

Christian G. ALLESCH

Methodological prerequisites for an Interdisciplinary Concept of *Cultural Studies*

Paper presented at the Conference "Cultural and Cross-Cultural Psychology in the Field of Cultural Studies: Theoretical and Methodological Alternatives and Controversies", Institute for Cultural Studies, Essen, Mai 17-19, 2001.

It seems to be unquestioned that cultural studies require an interdisciplinary approach, and I think that this auditory does not need to be convinced about that matter. Therefore, I won't waste time by lengthy arguments but present my points: First: Which disciplines do we actually have in mind when we call for an interdisciplinary approach in cultural studies; second: what exactly does "approach" in this context mean? Third: In what manner can an interdisciplinary approach in cultural studies be enriched by the contribution of psychology, or, more directly: what kind of psychology is needed in an interdisciplinary approach to the field of cultural studies? And last: Is there any chance to find a common methodology which could connect different disciplines such as literary criticism, political science, ethnology and even cultural psychology, to a common scientific project?

When I speak of "cultural studies", I will neither exclusively refer to *cultural studies* in the sense of that Anglo-American paradigm which sprang up in the 50ies and was originally associated with the Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS), nor to *Kulturwissenschaft* in the broader sense of the German tradition. But I think that reflecting the differences between and the common ideas of these concepts may help us to analyse the interdisciplinary status of cultural science at all and the prerequisites of implementing it as an interdisciplinary project.

In his contribution to the volume *The contemporary study of culture*, which documents the contributions of a conference on this topic held in Vienna in 1997, Lawrence GROSSBERG, a leading figure of American *Cultural Studies*, indicated interdisciplinarity to be a central commitment for cultural studies "because understanding 'culture' ... requires looking at culture's relations to everything that is not culture" (Grossberg 1999, 28). Asking further "where, how and how much interdisciplinarity is necessary" he just pleads for "a political and strategic answer", namely that cultural studies as an interdisciplinary project "has to be responsible enough to produce useful knowledge even while it is limited by the strategic demands of the politics of the context". This matches the self-assessment of *Cultural Studies* as "a political project and an intellectual practice aiming at understanding theory as strategy and tool for making usable the production of knowledge in concrete situations beyond the academic context", as LUTTER & REISENLEITNER (2001, 11) put it, but it is not too satisfying an answer to the concrete question "where, how and how much interdisciplinarity is necessary".

However, we have to concede that this question cannot be answered in a definite way. It is illusionary to conceive of a valid scientific strategy to define which disciplines are necessary to conceptualise a concrete scientific field and to what amount they are necessary. Paradigms do not change by following strategic plans but historical chance. I think that Thomas KUHN was right to suggest that paradigmatic changes in science, like revolutions, happen in a chaotic, unpredictable way, however expectable the fact of a change might have been. If the formation of *Cultural Studies* in the second half of the past century was such a paradigmatic change - also Lutter & Reisenleitner (2001, 7) speak of a "cultural turn", at the same time conceding that it was mainly a turn within social science and *Geisteswissenschaften* - we should assume that it was rather the consequence of internal developments within those disciplines from which *Cultural Studies* emerge than the product of strategic planning.

This means that the "cultural turn" in human sciences, if it happened at all, was coined much more by actual political interests of a certain generation of social and cultural scientists than by the intention to form a new scientific project in order to implement shared interest of different disciplines. Interdisciplinarity was not a primary intention of *Cultural Studies* but, at best, a well-accepted commitment which, additionally, was conducive to the reputation of this approach. This essentially distinguishes the "cultural turn" from the famous "cognitive turn" which resulted from a common interest of a broad range of different disciplines and was not at all a paradigmatic change within psychology in particular - maybe that the overwhelming success of the "cognitive revolution" is due to this clearly formulated and strategically planned interdisciplinary program.

In this sense, interdisciplinarity was rather an accessory than an intentional feature of *Cultural Studies*. Rolf LINDNER, a fellow of the Vienna International Research Centre for Cultural Science, in his newly published essay *Die Stunde der Cultural Studies* argues, it was "to be feared that the frequently conjured interdisciplinarity is not more than a label" - referring to no less a source for this assessment than Lawrence GROSSBERG (Lindner 2000, 114).

