Karl Mannheim and the Legacy of Max Weber

Retrieving a Research Programme

David Kettler
Colin Loader
Volker Meja

ASHGATE e-BOOK

KARL MANNHEIM AND THE LEGACY OF MAX WEBER

Rethinking Classical Sociology

Series Editor: David Chalcraft, University of Derby, UK

This series is designed to capture, reflect and promote the major changes that are occurring in the burgeoning field of classical sociology. The series publishes monographs, texts and reference volumes that critically engage with the established figures in classical sociology as well as encouraging examination of thinkers and texts from within the ever-widening canon of classical sociology. Engagement derives from theoretical and substantive advances within sociology and involves critical dialogue between contemporary and classical positions. The series reflects new interests and concerns including feminist perspectives, linguistic and cultural turns, the history of the discipline, the biographical and cultural milieux of texts, authors and interpreters, and the interfaces between the sociological imagination and other discourses including science, anthropology, history, theology and literature.

The series offers fresh readings and insights that will ensure the continued relevance of the classical sociological imagination in contemporary work and maintain the highest standards of scholarship and enquiry in this developing area of research.

Also in the series:

Science, Values and Politics in Max Weber's Methodology
Hans Henrik Bruun
ISBN 0 7546 4529 0

Crossing the Psycho-Social Divide
Freud, Weber, Adorno and Elias
George Cavalletto
ISBN 978 0 7546 4772 0

Vilfredo Pareto's Sociology
A Framework for Political Psychology
Alasdair J. Marshall
ISBN 978 0 7546 4978 6

For more information on this series, please visit www.ashgate.com

Karl Mannheim and the Legacy of Max Weber

Retrieving a Research Programme

DAVID KETTLER
Bard College, USA

COLIN LOADER
University of Nevada, USA

VOLKER MEJA
Memorial University of Newfoundland, Canada

ASHGATE

© David Kettler, Colin Loader and Volker Meja 2008

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

David Kettler, Colin Loader and Volker Meja have asserted their moral right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the authors of this work.

Published by
Ashgate Publishing Limited
Gower House
Croft Road
Aldershot
Hampshire GU11 3HR
England

Ashgate Publishing Company
Suite 420
101 Cherry Street
Burlington, VT 05401-4405
USA

www.ashgate.com

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Kettler, David
Karl Mannheim and the legacy of Max Weber. - (Rethinking classical sociology)
1. Mannheim, Karl, 1893-1947 2. Weber, Max, 1864-1920 - Influence 3. Sociology - Research - Germany - History - 20th century
I. Title II. Loader, Colin, 1941- III. Meja, Volker
301'.072'043

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Kettler, David.
Karl Mannheim and the legacy of Max Weber : retrieving a research programme/ by David Kettler, Colin Loader and Volker Meja.
p. cm. -- (Rethinking classical sociology)
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-0-7546-7224-1 (hardcover) 1. Knowledge, Sociology of. 2. Mannheim, Karl, 1893-1947. 3. Marx, Karl, 1818-1883. I. Loader, Colin, 1941- II. Meja, Volker. III. Title.

HM651.K43 2008
301.092--dc22

2008030292

ISBN: 978-0-7546-7224-1

Mixed Sources
Product group from well-managed forests and other controlled sources
www.fsc.org Cert no. SA-COC-1565
© 1996 Forest Stewardship Council

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
MPG Books Ltd, Bodmin, Cornwall.

Contents

Series Editor's Preface *vii*
Preface *xi*
List of Abbreviations *xiii*
About the Authors *xv*

Introduction 1

1 The Challenging Context 9

2 Time and Place 23

3 The Social Structure of Advancement: Education for Life in the Economy 33

4 The "Intensive Study Group" Around Karl Mannheim 57

5 Norbert Elias and the Sociology of External Forms 75

6 Hans Gerth and Hans Weil: The Genealogy of the Liberal *Bildungselite* 85

7 Käthe Truhel and the Idea of a Social Bureaucracy 101

8 Natalie Halperin and Margarete Freudenthal: The Genealogy of Women's Movements 117

9 Jacob Katz: Sociology of the Stranger I 131

10 Nina Rubinstein: Sociology of the Stranger II 141

11 Individual Projects and Orphans 153

12 The Unfinished Business Between Karl Mannheim and Max Weber 187

Bibliography *197*
Index *207*

This page intentionally left blank

Series Editor's Preface

With Karl Mannheim (1893–1947) we encounter a different generation of 'classical sociologists' to those normally associated with the epithet. When thinking sociologically with the help of Comte (1798–1857), Tocqueville (1805–1859), Spencer (1820–1903), Marx (1818–1883), Pareto (1848–1923), Durkheim (1858–1917), Simmel (1858–1918) or Weber (1864–1920), or, for that matter, with Charlotte Perkins Gilman (1860–1935) or Jane Addams (1860–1935) or Dubois (1868–1963), there is a feeling that we are dealing direct with classical sociology. From the previous list it would be important to distinguish between generations and it is important to acknowledge that each of these thinkers might well point to other traditions and thinkers as significant for their own development; yet there is a sense that these figures are from periods when sociology emerges in earnest and one can almost approach their work, within intellectual history, *in media res*.

Since we feel we are dealing direct with classical sociology our hermeneutical tools are sharpened to acknowledge the historical, linguistic and cultural distances that separate us from their lives and works. In contrast, perhaps when dealing with Horkheimer (1895–1973), Parsons (1902–1979), Adorno (1903–1969), Homans (1910–1989) or C.W. Mills (1916–1962) there is more a sense of continuity with the past even though that continuity recedes year on year, especially as these names fall away from the ken of syllabi and discussion. The hermeneutical task in appreciating these classics is compounded by the fact that their own receptions of the 'first generations' of classical sociologists is a topic of concern as much as understanding their own work in the history of sociology. Indeed, often the history of sociology owes to them the classical legacy that their work ensured was passed on. The Russian doll that is the theoretical tradition in sociology, especially one that seeks to still comprehend its relation to the classical sociologists and their varying accounts of the rise, nature and possible futures of modernity, is of larger size when we consider the theoretical work of contemporary social theorists such as Habermas or more latterly, Jeffrey Alexander, Tony Giddens, Ulrich Beck or John Urry. Yet central aspects of the hermeneutical task are shared nonetheless—whilst their historical and social experiences may feel more familiar and their national traditions less diverse than might be the case with an Adorno or Homans the layered texture of their theorising *vis-à-vis* classical and contemporary sociological writing is more dense. In contrast, the earlier generation's layering of influences and debates might well be less dense, but their historical experiences feel more remote. Given that many of the figures who were writing prolifically in the 1930s and 1940s had their lives and careers disrupted by the rise of National Socialism (and prior to this for some by the 'Red Revolutions' in the aftermath of the Great War) and the voluntary and enforced migrations thereby occasioned,

the historical and political settings of social thought press themselves upon the contemporary interpreter, demanding to be factors to be included in understanding the production of sociological knowledge. This is especially the case with regard to Mannheim as his career moves from Hungary to Germany to England and the London School of Economics.

This volume *Retrieving a Research Programme: Karl Mannheim and the Legacy of Max Weber*, by David Kettler, Colin Loader and Volker Meja, is the second one in our series to move beyond the first generations of classical thinkers; George Cavelletto's very well received *Crossing the Psycho-Social Divide* included analysis of the work of Adorno and Elias in addition to the legacies of Freud and Weber. We have already published fine volumes on rethinking the classical legacies of Marx, Weber, Durkheim and Pareto. Looking at more contemporary 'classical' figures raises, as I have intimated, related but different issues.

With Mannheim (1893–1947), the figures and texts of Marx, Weber, Durkheim, Simmel, Lukacs (1885–1971) and others, were certainly influential intellectual forebears if not yet 'classics'. When engaging with Mannheim and classical sociology, the interpreter needs to deal then not only with placing Mannheim into his political, social, intellectual and cultural context but understanding how those contexts impacted on his reading of the 'classics' and his formulation of the nature and task of sociology. For sure, Mannheim does not have the status of a thinker with whom one must engage as a stage on the journey to encounter the classics more or less at 'first hand'. Yet sociology is not a discipline whose insights cumulate with each generation so that it can be accepted that each figure in the tradition functions as a filter for what in the 'founders' is considered valuable for sociology and transcends time and place, on the one hand, and, on the other, pointing out the limitations at source. There are clearly limits to writing a history of classical sociology on the basis of the chronological dates of birth and death of individual sociologists. Yet Mannheim himself reminds us of the importance of generations for the nature, content and dissemination of knowledge. Just as there are a variety of traditions and routes by which the present day social theorist might arrive at the door of the 'founding classics', so too with the next generation of writers, whether that be Mannheim, Talcott Parsons or Robert Merton for example.

In previous times the route to Karl Mannheim's thought was perhaps far more immediate and clear to sociologists than it is perhaps today. This appears to be a shame, if true, since Mannheim's concerns with the affinities between social group location and ideologies, the role of the intellectual and the expert in civic debate about the future of society and so on, are hardly of arcane interest. For example, when *Ideology and Utopia* had recently appeared, Mannheim instantly drew attention and commentary in surveys of the discipline, and, of course, in relation to the apparently new sub-field of the sociology of knowledge. One example of the latter is Becker and Barnes' *Social Thought from Lore to Science*, originally published in 1938. In the mid-1960s, many readers would be reminded of Mannheim since Berger and Luckmann devoted required space to his ideas in the development of their own sociology of knowledge, in their contemporary classic *The Social Construction*

of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge (1966)—although the very success of their work placed Mannheim into the shadows somewhat. Prior to this, Robert Merton had already underlined in 1941 that Mannheim needed to be taken into account in considerations of the sociology of knowledge, of ideology and of science (the essay is reprinted in Merton's classic collection: *Social Theory and Social Structure*). Whilst Timothy Raison's influential (in England at least) *The Founding Fathers of Social Science* (1969) included an important portrait of Mannheim (by Jean Floud), as did Coser in his *Masters of Sociological Thought* (1971), it is only in a text like the recent *Fifty Key Sociologists: the Formative Theorists* (2007) amongst a host of other published Readers and introductory texts that Mannheim will be found discussed. Part of the reason for this, no doubt, is that the latter work is very wide in its coverage of 'founders'. The vagaries of reception and exegesis, and the shifting intellectual and political priorities of sociologists as they react to contemporary events and intellectual fashions, are not without impact on the legacy and reputation of founders and other classics.

It is of course significant that the essay in John Scott's (ed.) *Fifty Key Sociologists* was co-authored by Kettler and Meja. Whilst many of us may have been looking at the history of sociological thought with a clouded lens, the authors of this volume have, for many years now, been viewing Mannheim's writing, teaching and legacy with a clear and focused vision. Readers of *Retrieving a Research Programme* can benefit from this long concentration on the Mannheim legacy. The manner in which the thought of classical sociologists comes down to a present generation of scholars is often the chance interaction of a range of factors. These factors include institutional settings and whether a classical thinker was able to have direct influence on colleagues or students; the history of the publication (and more often the circumstances and nature of the production and transmission of translations) and selections from their work, the standing and specifics of interpretation proffered by figures that act as a bridge or conduit for the work of the classical authors and so on. The work of Mannheim and its promise for contemporary sociological work and practice has benefited enormously from the labours, singly and jointly, of the authors of *Karl Mannheim and the Legacy of Max Weber*. The work has included in addition to exegesis and commentary, the important task of editing, introducing and publishing Mannheim's sociology.

Karl Mannheim and the Legacy of Max Weber is an important example of how one might revisit a classical legacy or 'rethink' a classical sociologist and their work. Whilst there is obvious dividend with engaging with Mannheim in terms of those aspects of his legacy that have become synonymous with his name, Kettler, Loader and Meja direct their attention to a specific period in Mannheim's career: at Frankfurt from 1930 to 1933. In other words, this volume is not a re-reading in the light of contemporary concerns or theoretical advances of Mannheim's standards texts. Also, without gainsaying either the benefits to be gained from, or the hermeneutical complexities involved in, understanding Weber (or any other classic author) through Mannheim, *Karl Mannheim and the Legacy of Max Weber* takes the 'Russian doll' apart in such a way that the classical tradition that

Mannheim inherits and wrestles with emerges through the practicalities of the research programme he was developing: in much the same fashion as the authors expect Mannheim's legacy to emerge through similar practical concerns. The authors' aim to reconstruct the research programme that Mannheim promoted during this relatively short period whilst at Frankfurt. Understanding the history of sociology and rethinking the classical traditions of sociology, it clearly emerges, is not only about exegetical work, but also includes biography, milieu analysis and the workings of research groups and centres (with their individual personalities, biographies and relationships) within and without formal academic institutions. If the legacy of Merton and Lazarsfeld is closely intertwined with the Bureau for Applied Social Research at Columbia, the legacy of Mannheim too, albeit on a much more modest scale given the rise of National Socialism, is also intertwined with the work of colleagues and students at Frankfurt. This Mannheim research programme is contextualised by Kettler, Loader and Meja through the highlighting of relevant Mannheim texts. In addition to this analysis, a series of fascinating studies of those colleagues and students that collaborated with Mannheim in various ways is provided, and this forms the bulk of the volume. These figures include, Norbert Elias, Hans Gerth, Hans Weil, Käthe Truhel, Natalie Halperin, Margarete Freudenthal, Jacob Katz and Nina Rubinstein. It is this research programme that forms, if one will, the body of work that can be examined in the light of contemporary concerns. It is this research programme that, the authors argue, can be beneficial to keep in mind and think with when producing contemporary theoretical and empirical work within the traditions of Mannheim and Weber.

Professor David J. Chalcraft
Cumbria, June 2008

Preface

The authors of the present volume have thought and written about Karl Mannheim for many years. The earliest publication on the subject by the oldest among us appeared in 1964. Our only excuse is the hope that we have contributed during these years not only to getting this representative twentieth-century figure right but also to Mannheim's subjects, which have never ceased to be of interest and importance to an interdisciplinary scholarly public. In these respects, we believe, there are always new openings to learn about, to pursue and to point out.

We have written individually on Mannheim in the past, as well as in several combinations of authors; and we have sought in the present project, quite in the spirit of Karl Mannheim, to find seamless ways of cooperating that nevertheless do not require us to agree on all things. A historian, a sociologist, and a political scientist, we also have our origins in different academic disciplines. Our subject permits us to put our differences aside while we jointly explore a dimension of Mannheim's legacy that was designed precisely to make such common work possible.

Inevitably, the book draws on our past writings in this field, but it is especially indebted to the following earlier publications, whose separate findings and analyses are expressly brought together here within a unified interdisciplinary matrix: David Kettler and Volker Meja, "Their own 'peculiar way': Karl Mannheim and the Rise of Women," *International Sociology* 8 (March, 1993), 5–55; David Kettler, "Self-Knowledge and Sociology: Nina Rubinstein's Studies in Exile," in Edward Timms and Jon Hughes, eds., *Intellectual Migration and Cultural Transformation* (Wien and New York: Springer, 2003), 195–206; David Kettler and Volker Meja, "Karl Mannheim's Jewish Question. History, Sociology, and the Epistemics of Reflexivity," in: *Simon Dubnow Institute Yearbook* 3 (2004), 325–347; David Kettler and Colin Loader, "Temporizing with Time Wars: Karl Mannheim and Problems of Historical Time," *Time and Society*, 13 (2004), 155–172; David Kettler and Volker Meja, "Karl Mannheim in America: The Loyalty of Kurt H. Wolff," in Gary Backhaus and George Psathas (eds), *The Sociology of Radical Commitment: Kurt H. Wolff's Existential Turn* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 2006); David Kettler, "Women and the State: Käthe Truhel and the Idea of a Social Bureaucracy," *History of the Human Sciences*, vol. 20, No. 1 (2007), 19–44.

Our research has been supported at various times by our respective home institutions: Bard College, Memorial University of Newfoundland, and the University of Nevada at Las Vegas, for which we are grateful. David Kettler and Volker Meja are indebted to the Simon Dubnow Institute in Leipzig, Germany for a productive and congenial month as visiting fellows in 2003.

This page intentionally left blank

List of Abbreviations

AA	Authors' Archives
CUL	Oscar Jászi Papers, Columbia University Library, Rare Books and Manuscript Library, New York City.
HSP	Hans Speier Papers 1922–1989 (GER–084), German and Jewish Intellectual Émigré Collection, M.E. Grenander Department of Special Collections and Archives, State University of New York at Albany, N.Y.
KMP	Karl Mannheim Papers, University of Keele Library, Keele, Staffordshire
LWP	Louis Wirth Papers, Regenstein Library, University of Chicago
RF	The Rockefeller Foundation Archives, Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, N.Y.
NR	Nina Rubinstein Nachlass, Archiv für die Geschichte der Soziologie in Österreich, Institut für Soziologie, Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz
NRI	Rubinstein-Kettler-Papanek Discussions, Nina Rubinstein Nachlass, Archiv für die Geschichte der Soziologie in Österreich, Institut für Soziologie, Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz
SAK	Kurt H. Wolff Nachlass, Sozialwissenschaftliches Archiv, Universität Konstanz

This page intentionally left blank

About the Authors

David Kettler is Research Professor at Bard College (New York) and Professor Emeritus in Political Studies and Cultural Studies at Trent University (Ontario). Recent book publications include *Karl Mannheim and the Crisis of Liberalism* (coauthored with Volker Meja) (Transaction, 1995), *Domestic Regimes, the Rule of Law, and Democratic Social Change* (Galda + Wilch, 2001), *Adam Ferguson: Social and Political Thought* (Transaction, 2004) and *Karl Mannheim's Sociology as Political Education* (coauthored with Colin Loader) (Transaction, 2002), as well as four edited volumes arising out of the "Contested Legacies" project: *Contested Legacies: The German-speaking Intellectual and Cultural Emigration to the United States and United Kingdom, 1933–45* (Galda +Wilch, 2002), *Political Theory and the Hitler Regime* (special issue of European Journal of Political Theory) (coedited with Tom Wheatland), *Exile, Science and Bildung: The Contested Legacies of German Intellectual Emigres* (co-edited with Gerhard Lauer) (Palgrave-Macmillan, 2005), and *Limits of Exile* (co-edited with Zvi Ben-Dor) (Special Issue of the *Journal of the Interdisciplinary Crossroads*, 2006).

Colin Loader is Professor of History at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. He is the author of *The Intellectual Development of Karl Mannheim* (Cambridge University Press, 1985, and, with D. Kettler, *Karl Mannheim's Sociology as Political Education* (Transaction, 2002). He and Kettler also edited a collection of Mannheim's writings, *Sociology as Political Education* (Transaction, 2001). He has also written on Max and Alfred Weber, as well as Werner Sombart.

