one against disciplinary research. By using the full potential of interdisciplinary work, American Studies can be more than just a set of different perspectives on mostly distinct subjects. American Studies can reclaim its subject from a critical perspective, rather than throwing the baby out with the bath water. If the crisis outlined above is one caused by a lack of geostrategic interest of funding institutions, an academic split within the unraveling public university, and an evaporating research subject, the ways out of the crisis are all linked to a reinvigoration of interdisciplinarity. American Studies can be salvaged and strengthened by restating the research subject—an analytical move—, by bridging divides in the university—a disciplinary move—, and by highlighting its interest and relevance—a strategic move. These strategic alignments hold true for and can be transposed to interdisciplinary area studies more generally.

_The analytical move—rethinking the research field’s constituent subject_

Why is interdisciplinarity in American Studies more than the sum of its parts? Why would we care for it in the first place? And why should we return to a more interdisciplinary approach? For one, from a more interdisciplinary perspective, it quickly becomes clear that the notion of a postnational era—which is regarded by some as one reason for the crisis of American Studies—is somewhat premature. In current debates, scholars are too quick in assuming that the era of the nation is over.8 An interdisciplinary take would contribute much to making this case by extending the perspective to an analysis of institutional arrangements and economic interests that go beyond the discursive dimensions of identity politics.

For instance, there is an established and expanding literature in sociology and political science that discusses the role of the state in processes of globalization.9 These social science perspectives complicate the conflation of nation and nation-state and do not assume a congruous and mono-causal relationship between the two. If one assumed that the nation-state was on the decline, then, that does not mean that we could say the same about the nation as a group of belonging (Calhoun, “Nations Matter”). And even while many scholars agree that the state is changing because of new global interdependences, processes of economic restructuring, changing migration

---

8 I make this argument in more detail elsewhere. See Vormann, “Who Needs American Studies.”

9 See for example Panitch and Gindin as well as Mazzucato. For a systematic overview of the field see Levy, Leibfried, and Nullmeier.
patterns and communication technologies, many of them would also argue that the nation-state does not vanish in the process, but simply changes in shape (Sassen).

To analyze this metamorphosis of state structures and structures of affect would be a promising research objective for interdisciplinary American Studies—and area studies more broadly speaking. While the transnational critique of methodological nationalism is warranted, interdisciplinary work can lead the field out of its cul-de-sac. Of course, this does not imply a return to exceptionalist paradigms of American Studies as they dominated research until recently (Fluck and Pease; Fluck, “American Exceptionalism”). It means to reassess American exceptionalism as one exceptionalism among others. How, then, does the nation-state mobilize affect, political support, and economic resources? What role does the sense of national superiority and uniqueness (still) play in US literature, movies, and inauguration addresses? How do other—Quebecois, Canadian, Mexican, Southern—nationalisms in North America generate group identities? What is their relation to the state and to the other North American nations and nation-state institutions?

Many more ideas for promising strands of research come to mind. What unites them is that the research subject is not dissipating, but simply needs to be analyzed from a more critical, interdisciplinary perspective. American Studies can maintain its multifaceted focus on the United States and Canada, building on existing research and debates, but with a keen awareness of the changing structures of the state and an acute sense of the pitfalls of methodological nationalism.

*The disciplinary move—a cooperative experiment*

Interdisciplinarity is certainly not a panacea. But, in addition to sparking our imagination, it can serve to build a bulwark against the dynamics of fragmentation so prevalent at German universities. The same holds true, of course, for (comparative) area studies in other neoliberalizing academic systems. The most important goal of a reassertion of interdisciplinarity is to reaffirm the value of qualitative research in academic work. On the one hand, this might necessitate interventions in the realm of quantitative research, so as to critique its sometimes reductive understandings of the social, of the political, and of culture on its own turf. Why not engage with and question the assumptions of positivistic sciences head on in a productive debate, rather than lamenting its dominance in circles where everybody agrees? On the other hand, interdisciplinarity would mean to point out the necessity of qualitative humanities and social science research. Sometimes this might entail that we have to render our normative assumptions more explicit. Sometimes it might force us to express our own position in the field—and not to mimic the natural sciences and pretend a Cartesian view from nowhere.
Research is not just an endless relativization then, but also the taking of positions. From this perspective, one could conceive of research as both a craft and an art. There are better or worse ways of doing it. Good research builds on skills we can acquire, but also on our creativity and spontaneity. The notion of useful knowledge that this affirmative stance might evoke is a contentious point—and it is an apple of discord for good reasons: Knowledge needs to surpass direct instrumental needs; it must not be subjugated to the demands of the market or politics if we want to maintain our faith in the emancipatory potentials of the academe.