If I am right that interdisciplinarity was not a central aim of the "cultural turn" in human sciences from the beginning, then it will be much more difficult to conceptualise a common methodological and theoretical approach within the framework of cultural sciences as it actually exists and to reconstruct *Cultural Studies* within a more complex interdisciplinary framework. In order to evaluate the situation I would like to briefly sketch the development of *Cultural Studies* vs. *Kulturwissenschaften*:

I would like to start with a brief outline of the evolution of *Cultural Studies*. This might be a redundant instruction for most of you but it is my experience that in the same way that *Culture Studies* - despite of its claim for interdisciplinarity - neglected most of the actual concepts and developments of cultural psychology, the existence of *Cultural Studies* was neglected by cultural psychologists. Thus it will do no harm if we call to our minds what we speak about when we speak of *Cultural Studies*.

Cultural Studies emerged as a critical opposition to traditional literary studies in Britain. It opposed the interpretation of culture as a moral guide against anarchy and a stabilising factor of the established social system. In the 50ies, this interpretation was mainly represented by F. R. LEAVIS and the Journal *Scrutiny*, where the traditional "English" culture of the past was opposed as a moral standard against popular culture. It was Richard HOGGART who, in his book *The Uses of Literacy* (1958), tried to focus the attention of literary studies to popular culture and the cultural life of the working classes in England. In 1964, the famous *Birmingham Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies* (CCCS) was founded, which is generally considered to be the birthplace of Cultural Studies and was administered by HOGGART until 1968.

In the same year as *The Uses of Literature* another important "bible" of *Cultural Studies* was published, namely *Culture and Society* by Raymond WILLIAMS. Superficially, this book did not represent more than a history of English from 1780 to 1950. In fact, it pointed to the social context of the literary production of this period and thus matched exactly the intentions of the Birmingham Institute. In this book WILLIAMS already characterised culture as "the whole way or life" and as "a mode of interpreting all our common experience" (1958, xviii). In another significant work, *The Long Revolution* (1961), WILLIAMS defined culture as a way of life which is expressed in institutions and in everyday behaviour as well as in art and literature.

Another important figure in the history of *Cultural Studies* was Stuart HALL who directed the CCCS after HOGGART for more than ten years. Christina LUTTER and Martin REISENLEITNER,

in their interesting outline of the history of *Cultural Studies* and the Birmingham Institute (2001, 33), point to the fact that the appointment of HOGGART to the CCCS was primarily motivated by the desire for a theoretical and methodological support of the interdisciplinary intention of *Cultural Studies*. On the one hand, as LUTTER and REISENLEITNER (2001, 33) argue, the interdisciplinary approach of HOGGART, WILLIAMS and THOMPSON, was "devastatingly criticised" by the specialist of literary science. The origin of *Cultural Studies* from literary science, on the other hand, was an obstacle for adopting the empirical methods of the American media research, although mass media as a mediating instance of modern popular culture eventually has become a central topic of the scientific interest of *Cultural Studies*. In this situation - I quote - "HOGGART realised that the aspired interdisciplinarity required more elaborated theoretical fundamentals to be developed at the CCCS".

Thus, *Cultural Sciences* developed an original approach to mass media culture that "tried to combine methods of textual analysis with sociological and historical approaches":

"Enriched by the post-Freudian theories of Jacques Lacan and Julia Kristeva, Cultural Studies as pursued at the CCCS were thereby given a theoretical and methodological framework that linked semiotics, psycho-analysis and (neo-)marxist political theory in the interpretation of cultural phenomena and in which the resulting analysis of texts was to become the preferred method" (Lutter & Reisenleitner 2001, 34).

Although *Cultural Studies* attached great importance to *lived experience* and although openness for theories and methods as a consequence of its interdisciplinary commitment remained a main feature of Cultural Studies, the range of theories and methods actually adopted has been rather restricted to the field of historical, political and literary sciences, and the interdisciplinary penetration with psychology, at best, was limited to the adoption of theoretical fragments of psycho-analytical provenience. This is my first premise in analysing the methodological prerequisites for an interdisciplinary concept of *cultural studies* of the future.