Volker Meja studied sociology, economics, and philosophy at the University of Frankfurt and at Brandeis University. He is Professor Emeritus of Sociology at the Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Canada. With D. Kettler and N. Stehr he is author of *Karl Mannheim* (Ellis Horwood and Methuen, 1984) and *Politisches Wissen* (Suhrkamp, 1987), and with D. Kettler of *Karl Mannheim and the Crisis of Liberalism* (Transaction, 1995). His other (co)publications include *Der Streit um die Wissenssoziologie* (Suhrkamp, l982), *Modern German Sociology* (Columbia University Press, 1987), *Knowledge and Politics* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, l990), *The Sociology of Knowledge* (Edward Elgar, 1999), and *Society and Knowledge: Contemporary Perspectives on the Sociology of Knowledge and Science* (Transaction Publishers, 2005). He is also editor, with D. Kettler and N. Stehr, of the previously unpublished German writings of Karl Mannheim, published in English as *Structures of Thinking* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1982) and *Conservatism* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986).

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

Karl Mannheim would not have been surprised by the fact that his reputation in sociology has fluctuated during the sixty years since his death, and that different aspects of his work have been variously recognized or consigned to history by later generations. The study of changing and differing perspectives on knowledge was after all his lifelong preoccupation. Insofar as his work has been scrutinized only in terms of his grandest theoretical ambitions—the hope that sociology of knowledge could be an organon for overcoming ideological constraints on knowledge and for grounding a science of politics, or the aspiration towards a diagnosis of post-liberal society with therapeutic effects, based on a new mode of rationality—the question of Karl Mannheim largely belongs to the past. In recent years, however, with the maturation of a generation of scholars who have not been party to the earlier, rather one-sided grand debates, there have been modest receptions of Mannheim as exciting innovator and fruitful discussion partner in more limited fields of inquiry, from the sociology of generations to the sociology of artistic productions. These welcome uses of Mannheim's work have to make their way in scientific discussions without claims to authority from any master or school. They make use of texts in the usual way of scholarship by extracting ideas or methods or findings and by attempting to make them good as resources for their work.

Our present undertaking is different, although its aim is to support this work. In order to expand the scope of Mannheim's usable legacy, we shall apply some selected studies of texts by Mannheim to the reconstruction of the promising and surprisingly productive research programme that he was only barely able to initiate among collaborators—mostly doctoral candidates—during his brief term in Frankfurt between 1930 and 1933. There was never a Mannheim School, but there was a Mannheim research group, whose members include several who became well-known indeed, as well as others whose promise was destroyed by the years of National Socialist rule—whether at home or in exile. Although their work has been catalogued and briefly characterized in earlier treatments, it has never been taken together as mutually complementary products of a research paradigm whose interest derives as much from adaptations of Max Weber as from practical translations of Mannheim's designs, and whose accomplishment deserves to be assessed as a whole—and made available for present-day adaptations.

Some academic generations ago, it made good sense to open a plea for a reconsideration of Karl Mannheim's sociology of knowledge by rejecting the tendency to treat him as a muddled if admirable precursor of an inquiry that had to be completely recast to satisfy the then current standards of social-scientific rigor (Kettler 1967). The need then was to propose ways of comprehending and

legitimating modes of social theory that served critical reflection without being constrained by the norms of theory formation variously imported from economics and psychology. In addition to resources derived from philosophy, there was help to be found in traditions of political theory, as well as influential currents of discursively grounded public philosophies, subject to dialectical appreciation and assessment. The polarized state of academic debate was an obstacle to the more balanced proceedings which are open today, where recognition is given to many more models of theory-formation and where the relations between empirical inquiries—including the kinds of inquiries earlier absolutized—and the reality-testing of theories have become more subtle. As for Karl Mannheim, moreover, his life's work is no longer cast in stone as obsolete relic or classical monument but malleably subject to fresh interrogation, negotiation, and adaptation. It is even possible to distinguish for the sake of argument, as he did himself, between his philosophically charged, rather personal theoretical enterprise and a more nearly collaborative research programme of investigations into empirical social relations, which he sponsored and led, using the most widely accessible methods for testing the kinds of claims that such a programme entails. The latter is the prime subject of our present study.

A central feature of Karl Mannheim's analysis of modern intellectuals is the recognition of their versatility. They have the capacity, he maintains, of orienting to multiple social constituencies and mediating diverse expectations and outlooks. Applied to Mannheim himself, this insight illuminates his multifaceted legacy. In addition to a long line of academic studies that addresses him strictly within the frame of reference of sociology of knowledge as a contested subfield of academic sociology, there have been several divergent receptions in the past generation, first, of his achievements as pioneer experimenter in reflexive sociology, oriented to a public of literary intellectuals, and second, of his efforts in political education, constituted by his exchanges with wider educated publics and elites. Insufficiently attended to by these important receptions to which the present authors have contributed (Loader 1985; Kettler and Meja 1995; Loader and Kettler 2002), is the aspect of Mannheim's work that had Max Weber's social-scientific prospectus as paradigm and that formed an essential element in his interaction with the most admired substantive sociological studies of his time. This more nearly technical work shaped his relations with his advanced students, legitimated his standing in the wider emerging international profession, and enacted his genuine curiosity about the resourcefulness of empirical sociology as a practice.

The present study seeks to explore this "empirical" aspect of Mannheim's project, with special attention to its first and especially creative constituency, the regrettably small group of postgraduate students whose doctoral researches were given their direction by him during the few years between his appointment at Frankfurt in 1930 and his dismissal in the Nazi purge in 1933. Contrary to the view that Mannheim's sociology was a strictly individual performance, essentially limited to his suggestive and widely read but idiosyncratic *Ideology and Utopia*, and lacking the capacity of initiating a sociological research programme, we shall

argue that several of his less well-known papers, as well as the researches of his students show that he did develop a model and strategy of research that was not narrowly constrained within his distinctive metasociological convictions.

The book consists of an introduction and twelve chapters. In the first three chapters we examine the textual and contextual setting for Mannheim's empirical model, with recurrent emphasis on his relationship to the Weber brothers, Alfred and Max, especially the latter. While Alfred Weber had served as Mannheim's mentor and patron during his years as candidate and Privatdozent at Heidelberg, it was Max Weber's work that became ever more important to Mannheim as a point of reference for his own project. We show the complex interweaving between Mannheim and Max Weber, first, in connection with *Ideology and Utopia*, which also permits a brief look back at our earlier emphases on the interpretive side of Mannheim. Second, then, we examine Mannheim's treatment of time as a constituent of sociological formations, which he considered to be the issue that most clearly showed his effort to advance loyally beyond Max Weber. We conclude this section with, third, a close reading of what we consider an important entry point into Mannheim's empirical sociology, his 1930 "contribution to the sociology of economics," whose German title is best translated as "On the Nature and Significance of the Striving for Economic Success. A Contribution to Economic Sociology."[1] This essay is Mannheim's most sustained attempt to make sociological use of Max Weber's *Economy and Society*, a book that is much less a theoretical treatise than a guide for empirical research. Mannheim's empirical designs, we attempt to show, however much informed by his years with Alfred Weber, emerge above all out of his negotiations with the work of Max Weber.

In the eight following chapters we examine the work of a research group around Mannheim, including a number of dissertations but also two important studies by individuals who were further advanced in their studies than the postgraduate students. As will be shown, the parameters of Mannheim's research programme were broad enough to permit independent initiatives by the collaborators, given a certain commonality in style and a substantial measure of intercommunication among the researchers. There was no Mannheim "school," but there is an important and promising body of work that centers on his version of the Weberian model.

In the final chapter we briefly consider the sequel to the Frankfurt years, in Mannheim's efforts in exile to reconstitute a research group, all of which failed, notwithstanding his professional success in other respects, as well as in the subsequent careers of selected members of the group, where these were not simply aborted by domestic oppression or distraction in exile. The aim of the book is intended to be constructive and contributory to fresh work in sociology, but no

---

1 The title in the posthumous English translation is revised, presumably in order to underline its connection to Mannheim's later interests and reads "On the Nature of Economic Ambition and its Significance for the Social Education of Man" (Mannheim [1930] 1970 [1952]). When three dates appear in the citation, our ordering is as follows: the [original publication], the more recent German edition, the [English translation].

treatment of this generation can simply neglect the historical dimensions of the epoch from which we seek to learn.

Mannheim's Interpretive Hopes and Empirical Projects

To begin by bridging the gap between our earlier and present findings, we preface our new departure with a quick review of the hardest example, where the interpretive, philosophical and empirical strands are most closely interwoven; we begin with a review of Mannheim's best-known project, seminally expressed in *Ideology and Utopia*, a work whose centrality for its time is indicated by the quality of reviewers from the author's generation—including Max Horkheimer, Herbert Marcuse, Hannah Arendt—and whose subsequent reception in English translation made it an academic standard.

We thus turn, first, to the interpretive dimension. As a writer for a broader public, and even more as a teacher, Mannheim believed that one had to speak directly to actual experiences, that it was pointless to offer answers to questions that people have not been led by their lives to ask or recognize. With his sociology of knowledge, Mannheim hoped to clarify—and to help overcome—at least three kinds of troubling experiences, all of which are as common today as they were in his time. The first experience takes the form of a discrepancy between one's own situation, as lived subjectively in mind and body, and the supposedly objective "meaning" ascribed to it by the publicly recognized and officially sanctioned ways of talking about things. Mannheim cites the cases of women and young people: there is an accepted definition of what it means to be a woman or to be a youth, but women and youth cannot apply those meanings to make sense of what is happening to them, what they are doing and what they are feeling. The existence of a generally accepted objective construction of meanings—often called "worldview"—caught Mannheim's attention early on, instructed by some of the intellectual mentors of his younger years, notably the sociologist, Georg Simmel, and the literary and social theorist, Georg Lukács. While other sociologists are more likely to emphasize the extent to which such socially constituted constructions of reality shape and define our experiences, Mannheim focuses on the experience of discrepancies between the "objective" and the "subjective," which his own mentors variously saw as a source of profound and irremediable dissatisfaction (Simmel's "tragedy of culture") or as a potential source of crisis and revolutionary overturn (Lukács's theory of "alienation"). For Mannheim, the awareness of such discrepancies was rather the opening and point of departure for an activity of learning, which he believed to have constructive possibilities, if it is not prematurely closed.

The second of the troubling experiences qualifies and to some extent undermines the first, in that one is often confronted with conflicting ways of assigning "meanings." There may be no single "publicly recognized or officially sanctioned way." And these multiple ways may be mutually incomprehensible, so that one group may not even understand what another group means. They "talk past each

other." Mannheim emphasizes such contested concepts as religion, superstition, science, education, but also such fundamental philosophical categories as time and space. After Mannheim came to Germany in 1919, exiling himself from the harsh rightist regime of his native Hungary, and as he reflected on the pervasive intellectual, political and social conflict of postwar central Europe, he concluded that most sectors of modern societies are characterized by a competition among incompatible models of meaning, not by a single integrated worldview.

To designate these multiple constructions, he borrows and revises the concept of ideology from Marxist theory. From Marxism, too, Mannheim adapts the notion that ideologies have to be understood as a "function" of some distinctive social location, that there is a "correspondence" between occupying a certain position in society and interpreting the world in a certain way. Ideologies are socially grounded; they are "imputable" to a given social site. Mannheim avoids a causal vocabulary; he does not claim that all individuals sharing a social location profess the same ideology. Yet he is confident that a "fit" can be demonstrated and that the ideology can only be elucidated by reference to that experiential grounding.

Mannheim's adaptation differs from the Marxist theory in two important respects. First, he identifies some social locations other than economic class position as possible grounds of ideologies. His prime examples in *Ideology and Utopia* are the bureaucracy—highlighted by Max Weber's studies—to which he imputes a special kind of "bureaucratic conservatism," as well as, within the strategic formation of "the intellectuals," a deracinated segment that serves as social reference point for an understanding of fascist ideology. Generational and gender differences also enter as important sources for modifications or adaptations of ideological structures. As these examples suggest, Mannheim saw the primary ideologies competing in his time as taking the form of political ideologies, and he designated them by the names of prominent political tendencies and parties: socialism, liberalism, conservatism—and, as noted, bureaucratic conservatism and fascism.

In explaining the linkages between social locations and ideologies, Mannheim expressly avoids the notion that groups only talk about the world in a certain way because this promotes their economic interests. He acknowledges that this often happens, but he does not consider it to be the ultimate account of ideology. The rise of interest to prime category must itself be accounted for. He explores instead the metaphorical language of "perspective" and "standpoint." Things simply look different when one is operating from different locations. Their respective socially grounded interpretations enable groups to orient themselves to the activities and problems peculiar to their location in social space and time, including their struggles for power. Ideologies make sense of the world they encounter.

Second, Mannheim differs from Marxism in rejecting the central Marxist claim, especially prominent in the version of Marxism brilliantly elaborated by his former mentor, Georg Lukács, that a class may be ordained by history with a privileged point of view, because it is destined to shape the next stage in history. Not rarely, Marxists apply the label "ideology" only to the views of their opponents

and the term "science" to their own. Mannheim expressly asserts that Marxism is as much an ideology as the "liberalism" of the bourgeoisie or the "conservatism" of the older dominant social groups hostile to modernity.

The most serious of the "troubling experiences" mentioned above presupposes the other two. On the German political scene of the 1920s, Mannheim diagnosed a crisis of universal distrust. All political parties claimed that they could see through the arguments of all the others as nothing but the self-interested point of view of some class or social grouping, "ideology" in the vulgar sense. Under these conditions, Mannheim concludes, there is no productive competition among ideologies. No one can persuade anyone of anything; they cannot even negotiate. And the fascists, Mannheim observed at the time, were the most thoroughgoing advocates of the proposition that there was nothing to reason or to bargain about in politics, that the only thing was to have an ideology that could win. "Ideology" and violence, in this view, are part of the same equation.

For Mannheim, in contrast, ideology is a partial but invaluable mode of knowing. Sociology of knowledge is a form of holistic "therapy." It is a strategy for having available social knowledge take a form that promotes the reasonable management of human affairs. Implicit is the possibility of achieving a "synthesis," which involves a "total" vision, bringing together in a multidimensional whole the things that the various ideological perspectives are best situated to see. Socialists can see the mechanisms of economic exploitation, for example, while liberals can see the dangers of oppressive state power. A "synthesis" of perspectives would not eliminate all conflicts among groups, but it could provide a common reference point for calculating the costs and benefits of different alternatives, and a reference point as well for bargaining and deal-making. There would be new opportunities for responsible choices within a constitutional order of democratic competition, a culminating point of the analysis that reveals Mannheim as a successor to Max Weber in political thought.

How can such a "synthesis" come about if all perspectives are partial? Mannheim's famous answer is that modern societies include a stratum of social actors who are in important ways relatively "detached" from the social ground: the "intellectuals." This formation, leaving aside the demoralized segment associated with fascism, is recruited from diverse social locations and engages in activities—notably of an intellectual kind—that keep its members from identifying completely with the groups and standpoints of their origins. Their formative experience of intense and advanced education—or, in rare cases, its autodidactic equivalent—, as well as their learned capacity for analysis and mutual exchange, permit them to gain a "distance" from the ideologies at home in one or another primary social location. They can acquire insight into ideology without the bitterness or frustration that accompanies the dismissive versions of that insight, which is typical of the political groups caught up in the "crisis of distrust." As the intellectuals-turned-sociologists develop and refine the sociology of knowledge, then, they can promote "synthesis" and help to overcome the "crisis," not by presuming to take command (as fascists do) but by a combination of two things. First, they act as catalysts in

the political process, offering interpretations that cool temperatures and promote bargaining. And second, they bring "political education" to the newly enfranchised democratic "masses," to counteract fanaticism and to infuse the people with a recognition that there are no saviors or saving visions, echoing Weber, as well as a sense of their own responsibility.

The debate about *Ideology and Utopia* ([1929] 1969 [1968]), where these arguments were seminally laid out, was mainly philosophical and political, with the focus, first, on Mannheim's hope of overcoming both ideology and political distrust through sociology of knowledge; second, on his conception of the intelligentsia as the social stratum uniquely equipped and even destined for this task; and third, on his activist conception of sociological knowledge, its inherent mediation, as a mode of public consciousness raising, between theory and practice (Meja and Stehr 1982; Meja and Stehr 1990). Almost all commentators recognized the special importance of Mannheim's essay in *Ideology and Utopia*, "Is Politics as Science Possible (The Problem of Theory and Practice) [*Ist Politik als Wissenschaft möglich? (Das Problem der Theorie und Praxis*)]." (Mannheim [1929] 1969 [1968], 95 [97]) In it Mannheim argues that the comprehensive social knowledge capable of diagnosing the historical situation and grounding a scientific politics is generated by social interpretation of the clashing ideologies rending the political terrain. There are good reasons for believing this chapter to represent one of the essays in Mannheim's unfinished effort to balance his complex accounts with Max Weber, expressing his most ambitious interpretative hopes of moving beyond Weber's "disillusioned realism."

In his lecture on "Science as a Vocation" (M. Weber [1919a] 1946), Max Weber distinguishes between words in politics and in science, likening the former to weapons for overpowering opponents and the latter to ploughshares for cultivating knowledge. Mannheim offers the sociology of knowledge as a way of bringing about the Biblical transformation of swords into pruning hooks prophesied by Isaiah. He claims that the sociology of knowledge constitutes the "organon for politics as a science." It provides an instrument for operating on the ideological views active in politics so as to give them a new character, constituting a field of knowledge with a structure appropriate to this dimension of reality and to the work that knowing performs in it. Although Mannheim nominally defers to Weber's conception of politics as a sphere governed by choices no knowledge can dictate, his conception of the political involvement implicit in gaining insight into political situations here shifts the meaning of the Weberian formulas he invokes. Mannheim credits Weber with uncovering that the Marxist method for exposing the social provenance and function of political ideas applies no less to the proletarian view of the world. But rendered nonpartisan, the method can now reveal its constructive powers. While the disillusioning discoveries of the earlier generation have to be preserved, they gain new positive functions. When Weber quotes Isaiah's admonition to watchmen in the night, he intends to reproach those who wait in vain for prophets of salvation instead of soberly meeting the demands of the day. Mannheim uses the same passage to call intellectuals to a mission

of guardianship (Weber [1919a] 1946, 156; Mannheim [1929] 1969 [1968], 140 [143]). These high hopes of 1929 could not be sustained.

