

nen Verständnis ihrer eigenen Grundlagen gelangen kann, die seit der Paulskirche und der Nationalversammlung in Weimar manchen, obschon sonst oft verschüttetes, Gemeingut blieben.

Anmerkungen:

- 1 Vgl. K. Nowrot, Das Republikprinzip in der Rechtsordnungsgemeinschaft. Methodische Annäherungen an die Normalität eines Verfassungsprinzips, 2014; dazu H. Goerlich, Die Verwaltung 48 (2015), S. 290 ff.
- 2 Dazu kritisch C. Schönberger, Der „German Approach“. Die deutsche Staatsrechtslehre im Wissenschaftsvergleich, mit Beiträgen von außen von A. Takada, Die Eigenschaften der deutschen Staatsrechtslehre und ihr künftigen Herausforderungen, und A. Jakab, Staatslehre – Eine deutsche Kuriosität, FJP 4 (2015).
- 3 Für eine Quelle, die in die Schweiz führt, A. Kley, Kants republikanisches Erbe. Flucht und Rückkehr des freiheitlich-republikanischen Kant – eine staatsphilosophische Zeitreise, 2013.
- 4 Hierzu verweist Schulz auf T. Thiel, Republikanismus und die Europäische Union. Eine Neubestimmung des Diskurses um die Legitimität europäischen Regierens, 2012; dazu auch B. Assenbrunner, Europäische Demokratie und nationalstaatlicher Partikularismus. Theoretischer Entwicklungsrahmen, unionsrechtliche Ansätze und Perspektiven europäischer Demokratie nach dem Reformvertrag von Lissabon, 2012.
- 5 Dazu in Kritik an E.-W. Böckenförde H. Goerlich, Die Legitimation von Verfassung, Recht und Staat bei E.-W. Böckenförde, in: R. Mehring/M. Otto (Hrsg.), Voraussetzungen und Garantien des Staates. Ernst-Wolfgang Böckenfördes Staatsverständnis, 2014, S. 194 ff.
- 6 Erwa E.-W. Böckenförde, Demokratie als Verfassungsprinzip, HDStR Bd. I, 1987, § 22 Rn. 14 ff.; ein Beitrag, der seit BVerfGE 83, 60 (72) bis BVerfGE 123, 267 (341 ff.) die Rechtsprechung befruchtet hat; für einen kritischen Bericht zum Hintergrund B.-O. Bryde, Ausländerwahlrecht revisited, in: M. Krajewski u. a. (Hrsg.), Gesellschaftliche Herausforderungen des Rechts, GS für H. Rittstieg, 2015, S. 99 ff.

**Zachary Lockman: Field Notes. The Making of Middle East Studies in the United States, Stanford: Stanford University Press 2016, 351 p.**

Rezensiert von  
Cyrus Schayegh, Geneva

A leading Middle Eastern historian, Zachary Lockman (New York University) wrote monographs on Egypt, leftism, and Palestine before publishing, in 2010, *Contenting Visions of the Middle East*.<sup>1</sup> The highly instructive *Field Notes* usefully complements that work. An archivally rich account of key players in U.S. Middle Eastern area studies (specifically, foundations including Rockefeller, Carnegie, and Ford) it details “how the sausage is made” (xvi) by closely reading foundation reports from the 1920s–1980s. Foundations evidently formed only one part of a broader area studies landscape. Other players included the government, whose role earlier scholars like Timothy Mitchell highlighted, and universities that, while securing government and foundation funds, dedicated own resources to area studies, too. Examples include Princeton, to which Lockman dedicates most of the fourth chapter, and Harvard, which in 1955 recruited the also organizationally initiative orientalist H.A.R. Gibb from Oxford.

Still, foundations mattered. They acted before most universities, Rockefeller e.g. before World War II; their funding benefited multiple universities; and they were

instrumental in attempts to define area studies. Bodies they created comprised the Rockefeller-funded American Council of Learned Societies (founded 1919 [3ff.]), the Carnegie- and Ford-funded Social Science Research Council's (SSRC) Committee on World Area Research (CWAR; founded 1946 [42ff.]), and the SSRC's Committee on the Near and Middle East (founded 1951 [117ff.]). Lockman *en passant* also discusses organizations that were not directly foundation-related, like the American Association for Middle East Studies (founded in 1959 [160ff.]); here, his notes on Israeli/Zionist connections and on Arab (American) activities in the USA can be read with other recent monographs.<sup>2</sup>

Areas were defined in different ways, which moreover shifted. Thus, after 1945 the Near East turned into the Middle East.<sup>3</sup> And whereas CWAR in 1946 asserted that "the world's civilization can be grouped into thirty or forty significant Areas" (p. 43), funded area studies could be counted on the fingers of two hands. Moreover, methodological debates were never solved (see e.g. p. 81, 90, 94, 118, 157, 226, 243, 254, 262). Some scholars, like Gibb, emphasized expertise in distinct languages, while others, many at the SSRC, insisted on comparatively usable, cross-area social scientific tools. Related, a red thread running through Lockman's monograph is foundations' and scholars' inability of making area studies a discipline. Common methods, themes, or perspectives never emerged, and early interdisciplinary promises foundered.