In addition, it may be questioned with good arguments whether *Cultural Studies* was a new theoretical and methodological paradigm at all. Elisabeth LIST, an Austrian philosopher who at the moment is organising a course of cultural studies at the University of Graz, in her critical review of Lawrence GROSSBERG's essay on *The Globalization and "Economization" of Cultural Studies*, supports the German cultural scientists Aleida ASSMANN and Renate SCHLESIER in characterising *Cultural Studies* as "a global mix of theories and terminologies" (Assmann 1999, 86) or even "an a-historic conglomeration of different theoretical pieces" and adds "that the aura of the totally new by which *Cultural Studies* is surrounded in its reception, is due to the forgetting of the past history of its terms and concepts" (List 2000).

This is one more reason to look for the corresponding situation of cultural sciences in Germany and in the other European countries: During the 20 century, the field of German *Kulturwissenschaften* may be characterised rather as a field of clearly marked disciplinary claims than an interdisciplinary project. Of course there is a difference of the historical developments in the scientific tradition of America and in the particular European countries: Among several different features it was in particular the intensity of the relation between cultural science and the arts that distinguished the development in France from that in Germany: In France, theorising about culture and the arts was always closely related to artistic and literary production and to social life - I would just like to point out Jean-Paul SARTRE and Albert CAMUS or journals like *Les Temps Modernes* edited by the excellent philosophers SARTRE and MERLEAU-PONTY. Another prominent author of French

philosophy of culture, Henri BERGSON, was honoured by the Nobel prize of literature. This was the climate where, long before the start of *Cultural Studies* in the modern sense, a scientific program of *Cultural Studies* was to be shaping up which closely interrelated different theoretical and practical points of view - including even political aspects - and an intensive interest in everyday life: let me point to the early investigations of Pierre BOURDIEU as an example of this approach, which may be characterised rather as a transdisciplinary aspect of cultural science than an interdisciplinary project of separated disciplines.

In the German tradition of the 20 century, there is no comparable interweaving of cultural science and cultural life. Cultural science and cultural life rather reflected the contrast of day's hard work and evening's leisure time. Culture, in a very strong sense, was the *object* of cultural science and scarcely the *medium* of scientific reflection about culture.

Within certain limitations, this is also applicable to the scientific approach to culture in England and America. The relation between cultural science in Germany and the Anglo-American tradition may be pointed out by the different connotations of the terms *cultural anthropology* and *Kulturanthropologie* despite of their similarity of wording and definition. *Cultural anthropology*, as counterpart to *physical anthropology*, deals with human behaviour and the products of human behaviour, reaching from real objects to social systems, religious conduct or other ideal subjects and topics. Or, as KARDINER concisely put it, with all elements of human environment that are *man-made*. This, to some extent, is accurate for both, *cultural anthropology* and the German *Kulturanthropologie* as well, but there is an obvious contrast between the theoretical position of cultural anthropologists like Franz BOAS or Edward SAPIR, on the one hand, and German scholars like Erich ROTHACKER, Arnold GEHLEN, or Wilhelm MÜHLMANN, on the other hand. However, an exception might be seen in the activities of the Frankfurt School whose intentions were much closer to those of modern Cultural Studies than those of traditional German *Kulturwissenschaft*.

In her essay on *Cultural Studies and Historical Memories*, Aleida ASSMANN tries to throw some light on these historical developments of *Cultural Studies*. She proposes the thesis that *Cultural Studies* in general "emerged out of a crisis in the humanities" - a suspicion already put forward by Stuart HALL in the title of his essay *The Emergence of Cultural Studies and the Crisis of the Humanities* (1990) - and that "in Germany, the crisis in the humanities took the shape of the crisis of an academic institution, of the so-called *Geisteswissenschaften*" (Assmann 1999, 87). "In the nineteen seventies and eighties", she argues,

"...it became manifest that the emphasis on the uniqueness of their hermeneutic methodology had resulted in the *Geisteswissenschaften* maneuvering themselves into a rather uncomfortable position. They were caught in a binary opposition which surrendered prestige, legitimation and funding to the *Naturwissenschaften*, and left the former ones, by contrast, in a precarious state characterized by an uncertain reputation and a notorious lack of social legitimization" (Assmann 1999, 87s.)