Mannheim's proposals were widely canvassed in the leading periodical reviews and subjected to intense criticism, but his reading of the intellectual situation was almost universally applauded. In the cultivated Weimar public for political-literary topics, as among the participants in what has been labeled the 'Weimar conversation' about the situation of social thought after Nietzsche and Marx, *Ideology and Utopia* figured as the representative book of its time, whether as symptom of cultural crisis or as promise of a way out. While Mannheim never disavowed his distinctive "political" sociology, he nevertheless devoted the remaining years in Germany almost wholly to themes closer to the agenda of sociology as an emerging profession. In brief, he shifted his emphasis from the interpretive to the empirical dimension, and this put him in contact and competition with a different side of Max Weber.

Chapter 1

The Challenging Context

Robert K. Merton has observed that Mannheim's metasociological speculations about the contributions that sociology of knowledge can make to therapeutic political knowledge amount to little more than an awkward way of highlighting the value relevance of his undertakings, whatever he may have proposed in his more speculative flights (Merton [1937] 1968). For the purposes of our present study, we can almost accept this skeptical emendation, precisely because Mannheim himself treated his metasociological theories as experiments, which were not required in order to comprehend his primary sociological practice. Merton has suggested how this could be done with regard to the sociology of knowledge exercises by extracting empirical research issues from the interpretive framing that Mannheim provides (Merton [1941] 1968). The dual levels of analysis proposed by Merton's approach to Mannheim are no less applicable to the work of Max Weber, especially as he framed it in his last years in the famous "vocation" essays, which situate his sociological inquiries within debates about meanings and value choices (compare Kettler and Meja 1996). While Mannheim's research programme certainly owes a debt to Alfred Weber, the most influential sponsor of Mannheim's habilitation at Heidelberg, it is oriented more strongly to an intergenerational competition with the older brother, Max Weber, whose successor he aspired to be and whose work he studied especially closely for a number of years, as he attempted to write a major study of him.

The dualism between the empirical and interpretive dimensions of Mannheim's work is manifest in his contrasting additions to the English-language edition, *Ideology and Utopia*. First, the volume includes an English translation of a systematic article on "Sociology of Knowledge" (Mannheim [1931] 1969 [1968]) that was Mannheim's contribution to a *Handbook of Sociology* edited in 1931 by the prominent German sociologist, Alfred Vierkandt, and intended to assist the transmutation of sociology from catch phrase to legitimate academic discipline. In that article, Mannheim clearly separates the programme of sociology of knowledge as a research method to comprehend the factual relations between knowledge and its social correlates from sociology of knowledge as a doctrine relevant to epistemological inquiries into the implications of such relations for philosophical theories about the grounds, structure, and scope of knowledge. This latter is the systematized and academically circumscribed version of Mannheim's much less formal metasociological speculations, notably in the essay on "Politics as a Science," about the political and pedagogical consequences of sociology of knowledge as an intervention in the contexts of public discourses. It is noteworthy that Mannheim here says expressly that it is possible to accept the more strictly

sociological project without taking part in the philosophical. In the second of Mannheim's additions to the original German text, however, an essay designed to speak to a wider, humanistically educated audience in England, such a division between the sociological study of factual relations and the philosophical study of epistemological implications is unimaginable. The sociology of knowledge project throughout appears as a kind of political intervention to render practical political orientation more effectual and clear-headed. In conclusion, Mannheim defends the "essayistic-experimental attitude," which perceives in contradictions the "points of departure from which the fundamentally discordant character of our present situation becomes for the first time really capable of diagnosis and investigation." (Mannheim [1936] 1968, 48) This essay in turn was written as a major qualification of the introduction by Mannheim's editor, Louis Wirth, who consistently treated Mannheim's sociology of knowledge as a purely social scientific exercise, along the lines of the strictly sociological account. A first approximation of Mannheim's thought, in short, has to tolerate both dimensions, especially with regard to sociology of knowledge in the narrower sense, but an inquirer into the sociological fruitfulness of his wider body of writing and teaching may well move through the essayistic to the more narrowly sociological, as almost all of Mannheim's actual students may be seen to have done, with his blessings.

During his five semesters as professor in Frankfurt, Mannheim in effect declined the role of public intellectual. He separated the professional aspects of his activities from his public reputation. Only one of the critics of *Ideologie und Utopie* received an answer, and then only a rather conventional and academic rejoinder to the charge of trespassing beyond the bounds of sociology. While he drew close to Paul Tillich and his circle of religious socialists in private discussions, his publications and organizational efforts concentrated on strengthening his legitimacy in the sociology chair. His classes attracted a large and comparatively diverse audience, including many women and men students with diverse but active political commitments. Mannheim's strategy in his courses was to build on the generalized popular "sociological" attitude he expected them to bring with them, but to argue the need for a move towards rigor in method and specificity in research work. Celebrated and embattled as an "intellectual," he defined himself ever more as a professional sociologist. According to Mannheim, sociologists are bound to be empirical in their methods in the sense that they must adduce communicable evidence beyond the logical coherence or aesthetic appeal of their theoretical models or the experience of intuitive certainties, but the methods are as likely to be historical or phenomenological as they are to be adaptation of the "American" methods that did indeed also fascinate Mannheim as a possible tool of investigation. His sociologists are empirical because they aspire to realism, but they are not empiricists. There is nothing resembling the epistemologically grounded inhibitions of earlier positivism or later logical positivism in his approach. Epistemology explains knowledge; it does not condition it. The use of empirical methods, of whatever kind, does not in itself limit the kinds of variables that may be adduced or the kinds of questions that may be asked (Mannheim

[1931-2] 2001; Kettler and Meja 2006). As noted earlier, Mannheim's 1931 article on sociology of knowledge in Vierkandt's *Handbook* was philosophically more cautious than *Ideologie und Utopie*, hiving off speculations about political or philosophical implications from problems of empirical inquiry. In 1932 he found himself providing a comprehensive guide to the "present tasks of sociology" for teachers (Mannheim 1932). While expanding the boundaries of the field to include contemporary political studies and cultural approaches that might have been left out by others, he took great care to respect the territorial rights of the major figures in the discipline and to avoid anything like his earlier polemics against positivism. Mannheim clearly did not want to become a man of one book, however brilliant his success with *Ideologie und Utopie* had been.

In emphasizing the work resulting from Mannheim's negotiations with a field for which Max Weber was a common point of reference and legitimation, the present study proposes an interpretation of Mannheim to complement other readings, not to compete with them. The present authors themselves have variously emphasized different perspectives on Mannheim's thought in their earlier writings. Loader has offered a comprehensive reading of Mannheim's work as a coherent sequence of methodological responses to problems of historical thought, while Kettler and Meja have made a case for an interactive focus on characteristic philosophical problems of progressive liberalism. Most recently, Loader and Kettler have situated Mannheim's work as Frankfurt professor —notably as undergraduate teacher—in the context of Weimar debates about *Bildung*, with special emphasis on the political education of a new democratic mass public. Now we are attuning ourselves to a different one of Mannheim's multiple voices, a voice that is much closer to the practices of "value-free" social science.

If this was indeed the case, we must inevitably address a prior question, couched in a formula that especially impressed a number of Mannheim's students: "who speaks?" In our study, we shall be focusing on a body of writings and other documentary evidence arising in Weimar Germany during the years between 1928 and 1933, and these were by no means years conducive to intellectual work *sine studio et ira*. The autumn of 1929 following the publication of *Ideology and Utopia* was a troubling one for the Weimar Republic. The U.S. crash on Wall Street triggered Germany's plunge into economic crisis. It created a split in the republican coalition, symptomatically on the subject of unemployment insurance, which resulted in parliamentary gridlock, throwing the government into the hands of a reactionary elite. The referendum on the Young Plan, one of a series of treaties with the Western victors in the war, marked the beginning of a continuous campaign against the republic by Adolf Hitler's National Socialist Party, leading to its seizure of power in a little over three years. How was it possible for Mannheim at just this time to initiate a research programme concentrated above all, as we shall see, on questions of social mobility amid social change? More fundamentally, was it not an act of blindness and civic irresponsibility to choose just this time to resolve the tension between the vocations of science and politics in this way, a way that is epitomized by Mannheim's remark to a potential student as late as January 1933

that he and the others in his "rather intensive study group…act as if we had a lot of time and could discuss the pros and cons of every matter", [Letter to G. Jászi, 16 January 1933, Oscar Jászi Papers, Columbia University Library, Rare Books and Manuscript Library (New York)] and, perhaps more shockingly, his determination, expressed to one of his students in April of that year to "remain at [his] post as a Prussian civil servant". (Rubinstein 2000, 83)

One answer to Mannheim's concise and searching question, "who speaks,"—itself perhaps a skeptical adaptation of Lenin's subversive "who whom?"—might be that "the German mandarin" speaks, ignorant about political conflict and hostile to it. However plausible, this answer would imply that the near consensus among just such "mandarins" against Mannheim as an excessively "political" figure and interloper had no basis. A more considered answer might be that Mannheim speaks for a deluded liberal (and Jewish) *Bildungsbürgertum* that could not abandon its faith in reason and progress. The comparatively reflective form of such a critical retrospective in the 1960s by Norbert Elias (Elias 1990), who was himself always loyal to the ideal of "distantiation" that was instantiated by Mannheim's "intensive study group," in which he had himself played such an important part, is very different from the harsh mutual and self-denunciations of other Weimar academics and intellectuals in exile (Neumann in Perels [1954] 1984, 9–10), but its critique of excessive "rationalism" is nevertheless a simplification to be understood in some measure by the exigencies of exile thought.

It was not a sign of credulity or moral indifference to conclude that the only activity one was qualified and called upon to perform under conditions of crisis was to actualize the civil and humane possibilities of the institutions in crisis. For a "Prussian civil servant" in the university, this meant to render one's academic discipline supportive of political education for democratic understanding and responsibility (Loader and Kettler 2002). This required intensive inquiry into possibilities for deepening both the role of the civil servant—or bureaucrat—and the discipline itself, "performative" as well as reflective undertakings we will find prominent in the research programme to be examined below. It is analogous to the efforts of republican and socialist jurists in Weimar to render both constitutional and civil law congruent with the (social) democratic project without disqualifying themselves as working lawyers and legitimate participants in the profession. These were risky commitments, and the efforts were defeated, but the idea that there was some obvious alternative that was lightly cast aside has little support in the evidence of the times. If empirical research could not avert the German disaster, neither could a critical theory.

This is the context in which Mannheim began the research programme whose development was to be so harshly interrupted. To speak of a "research programme" in the social sciences, especially in the context of the heroic era of German sociology, is to extend a term from more differentiated and rationalized disciplines to a complex of practices constrained less by a common methodology and scientific focus, in the strictest sense of the words, than by a similar intellectual strategy and closely related aims. They share a catalogue of authorities and, even more, a set of intellectual

traditions that they reject. While these substantive circumscriptions provide some loose analytical supports for descriptive and comparative treatments of research programmes in this sense, the concept is more reliably characterized in terms of the social processes to which it refers. Above all these are negotiations among participants who extend recognition to one another as legitimate parties, and who bargain their way from one provisional common "platform" (to use Mannheim's term) to another. The process may originate in relations between a master and disciple, or teacher and student, but it differs from the constitution of a "school" precisely to the degree that these relations are open to reciprocal exchanges among the parties, and that entry and exit are constrained only to the extent that some participants may be conditionally dependent on rewards at the disposal of others. That there is mutual recognition and that the state of the platform at any given time is a function of a negotiated settlement does not mean that there are not disparities of power and authority among the parties. The critical points are, first, that the resistances that are a concomitant of all power relations are accepted as more or less legitimate—and perhaps in some way institutionalised, perhaps by the degree of autonomy conceded to participants, even where there are also dependencies—and, second, that the bargaining process is open to a dimension of metabargaining where the terms of recognition, legitimacy, and the determination of what counts as a offer or counter-offer are themselves subject to explicit or implicit renegotiation.[1]

This understanding of the social process constituting a research programme shows it to have important elements in common with the even less formal "intellectual circle," with the primary differences deriving from the location of the research programme within a disciplinary setting, where a distinct class of institutionalized criteria, however contested, define research and its products.[2] For Karl Mannheim, as a young man in Hungary, his primary intellectual orientation shifted quite early from the purely academic setting of his university programme to the self-enclosed habitus of the intellectual circle around Georg Lukács. A confluence of well-known developments destroyed this group process, and Mannheim, now in exile, searched for a new setting that he was prepared to recognize, asking for recognition in turn. After some instructive but failed attempts to find accommodation in the research programmes of several prominent philosophers, Mannheim found a home within the wide tolerances of Alfred Weber's research programme in cultural sociology. It was a restive affiliation, however, since Mannheim brought unfinished business with Lukács—both as post-Hegelian cultural critic and as Leninist revolutionary—as well as great and eventually unsettling admiration for Max Weber, Alfred Weber's brother and

---

1 Mannheim tended to speak of this entity and others like it as a "generational unit" in the narrowest of his senses of the term. For a treatment of the Lukács Circle as a common "platform" rather than as a mere coincidence of diverse career routes, see Kettler 1971.

2 For the transition of Mannheim and others from the circle of intellectuals to the research setting of the university and its structured settings during the Weimar period, see Kettler 2007.

object of competition, whose aura was enhanced by his early death and whose virtual presence in Heidelberg was embodied in the periodic meetings of what had been the Max Weber Circle, which Mannheim attended. Still, as Reinhard Blomert has shown, Mannheim's work for the half dozen years between 1922 and 1928 fit largely into the Alfred Weber research programme, especially as its boundaries were extended by Weber's colleague, Emil Lederer (Blomert 1999). Max Weber had separated his scientific work, which he carried on in strict isolation, from the intellectual activities in the circle, where he sought to mix brilliant younger thinkers with more established academics in a setting of playful contest rather than common intellectual effort.

Although Alfred Weber was dedicated to continuing Max's tradition of the informal circle, his scholarship was conducted in an academic setting rather than in isolation. He established institutes in affiliation with the university and organized his students and junior associates in working groups and common ventures. And he also created transitional "institutions," such as his "Sociological Discussion Evenings" every two weeks in a local hotel, between the formal and the informal settings (Blomert 1999; Jansen 1997). While Mannheim moved closer to Max Weber methodologically in the Frankfurt years, he brought with him from Heidelberg Alfred's pattern of interacting with students and other thinkers.

A framing preoccupation of the Alfred Weber programme, shared by Max Weber in his own work as well, was never abandoned by Mannheim: the civic education of the democratic populace through sociology. It was not a new concern, having been the goal of the republican leadership, and it led directly to Mannheim's call to a chair of sociology in Frankfurt (Loader and Kettler 2002). The brothers had led a "revolt" against the imperial academic establishment and particularly their common mentor, Gustav Schmoller. The latter was a strong supporter of the bureaucratic authoritarian empire and an opponent of the parliamentarianism both brothers supported. Schmoller believed that the bureaucratic establishment, and especially its academic wing, provided both a set of limits for the political leadership and the larger arbitrage of cultural values for the nation. Thus, as both officials of the state and the cultural elite, academics mediated the organic synthesis between the state and culture. Civil society, including parliamentary parties that were viewed as representing the economic divisions of that sphere, was relegated to a subordinate status. The Weber brothers challenged this Hegelian arrangement and offered a parliamentary alternative. However, they significantly differed in their own approaches to civic education in the new Republic.

Both brothers engaged in empirical studies early in their careers under Schmoller, Max investigating cottagers and agricultural laborers in East Elbian Prussia, Alfred the sweating-system in the ready-made clothing industry. Paradoxically, these studies cast doubt on the basic premises of the system that sponsored them. They helped lead both brothers to acknowledge the increasingly rationalized sphere of

modern capitalism and to tie the bureaucratic state to that rationalization.[3] Both shifted their emphasis from the early narrow empiricism to theoretical work. Max launched his essays on methodology and comparative religion that established his reputation as one of the intellectual greats of the twentieth century. Alfred, after a brief flirtation with Austrian economics in his study on the location of industries, began to lay the foundations of his cultural sociology. In these studies, in which the question of values was central to both brothers, one can see a difference in their approaches—Max focusing on the individual as the decisive source of values, Alfred on the relationship of the creative individual to a larger organic totality of values.

This difference in emphasis paralleled a difference in biography. The career of Max in the academy disintegrated under the clouds of recurrent mental incapacitation. When he gained some control over his demons early in the first decade of the 1900s, he began the essays that established his reputation as the greatest sociologist of the twentieth century. Alfred joined his older brother in Heidelberg when he was called to a chair at the university in 1907, where he remained until his forced retirement by the Nazis in 1933. He had the long academic career that was denied to Max. While Max, through the richness of his writings and the intellectual circle he presided over with his wife Marianne, had an intellectual circle, Alfred generated a research programme, primarily among his students. The brothers witnessed Germany's defeat in World War I and the advent of the first German republic. Both actively engaged themselves in the formation of the new government. Max's attempts were ended by his premature death in 1920, Alfred's by his political ineptness. Alfred would outlive his brother by almost four decades, during which time he attempted to preserve the Weber legacy while, at the same time, wrestling with the ghost of Max.

Both brothers addressed the values that would shape the new democracy, Max pointing to the individual politician who was inspired by a set of values and practiced an ethic of responsibility, Alfred to the creative individual who was part of a larger organic cultural synthesis of values that established by a new cultural vanguard in conjunction with and as a guide to political actors. For Max values remained essentially individual, while for Alfred they remained communal. This difference in cultural politics also resulted in a difference in the role assigned to "science," or organized knowledge (*Wissenschaft*). For Max, science was of great help in the clarification of means to realize the values of the democratic political actor, but it could not establish those values itself. For Alfred, science, while broadened beyond the organized knowledge of the imperial academy to include less elitist and less rational elements, continued to be an important shaper of values.

This difference in basic approaches to the relationship of science and culture to politics also resulted in a difference in methodological approaches. In the

---

3 Max's work on the goal-rational bureaucratic orientation was actually preceded by Alfred's essay on officialdom.

introduction, titled "Tasks and Methods," to his 1927 collection of essays in cultural sociology, Alfred specifically outlined two basic methodological differences from Max (A. Weber [1927] 2000, 52–4). First, Max, in order to achieve a conceptual exactness, sacrificed any attempt to grasp phenomena as a totality. What this naturally can easily lead to, then, is that as an end result one retains an abundance of very valuable conceptual schemata and an equally great abundance of conceivable or real causal connections between the parts of the totality of life, but nothing more. The value of the sociological conceptual apparatus created by Max Weber, which is laid out in *Economy and Society,* is enormous. But because its goal is the purest possible ideal-typical conceptual formation (through exaggeration or isolation), it is undoubtedly in many of its parts a net meshed somewhat too widely for the accommodation of the material if the concepts are introduced for the characterization of something that is entirely concrete (53).