Consequently, an inferiority complex *vis-à-vis* the social sciences and history, aggravated by funding fears, persistently racked

area studies. This complex was not quite justified, as Lockman points out. Even when modestly understood as a "common geographic focus [with] ... an essentially institutional, pedagogical and social rather than intellectual basis," area studies can create added intellectual value (p. 255). Social science methods are not fixed, either,<sup>4</sup> and "the social sciences (and the discipline of history) were also transformed ... by their encounter with area studies, ... question[ing] whether the claims of Western social science were truly universal" (p. 261). Still, it is instructive to follow up-close, in innumerable committee reports, area studies specialists' hand ringing. And "failure" mattered: first around 1970 when the "bonanza" (p. 142) of the 1950s–1960s abated (p. 205ff.); again in 1996 when the SSRC turned to global studies. Although recalibrated, this decision affected knowledge production.

Underlying Lockman's story is the argument that U.S. area studies were not only or even mainly, and not initially, created by Washington, and cannot be simply understood as a function of U.S. Cold War strategy. He here pushes back against scholars like Mitchell (p. 256–257).<sup>5</sup> While recognizing pre-war roots, the latter posited a World War II break, and stressed U.S. area studies' Cold War nature. By backdating his periodization, Lockman complicates that genealogy and the resultant explanation of area studies' nature, too.

Two critiques can be made. Firstly, Lockman insufficiently links his account to other analyses of foundations, including their overlap, also in personnel, with Washington.<sup>6</sup> Related, his argument underplays, though he empirically recognizes (e.g. p. 52, 57–59, 72, 101, 112ff.), that

in the Cold War and before, foundations, just like Washington, acted with (their vision of) U.S. strategic interests in mind. (Hence, their special attention to Russian and East Asian Studies! [p. 115].) Secondly, Lockman's forte, his U.S.-centricity, is a weakness, too. Area studies have been both transnational and national.<sup>7</sup> More specifically, even a U.S.-centric story has inextricably transnational dimensions. Some, Lockman mentions en passant, like French and British orientalist models for U.S. area studies [p. 21, 74, 81], which he however deems less important than others. Three others can be mentioned. One is foundations' financing of area studies and other area-related fields also outside the United States.<sup>8</sup> Also, U.S. universities, partly with foundation support, from the 1950s invited Middle Eastern academics.<sup>9</sup> These ties were Cold War related; moreover, they can be seen to have deep, even pre-modern roots.<sup>10</sup> Last, that Latin America was the initial U.S. area studies field shows how much reasons of empire carried academic weight even before 1914 (p. 34; also p. 22, 62, 164, 219). One may ask how Latin American studies roots paved institutional ways for later area studies. These critiques notwithstanding, Lockman's monograph is an empirically rich and conceptually innovative contribution to the history of area studies. It belongs on the shelf of anybody working in these fields, which continue to help shape debates in the social sciences and humanities.

#### Notes

- 1 Contending Visions of the Middle East. The History and Politics of Orientalism, 2nd ed. Cambridge 2010.
- 2 S. Yaqub, *Imperfect Strangers. Americans, Arabs, and U.S.-Middle East Relations in the 1970s*, Ithaca 2016; also L. Deeb, Winegar Jessica,

- Anthropology's Politics. Disciplining the Middle East, Stanford 2016.
- 3 O. Khalil, *The Crossroads of the World. U.S. and British Foreign Policy and the Construct of the Middle East*, in: *Diplomatic History* 38 (2014), p. 299–344.
- 4 T. McDonald (ed.), *The Historic Turn in the Human Sciences*, Ann Arbor 1996.
- 5 T. Mitchell, *The Middle East in the Past and Future of Social Science*, in: D. Szanton (ed.), *The Politics of Knowledge. Area Studies and the Disciplines*, Berkeley 2004, pp. 74–118; similarly: H. Harootunian, *History's Disquiet*, New York 2000, p. 41; B. Kolluoglu-Kirli, *From Orientalism to Area Studies*, in: *New Centennial Review* 3 (2003), p. 93–111, here p. 97, 108.
- 6 I. Parmar, *Foundations of the American Century*, New York 2012.
- 7 M. Bossaert/E. Szurek, *Transturcologiques. Vers une histoire transnationale des études turques (XVIIIe-XXe siècle)*, in: *European Journal of Turkish Studies* 24 (2017), p. 1–23.
- 8 J. Meloy, *Arab and Middle Eastern Studies at AUB. Between Local Concerns and Global Pressures*, in: N. El Cheikh; B. Orfali (eds.), *150 Years AUB*, Beirut 2016, p. 85–94; C. Schayegh, *The Man in the Middle. Developmentalism and Cold War at AUB's Economic Research Institute in-between the U.S. and the Middle East*, in: *150 Years AUB*, p. 105–119; C. Schayegh, *The Inter-war Germination of Development and Modernization Theory and Practice. Politics, Institution Building, and Knowledge Production between the Rockefeller Foundation and the American University of Beirut*, in: *Geschichte und Gesellschaft* 41 (2015), p. 649–684.
- 9 See e.g. (Princeton Near Eastern Studies chair) Cuyler Young to (AUB history professor) Constantin Zurayq, Princeton, January 24, 1957, Folder 2, Box 8, Group AC164, Seeley Mudd Manuscript Library, Princeton University (SMML/PU); Young to (senior Iran Plan Organization member) Khodadad Farmanfarmaian, Princeton, September 17, 1962, Folder 6, Box 4, Group AC164, SMML/PU.
- 10 J.-P. Ghobrial, *The Secret Life of Elias of Babylon and the Uses of Global Microhistory*, in: *Past&Present* 222 (2014), p. 51–93.