ASSMANN points to Juergen MITTELSTRASS who in 1995, in a lecture at the Berlin-Brandenburg Academy of Science, called upon the *Geisteswissenschaften* to disengage themselves from hermeneutics and to concentrate on real issues rather than texts in order to alleviate the situation (Mittelstraß 1996), and to Uwe STEINER, who in 1997, just two years later, published an essay raising the question *Can the Kulturwissenschaften perform a moral function?* - stressing at the beginning that "the totalizing and unifying concept of Geist needs to be replaced by the notion of culture" (Assmann 1999, 89). ASSMANN interprets the difference between these two essays as a "change in paradigms" because by moving "from the discourse of *Geisteswissenschaften* to the discourse of *Kulturwissen-*

schaften ... we move from a discussion of values to an analysis of symbols" (ibid. 90). That may well be but the idea was not actually new because already in 1899, that is one century ago, Heinrich RICKERT in his essay *Kulturwissenschaft und Naturwissenschaft* with very similar arguments had claimed for the term *Kulturwissenschaft* against DILTHEY's distinction between *Geisteswissenschaften* and *Naturwissenschaften* which in consequence provided hermeneutics as a distinct methodology for the humanities.

In his preface to the 6 edition of *Kulturwissenschaft und Naturwissenschaft* of 1926, RICKERT resumed this argument:

"It does not matter that the one sciences investigate bodies and the other ones minds. Rather methodology has to pay attention to the fact that the one disciplines deal with nature free from judgements of value and meaning, putting it in general terms, while the other ones point out culture as related to meaning and value, thus not being able to be satisfied with the generalising procedure of natural science" (Rickert 1986, 12).

This fact, RICKERT resumed, could be much better expressed by the term *Kulturwissenschaften* than "by the ambiguous and thereby meaningless term *Geisteswissenschaften*" (ibid.). This is exactly the point of STEINER's and ASSMANN's argument and this underlines Elisabeth LIST's suspicion that many features that seem to be new with *Cultural Studies*, are so because of the forgetting of the past history of its terms and concepts.

I am trying to resume and come back to my original question which disciplines we could actually have in mind when we claim for an interdisciplinary approach in *Cultural Studies*. I think we may not expect a satisfying answer from *Cultural Studies* itself. With respect to concrete ways of implementing interdisciplinarity the protagonists of this paradigm remained strangely unconcrete. Lawrence GROSSBERG, for example, points to the inevitably interdisciplinary character of cultural studies by arguing that "understanding culture ... requires looking at culture's relationship to everything that is not culture" (1999, 28), following the early definition of cultural studies by WILLIAMS, who characterised cultural studies as the study of all elements of a way of life and from that definition also derived the necessity of conceptualising cultural studies as an interdisciplinary project. However, none of these declarations gives us any useful hint about which concrete disciplines, which concrete methodology should be implemented in order to establish cultural studies as an interdisciplinary project. I even think that conceptualising *Cultural Studies* as an open project, as most of its partisans do, actually excludes any concrete formulation of strategic goals with respect to interdisciplinarity. If Lawrence GROSSBERG states that "practicing cultural studies involves constantly redefining it in response not only to the changing context in which it works ... but also the possibilities of making a home for it within specific disciplines even as it challenges the legitimacy of the disciplinization of intellectual work" (1999, 24), he actually claims for a-disciplinarity rather than interdisciplinarity or at least leaves the implementation of interdisciplinarity to vagueness and historical chance.

Speaking in terms of Thomas KUHN we might suppose that *Cultural Studies*, as the result of a scientific revolution, of a "cultural turn" in human sciences, never reached the status of a "normal science" again but remained in the chaotic status of a revolutionary process, which, by the way, exactly matches its political self-assessment. However, we have to face the fact that *Cultural Studies* have remained a project in the tradition of traditional social, political and literary sciences until now, and in this context I would like to repeat my thesis that new paradigms that are not an interdisciplinary project from the very beginning but just claim for interdisciplinarity as a necessary prerequisite, are coined much more by their scientific traditions and by actual political interests than by an actual methodological enlargement. Critically sharpening this argument we could say: There are paradigms that

start by a scientific revolution, and there are paradigms that started by inventing legends about their origin, and I think that the paradigmatic change to cultural studies is rather one of the second kind of revolutionary paradigmatic changes.