Second, Alfred wrote, Max considered social structure and its movement as well as all transpersonal forces strictly through "the social intentions, attitudes and reactions of individuals." He proposed an alternative:

> We want to illuminate complex totalities in their complexity while consciously preserving them as unities, since our whole intent is directed to the passable understanding of insoluble historical collectivities that at their core are quite irrational in their unity. It is directed to large, assembled total phenomena, which are traversed by infinitely many individual causal series of the most heterogeneous kind that are of no concern to us. As stated, to that extent, but in fact only to that extent, are we operating universalistically here. Naturally without any statement thereby about the ideational preference for an individualistic or collectivistic attitude in life. (54)

Let us examine further these two methodologies with an emphasis on how they might serve as guides for empirical studies. So much has been written on Max Weber's methodology[4] that we will only discuss those aspects that are mentioned in Alfred's critique and are also significant for Mannheim: the emphasis on an individualizing heterogeneous causality, the concept of understanding (*Verstehen*), and the main form of conceptual formation, the ideal type. Finally, we will examine the meaning of the first three aspects for larger structural issues.

In his famous "Objectivity" essay of 1904, Max Weber stated his basic premise about knowledge in the human or cultural sciences.

> Knowledge of cultural events is inconceivable except on the basis of the *significance* that the concrete constellations of life have for us in certain *individual* concrete situations (*Beziehungen*). ... "Culture" is a finite segment of the meaningless infinity of the world process (*Geschehen*), a segment on which *human beings* confer meaning and significance. (M. Weber 1949, 80–81, original emphases)

4 See, for example, Kalberg 1994, Burger 1987, Oakes 1988, Huff 1984, Bruun 1972, Wagner and Zipprian (eds) 1994, Merz-Benz 1990. Kalberg's book has been especially useful in the following discussion.

When human beings act, they do so in a world that makes sense to them according to the meaning they have given it. Because action is ultimately individual, so is meaning. However, action takes place in a social context. If individuals decide on a certain course, they have to anticipate how others will respond. In other words, they interpret, come to an understanding of that response. They try to make sense of others' actions, just as cultural scientists might try to make sense of theirs. This position has an important corollary: it presupposes the possibility of making sense of all social action. All understanding is to some degree rational.

If social action is individual, how do we arrive at generalizations about it? Weber proposes the "ideal type," described as a "one-sided *accentuation* of one or more points of view," a "unified *analytical* construct," that "in its conceptual purity" cannot be found empirically anywhere in reality. "It is a *utopia*." As such, it is not a hypothesis but a heuristic instrument to aid in the construction of specific hypotheses (90, original emphases). In *Economy and Society*, Weber lists four ideal types orientation for social action: instrumentally rational (*zweckrational*), value-rational (*wertrational*), affectual and traditional (M. Weber [1922] 1978, 24–6). In accordance with his theory, these types seldom, if ever, occur in pure form. Most social action is the result of a combination of types of action. And it need not be the motivating factor of an individual, but what that individual perceives as orienting others. For example, Weber tells of attending a Baptist baptism in a cold mountain stream in North Carolina. When a Mr. X was baptized, Weber's cousin explained that Mr. X planned to open a bank and needed credit. His admittance to the Baptist congregation was of importance to his Baptist customers, but more so to his non-Baptist customers, because it certified that his moral and business conduct had passed an ongoing set of inquiries by the congregation (M. Weber [1920] 1946, 304–5). A social relationship then involves a "plurality of actors" who take account of the orientations of one another. This relationship can be one of cooperation or conflict (M. Weber [1922] 1978, 26–7).

Weber constructs two ideal types of social relationships. When the relationship is based on affectual or traditional orientation, he terms it "communal" (*Vergemeinschaftung*). When it is based on value-rational or instrumentally rational orientation, it is "associative" (*Vergesellschaftung*). Weber acknowledges that these two types are based on Ferdinand Tönnies's earlier pair, community (*Gemeinschaft*) and society (*Gesellschaft*). His modification allows him to escape the rigidity of Tönnies's dichotomy for something resembling a spectrum, as is in keeping with his concept of the ideal type (M. Weber [1922] 1978, 40–1). The myriad of types Weber introduces in *Economy and Society* derive from his four ideal types of action. All are, of course, themselves ideal types. For example, he characterizes organizations by their types of "domination" (*Herrschaft*), or authority, which, in turn, depends on the their legitimacy in the eyes of both those who issue orders and those who follow them. The three "pure" types of domination/authority he identifies are legal (which is based on value-rational and/or instrumentally rational grounds), traditional (which is based on traditional grounds) and charismatic (which is based on charismatic grounds, themselves a

form of affectual orientation) (53–4, 215–6). Thus, all larger structural forms are built out of components consisting basically of individual action.

It was to this composition that his brother Alfred objected, describing the stages of his own methodology:

> Total intuition of the stuff of historical existence of a time, dissection and classification of the same according to the large indicated categories or at least with reference to these, illumination of the same apart from the thusly analyzed total constellation and then the reinsertion in that improved total view corrected by the specialized analysis. (A. Weber [1927] 2000, 43)

If Max started with the individual and worked out, Alfred started with the general and worked in. Inspired by vitalism since his early days in Heidelberg, he believed in a unity of life. There is a "life substance" in which the individual soul, as well as the collective soul, is embedded. This substance is both unity and multiplicity, but it is not static. It flows, forming a historical stream. It is composed of three different forms of movement, each connected to a different sphere of life, which interact with one another "like breakers cresting over a tide, raising up and forming troughs, undulating and flowing forth." They can be distinguished from one another only "intellectually."[5] (36–7) Like Max's ideal types, the division of the three is seen as a heuristic device.

These three types were originally a dualism, "civilizational process, which rests on the elucidation of consciousness and spiritual-technical progress along its consequences," and "cultural movement, which contends with the psychic-spiritual permeation of the substance of life." In 1920 he added "social process, which brings into general forms the most primary moving forces, the natural ones of drive and will." The two processes are characterized by developmental movement; the civilizational he describes as unilinear, the social as evolutionary. In contrast, cultural movement, which makes sense of the other two, is eruptive and discontinuous (A. Weber [1921] 2000). It is to be understood as the "will to expression and formation of the stuff offered by the other two." The task of the cultural sociologist, then, is the interpretation of this interaction as "the completely concrete, unique constellation of a historical moment."[6] (A. Weber [1927] 2000, 46, 37–8)

Alfred Weber describes the method of the cultural sociologist as akin to the phenomenological "intuition" (*Schau*), but differing in that it is not only intuitionistic

---

5 For Alfred Weber, "intellectualism" is a negative term, which he associates with the artificial and the life-destroying. This is how he designates Marxist theory and it is the term he uses to attack Mannheim in their joint seminar in 1928 (Mannheim [1928] 2001, 111–4).

6 Throughout this essay Weber alternates the term "constellation" with another, "physiognomy" or "life-aggregation," these latter two having a more vitalistic ring. It is instructive that Mannheim borrowed the first but not the other two.

and synthetic, but also consciously analytic (44–5). While he remains vague about the more specific elements of this analysis, one might presuppose that it began with the location of a historical constellation in the civilizational process—its place either in the mainstream of theoretical, scientific and technological progress or as merely a backwater. Then one could examine the social process (which interacts closely with the civilizational), things such as the social structure and even aspects of the economy. Here we can see Alfred, as did Max, offering Marxism its due. But the crucial step is adding the cultural dimension, the forming of the two processes in a unique, meaningful unity:

> The analysis of the cultural sphere … exists evidently in only in the clarifications of the situation in which the always creative, psychic human power—with its configurational need to strive for the connection of "soul" and "world," to express something that is in truth probably only metaphysically explicable here in a very superficial way—is situated in the life substance to be investigated beforehand exactly according to its civilizational and social, as well as historically cultural quality. Those are the sociological constellations and their transformations in the historical process that are to be clarified. … This method investigates them, then, according to their exact gestalt and clarifies them in their conditions. Nowhere, therefore, does it provide an exhaustive causal explanation. (47)

With the exception of the three forms of historical movement, Alfred never offered Max's detailed taxonomy of types in *Economy and Society*. We can glean his early approach to cultural sociology from his announcement in the journal *Die Tat* in 1913, the year he published his first theoretical essay on the sociology of culture, of a new series in the discipline (A. Weber [1913] 2000, 379–80). He argues that in spite of an impressive theoretical sociology and also of a growing literature on mass phenomena and regularities in social life, as well as expanded literary means about spiritual phenomena, there is no way to connect the spiritual streams with real life processes, "to place them in the concrete phenomena from which they grow and, in turn, upon which they shall have a forming and configuring effect." The new series will be concerned with empirical contributions to the following problems: how social forms and strata are integrated with spiritual tendencies and cultural phenomena and what the cultural meaning of these configurations are, i.e. how they are connected to the underlying "life-bearing forces." The investigations, all dissertations directed by Weber, are connected to three complexes of facts: the formation and essence of cultural organizations, the cultural interests and productivity of social strata, and tendencies in the economy, technology, politics, religious organizations, for example, whose cultural meaning can be grasped. Among the specific topics listed are the ceremonies of the Salvation Army, the sociology of the cinema, the feuilleton in the modern press, the broadening of modern theatre circles, and working class intellectuals. After World War One, as he became more disillusioned about the ability to establish an organic unity of values for the republic, his work became less empirical and more metahistorical and his students were given greater leeway in their projects.

There are similarities and differences between the methodologies of the Weber brothers, both approaches reflecting their training in the Historical School of National Economy. They agreed that cultural sociology could not be nomothetic, and they both understood that the purpose of generalizations was the illumination of specific historical situations. Although Alfred never considered himself to be constructing ideal types, he understood that the interaction of his three types of movement is unique in every situation. But the brothers differed about the relationship of the individual to the larger society. Max's approach was based on the individual. Larger units are simply assemblages of their individual parts. Accordingly, his concepts of understanding (*Verstehen*) seeks to make rational sense of individual motivations and action. This belief determined the types he constructed. Alfred, on the other hand, believed that the unified vitalistic force of "life" flows through all of human existence. Larger units and the individuals that compose them exist in an organic relationship of macrocosm/microcosm. This assumption he shared with the older concept of cultivation (*Bildung*). Accordingly, his types were those of more general historical movement that characterized the three spheres of society, spirit, or intellect (*Geist*), and the soul, or psyche (*Seele*), all of which are seen as both individual and collective.

How Mannheim worked out his intellectual relationships to Max and Alfred Weber would be better known if we had any textual evidence or reliable testimony of the proseminar on Max Weber that he conducted as Privatdozent at Heidelberg in the Winter Semester 1927/28, a class attended by Hans Gerth, the Mannheim student most closely associated in later years with the interpretation and popularization of Max Weber, notably in the United States. The seminar was doubtless associated with Mannheim's project to expand his habilitation presentation on the "Contemporary State of Thinking in Germany" into a volume containing separate essays on Ernst Troeltsch, Max Scheler, and Max Weber. The book never appeared, although he published the first two essays in essay form. As for the Weber project, Mannheim wrote to the editor at the press that it would require a book rather than an essay, and that he hoped to gain release for a semester to complete it.[7] In the event, the plan was overtaken by the professorship in Frankfurt. There is no further documentation of the book project.

Although Mannheim had a certain sympathy for the idea of a conflict between culture and civilization, he was increasingly uncomfortable with Alfred Weber's

7 See Mannheim's correspondence (27 March 1929 and 2 October 1929) with his publisher, Paul Siebeck (Mannheim 2003). See also Mannheim's request for a leave of absence for the Winter Semester 1929/30, addressed to the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Heidelberg, on 27 September 1929 (Mannheim 2003, 34–37). Mannheim explained his request as follows: "As justification, I want to say that I am working on a book on Max Weber and that I want to devote all of my working time to the completion of this work. Implicitly claiming priority, he adds, "Perhaps I may also add that the tenth anniversary of Max Weber marks a certain deadline for this work and that it would be desirable that there should be a presentation and analysis available at that time."

sharp division of the realms and, as it seemed to him, the unhistorical and anti-rational character of the domain of ultimate values. The tensions were articulated first in differing uses of Marx, which could nevertheless be contained within Alfred Weber's research programme by the participation of Emil Lederer, and, second, as has already been suggested, by selective adaptations of Max Weber's more interactive model and the appropriation of key themes. It was around these motifs that Mannheim developed a competing research programme during his last years at Heidelberg, expressly attempting to bypass the methodological issues between the Weber brothers by a distinctive relationship to historicism. The most comprehensive characterization of the underlying strategy of this programme is to be found in Mannheim's conception of time.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 2
Time and Place

When Mannheim arrived in Germany in 1919, in self-chosen political exile from his native Budapest, he came to an intellectual scene rife with experimentation, much of it related to the "crisis of valuation" to which the Weber brothers also addressed themselves, and which was often diagnosed as a "crisis" arising out of the pervasive influence of "historicism." Amplifying the transitional remarks on this problem constellation quoted earlier, Mannheim wrote, in an essay titled "Historicism" and published in 1924:

> The historicist principle not only organizes like an invisible hand, the work of the cultural sciences (*Geisteswissenschaften*), but also permeates everyday thinking. Today it is impossible to take part in politics, to understand a person … without treating all those realities that we have to deal with as having evolved and as developing dynamically. … These forces are grasped and understood as potentialities, constantly in flux, moving from one point to another; already on the level of everyday reflection, we seek to determine the position of our present within a temporal framework, to tell by the cosmic clock of history what time it is. (Mannheim [1924] 1970 [1952], 246 [84])

The radicalization of temporality in the self-understanding of cultural theorists responding to the "crisis of historicism" spawned a rich variety of intellectual experiments, for better and for worse, to overcome the aporia of philosophical relativism and political disorientation. Nineteenth-century historicists, believing themselves to be the arbiters of norms for an organic cultivated public, had ignored the inherent relativism of their worldview. In assuming this elevated status, mainstream historicists closely aligned themselves with the classical ideal of *Bildung*. But as that public began to fragment in the late Empire and especially in the Weimar Republic absent the prop of the imperial state, relativism emerged as a larger problem (Loader 1976), and the older historicist Friedrich Meinecke lamented:

> This endless pluralism of individual values which we are discovering everywhere … is able, especially now in our gloomy position, to thrust us into confusion and leave us helpless. Everything is individuality following its own laws, everything is flux... . How are we to emerge from this anarchy of values? From historicism how does once again come to a science of values?" (Meinecke [1922] 1948, 223–4)

Even in the article in which he accepted historicism as the frame of reference for his own work, Mannheim admitted that disciplinary and social divisions remained

unreconciled. “That historicism has not solved this task must be emphasized rather than concealed.” (Mannheim [1924] 1970 [1952], 304n [131n])

The fragmentation of the public was accompanied by a fragmentation of perceptions of time. Absent a “Greenwich mean time,” other alternatives presented themselves. One could retreat into a Bergson-like vitalism in which time became an intuitively perceived endless stream; or one could rationalize time via the dialectic in good Hegelian fashion; or one could adopt the liberal faith in a mechanistic idea of progress; or one could cling to the old organic hopes of the former mainstream. All of these sought to establish a single time and thus were “utopian” in the Mannheimian sense. Another alternative, the one taken by Mannheim, was the acceptance of the fragmentation of time. He pluralized time, postulating a time-space continuum that allowed for different times connected to different social spaces. These differences could never be subordinated to a single organic system, but they could be addressed in a manner that related one to the other.

In his first treatment of the sociology of culture in 1922, a work written prior to his time with Alfred Weber, Mannheim emphasized the unsettling nature of historicism, and expressed the view that Max Weber’s approach was insufficient for the problem. He distinguished three types of sociology and their corresponding sociologies of culture, noting that differences in the conceptions of time were critical to the distinctions among them (Mannheim [1922–24] 1982, 101–30). “Pure” or “formal” sociology he identifies with various philosophically-driven projects for finding a universal non-metaphysical ground for knowledge about the variations and diversities of the historical world, abstracted from both time and space. In intention, such sociology negates historical time. Mannheim is not unsympathetic in principle to “pure sociology,” although he criticizes the efforts of Simmel, von Wiese, and others of that generation, because he is convinced that the future of this type of sociology lies in an adaptation of phenomenological intuition of essences. “General sociology” is a second type. In this approach, which Mannheim identified above all by Max Weber, the social phenomena are comprehended in their historical facticity, but the reliance on induction and the aim of generalization mean that “it does not accept historical time as a constituent part” of its materials. (113) General sociology generates “surface” typologies, unstructured by temporal relations. Such findings in the mode of the natural sciences have their uses, according to Mannheim, but they can only comprehend surface dimensions and provide instrumental help to deeper levels of explanation. To understand the deeper meanings of social phenomena and the social dimensions of culture, it is necessary to apprehend the ways in which location in an appropriate historical sequence enters into the inner structure of the materials studied. That something is “later” than something else is integral to its meaning. Dynamic sociology (and dynamic sociology of culture), according to Mannheim, represents a systematization of the common experience of assigning meanings on the basis of an understanding of relevant antecedents. A different formulation of this experience can be found in philosophies of history, including theories of progress, but these are in error because they link the valid

insight to valuations and because they impute the conditions for understanding to historical time in some metaphysical way. Dynamic sociology recovers the insight without these excrescences.

The hallmark of dynamic sociology is periodization, the typological recognition of irreversible sequences constrained within the kind of "historical space" that Mannheim describes as "the bodily shape of history." Rejecting the positivist "law of three stages," he contends that "the most general types of sociological concept (such as family, urban economy, capitalism, etc.) gain pregnant meaning only when they are classified by reference to that unique structure in which each originated." (115) The time of dynamic sociology is "hierarchical" rather than simply chronological, in that relations between past and present are mediated by structures of meaning that cluster and accumulate events and that differ in rates of change. Unlike historiography in the narrow sense, dynamic sociology proceeds at a distance from individual events, except insofar as the typological characterization of periods must be constantly tested and refined by applications to representative examples. If the movement discerned by historiography, properly so called, is continuous, dynamic sociology sees change with an eye to the disruptive transitions bounding a period, a feature that may be called dialectical, but only in a non-metaphysical sense.