Still, it has to be publicly relevant. By "useful" I do not mean knowledge that can be valorized in the marketplace. Neither do I refer to knowledge that is directly applicable in any way. Rather, I think that specialization and abstraction can be taken too far. Some debates develop a dynamic of their own, fully detached from any public significance. If this meandering is also a crucial part of research, we should be more careful not to lead zero-stake-debates only for the purpose of articulating niche claims. In that sense, interdisciplinarity provides a reality check against the pitfalls of extreme specialization. Writing and teaching in the interdisciplinary area studies context forces us to express our thoughts and lines of argumentation in a language that is accessible to non-specialists and prevents us from hiding behind unnecessary jargon.

If interdisciplinary area studies does not—and should not—replace disciplinary research, this type of interdisciplinary work does things specialized research cannot do. Qualitative interdisciplinary American Studies fulfils tasks that other disciplines, sets of methods, and fields cannot replace. It tackles questions at the interstices of overly specialized and self-enclosed citation circles. As such, interdisciplinarity undergirds the necessity for American Studies in rapidly changing and specializing university landscapes. American Studies should revisit its foundation as a "cooperative experiment" (kooperativer Versuch)—to use a phrase coined by one of the field’s post-War founders, Arnold Bergstraesser—in order to articulate alternative visions of university research and teaching. Only then can it avoid giving in to dynamics of rationalization and collapsing into splintered monodisciplinarity.

The strategic move—attracting research funds
How can the funds be acquired to revitalize American Studies in such a manner? Strategic action does not necessarily imply selling out. As critical theorists have emphasized in different contexts (e.g. Calhoun “Critical Social Theory”; Brenner), we can seek contradictions and emancipatory possibilities within an existent paradigm on our search for liberating alternatives that point beyond it. The task for American Studies at this juncture is equally to find openings within the present set of epistemic limitations and institutional restraints. This is a move that is distinct from what I have
discussed so far—and a contentious one at that, because it decouples strategy from content and therefore might easily be misconceived as cooptation.

Put bluntly, interdisciplinary subfields within American Studies offer more substantial traction to attract money. American Studies scholars need to outline the social relevance of the field if they want to appeal to sponsors. This endeavor is something else than what I meant by "useful knowledge" above. It is not a question of public relevance in the true sense of the word, but one of branding. Working together across disciplines and making this case on a content-level will be a protection against divide-and-conquer dynamics, because it integrates the different disciplines in a research-centered logic.¹⁰

American Studies needs to present itself as geostrategically important to attract resources from think tanks, private donors, corporations, and the state. The social sciences can contribute to adding this dimension to American Studies, especially because social science research on the US also exists outside the university context and so do funding structures (Thunert). At a point in history when the hegemony of American Empire is increasingly questioned but rests unchallenged, where Germany is the strongest economy of Europe and a pivotal actor in transatlantic relations, it is hardly plausible why American Studies in Germany is underfunded and underequipped. Yet, the case for American Studies and interdisciplinary area studies needs to be made.

One often unacknowledged but central reason for the continued existence of American Studies that goes beyond external branding efforts is teacher education. Even though the literature and culture of the United States are crucial dimensions for students of American Studies, future teachers should also learn about its political system, economic position, and social development in more depth. In other words, a more interdisciplinary stance of American Studies departments that educate teachers could be strategically used not just to maintain, but even to expand their programs. In such a manner, support from the private sector can be matched by actual increases in state funding. At a moment of neo-nationalist tensions and the return of geostrategic Realpolitik, it should be very feasible to formulate the urgency of such priorities in a way that is worthy of private and public support.

IV. Conclusion

If, to this day, interdisciplinary work in American Studies is hailed by most institutions in Germany, there have been few times in its history when this ideal was ever actually realized. The field has oscillated between the two

¹⁰ Although the argument would look different for other area studies, this core principle could of course be transposed.
poles of ad hoc interdisciplinarity and de facto mono-disciplinarity. Conflicts between the disciplines have existed ever since the founding of the field. In the German Association of American Studies (DGfA), apart from the first decade of its existence, literary studies and cultural studies have been the dominant disciplines (Gassert, "American Studies" 116). The crisis of American Studies gives us an opportunity to rethink the relationship between the disciplines.

Interdisciplinarity in the early days of American Studies in Germany was hardly a role model for what its proponents would imagine today. The transdisciplinary approach, always latent and utopian, was given up because it was too reminiscent of Schönemann's pre-1945 beginnings of American Studies. Arnold Bergstraesser was finally able to reconceptualize the field of American Studies as a "cooperative experiment" between the humanities and the social sciences. Given the current tripartite crisis of American Studies, this experiment needs to be engaged more courageously.

Interdisciplinarity is not an end in itself, but a tool. There is no need for even more proposals and applications that stress their interdisciplinarity and do the opposite. As a means to an end, interdisciplinary research can break up rigid institutional structures, arranging and re-arranging interdisciplinary collaborations depending on the concrete research subject. Many such subfields can be created within and across existing institutions. And many such experiments are already taking shape, from Urban American Studies to, more abstractly speaking, Comparative Area Studies. These projects contain the germ of a new American Studies that arises on an altered analytical, disciplinary, and strategic terrain.
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