Thus we have to face the exciting situation that we all are totally convinced that *Cultural Studies* have to be conceptualised as an interdisciplinary project but there is no unquestioned rule with respect to which subjects or methods can be definitely excluded from or included to an interdisciplinary concept of cultural studies or which grade of relevance were to be attributed to particular disciplines or methods.

Anyway, I think that there are some helpful landmarks in the actual discourse that might help us to find at least some possible objectives for implementing *Cultural Studies* as an interdisciplinary project. I again would like to get back to Aleida ASSMANN and her suggestion that substituting the concept of *Geist* by a reformulated concept of *culture* could represent a paradigmatic change within *Cultural Studies*. I still insist on my comment that this is not a not a new idea but a magnificent satisfaction for Heinrich RICKERT and his ideas after almost a century, but that does not matter. I want to follow the reflections of Aleida ASSMANN and Uwe STEINER in order to explain the argument that this shift from *Geist* to *culture* could be a decisive step to an interdisciplinary reconceptualisation of *Cultural Studies*:

Culture, Aleida ASSMANN argues in this context,

"...is defined as a complex mechanism of reproduction and continuation, constantly transforming the past and the potential into the presence and actual. In this process of culture, however, memory does not operate as an autonomous mechanism but is regulated by reflection. Culture is both memory and reflection, which means that cultures not only contain programs to ensure their continuation, but also are self-referential in that they establish stances of self-observation." (Assmann 1999, 90).

I think it is exactly this statement that links *Cultural Studies* with psychology and gives us a concrete perspective where an interdisciplinary concept of Cultural Studies should start from. Aleida ASSMANN rightly states that in this perspective "the dynamics of culture are described ... in terms of a complex and highly conflictual systemic development" (ibid.) and, following the arguments of Uwe STEINER, she advocates "a limited competence of cultural studies to reflect on the reality-generating force of symbols, to provide a reflexive stance with regard to symbolic practices in different domains of culture".

Kulturwissenschaften, in this sense, "analyze how [symbolic] realities are constructed and how they function as frames of action and values which shape and limit human possibilities" (Assmann 1999, 91). This is, almost exactly, the definition of *culture* Ernst BOESCH formulated in his *Symbolic Action Theory* (Boesch 1991) and with regard to the processes involved, this systemic approach matches very well the semiotic-ecological perspective Alfred LANG proposed on past congresses of this society (Lang 1992). Thus, the common topics are at hand, and it is just the problem to know each other and to find each other in the labyrinth of academic disciplines. In other words: It is more important to raise the flag "Here I am" than to reel of the litany of the necessity of interdisciplinarity and, as Lawrence GROSSBERG critically put it, to continue working as usual, just adding some footnotes to the sources from outside of one's own discipline (Grossberg 1994, 33). This answers the second of my introductory questions: An "interdisciplinary approach" is not actually an "approach" if it happens just in footnotes and acknowledgements. It has to be realised in concrete projects of co-operation and this, I think, is an important task for *Cultural Studies* in the future.

In order to implement such a discourse, at least between *Cultural Studies* and psychology, I support the idea which Aleida ASSMANN outlines in the second part of her essay, namely

to conceive of memory as a key concept of *Kulturwissenschaften*. This also corresponds very well with original intentions of our society - I'll just remind you of the studies of Hans WERBIK and Jürgen STRAUB in Erlangen and to Jürgen's book about *Historisch-psychologische Biographieforschung* (1989). I also support ASSMANN's thesis "that German *Kulturwissenschaften* revolve around a central concept of memory which ... is missing in the cultural studies of the United Kingdom and only marginally present in those of the United States" (Assmann 1999, 92).