All cultural sociology, according to Mannheim, begins with some conception of cultural objects as a "function" of some experiential contexture. In the abstract, a cultural sociological reading can be illustrated by the interpretation of a "scream" as a "cry." Actual historical cultures must be approached in two steps. First, the cultural products to be examined must be interrelated with the help of a construct of "style," or "tendency." Such units can be studied historically if they are applied to "epochs" in the distinct lines of development of different cultural media, but such studies are not of primary interest to Mannheim, except insofar as reflections on such specialized histories have refined the concept of worldview introduced into cultural history by Dilthey. Worldview identifies a cross-sectional "sense of life" that is common to epochs in distinct cultural fields. Mannheim calls this "structural analysis" of cultural phenomena. Second, then, the respective worldviews are correlated to a characteristic period in social development. It is this last step, the social interpretation of the experiential contexture manifested in the worldview that constitutes cultural sociology as such. Mannheim recognizes both "pure" and "general" sociologies of culture (with Simmel's study of "money" as model of the former and Max Weber's study of the Protestant ethic as model of the latter), but his own interest is centered on dynamic sociology of culture and the interrelations among styles, worldviews, and experiential situations variously located in the "historical body" of some period in social development.

Mannheim's work on conservatism attempts to make good the claims of this somewhat sketchy prospectus. The choice of an "ideology" rather than a "style" or "philosophical tendency" as the cultural "type" to be examined brings to the fore an issue that Mannheim had already identified at the conclusion of his first preliminary study, that it is a questionable simplification to suppose that there is

only one consistent worldview manifested in a given historical period. Societies of the modern era are split into plural sites of experience and competing designs upon the world. Proceeding in the manner of dynamic sociology rather than particularistic historiography, Mannheim refers to typical social locations rather than individual biographies, although the "locations" are themselves undergoing change.

Although the contrasting readings of the world imputable to different locations within the changing scheme of social stratification are Mannheim's most characteristic concerns, his set piece article on generations—written for publication in Leopold von Wiese's closely held sociology journal more in the manner of von Wiese's formal sociology than his own dynamic sociology—connects most exclusively with the movement of social relations, social knowledge and social action in time. This is the context in which Mannheim draws on the "stroke of genius" of the art historian, Wilhelm Pinder, to cite the "non-contemporaneity of the contemporaneous" as much more than a vivid statement of the puzzle confronting art historians when they find themselves dating a work of art as belonging to a style antedating the others produced in the same chronological and art-historical epoch. Mannheim welcomes Pinder's formula as the epitome of objections to conceptions of history as a succession of self-contained and uniform "spirits of the age" (*Zeitgeiste*), although he immediately registers his dissent from Pinder's total rejection of any such common context and his eclectic compounding of Positivist and neo-Romantic elements, as Mannheim sees it, where "contemporaneity" is understood as a conjunction of mysterious natural rhythms of birth and death and incessantly superseded, creatively willed generational worldviews, labeled "entelechies." More generally, Mannheim rejects both the positivist attempts to derive laws of social and cultural development from demographic rhythms of generational succession, all seen as transpiring in a uniform "natural" chronology, and the neo-Romantic use of the "generation" concept to articulate their sense of irrational mystery about the starts and stops of human creativity. For Mannheim, the problem of generations is first of all a sociological one, and the disruptive innovations associated with generational succession are constrained by the periodic development of social configurations. "The 'spirit of the age' [*Zeitgeist*]," he writes, "is … the outcome of the dynamic interaction of actual generations succeeding one another in a continuous series." ([1928] 1952, 314n2)

The generations in question, however, are not simply the generations of the positivist demographer. Their rise and fall and rates of succession are a function not of the meaningless facts of human biology, but of the patterns of social change—social differentiation, rates of transformation, conflict and crises. The time measured by the succession of generations is thus dramatically variable, ranging from the epochs tolled by Old Testament genealogies to the latter-day dizzying pace of succession, where siblings seem to live in different times. To bridge the gap between the statistical phenomena of age groups and the sense of generation relevant to social and cultural understanding, Mannheim distinguishes three concepts, subdividing socio-historical space. "Generational location" divides

the biological cohort into specific cultural regions. Chinese and Germans born in the same year do not share a generational location. Generational location, in turn, is decisively qualified by "generational association," which Mannheim defines as participation in a common fate or sensibility, especially the perception of change. Peasant youth, whose world is largely routinized according to seemingly timeless tradition, are less able to perceive change and thus belong to a different context than urban youth, who are more "exposed to the social and intellectual symptoms of a process of dynamic destabilization." (307) No less important, the experiences of the prewar youth movements, the wartime frontline, the coming of age in the hyperinflation, all may constitute their own respective generational associations. This is what Mannheim calls an "actual generation," conjoined by a common sense of problems, and possessing, to that extent some elements of a distinctive and unique "entelechy," to use Pinder's term, now given social grounding. But actual generations need not respond in a common way to these shared problems. Mannheim sees a diversity of "generational units" variously linked to the other fault lines within the composite "spirit of the age" corresponding to the social-cultural location, notably those exemplified by political parties in conflict and articulated in competing ideologies. Like the social mechanism of competition (as mediated by sociologically informed *Realdialektik*) and the transformative impulses comprehended by the utopian dimensions of social thought, the cross-cutting identities defined by memberships in an actual generation is one of factors that renders the ideological field both dynamic and capable of the provisional negotiated settlements, which Mannheim, in the fashionable language of the time, called syntheses.[1]

If Mannheim's treatment of the "sociological problem of generations" in relation to the constitution of the "spirit of the age" focuses most directly on the contest between "objective" and "subjective" renderings of time, contrasting conceptions of historical time are no less central to his understanding of ideologies or utopias.[2] In both cases, as noted earlier, the critical point is that Mannheim

1 Not a few of Mannheim's terms, taken from the social discourse of the time, are also coopted into the vocabulary of the more ambitious National Socialist publicists, notably Josef Goebbels. "Generation," "synthesis," and "worldview" are especially burdened in this way. Karl Kraus argued in 1933 that the fashion for these terms among the journalistic (and Jewish) intelligentsia was a critical part of the destruction of culture and thought that made Nazism possible. (Kraus 1952) Mannheim was not wholly impervious to the danger that his way of speaking and thinking might bring him close to precursors of a German fascism, but he insisted that his project of constituting a historical reading, however complex, made the decisive difference. (Loader and Kettler 2002)

2 In revisiting Mannheim's sociology of knowledge with a view to methodological issues, we focus on Mannheim's *Conservatism* ([1925] 1986), and two of the essays contained in *Ideology and Utopia*, "The Prospects of Scientific Politics" and "The Utopian Mentality." The essay, "Ideology and Utopia," written one or two years later than the others, attempts a temporary bridge between their admittedly different approaches. In the English version of the book, Mannheim included essays from two additional occasions. On the questions of

uses the conventional terms to refer not simply to complexes of political ideas but to divergent "modes of thought," distinguished by their respective "categorical structures" (Mannheim [1929] 1969 [1968], 74 [73]), or forms of thought, including distinctive conceptions of time and space, as well as other constituent elements of knowing. He distinguishes between recognizing these structural elements in the modes of experiencing that underlie the various ideologies and tracing them in their various philosophical explications, which are a function in turn of the historical changes to which ideologies are subject, while remaining grounded in their foundational mode of experience.

Mannheim's study of conservatism represents his most elaborate attempt at "structural analysis" of an ideology, conjoined with both historical tracking and social interpretation of its development. In this context, he begins with a contrast in the "experience of time" between conservatives and "progressives" (including both liberals and socialists in the latter category): "The progressive always experiences the present as the beginning of the future, while the conservative regards it simply as the latest stage reached by the past." (Mannheim [1925] 1986, 97) Without denying the conservatives' deep interest in the past, he nevertheless refines his conception of their sense of time in the light of their insistence that the past is within the present. He concludes that their "picture of historical time takes on something of the quality of an imaginary space," an "inclination ... toward ... a resolution of every temporal succession in to a spatial contiguity or inclosure." Transitory events and individuals appear as mere accidents of the "compacted, spatial substratum" of land and soil. Mannheim cites Adam Müller's Romantic celebration of the conservative *Raumgenossen* as against the progressive concept of *Zeitgenossen*—a fellowship in space rather than time. Interestingly, he finds a certain similarity in the structure of proletarian and socialist thinking. Here, too, there is a certain aggrandizement of "spatial, corporate units," relatively "unconfined by time," although the relations and classes that are the focus of this thought lack the organicism of the conservative entities, and they are read from a radically different direction. The democratic-liberal mode of bourgeois thought "does experience movement," but "it is only able to master this dynamicism by segmenting the movements into discrete instants," just as it understands society only as an assemblage of atomized individuals. Mannheim concludes:

> In short, while conservative thought is oriented towards the past surviving in the present, and bourgeois thought, because it the carrier of the present, nourishes itself on new developments, as they transpire from moment to moment, proletarian thought attempts to consider and to further the future within the present, by putting into the foreground those present factors which herald the future structural forms of life. (Mannheim [1925] 1986, 99)

---

interest here, there are no substantial differences in this compilation of interlinked essays, but the consideration that "each of these essays has its own intellectual objective," and exhibit an "essayistic-experimental attitude," as Mannheim noted (Mannheim [1936] 1968, 47), cautions against overgeneralizing (or systematizing) the elements of Mannheim's work.

None of these ideologies has an understanding of time adequate to the complex sense of history required by dynamic sociology.

When Mannheim returns to the comparison three years later (Mannheim [1929] 1969 [1968]), he nevertheless finds promise in the interrelations among these mutually incompatible views, because he is contrasting them with fascism, which he takes to be indifferent to history, except as an arbitrary construction used to manipulate passive masses. After a summary statement of the fascist dismissal of situational orientation or constraints, Mannheim writes:

> The [fascist] conception of history ... is not comparable either to the conservative, the liberal-democratic, or the socialistic conceptions. All of these theories, otherwise so antagonistic, share the assumption that there is a definite and ascertainable structure in history within which, so to speak, each event has its proper position. Not everything is possible in every situation. This framework which is constantly changing and revolving must be capable of comprehension. (Mannheim [1929] 1969 [1968], 118 [120–1])

Such projects of rational understanding presuppose the applicability of basic categories of time, space, and explanation, in some structural design. This does not of course mean that they share an identical conception of rationality:

> While the liberals and socialists continued to believe that the historical structure was completely capable of rationalization the former insisting that its development was progressively unilateral, and the latter viewing it as a dialectical movement, the conservatives sought to understand the structure of the totality of historical development intuitively by a morphological approach. Different as these points of view were in method and content, they all understood political activity as proceeding on an historical background, and they all agreed that in our own epoch, it becomes necessary to orient oneself to the total situation in which one happens to be placed, if political aims are to be realized. (119 [121])

It is noteworthy, first, that the qualities that Mannheim sees common to the three ideologies correspond to his basic design of dynamic sociology. It is to be understood as a reflexive mode of the situation of thought in the contemporary period. Second, then, it is remarkable that the spatial dimension that Mannheim had associated with both conservative and socialist ideology plays a vital part in his comparative exposition of the ideologies. Rationalization entails an important measure of spatialization. One has to see oneself as located somewhere in a situation in which one is placed. An adequate understanding of historical time requires first an appreciation of these spatial configurations and diversities, and it comprises a platform informed by the incompatible points of departure and an understanding of their limited perspectives, without attempting to homogenize them. In his article on "sociology of knowledge" for Vierkandt's 1931 *Handbook*, mentioned earlier, Mannheim coquets with analogies from popular representations of current scientific reflections to strengthen his case. He cites Heisenberg's indeterminacy principle and even Einstein's theory of relativity to underline the

point that there is nothing outlandish or contrary to the most serious thought to recognize that variable standpoints and instruments of measurement enter properly in the explanation of relations between movements through time and locations in space (Mannheim [1931] 1969 [1968], 262–3 [275]). In a loose sense, without in any way imputing to him the aspiration to unequivocal mathematical solutions of the problem that in fact defined the projects of both Heisenberg and Einstein, we can say that Mannheim identified his reading of the problem of historical time with the potent metaphor of the time–space continuum.

In a reformulation of his argument in 1930 for students in his first class as Professor of Sociology in Frankfurt, Mannheim used the spatial dichotomy of "limitation" and "expansion" to distinguish the sociological attitude from other ways of approaching the world. Limitation means that "we try to grasp the whole of life through paradigms—models—appropriate to a specific narrow sphere of life." (Mannheim [1930] 2001, 4) Traditional primitive societies governed by religious attitudes have unambiguous meanings. Such unambiguity "binds" their members so that they are not able to achieve any separation from those meanings, to expand themselves beyond the limitations of the closed community. Mannheim writes that as communities become socially differentiated, the "unambiguous alignment of meaning" is shattered, providing that the differentiation results in mutually antithetical life spheres. When entertaining the notion that "I" am also an "it," self-reflexivity begins. One regards oneself as something that could also be something else, becoming open to the idea of one's own transformation.

It becomes clear that every individual intellectual point of departure (*Denkansatz*) originates in a standpoint that is particular. At the moment when volitions meet, when localities and regions—not to speak of classes and status groups—converge in a common stream, it becomes possible to see that every locality, status group, and class lives only in a small corner of the world. The basic structural tendency of humans is to see their own particularity as absolute. But none of them is in fact absolute. This new insight marks the first stage of a cosmopolitan situation. Certain ways of thinking take form in certain stages of life, and the present moment may present the stage at which it is possible to confront diverse developments (64). This pressing beyond the limits of one's particularity is what Mannheim means by "expansion," and the possibility of a "cosmopolitan situation" stands in for the enlightenment ideals that he never abandoned.

Yet Mannheim's fascination with "utopia" suggests a measure of dissatisfaction with this complex rationalization. Taking the chiliastic immediacy of Anabaptist life in perfection as paradigm of the utopian mentality, he interrogates liberalism, conservatism, and socialism about their utopian dimensions, the elements in their thought that possess the capacity to disrupt the orderly course of things, to arrive at a place that does not appear as a place at all on the maps of everyday. The utopian moment is timeless for the chiliastic utopian; it is always here if it is chosen. In this context, he traces a decline of the utopian element through the historical succession of liberal humanism, conservative idealism and the communist-socialist utopia, ever more attuned to the "here and now" and thus, it seems, ever less driven by a

will to transformation, culminating in a matter-of-factness that threatens "a static state of affairs in which man himself becomes no more than a thing. …Thus, after a long, tortuous, but heroic development, just at the highest state of awareness, when history is ceasing to be blind fate...with the relinquishment of utopias, man would lose his will to shape history and thereby his ability to control it." (Mannheim [1929] 1969 [1968], 225 [236])

There is a curious and risky similarity between this atemporal conception of utopia and the indifference to a meaningful construction of time that he finds in fascism, but when Mannheim explores his own affinity to utopianism, he associates chiliasm in his own time with the widely admired anarchist martyr, Gustav Landauer, assassinated by rightist gunmen. And in his return to the topic in his 1930 classroom lectures, when he is urgently troubled by the tendency of the protofascist sociologist, Hans Freyer, to equate a conception of utopia congruent with Mannheim's own with the "revolution from the right," Mannheim integrates the utopian element within the processes of expansion, as merely a preliminary phase of distantiation from the world of settled meanings (Mannheim [1930] 2001, 22–23). The utopian will to transform now appears as only the beginning; it cannot complete the process to achieve genuine self-reflexivity. Utopians strive to establish an absolute, or rather a counter-absolute, to the existing one. When attempting to implement their vision in the real world, they must adopt an empirical attitude to the ambiguous realities of social life. They must become self-reflexive to some degree or fail. And it is precisely this self-reflexivity that moves them beyond utopian faith, and eventually to the sociological attitude. This observation is akin to the Max Weber's observation in "Politics as a Vocation," where Weber rejects the "ethic of ultimate ends" (*Gesinnungsethik*), implicitly alluding to Landauer as well, in favor of an "ethic of responsibility" that combines the will to change with a realistic assessment of present possibilities (M. Weber [1919b] 1946). This similarity between Mannheim and Weber adds to the body of evidence that Mannheim progressively narrowed the range of differences between their views.

Mannheim's conception of the sociological attitude as a mode of realism in 1930 can be seen especially well in his characterization of two prominent contrasting models—the orthodox Marxist class theory, which has become dogmatic, inflexible and, hence, static, and the pure will of fascism, which divorces its decisionism, its commitment to the deed, from any consideration of time or place—as forms of "reprimitivization." At the time, Mannheim was more concerned with fascist reprimitivization and its two primary academic sponsors, Carl Schmitt and Hans Freyer. Fascism represents a conscious denial of the pluralism of modernity, a "decision" to regress to the unambiguous meaning of an unproblematic and unified culture on command, to become "primitive" in the face of the modern world (39). But orthodox Marxism also embraces limitation and resists expansion through distantiation. By the "acceptance of a given stage as absolute," (Mannheim [1930] 2001, 53) orthodoxy in effect also stops time. In contrast to these two extremes, the sociologically thinking person "feels his

way through the intermeshing weave of the actual situation," using sociology as the instrument for a new "reformation of life." (48, 35) In Mannheim's terms, the sociological attitude should combine decision and expansion, so that they exist in a dialectical relationship. Expansion without political engagement leads to a sterile fatalism. Decision without sociological clarification assumes the form of pure utopian volition. Together they situate individuals in the time–space continuum and drive that continuum onward.

Mannheim's conception of the time and place of sociology doubtless underlies both his adaptations of models from Max and Alfred Weber and his strategy in preparing his students for participation in the research group, but his practical research maxims emphasize rather the priority of the experimental encounter with the discrepancies between experience and the most readily available interpretations. Above all, he cautions against likening the discipline to complete "systems" that prejudge what may and may not count as sociological knowledge. The very opening of Mannheim's first Frankfurt lecture to students expresses a "caution about the functions of methodology": "In our view, the point of methodology is not to destroy a newly emerging object like sociology, something that is first being existentially enacted [*Vollziehendes*]. The need is, rather, to work out a methodological apparatus as intricate as we may require to grasp and to understand the novelty." (3)

He expands on the point later in the course:

> From the previous century, we have inherited the illusion that knowledge is a closed and teachable system, and that everything known comprises contents of instruction. This misconception derives from the institution of examinations. It is the hallmark of examinability. In sociology, I have no reason to reenact [vollziehen] this procedure. I will show you that living thought is a process of constant self-expansion, where it is possible to introduce by pedagogical means a precept that incorporates self-discipline and methodical self-observation. (47–8)

The attitude expressed here remains a feature of Mannheim's teaching even in those layers where he draws somewhat narrower boundaries.

Chapter 3
The Social Structure of Advancement: Education for Life in the Economy

Mannheim's essay on economic success (Mannheim [1930] 1970 [1952]) offers the best example of his adoption and adaptation of aspects of Max Weber's historical typology. The distinction between the operative norms of concrete scientific inquiries within a research programme and theoretical reflections on methods, rationales, and wider ramifications is not alien to the history of science, as witness, for example, Thomas Kuhn's clarification of his concept of paradigm. The analyses epitomized by Newton's formulas, accordingly, are more central to the Newtonian paradigm for the active scientists who followed him than his methodological or cosmological constructions, which intrigued philosophers and intellectuals who remained outside of the course of scientific development. This does not mean, of course, that the achievements of Hume, Kant, or Voltaire are devoid of interest or importance. They are simply located in a different universe of discourse. The more modest and less clear-cut analogy in the case of Karl Mannheim might be the contrast between his carefully documented theses about conservatism as a historical mode of social knowledge and his pivotal self-reflexive article on "politics as a science," where he expounds on the method and rationale of subjecting political ideologies to sociological scrutiny. Since there is nothing in the case of Mannheim as vivid as the contrast between the symbols of calculus and the discursive language of Newton's pronouncements on method, the distinction is more ambiguous. And this is also to be expected, in view of the overlaps consequent on the notion of versatility put forward above. The contrast is clarified by the work of students and others in his research programme. Whether by choice or by instruction, they worked quite consistently from the practical models and did not attempt to rationalize their efforts by theoretical or methodological elaborations.

Mannheim's eagerness to bring forward this substantive side of Max Weber's thought emerges clearly in a letter written at the very time that he was working on the remarkably Weberian essay to be examined below. He is writing to his publisher, to explain a further delay in his submission of the long-promised manuscript arising out of his habilitation address on Max Weber, Max Scheler, and Ernst Troeltsch. It is the steady accumulation of "matter and problems" regarding Max Weber that are holding him up, and he is increasingly inclined to write a book completely devoted to his work, including not only an engagement with him on the issues most urgent to Mannheim but also an exposition of his writings, designed "to serve his work." He has accumulated much material over the years,

which he could now bring together. "A monograph that smoothes the way to the actual Max Weber" is all the more appropriate in view of the impending tenth anniversary of his death. "Such a work would be all the more to be desired, in my opinion," he continues, "because we are altogether without a work that attempts to grasp Max Weber not from the side of methodology alone but from his substantial-sociological side."[1]

On this view, it would be paradoxical to examine this aspect of Mannheim's legacy by extracting principles of method or explicating philosophical presuppositions from the work deemed to be most illustrative of his empirical side. Instead, the procedure will be more a matter of substantive reconstruction and descriptive commentary, beginning with what is perhaps the most expressly "Max-Weberian" of Mannheim's studies, his 1930 "contribution to the sociology of economics," whose German title is best translated as "On the Nature and Significance of the Striving for Economic Success. A Contribution to Economic Sociology."[2] This study also offers an especially good starting point for present purposes because it shows Mannheim's early interest in "social" psychology as a way of specifying the relations left in a black box by the Marxist discourse of base and superstructure, an important theme in Mannheim's Frankfurt courses and in the most influential work arising out of his research group, the remarkable achievements of Norbert Elias.

Using Merton's familiar formulation of a key Weberian idea, we can say that the "value relevance" of Mannheim's 1930 article on the striving for economic success can be traced to the occasion of its first presentation, as a contribution to a lecture series, "Man in the Economy," sponsored by a society for continuing education in political studies (*Staatswissenschaft*).[3] The wider context is provided by the inter-war challenges to the established humanistic curriculum, the dispute about the supposed obsolescence of the *Bildung* institutionalized above all in academic secondary schools. The combination of the concerns derived from this location leads Mannheim to ask not how human striving for economic success

---

1 Karl Mannheim to Paul Siebeck, 2 October, 1920 (Mannheim 2003, 36). Mannheim's determination to pursue this project, notwithstanding the more modest alternatives that also he offers Siebeck, is evident from his request, written a few days earlier, for a semester's release from teaching in order to "devote himself wholly to a book on Max Weber," a scheme that was side-tracked by the professorship from Frankfurt. Karl Mannheim to the Philosophical Faculty of Heidelberg University, 27. September 1929 (Mannheim 2003, 35–6).

2 The title in the posthumous English translation is revised, presumably in order to underline its connection to Mannheim's later interests and reads "On the Nature of Economic Ambition and its Significance for the Social Education of Man." Our translations of the German original often differ from those of the 1952 English translation.

3 "Man" is occasionally used as the translation of "Mensch" because the usual ungendered substitutes may in some contexts be misleading in translating analytically stringent work. Neither "person," "human being," nor "man or woman" is always accurate.

affects the economy, but rather how the changing economy shapes human beings in the society of his time, including the forms that their ambitions take.

His pedagogical message was that an educational curriculum indifferent to the actual demands and opportunities pressing on individuals in society, which condition their aspirations, will either be entirely without effect or it will foster an "unhappy consciousness" in individuals who cannot achieve what they value and who disvalue what they are led by the hardly resistible imperatives of modern social life to undertake. In Mannheim's view, while the ideals and objectives of the older *Bildung* retain their worth, they cannot be conveyed in practicable form without an understanding of and adaptation to the social realities in which the students are embedded. Such sociological pedagogy serves two prime purposes. First, it satisfies "civilizational" needs, giving students specialized knowledge and skills, training for the tasks they are called on to perform in the current state of social and economic development. Second, it exposes students to "cultural" reflections that have no immediate practical use, but are essential to the forming and shaping of values (*Gesinnungen*). In order to enable students not only to achieve within the current reality, but also to move beyond that reality towards a new kind of "man and society," education must prepare them for the decisions of "life." However, to accomplish this, life must be sociologically understood as a constrained location in a given historical phase. Otherwise education gives rise to the idealized moral didacticism hateful to moderns because it banishes individuals to an ineffectual sphere of subjective and inconsequential emotionalizing (Mannheim [1930] 1970 [1952], 628–9 [232–3]).

Mannheim takes terms such as "civilization," "culture," and "life" from Alfred Weber, for whom they were central, but he sets out to avoid Weber's excessive reliance on their rich literary suggestiveness and, above all, to lessen the distance between the cultural and civilizational dimensions.[4] Turning from Alfred to Max Weber as his practical model, he devotes the substance of the article to an analysis of the factors that constrain rational choice because they condition the effects of the choices made. Such an undertaking, Mannheim agreed, requires a general and explanatory sociology sensitive, first, to the diversity of historical structures, second, to differences of social location within such structures, and, third, to tendencies of social change. While the techniques of formal sociology may provide some preliminary conceptual clarification, the actual findings depend on sociological analysis that is in principle empirical, although it may project a general design on the basis of widely shared or reliably established generalizations, rather than organizing a separate fact-finding operation.

In some of his earlier writings on method, Mannheim had objected that Max Weber's "general sociology" was unable to probe deeper layers of meaning because of typologies he considered insufficiently historical, but in the present study he does not see such differences, announcing, rather, that Weber's "general

4 This was the primary criticism that Lukács made of Alfred Weber. See Lukács 1915.

sociology is presupposed throughout this inquiry." (638 [239]) Mannheim is almost effusive in his repeated acknowledgments of debt to Max Weber, a feature of the original article that is largely eliminated, apart from curt citations, by the editor of the posthumous English translation. Similarly deleted, interestingly enough, is a note in which Mannheim claims that Weber's historical life's work is dedicated to confirming Nietzsche's distinction between an experience of life among social strata exempted from work, for whom things have meaning only in relation to a static ultimate reality, and the experience of persons oriented to achievement, which yields an understanding of the processive character of reality. As usual, then, there is also a reflexive element in Mannheim's choice of subject: the exploration of changes in the forms and objects of striving simultaneously probes the sources of his own interest in such historical issues—a daemon he also recognizes at work in Weber.[5]

Broadly stated, Mannheim's study of the striving for success can be understood as a constructive intervention in a discussion where there is less difference than usual between Karl Marx and Max Weber. Perhaps it would be best to be more specific and to speak of the Marx whose concept of alienation is highlighted by Mannheim's mentor, Georg Lukács, and the Max Weber of the "iron cage" prophecy on the closing pages of *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (M. Weber 2002a and 2002b; Baehr 2001). Mannheim learns from both, but attempts to find, through his reanalysis of a "variable" situation, sufficient grounds for rejecting the revolutionary diagnosis of the one and the almost despairing tragedy of the other, and to point instead towards a strategic direction for moderate change.

The discussion begins at the quotidian level of man in the economy. To Mannheim, as for Max Weber, it seems clear that the striving for economic success is a major link between the social order and human aspirations. If economic success is a function of the historical constellation of the economy and if the striving for economic success is a normal attribute of human agents, a sociological understanding of the various phases and varieties of this striving will show how the economy actually enters into the experience and thereby into the constitution of social actors, a relationship postulated by Marxist and related sociological theories but poorly comprehended by such simple and unhistorical models of human wants as interest psychology.

The point of departure for the analysis of this pervasive phenomenon is the conceptual relationship between achievement and success. They can both be characterized as modes of effectuating a posited design. In the former case, the actualization is situated in a substantive field of activity—whether artistic, technical, political, or commercial—and the quality of the achievement is determined by

5 The revisions made in the English versions of Mannheim's texts in the years after his emigration, doubtless in keeping with his own preferences, have the advantage of highlighting his empirical interests, as we are also doing now, but they also brush out some motifs that reveal the energy behind his research project, and we will accordingly call attention to them from time to time.

standards internal to that field. Success, in contrast, is "a form of actualization in the social field," a measure of recognition for the achievement, which will be conditioned, for example, by the social standing of the field in which it is achieved. Mannheim finds a term in ordinary language to designate the mechanism of success, a concise German word for the act of prevailing in the face of opposition or indifference (*Sichdurchsetzen*), but he distinguishes between the social recognition gained by the achievement in itself (objective) and the extent to which the person responsible for the achievement prevails in the social sphere (subjective). In the class of achievements pertaining to a field that is itself social, like the activity of a military commander, organizer, or teacher, Mannheim argues, achievement and success can hardly be separated from one another. Still the distinction is important because, first, an achievement may be recognized as an objective success in other fields even if subjective success is denied to its author, and., second, something that bears the hallmarks of success but lacks a concomitant achievement is simply a case of "luck" and without interest. Most important is that both achievement and success are subject to historical change. What is an achievement in one state of technology or art or science is considered obsolete and without value in another, and, however remarkable, an achievement in a field that has lost its social standing will not be accounted a success (634–8 [236–9]).

Mannheim distinguishes in any case between ephemeral and relatively stable forms of success, with the former encompassing the recognition accorded by short-lived "prestige" standing, and the latter, the success that is translated into enhanced opportunities for social efficacy and dispositional powers, the structural qualities named by Weber and indicated by the acquisition of money, property, and position. Ordinary language itself, he notes, distinguishes between "moral" and "real" victories in such strivings. Strictly speaking, even the latter effects cannot be considered truly fixed, except in the short term, because they are ultimately dependent on the stability of the social structure, which is of course subject to change. Mannheim acknowledges that the three domains where "real" success can be achieved—the structure of power, the economy, and career—are not on the same plane, since the last named can be variously divided between the other two, but, in an indication of the importance he attaches to career in his projection of social trends, Mannheim insists that his analysis requires all three. What makes success in the realms of power and the economy real is that these are spheres of consequential human action, whereby the conduct of others is actually constrained and rendered interdependent—by coercion in the one case and by the operation of self-interest in the other. As ordinary language recognizes, the rewards of fame are matters of "mere ideology," supported by nothing more than the opinions of publics, which become ever more volatile as society abandons traditional forms and moves towards rule by "public opinion." (638–41 [239–41])

In an extended footnote, deleted in the English translation, Mannheim implicitly confronts the remarkable change of front from his sociology of knowledge conveyed by this characterization of opinion. He notes that the rule of a freely fluctuating public opinion is almost a limiting case, realized only in marginal spheres of casual

conversation and genuinely voluntary associations. For the rest, the reality is that the so-called power of opinion is subject to the spheres of power and the economy. As men emancipated themselves from traditional forms, the bearers of power within the political and economic domains stepped in to stabilize and stereotype opinions, using coercion and techniques of mass psychology. A comparatively stable fame is possible within the resulting comparatively stable structures of ideational interdependence—which he does not expressly call ideologies—but the success recognized by such fame is closely tied to the "real" powers. Although this footnote mitigates the seeming disregard of ideology in the essay, it should be noted that what is recognized is not the "total ideology," which is the prime interest of *Ideology and Utopia*, but rather the instrumental "particular ideology" he mentions there only in passing, and which is altogether congruent with Max Weber's conception of political language as a political "weapon." (641)

Accordingly, Mannheim turns next to relations with structures of actual human action rather than structures of meaning, to lay out several general aspects of the striving for success. First, in the search for security and continuity, such striving looks to rise in spheres where participants are most effectively subjected to control, unless the key positions in these spheres are already monopolized by strata to which the aspiring agent does not belong. Anticipating Robert K. Merton's concept of opportunity structures, then, Mannheim notes that the direction of the striving for success will depend on the structure of society and one's location within it its stratification. A second general point, closely related and expressly credited to Max Weber, is that it is only with the consolidation of capitalism that the economy has joined the domain of political power as a sphere where overall conduct is sufficiently controlled by internal interdependences to make success really worth while. Before that, the political domain was alone in this respect and wealth was subject to the arbitrary disposition of the politically mighty.

With his third generalization, Mannheim draws very close to a side of the question in which he has a personal stake. After recalling that success is a function of the social standing of the field in which an achievement is situated, he observes that—in the absence of the official cultural gradations earlier in place in India, China and medieval Europe, as well as the decline of the transitional estate formations within which settled prestige positions could be assigned to patronized cultural producers—achievements in cultural spheres are dependent for their recognition on the socially interstitial domain of public opinion. Cultural achievers must now gain recognition by their peers as well as an inherently unstable measure of fame within comparatively open publics oriented to these activities. Mannheim acknowledges that universities and similar academies in the arts now provide a structure of offices achievable by cultural success, but quickly adds: "The importance of public opinion for modern stabilization of success is so great that it is often the case that, even where cultural achievements are linked to "offices" (Instructors in Academies of Art and Universities), the attainment of positions can be secured only in an indirect way through public success." (643

[243]) There speaks the newly famous author of *Ideology and Utopia*, freshly appointed as professor at the University of Frankfurt!

As illustrated by the contrast between England and Prussia in the weighting of military success or the surprising rise in the status of athletic achievement, national differences and historical change exhibit the diverse possibilities of success, but the structural feature that Mannheim singles out is, of course, the rise of the economic sphere to dominance. This occasions, first of all, a democratization of society in the suprapolitical sense that no status group can appropriate economic success measured in wealth, at least as long as the competitive market is not (yet) displaced by governable monopolistic associations. "The anonymity of money" pushes aside the personalistic and surveyable complex of power. There is an orderly and predictable system of interdependence, but little control through command. The individual freedom thus presupposed by the new economic mechanism exposes the individual to a socialization that renders him responsive above all to a utilitarian calculus that entails a thorough domestication to a restricted mode of rational conduct even in spheres remote from the economy. Although the concept of progressive rationalization is familiar from both Max and Alfred Weber, Mannheim's dramatic language rather anticipates the thesis of Herbert Marcuse's *One Dimensional Man*, however little inclined this author would have been to acknowledge such paternity. Mannheim writes:

> The domination by money, despite all the freedom that it presupposes at its beginnings and also effectuates, is far more despotic and determines the interests and private spheres of human existence far more intensively than the system of domination of any despotic prince, who has at his disposal nothing but political means of coercion. (645 [244])

Mannheim next examines the consequences of the new development for the non-material dimensions of society, what is conceptualized in the older philosophy as the realm of the spirit. He turns, in short, to the subject matter of his sociology of knowledge. In contrast to his earlier contention that ideologies are modern cultural formations that presuppose the disruption of tradition, however, he now argues, first, that societies structured mainly by coercive power are especially dependent on "ideological contents and bonds" because military and bureaucracy cannot control all the interstitial social spaces subject to disruptive cultural forces. Such societies are therefore typically marked by an alliance between functionally distinct powers, the bearers of the ideological element and the bearers of physical force—priests and warriors. The ideologies are traditionalized in time and expand into areas beyond those minimally necessary for the maintenance of the social order.

This changes with growing socialization through economic interdependence mediated by enlightened self-interest. Traditional religious and moral controls are ever more displaced by calculable rules of conduct, and even the "irrational" disruptions in the rational net of transactions can be predicted and taken into account. To use Max Weber's terminology, one form of routinization is replaced by

another. Mannheim summarizes: "Those places … in which only the traditionalist-ideological reactions of men once created comprehensible conduct, are now increasingly occupied by economic constraints, which bring about foreseeable conduct by way of enlightened self-interest." (647 [245–6])

With economic development, societies are ever more prepared to dispense with ideologies and to practice tolerance, if only because they are benefited by greater flexibility and diversity among its members. Yet this displacement of ideological controls in everyday life does not mean the end of ideologies. Only if the society were purely economic would this be the case, but the accumulation of property at key places represents a coercive, supra-economic element in the economy, and clashing ideologies accordingly cluster in the political sphere where this power is the object of conflict.

Strikingly, however, Mannheim now turns away from this conflict and its ideological face. He likens the relation between power and the economy to the earlier relation between power and tradition. In both instances only the key positions have to be upheld by coercive modes of power, while conduct is ordered in the latter case by traditionalized ideology and in the former by the immanent structure of the economized society. The psychological link between the individual and domestication through the economy is the striving for success: "Anyone who has submitted to the striving for economic success becomes compliant and transparent in the sequence of his actions." (649 [247]) The mechanism renders "religious" and "moral" issues largely irrelevant to modern people, who disdain such "merely ideological" considerations. In a long footnote (largely deleted in the English text) Mannheim cites the example of sexuality, as a domain that has been made matter-of-fact by the production of means to control its consequences and by the transformation of the status of women. Reconceptualizing Max Weber's thesis about the displacement of value-rational individual orientations by instrumentally rational ones, Mannheim writes that "the ideological retreats in the same measure as social rationalization advances." (649–50n) Without sociological awareness, modern man equates the realm of interdependent rationalized reactions with "reality" as such, and dismisses all matters of the spirit as "mere ideology."