This leads me to my third question, namely in what manner an interdisciplinary approach in cultural studies could be enriched by the contribution of psychology. In part I have already answered this question by pointing out the amazing parallels between Cultural Studies and Cultural Psychology with respect to common topics and intentions and with respect to the underlying concept of culture. I again point to Aleida ASSMANN who, in a sketchy outline for the Cultural Studies project in Graz formulated the following "methodological guidelines" of cultural sciences: They "are interested in

- individuals as subjects with their own perceptions, their bodily experience and their possibilities and limits of action, whereby the subject itself and its historical, political and social position is part of its context of reflection;
- the contexts as a framework of functional coherence and of manners of production of meaning;
- the description of the mediation of reality by styles, media and materials and
- the difference of identities as undeniable condition of experience and of social order." (Assmann 2000).

I think that in this scientific program psychology and, in particular, cultural psychology is to rediscover its very own scientific tasks. Thus, I think that integrating psychology in an interdisciplinary framework of Cultural Studies is rather a problem of coming to know each other's intention and of getting acquainted with each other's research tradition than a problem of inventing common research topics. I concede that the actual image of psychology as a "hard empirical science" does not actually facilitate the dialogue but I notice an increasing openness even on the part of "official" psychology; I just like to point to the presidential speech of the past president of the German Association of Psychology, Rainer KLUWE, who at the congress in Jena last year explicitly claimed for an interdisciplinary engagement of psychology including its orientation on "social sciences and cultural anthropology" (Kluwe 2001, 3).

So far the topics, now the methods:

Looking up recent outlines of *Cultural Studies* I cannot evade the impression that the inherent tendency of *Cultural Studies* to react flexibly to the challenges of the cultural process is seen as contradictory to a fixed methodology and has actually prevented the coming about of any methodological standard. I remind you of Lawrence GROSSBERG's statement which I already quoted that "practicing cultural studies involves constantly redefining it in response not only to the changing context in which it works" (1999, 24). Pertti Alasuutari, in one of the rare textbooks on methods and *Cultural Studies*, states that "cultural studies methodology has often been described by the concept of *bricolage* [sc. patchwork, C.A.]: one is pragmatic and strategic in choosing and applying different methods and practices" (Alasuutari 1995, 2).

However, like the theoretical background of *Cultural Studies*, also its methodology was not thoroughly open and strategic but largely influenced by the methodological traditions of those disciplines it emerged from. Richard HANDLER, who in 1993 thoroughly criticised the *Cultural Studies* project from the point of view of a cultural anthropologist, rightly

questioned the focusing of Cultural Studies on textual analysis and the lack of field studies. Rolf LINDNER (2000, 79) quotes the Norwegian social anthropologist Signe HOWELL who stated that "on the whole, cultural studies, with a strong grounding in literary studies, has been about cultural products, representations and processes rather than social life.." (Howell 1998, 107 f.), and this is a very shocking sentence with regard to a scientific project that claimed to focus on *lived realities* and *lived experience*.

What is required? We may draw some directions from the description of the most important models or paradigms of *Cultural Studies* Lawrence GROSSBERG proposes in his essays. He specifies as objectives of *Cultural Studies*, depending on the underlying paradigm *culture as text*, *culture as communication*, *culture as difference*, *culture in socio-political space*, *culture in institution* and the move *from culture to discourse and everyday life*, and assesses the first two approaches as "becoming residual", the next two models as "dominant" and the two last approaches as "emergent" (Grossberg 1999, 31-35). Elisabeth LIST (2000) interprets these theoretical dynamics as a paradigmatic progress "from text to context" and "from context to situation". If this is true, this theoretical development is a most significant indication for what is actually needed in the methodological development of *Cultural Studies*, also with respect to its enlargement and improvement as an interdisciplinary concept. In this context I think that the subtle distinction between objective environment and perceived environment Kurt LEWIN had focussed upon in his early writings on psychological ecology could serve as a landmark for new theoretical and methodological directions. Perceived environment and, in consequence, representation of situations and environment as an essential part of identity and personality, on the one hand directly refers to identity as a central topic of *Cultural Studies*, as emphasised, for example, by Aleida ASSMANN, on the other hand forms a bridging topic between *Cultural Studies* and recent developments in psychological personality theory - I just point to the studies of Barbara KRAHÉ (1991) on the relation of situation cognition and coherence in personality. This also implies the possibility of implementing at least some methods of modern personality research to the broader field of *Cultural Studies*. Another starting point for an interdisciplinary development of theory and methods might be seen in the Aleida ASSMANN's suggestion to conceive memory as a key concept in *Kulturwissenschaften*: Here is also an essential distinction necessary, namely the Aristotelian distinction between *mnéme* and *anámnesis* or, in AUGUSTIN's wording, between *memoria* and *recordatio*. Considering this distinction one cannot stick on texts, that means: on memory in practising *Cultural Studies*. Proceeding from memory to recollection, from the text to the process, would not only open the interdisciplinary floor to psychology as an until now widely ignored discipline within *Cultural Studies*, but Cultural Studies could respectively take advantages of psychological methods as developed in particular in the realm of cultural psychology - I refer to the studies of Hans WERBIK, Juergen STRAUB and the Erlangen school.