The stabilization presupposed by this account of the "modern ontology of the capitalist orientation to life" is even more in evidence in Mannheim's account of the career as a locus of striving. He links this concept to a "chain of stable possibilities of success," providing a sequence of strictly rationed units of increasing chances for efficacy, dispositional power and prestige. In contrast to success in the spheres of power or economics, the successful personality cannot give form and direction to the newly acquired position, but he can at most instill his own spirit into it. The paradigm is an official career in a bureaucratized structure subject to planning, possessing settled vistas determined by prior decision and comparatively free of internal conflict, whatever maybe the case in its environment. Having characterized the ideal type, however, Mannheim immediately notes that conflict-free zones have to be understood as pacified enclaves within the conflict-laden domains of economic and political competition, whose extent and weight will vary from one

economic or political body to the other. The measure and tendency of the two possibilities are of decisive importance because they point to relations between two structures of success, and thus to two modes of striving for success, two distinctive human types, and ultimately to contrasting types of culture. (650–2 [247–9])

Here Mannheim borrows from both Weber brothers, but also modifies their positions. They opposed Schmoller's generation of the Historical School, which elevated the state and its bureaucracy to the more organic role of unifying the conflict-ridden and divisive sphere of "civil society," and, in doing so, also elevated the traditional ideal of *Bildung*, which was directly tied to the bureaucracy. Both brothers, along with others in their generation, placed the bureaucracy alongside the capitalist economy in the "societal" sphere, but while Alfred Weber looked for an overriding unity in the sphere of culture, Max sought the solution in the value-rational conduct of individuals. (Perhaps there is no better example of this than *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*.) Mannheim had followed both brothers in *Ideology and Utopia* by portraying "bureaucratic conservatism" as a static orientation. Here, however, he begins preparing the ground for a more flexible, perhaps even hopeful account of bureaucratization.

Mannheim opens his examination of the striving for success as such, not yet limited to the economic sphere, with a recollection of a prime theme in the religious thought that had intrigued him since his days in the Georg Lukács circle, the mystics' contrast between a soul formed in its deepest layers by orientation to successful practice and one oriented to contemplative self-abnegation. Playing on the overlap between religious and psychological languages, he proposes to treat the effects of different forms of the striving for success at the same deep level as religious thinkers do, to portray differences in personality structure resulting from different forms of the striving for success not merely as effects of certain causal factors, subject to the usual limiting conditions, but as transformations at the most profound structural level of the "soul." The striving for success is the "transfer point through which the economy forms the social-psychological habitus of individuals and this in turn, the cultural type." (654–5 [251])

He proceeds with reference to the religious language that is his paradigm in this exploration, to examine the effects of such striving on seven distinct aspects of the soul's formation, ranging from the experience of the times and of one's self to the capacity for adaptation and decision. It is important to note that this inventory can also be seen as a systematization of the dimensions that he elsewhere portrays as being constituted by "total ideology," and that the present exercise must therefore be understood as an experimental recasting of the cognitive-emotional structures underlying human action, an experiment whose further development will take place in Mannheim's later writings on planning, where ideologies are expressly treated as anachronistic.[6] In the present phase of his work, however, the most important feature of this design is his attempt to propose a psychological

---

6 The following passages draw on Meja and Kettler, "Karl Mannheim," in Scott (2007, 81–6).

mechanism—and perhaps thereby to counter one criticism of his sociology of knowledge—to account for the supposed correlations between social location and ideational superstructure.

First, Mannheim contrasts the senses of self and the world implicit in the choice between striving for success or passive acceptance, a choice which is itself often conditioned by traditional appraisals of one or the other option. In the former case, time is experienced as a continuous locus of endeavor and the subject as an agent who persists in that continuum despite occasional setbacks, while in the latter, the experience is discontinuous and the subject is always liable simply to lose himself, a possibility that may actually come to be culturally prized in some modes of that passive orientation. Here we see Mannheim subtly incorporating Alfred Weber's global distinction between continuous civilizational "process" and discontinuous cultural "movement," but individualizing and neutralizing it in a manner more akin to Max. Mannheim professes impartiality between the alternatives of striving and passivity, noting only that either choice can be implemented in ways that are better or worse, with the criterion being the extent to which the individual finds himself in the world.

The choice for or against the striving for success profoundly affects the relationship to the other. Briefly stated, Mannheim finds that in the context of the striving for success the other counts only insofar as he serves as a calculable factor in our plans, although the mutual intercourse between agents with a similar perception has precisely the consequences that the older political economy had already projected for market relations:

> There arises a distinctive linkage, a reciprocal limitation of existences, in which each has a view only to himself but is nevertheless compelled to attend to the other. This negative consideration turns into a positive bond. There emerges a respect for obligations and the rules of the game, which often take on a stringency greater than the most strict morality. (657 [252])

Mannheim remarks that it is the radiation of this orientation into the cultural sphere that creates the interest psychology that is documented, for example, in the characters peopling the novels of Stendhal, and their mutual relations, while the novels of Dostoyevsky document all the aspects of the soul that depend on a religiously grounded self-contemplation and are invisible to the striver for success. A lengthy footnote, deleted from the English translation, traces the insight into the hard bargaining mentality to Nietzsche and adds an appreciation of the success formulas compiled by De Séchelles in the eighteenth century. There is a certain nostalgic longing in Mannheim's evocation of the Dostoyevskian possibility, but no denigration of the world of Stendhal (657). It is as though Mannheim were taking his own counsel to considerateness in conducting a negotiation between these alternatives, implicitly construing them both, by the very fact of bargaining, from the standpoint of the practical option. Mannheim turns then, third, to the respective modes of self-observation. While the person who disdains success

will focus inward, whether in narcissism or mystic contemplation, the aspirant to success views himself from the standpoint of external effect and perceptions.

The latter distinctive orientation expresses itself, fourth, in a distinctive quality of experience, which Mannheim calls attentiveness to implementation. Both efforts and their outcomes are monitored in the greatest detail, with a view to minute and precise corrections, conjoining knowledge and intervention. In positivistic science as in the rationalized economy, wholes are taken as comprising a myriad of tiny details, comprehensible and subject to adjustment. As corollary, according to Mannheim, is, fifth, a sense of optimism, a suppression (*Verdrängung*)[7] of anxieties, as individuals extrapolate from their sense of command in their spheres of action to an experience of the world overall. Mannheim is quick to add that this need not take the form of heedlessness. He writes:

> The greater the increase of self-confidence and confidence in the controllability of both things and being through human reason, the greater the chances of a disposition to accept ever more responsibility, although these chances should not be exaggerated since the disposition presupposes a moral and practical pressure "from below." (659–60 [254])

The contrast model is displayed at the instance of tramps, Bohemians, and mendicant monks, who live simply "for the day." Their "day" has its bright and merry stretches, but it is otherwise obscured in impenetrable darkness, since nothing is objectified and all is mere atmosphere. In contrast to Mannheim's earlier juxtaposition of Stendhal and Dostoyevsky, which can still be read against the background of Mannheim's earlier enthusiasm for the latter, his extension of the contrast here underlines the extent to which he now credits the rationalized world with at least equal human worth. There is nothing like a crisis of rationalization—let alone a tragedy of culture—in this account. Mannheim takes his appreciation of the success-striving mentality to a polemical level when he contrasts, sixth, its capacity for adaptation and decision with its opposite. The "passive and impotent" man who "disdains success" and is "estranged from the world" is now shown to engage in mystification, whereby "he suspects 'profundities,' 'mysteries,' 'fate' where there are simple manageable circumstances." His vacillation and indecision, along with his utter incapacity for adaptation, according to Mannheim, "eventuates in a cramped existence, whose mechanism has recently been adequately described

7 Mannheim uses the term that is usually translated as "repression," and he does so in a paragraph that closes with a reference to Freudian psychoanalysis. As is not rarely the case with Mannheim, he hedges the question whether therapeutic guidance actually dispels the anxieties that are demonstrably diminished, in line with the general trend towards greater control, or whether they are merely covered over and in fact repressed, in the Freudian sense. He signals an inclination to take Freudian therapy at its word, except when it comes to the ultimate fear of death, which remains as an impenetrable boundary of the realm of human efficacy.

by psychoanalysis." Unexpectedly, he finds this type especially in the contemporary middle strata of persons living on incomes, whose situation denies them all insight into the links between their own actions and consequences in the real world, and "who are no longer even offered the opportunity of testing themselves by making decisions." (661 [255–6]) Moving beyond the "neutrality" that was his professed starting point, Mannheim now relegates Alfred Weber's neo-Romanticism, in effect, to a "dead-end track," just as he did Max's pure bureaucracy.

Mannheim's summary characterization of the two experiences of "reality," the seventh and final comparison of souls structured by pursuit and disdain of success, restores the balance, highlighting the limits of both choices. Both the inner and the outer "realities" of the person striving for success are limited to the field in which success is pursued, as witness both the exclusively political vision of the "Bismarckian realist" and the "economism" of the proletariat that was captured by Marx but that is no less evident in the orientation of capitalists. In expounding the contrasting view, Mannheim now recurs to the honorific language of the "*vita contemplativa*," but quickly traces this reality, static and limited as it is, to what can be intuited by the mind alone, to the "apathetic ecstasy" of the idle aristocracy, an imputation he also credits to Nietzsche. (662 [256–7]) The conclusion appears unambiguous, if applied reflexively to Mannheim's own objective in the analysis: only the striving for success can see reality as process.

With this typological account of such striving in hand, Mannheim turns next to the actual subject of the study, the striving for success in the economic domain, initially in its effects on the structure of personality. Here the main contrast model will be the aspiration to career advancement, although the abstention from striving will also come into play. Cautioning that the material elements of the striving for economic success depend on its concrete historical articulations in different periods and social locations, he nevertheless begins with three general attributes, viz., the mensurability of such success, the distinctiveness of conflict in this sphere, and the risk of self in economic transactions. If earlier sections of the study are not rarely suggestive of Mannheim playing the Weber brothers off against one another, not so much with regard to method—although that tension is also an undercurrent—as with regard to the static "cultural" option, in Alfred Weber's sense, the set-piece on economic striving in general rather resembles a complex settling of accounts with Mannheim's erstwhile mentor, Georg Lukács, whose *History and Class Consciousness* had been a recurrent object of study for Mannheim during the 1920s, most recently in the context of a joint seminar with Alfred Weber. (Mannheim 2001, 109–29)

The mensurability of success in the economic realm and the consequent dominance of computational and calculating reason in the encounter with the world shows the extent to which human life is structured by its telos, Mannheim says. And in this case, the web of quantification thrown over the world excludes the ultimately problematic issues of human life and creates the illusion of knowing precisely where one is, although in fact one is merely reading the market indicators that one has projected onto things and has not gotten beyond oneself to a penetration

of the world. A life dedicated to advancement in a career is similar in some respects, inasmuch as the rationed steps of progression obscure qualitative and vital elements in life, cloaking everything in a mantle of security. Yet that last quality points to a capital difference. Mannheim introduces it in a paradoxical way, beginning with a vision very close to Lukács, a "quantification of all elements of value ... in connection with economic success [that] brings forth a second world, a mask-like concealment of other values and characteristics," (Mannheim [1930] 1970 [1952], 665–6 [259]) which Mannheim also speaks of as a "disguising and reification of the world." Yet in the event Mannheim denies that this is in fact a petrified world. Its central feature is conflict, after all, a conflict without violence that depends on maximal exploitation of one's advantageous position and the disadvantages of the other. "Action [*das Handeln*] is no aggression," Mannheim writes, "but a negotiation [*Verhandeln*], a taking of advantage of favorable conditions" that are themselves the product of anonymous forces. In urgent language remote from the earlier characterization of an alienated world, Mannheim continues, "It is the anonymity of the conflict, this non-stinking [*non olet*] quality of money, that is the abstract but also fatefully vital aspect of economic life." (666 [259–60])

Mannheim unexpectedly celebrates this vitality. He speaks of economic life as possessing a "demiurgic" quality and characterizes the calculating intelligence as somehow "grandiose." "The ultimately positive thing about economic conflict," he judges, "is that the actors risk themselves and wager everything." In this respect, it is completely unlike the bureaucratic career. "This 'self-risking'," he concludes, "forms a human type whose element is an experimental life," bringing his characterization of the striving for economic success together with that of the sociological vocation, as he will present it later in 1930 to his students in Frankfurt. Moreover, it "heightens all human capacities, rouses the senses, awakens versatility, quickens intuition," while it also "incites a restless disquiet and the most complete dissolution of any sort of contemplativeness." Religions dedicated to contemplation now appear as the special foes of economic life, with Confucianism ("the typical religiosity of officials") as prime example. In its view, "the striving for economic success is the evil element that destroys the harmony of the soul, the ideal of a bureaucratized caste of intellectuals." (667 [260]) Slyly counting on his readers to remember that he is himself a member of such a bureaucracy, if not a caste, so that the issue in some form remains unresolved, Mannheim nevertheless executes a significant turn away not only from neo-Romantic superiority to economic engagement, which he takes to be hidden in Alfred Weber's distinction between culture and civilization, but also from other radicalizations of the critique of rationalization, including that of Lukács.

When Mannheim returns to his initial qualification, that the striving for success in the economic realm cannot be adequately dealt with at the level of generality, especially for the purposes of his analysis, he adapts the concept of "variability"

(*Flexibilität*)[8] from milieu theory in education to designate the historical and social-locational variability of the general structure. This serves as a reminder, then, of the normative setting of his inquiry. He writes: "On a showing that the striving for economic success … has stages of variability, it follows that the social- and economic-educational effort cannot succeed unless it comprehends, in view of the flexibility of [that] striving, the variability of the corresponding human type as well." (668 [261]) This reminder of his project is especially helpful because it points to the conjunction between Mannheim 's pedagogical problem set and his disavowal of radical critiques of rationalization, because these preclude democratic and most other forms of education for the common life of society.

Mannheim's measured management of concepts frequently associated in the Weimar period with ideological mobilizations, especially on the Right, is on display in his survey of the historical changes in the function of the economic leader, the director of an economic undertaking. In reviewing this case of quite dramatic variability, he compares four stages, each with their own inner dynamics and development. The first mode, highly valorized in the anti-modernist discourse of the time, is the master workman in the age of guilds, who combines the activities of the entrepreneur, the inventor, and the worker, although in fact, Mannheim thinks, the focus on the inner meaning of the activity, the absence of conflict, the secure and rationed objectives, and the consequent lack of risk make this altogether a limiting case of economic aspiration, in the sense of the general category. Mannheim expressly notes that this orientation is even consistent with a contemplative mentality, with quietistic mysticism as possibility. Yet a long footnote, addressing the relations between the work ethos as such and the ethos of guilds as social organizations indicates that Mannheim offers empirical guidelines and at the same time negotiates between his mentors. Adopting the language of many predecessors, including Alfred Weber, he describes the guild as an organic "life community," in which the vocational ethos stems from the "soul." But he also aligns his analysis with the effort to specify the elements of "what one is in the habit of calling 'change in the relations of production'." Like Max Weber, he credits Marx with important insights into this dimension of social reality, but, also like Max Weber, he considers it necessary to demystify the key concepts and to examine specific cases in order to specify the limits within which Marxist claims apply.[9] (669–70 [262–3])

8 Mannheim's term is too far removed from its English cognate, "flexibility," especially as that term is presently used in the context of economic sociology. "Variability" does not quite capture it either, since the point is not that the phenomena are unstable and subject to constant change but rather that formally similar elements may have quite different contents when they occur in different historical and/or sociological contexts, which are themselves quite structured and comparatively stabilized.

9 As is the case with most such footnoted contextualizations of Mannheim's project, the footnote is not included in the translation. These editorial cuts in the English version, doubtless made primarily out of respect for the Anglo-Saxon distaste for lengthy

Similar in some respects is the human type that is associated, according to Mannheim, with the economic leader under a mercantilist regime. While his organizational tasks are less clearly prefigured than in a guild, his position is nevertheless comparatively free of conflict and risk. He has the security and the qualifications of the bureaucrat, depending largely on bargaining and related diplomatic skills, and he retains a capacity for a contemplative relationship to culture, although clearly unlike the pietism of the guild master invested in his works (*Werkseligkeit*). Mannheim's attention to these admixtures in the various forms of economic striving points throughout to his framing question about the pedagogical possibilities—which are also always questions about the opportunities for cultivation (*Bildung*) left open by the various character types. The issue is most dramatically posed by the dynamic, active, but obsessively single-minded character corresponding to economic aspirations in the epoch of free competition.

Mannheim derives his ideal type from Gustavus Myers's *History of the Great American Fortunes* and he does not minimize the "piratical" attributes of these pioneers, functioning in a space where the economic domain itself has yet to be subjected to rules of the game and where greed, heedlessness and ambition have unlimited play. "Their person, their fortunes, their enterprises are all one," Mannheim writes, "and their drives towards achievement, possessions, and power mutually reinforce one another." At the same time, he draws up a list of the remarkable talents requisite to success in this creative struggle: "courage, imaginative realism [*Realitätsphantasie*], capacity for a psychological analysis of the opposition, the synoptic vision needed to ascertain at all times how one thing relates to another, the ability to see a wide horizon of possibilities and to anticipate the future in present day actions," and so on. He dwells most on the future-oriented frame of mind, and his language at the key point is another reminder of the elective affinities he seems to see between these entrepreneurial characteristics and the "experimental" mentality he elsewhere attributes to the sociologist. The entrepreneur, he says, "always orients himself to opportunities whose actualization has not yet taken place, and which are more decisive for our actions than that which has already come about." (671 [263]) This last passage indicates Mannheim's shift from the characterization of the entrepreneur alone towards a generalization about the attitude appropriate to human action. The paradigm overall reaches back behind the novel nineteenth-century "experimentalism" Mannheim often cites as a model for sociology to the Machiavellian adaptation of the Renaissance prince, whose search for power is as insatiable as that of the most piratical founder of a great fortune but whose virtuosic "penetration" and "foresight" exhibit the unique mode of dynamic, situational knowing common to the entrepreneur and—in a greatly modified form—to the sociologist as well. Mannheim is building, in short,

---

footnotes, especially where they deal with authors and books unknown to English speakers, may nevertheless have contributed to the neglect of the article among English-language commentators, by making it appear as an isolated, occasional exercise.

towards an unexpected congruence between the cultivation offered by sociology and the knowledge accessible to and indeed required by the individual caught up in newer forms of the striving for economic success.