With respect to the thematic range covered by the six paradigms of *Cultural Studies* as outlined by Lawrence GROSSBERG, the concentration of *Cultural Studies* on textual analysis is not reasonable; with respect to the dynamics of the paradigmatic change in *Cultural Studies* as postulated by GROSSBERG and LIST, it is even anachronistic. Thus, it is, in my opinion, an essential prerequisite for the future of *Cultural Studies*, not only to confess but also to practice interdisciplinarity in particular by including behavioural sciences into its interdisciplinary approach - of course not in the sense of an old-fashioned behaviorism but in the sense of a modern ecological and cultural psychology.

As already mentioned, *Cultural Studies* has been repeatedly interpreted as a consequence of a "crisis of the humanities" - I already pointed to statements of Stuart HALL and Aleida ASSMANN in this context. More recently we are to notice more and more suggestions that *Cultural Studies* is in a crisis itself. Christina LUTTER & Markus REISENLEITNER (2001, 45)

also point to the problem of "Textlastigkeit" (prevailing of textual analysis) in this context and, furthermore, to a tendency for analyses of particular topics instead of studying the *whole way of life* in the sense of Raymond WILLIAMS. The ritual of conjuring the crisis of a discipline, however, is not unusual, and a historian of psychology, as I am, of course remembers the "crisis of psychology" Karl BÜHLER had depicted in his well-known book of 1927. I think that there are some similarities between the crisis of psychology as BÜHLER analysed it and the difficulties of *Cultural Studies* to get implemented as an interdisciplinary project in its very sense. Thus I would like to remind you of the essential arguments of BÜHLER's essay:

The crisis of psychology, BÜHLER argues, is due to the fact that "the lots of psychologies", that sprang up at the beginning of the 20 century, ignored the multiplicity and aspectivity of the subject of psychology. BÜHLER suggested that at least three aspects had to be taken into consideration, namely behaviour, experience and achievement. The last one which BÜHLER called *Leistungsaspekt* or *Werkaspekt*, includes all things and structures that are created by individuals or groups in their daily life or also in history. It comes very close to the concept of "text" as it is used in a very broad sense in *Cultural Studies* and in its preferred method, textual analysis. It is even this aspect of the subject of psychology which BÜHLER pointed to as the main topic of "the idea of a cultural psychology", as he put it. At the same time he criticised Wilhelm DILTHEY for making this aspect the main and prevailing approach of psychology at all. I think that a good part of recent criticism on *Cultural Studies* follows this argument of BÜHLER.

BÜHLER concludes that unity of psychology will only be achieved if "any attempt will be excluded in the future to emphasise one of these aspects as the 'orthoscopic' aspect". In a similar way, I think, *Cultural Studies* will miss its ambitious goal to become a comprehensive and interdisciplinary project to study the *whole way of life* of individuals and groups in cultural context, if it - deliberately or guided by methodological trends and habits of its constituent disciplines - over-emphasises one aspect of its subject in the sense of BÜHLER's triangle and sticks on the methods related to it.

This may also be an answer to my last question, namely whether there is any chance to find a common methodology which could connect such different disciplines like literary criticism, political science, ethnology, cultural anthropology and even cultural psychology, to a common scientific project. I think there are lots of chances but it depends on our readiness to take into account the aspectivity of the subject of our research, namely man in a symbolic cultural context. This implies aspects of behaviour as well as experiences and, last but not least, texts and symbols.

The future of a project like this will depend on the fact, whether we, coming from different disciplines with different theoretical and methodological backgrounds, will try to cope with the aspectivity of our subject by mutually complementing our different methodological knowledge or whether we will waste our time and energy by quarrelling about the question whose aspect, whose paradigm and whose method is the right one.

In this sense *Cultural Studies* could also derive some benefit from studying the long history of mistakes in the history of psychology.

References:

- Alasuutari, Pertti (1995). *Researching Culture: Qualitative Methods and Cultural Studies*. London: Sage.
- Assmann, Aleida (1999). *Cultural Studies and Historical Memories*. In *The contemporary Study of Culture* (pp. 85-99). Wien: Turia & Kant.

- Assmann, Aleida (2000). *Wozu Kulturwissenschaft?*
http://www.cultnet.at/kulturwissenschaft/forum/aleida_assmann.html.
- Boesch, Ernst E. (1991). *Symbolic Action Theory and Cultural Psychology*. Berlin: Springer.
- Bühler, Karl (1978). *Die Krise der Psychologie*. Reprint of the 2nd ed. 1929. Frankfurt/M.: Ullstein.
- Grossberg, Lawrence (1994). Cultural Studies - Was besagt ein Name? *IKUS Lectures*, 3, H. 17+18, 11-40.
- Grossberg, Lawrence (1999). Globalization and the "Economization" of Cultural Studies. In *The contemporary Study of Culture* (pp. 23-46). Wien: Turia & Kant.
- Hall, Stuart (1990) The Emergence of Cultural Studies and the Crisis of the Humanities. *October* 53.
- Handler, Richard (1993). Anthropology is dead! Long live anthropology! *American Anthropologist*, 95, 991-995.
- Howell, Signe (1998). Cultural Studies and Social Anthropology. Contesting or Complementary Discourses? In S. Nugent & C. Shore (eds.), *Anthropology and Cultural Studies* (pp. 103-125). London: Pluto Press.
- Kluwe, Rainer H. (2001). Zur Lage der Psychologie: Perspektiven der Fortentwicklung einer erfolgreichen Wissenschaft. *Psychologische Rundschau*, 52, 1-10.
- Krahé, Barbara (1991). *Situation cognition and coherence in personality. An individual-centered approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuhn, Thomas (1996). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (1962). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lang, Alfred (1992). Kultur als 'externe Seele' – eine semiotisch-ökologische Perspektive. In: C. G. Allesch, E. Billmann-Mahecha & A. Lang (eds.), *Psychologische Aspekte des kulturellen Wandels*, Wien: Verband der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaften Österreichs.
- Lindner, Rolf (2000). *Die Stunde der Cultural Studies*. Wien: Universitätsverlag.
- List, Elisabeth (2000). Lawrence Grossbergs Beitrag zur aktuellen Situierung der Cultural Studies: The Globalization and the "Economization" of Cultural Studies.
http://www.cultnet.at/kulturwissenschaft/forum/grossber_list.html.
- Lutter, Christina & Reisenleitner, Marcus (2001). *Cultural Studies - Eine Einführung*. 3rd ed. Wien: Turia & Kant.
- Mittelstraß, Jürgen (1996). Die unheimlichen Geisteswissenschaften. *Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berichte und Abhandlungen*, AB.2, 215-235.
- Rickert, Heinrich (1926). *Kulturwissenschaft und Naturwissenschaft* (1899) 6th ed. Tübingen: Mohr. Reprint: Stuttgart: Reclam 1986.
- Steiner, Uwe C. (1997). Können die Kulturwissenschaften eine neue moralische Funktion beanspruchen? Eine Bestandsaufnahme. *Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift*, 71, H. 1, 5-38.
- Straub, Jürgen (1989). *Historisch-psychologische Biographieforschung*. Heidelberg: Asanger.
- Williams, Raymond (1958). *Culture and Society. Coleridge to Orwell*. London.