The newest of those forms, however, Mannheim sees as considerably modified from that appropriate to the primordial founding of the market economy. Through processes of integration and concentration in economic units, functions have changed once again from what he terms (in another homage to Max Weber) "the so-called 'heroic period' of capitalism." (673 [264]) A striking feature, according to Mannheim, is, first, the transformation of smaller risk-taking entrepreneurs into secure bureaucrats within the huge entities that have displaced their own enterprises. Much that had been decided by conflict is now a matter for management. The decision-making that was pervasive in the first market phase is now limited to the very top of the competing vast pyramids of economic operations. Moreover, that top is now itself rendered less aggressive. First, the shift to corporate forms required by the great rise in capital requirements leads to a division between the functions of proprietor and enterprise leader. The former may well turn into a rentier, a comparatively passive and static role open to certain kinds of contemplation. Second, then, the entrepreneurial perspective itself shifts to the longer term interests of enterprises so that, while the conflict dimension remains and the entrepreneur must initiate, lead, and steer, he requires organizational abilities at least as much as qualities of command. Adding the consideration that the entrepreneurial manager is not as strongly motivated by acquisitiveness as the owner-manager, and that his interests are thus more nearly identified with the scope, scale, and longevity of the enterprise, Mannheim concludes that the changes add up to an "objectification" of the functions and of the corresponding psychic orientations and qualities. Mannheim now refers to the leadership of enterprises as a "vocation" (*Beruf*), using quotation marks to highlight the weight of the term—and doubtless referencing Weber's two "vocation" essays, which he had made the subject of commentary in the "Politics as Science" chapter of *Ideology and Utopia*, as well as in the paper on "competition" that had drawn the ire of Alfred Weber (Mannheim [1929] 1990, 53–106)—and he curiously equates the objectification of that economic function's scope and character with a "refinement" (*Veredelung*, also in quotation marks) of the striving for success. The crux, he concludes is the question how far the vocations are in the realm of conflict and in the realm of bureaucratization. And the variability in this respect emerges only from a historical examination.

To illustrate the problems encountered in working out the correlations between psychic and cultural types, Mannheim first recollects the three "static" and three "dynamic" types encountered in the preceding historical survey and then argues the importance of working out the cultural concomitants and possibilities of the bureaucratic form of the static human type, because "it is to a certain extent our fate." Reverting to the wider value relevance of his inquiry, he remarks that "it is not a question of whether we like this or not, but the question can only be about the positive aspects that we may be able to extract from this situation,

which component we may be able to enhance and which ones, to inhibit." (675 [266]) More specifically, the cultural question ultimately concerns the modes of contemplation consistent with the striving for success bred by the increasing security of bureaucratic careers.

Mannheim begins with a comparison between the modes of security that present themselves to the independently thinking master craftsman and the dutiful bureaucrat. The contrast yields an awareness of the extent to which the latter is subject to what Mannheim calls personal dependencies, however objectified, by which he does not mean personal dependency on higher officials but rather the requirement for the bureaucrat to conform to the mental and emotional norms institutionalized in his career. His responses are regulated and rendered predictable not only by the competences and tasks assigned to him but also by the institutionally required psychological "habitus" and ethic. In the market transactions of economic subjects, the personal qualities and beliefs of the actors are largely a matter of indifference, as long as they are rationally calculable in their dealings with one another. In contrast, at least where the social supremacy of a single stratum is secure, one can even speak of an officially mandated set of required beliefs and attitudes (*vorschriftsmäßige Gesinnung*) among bureaucratic officials. Mannheim finds the situation more interesting, however, referring obviously to his own time in Weimar Germany, where overall rule is by coalitions among mutually conflicting social strata, since the disposition of the bureaucrat to be an implementer rather than combatant will produce a distinctive kind of objectivity, arising out of neutralized and mediated versions of the conflicting volitions. This "positive possibility" of bureaucracy, manifested, for example, in the continuity that bureaucracies have provided throughout the many regime changes in France, must be recognized, Mannheim says, even while one acknowledges "the ills and dangers of this form of life." (676–7 [267]) While bureaucrats are all too prone to impose certain narrow views in the name of impartiality, the immanent drift is nevertheless against arbitrariness. Unexpectedly, Mannheim appears to be suggesting that the bureaucracy, which he had essentially written off in *Ideology and Utopia* as a bearer of a static form of conservative ideology, has the possibility of institutionalizing a distanced and effective orientation that counteracts the crisis of distrust that he described in his earlier work as crippling political judgment in an age of ideological confrontation.

Having offered a hint of optimism, Mannheim returns to one of the most stereotyped defects of bureaucratic conduct, the cringing deference towards superiors and tyrannical overbearing towards those beneath them, inside as well as outside the service. He gets there by asking how it is that bureaucracies are able to maintain orderly procedures and preserve useful routines notwithstanding revolutionary changes in political direction. He answers that the key is precisely the hierarchical principle that limits drastic change to the top and assures effective compliance with new directions. Yet this adaptability due to conformity and systematic suppression of volition down the hierarchy, Mannheim notes, exacts psychic costs that manifest themselves in the bureaucratic behavior whose

commonplace caricature is all too often close to truth. As is the case with other steps in Mannheim's analysis, his suggestion of ways to deal with this specific problem leads beyond the immediate question he addresses towards a new theme. He speaks of a "dialectic of the soul" that serves simultaneously to intensify the tensions and to push towards their overcoming. It is methodologically important to note that this "dialectic," in keeping with Mannheim's consistent practice, is a "two-term dialectic," comprising alternate possibilities that are resolved by decisions or empirically explainable developments and not by a supposed inner logic of events. "Among the possible ways of overcoming the psychic tensions arising out of the sphere of [bureaucratic] careers," he writes, pointing back towards the pedagogical framing of his investigation, "is the proper forming of the 'leisure time' [*Freizeit*] of officials." (678 [268])

The possession of leisure time, in the sense of a time when the bureaucrats' economic orientations are altogether in suspension, is itself an ambiguous feature that they share only with modern workers, since the other types of economic striving do not know this experience, any more than they know the sharp distinction between their public and private spheres. Bureaucrats and workers, Mannheim says, have to have "two souls," to correspond to two spheres of life. In the sphere of work, moreover, the great bulk of lower bureaucrats, like workers, are required to execute tasks that do not in themselves make any sense, apart from a wider coordinated effort veiled from the operative agents, into which their products are fitted by the organization of their activities. Mannheim reverts to his "dialectical" formula once more to argue that the psychic effects of this "dual world" may take one of two forms—either the individuals affected attune themselves wholly to meaninglessness and sustain their indifference in their leisure by "drowsing" away the time in inns and bars, or they may seek "compensation" in the second of their worlds. Mannheim traces the image of drowsing away the time to research that purports to show that the usual mode of surviving senseless work is by entering a state of daydreaming, and he associates this in turn with recent findings about the mentality of clerical and retail employees (*Angestellten*) published in separate studies by Hans Speier (1986), Siegfried Kracauer ([1929] 1971), and Emil Lederer (with Jakob Marschak 1926), who are all three associated with Mannheim, noting especially the convergence between such daydreaming and the uses of movies to sustain that state. In contrast, according to Mannheim, "the second route, the compensatory utilization of leisure time over against the quotidian everyday [of work] is the great cultural opportunity [provided by] the contemplativeness of bureaucratic careers." (680 [270]) Interestingly, Mannheim does not turn his observations in this context towards social or political education, although he had noted earlier in a footnote that bureaucratic mentalities may in fact be undergoing deep changes through infusions from the co-participatory "social movement," but he focuses on the choice between the use of leisure to gain a wider, structural understanding of the work processes in which the individuals play narrow specialist roles or a dedication to truly compensatory expansions of experience in cultural fields, sociability, or travel. What matters to Mannheim, nevertheless, is

the potential he sees in these capabilities for approaching a solution of the most pressing cultural and economic problems of the time.

The trend towards bureaucratization is an ineluctable fact, he insists, and the "decisive question" is not whether it can be undone, but rather "the question about the possibility of utilizing and shaping the contemplativity of the bureaucrat." In an injunction doubtless addressed first of all to his original listeners in the educational forum he states: "The imperative is not to complain about the all too many signs and regions of decay in a bureaucratized existence but to seek out ever more attentively the positive possibilities." (681 [270]) And this requires first of all an abandonment of overgeneralization and a corresponding awareness of the variety and variability within the common category, and its susceptibility to re-formation. As noted earlier, Mannheim's focus on rationalization in the form of bureaucratization clearly belongs to his overall determination to engage with many of Max Weber's principal themes and theses, and the quality common to these encounters is refusal to despair, to insist—even in 1930—on the contrast between Weber as a brilliant representative of "disillusioned realism," as Mannheim called it in his "Conservatism" study, and the constructive initiatives of his own generation. From another standpoint, Mannheim's efforts to loosen the rigid formulas about bureaucracy, as well as the conditions that make them plausible, are doubtless linked to his growing conviction that the governance of social and economic life will have to take the form of planning, which can make no sense if bureaucracies cannot be opened to new modes of knowledge and management.

The last segment of Mannheim's analysis poses the question of the relationship to Max Weber on these issues in a compelling but curiously disguised way. To address the second, social dimension of the "variability" he had earlier examined from the standpoint of historical change, Mannheim literally begins with Weber's treatment in *Economy and Society*, which he calls "the best example of the social differentiation of motivations for success and work." (682n, passage deleted in translation) Mannheim acknowledges, if only in a parenthesis, that Weber's classification applies specifically to a commercial economy (*Verkehrswirtschaft*), but he does not indicate that Weber constructs the typology in the context of a comparison between commercial economies and planned ones, as was in fact the case. The passages Mannheim quotes come from a chapter called "Commercial Economy and Planned Economy," characterized by Weber himself as a "pointed" assessment of the (quite possibly prohibitive) costs of socialism, which refuses on principle to manage the irrationalities of economic life by the motivations and techniques at the core of the commercial economy—notably the motivation of workers by necessity, the control of the production process by all-powerful managers, and the formal rationality of the price system. (Weber 1978, 110) The third of these elements, of prime importance for Weber, is beyond Mannheim's scope in the present essay, but the other two are relevant. It is consequently important to attend quite closely to Mannheim's treatment of the corresponding motivations, to see whether he is implicitly searching for openings to their

adaptation beyond Weber's stark binary scheme of the two ideal-typical economies, and their corresponding motivational ecology.

Mannheim's initial revisions of Weber's terms tend towards greater historical specificity, so that the social cross-section refers to the contemporary form of the commercial economy. While Weber speaks of the unpropertied, the educationally privileged, and those who are in a position to gain from profit-making enterprises, Mannheim quotes his terms and then amends them "to make them more vivid," so as to read the wage worker, the professionally trained intelligentsia (officials and technical managers), and "the individuals engaged in capitalist enterprises as capitalist proprietor or enterprise manager." (Mannheim [1930] 1970 [1952], 683 [272]) The inclusions and exclusions of Mannheim's list are themselves revealing: Marx's proletariat and bourgeoisie are there as are the Weber brothers' bureaucrats; Max Weber's "heroic" capitalists and Mannheim's own "socially unattached intelligentsia" are not. Mannheim adheres quite closely to Weber's account—as he acknowledges once more—of the motivations operative at each level. For the first category, there is first of all the compulsion to avoid the risk that they and their families will be unprovided for. This circuitous way of speaking of necessity is important in Weber because it identifies a key reason why a planned economy, in his view, cannot build on this motivation. Such an economy, driven by ethical principle and ultimately dependent on ethical motivations, cannot ever threaten the dependents of its workers with want. For Mannheim, in contrast, this motivation signifies above all the profound gap between the first category and the second. While both writers concede that workers may also be actuated to some variable extent by an internalization of wage labor as a "form of life," Mannheim is especially concerned to show that this is closely related to religious motivations that are everywhere undermined by structural changes in social space as well as the workplace, (683n)[10] and that in any case it survives only as impassive backdrop.

Mannheim's reasons for emphasizing the obsolescence of the traditional component in the orientation to work become clearer in the light of his sharply accented emphasis on the contrast between the worker and the professionalized intellectual. For this second type, Weber lists increased consumption opportunities first of all, then ambition, and finally the "valuation of the preferred work as 'vocation.'" To understand Mannheim's reasons, in contrast, for singling out only the second of these factors, it is useful to recall that the German word for ambition is "*Ehrgeiz*," which is to say a "craving for honor." The professional intellectual is consequently doubly distraught if the conditions of his work change so that he must work simply to avert utter deprivation: he is also dishonored. Yet honor, says Mannheim, is something that the worker driven by necessity cannot even dream of identifying with the increasingly meaningless work that he must do—a reminiscence as well of the role that the "honor" of labor played in the aspirations of the craftsman in the time of guilds. Where the worker has not been

10 This footnote, with an illustrative quotation from Luther, is also missing from the English translation.

wholly demoralized, however, Mannheim observes, he may well invest his honor in another sphere, notably the political one, so that the outcome may be quite different than it appears if we look at the aims of work alone. (684–5 [272–3]) In the political environment of the day, Mannheim's refusal to mourn the loss of the culture of workmanship has a clear political meaning, as does his tacit change in the function of the analysis as a whole, so that the lack of workplace honor among workers connects, if only conditionally, to the possibility of honor through political life. This point is amplified by tying it to two others made separately by the Weber brothers. Alfred had noted during the inflation of the early 1920s that the "intellectual workers," faced with a leveling of incomes, resented the intrusion of the economic sphere into their lives, so that material necessity occupied a more central place at the expense of status, that is, honor. (A. Weber [1923] 1999) Because of their obsession with appearing "unpolitical," they rejected entry into the political arena and thus the possibility of another type of honor. The latter is exactly what Max urged for the bourgeoisie in "Politics as a Vocation." Denied the value-rational orientation of early capitalism (the Protestant ethic) in the reified modern economy, he believed they could find their vocation in the political realm. While Mannheim did not cite either of these texts, he was clearly familiar with both.

Mannheim's treatment of the entrepreneur or top manager, in contrast, is curiously tepid—and almost moralistic in its choice of language. Weber had laid great weight on this compound class of actors. They are moved, first, by their chance of personal capital gain or by "professional" dedication to such a pursuit, second, by the challenge of testing themselves, and third, by the exercise of power, both over the individuals subject to their direction and over the opportunities of an indeterminate number to satisfy their cultural or sheer survival needs. It is the requirement of dispensing with these opportunities and thus with these motivations that poses, in his view, the steepest obstacle in the way of a planned or socialist economy. Mannheim, in contrast, doubtless because of his earlier analysis of the transition underway in the leading role in contemporary enterprises, almost marginalizes these figures. Weber's drive for capital gain (or the professional dedication to this activity) oddly becomes a consumption motive, which Weber had imputed rather to the technical and bureaucratic intelligentsia; the drive to test and prove oneself is mentioned as an afterthought; and the enjoyment of power that plays such a key role in Weber's model, since it is precisely the channeling of this power through market rationality that is the secret of the commercial economy, is viewed by Mannheim through morally tinted glasses as a lust for power. Someone low in the workplace hierarchy cannot afford to crave power (*machtgierig*), but once a certain level is reached, he says, "the potential attains to virulence." (Mannheim [1930] 1970 [1952], 685 [273]) It is as if power were a pathology.

Mannheim adds some rather desultory remarks about the extent to which the motivational structures derived from location in the production order of society affect the orientation of individuals not only in the economic domain but also in

the habitus with which they confront everything in their lives. "It is not their field of vision alone," Mannheim writes, "that is dependent on men's field of operations and their types of ambition, but also the formal tendency to give shape to the things they encounter in other domains of life." (686 [274]) This reformulation of Mannheim's earlier approach to the genealogy of styles, in an extended sense, also may signal that he thinks of this study as the beginning of a fresh approach to the theory of ideology; but it does not acknowledge his new explorations in the possibilities of compensatory responses, whether in the case of the supposed contemplative potential of the bureaucrat or in the case of the worker displacing his search for honor into the political sphere. These remain as openings, to be further developed.

The importance of at least one of these is nevertheless manifest in Mannheim's overall conclusions. First, he returns to his emphasis on society and economy in a process of change. It is the effect of economic locations undergoing change on the formation of people that has been the subject of his study, he insists, and the prime lesson has been the need and possibility of precise analysis in place of familiar broad generalizations about supposed correspondences. His programme, even if only exemplified by sketches, is detailed empirical analysis.

Mannheim collects his key points in a single formula: "It is necessary to have recognized the basic tendencies of the [economic] forces, their capacity for modulation, [and] their layers of flexibility, before one can achieve, by volitional action, whatever can be done in the direction of the ennobling or objectification of motives." (686 [274]) As an instance where an ethically lower motivation is replaced by a higher one, he recalls from his discussion of historical flexibility the effect of the economic process itself in replacing the motive of power aggrandizement among economic leaders with the motive of objectivity. Economic pedagogy, he insists, can avoid vapid edification only if it grounds itself on a sociological understanding of such concrete life-spaces. Edification in fact hinders actual change because it "delights in the subjective sphere of moods." "The great moral progress of modern mankind," he affirms, "is that we no longer want that kind of standard." (687 [274])

Mannheim denies that his emphasis on the formative effects of the economy on man means that we must passively accept whatever is somehow necessarily consequent on the economic structure. "Quite to the contrary," he avows, "man can also form society and economy, given the right circumstances," but only if he avoids setting up theories of "absolute" human freedom, which serve only to render him "numb." It is necessary to have precise knowledge of the field of play—"the here and now of men today"—in which individuals hope to intervene with the freedom they do possess. In a Wagnerian finale, then, he conjures up of the "unique and uncanny thrust" with which the study of social determinants has seized control of present-day thinking, but he insists that the "true man" does not engage in such study in order to exonerate himself from responsibility for his failings, but rather "from a need to descend to these hidden, ruling forces, and to see through them, in order to master them by an intensified will and to place

them in the service of a consciously willed and freely accountable formation of humanity." (687 [275])

While such ultimately empty rhetorical flourishes often signify that a writer has abandoned a difficult problem, in the case of Mannheim they are rarely more than a way of marking the end of a specific, limited encounter with the complex issues he uncovers with his constant probing, and the problems are taken up the next time not at the end of the peroration but at the last substantive point. In this case, it is the need to ground education for purposive change in a rigorous programme of research into realities, trends, possibilities, and costs. That is where he and his students continue.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 4
The "Intensive Study Group" Around Karl Mannheim

Our review of Mannheim's intellectual negotiations with the sociological thought of Alfred and Max Weber shows, first, that Mannheim experimented simultaneously with a number of different settlements with these prime interlocutors, and, second, that the trend in his scholarly work around 1930 was towards a greater interest in Max Weber's practical research paradigm. The Max Weber from whom Mannheim was ever more willing to learn, however, was not primarily the author of the methodological strictures about the limits of disciplined inquiry, but the master of brilliant sociological typologies, the investigator of relations between religions and their social contexts and consequences, and—of course—the writer of the two "vocation" essays, whose scope and reasoning extended speculatively into extra-disciplinary realms. In his promotion of a research practice not inconsistent with a Weberian paradigm, both through his example and through his instruction, he did not abandon his hope that such work would point in time towards a comprehensive and potentially transformative vision of total historical development; but he assigned this step itself to the inner dynamics of inquiry that follows along the course of present possibilities. The years with Alfred Weber and Emil Lederer changed Mannheim's reference point of such possibilities from Georg Lukács's Marx to Max Weber, as he was first interpreted, for example, by Albert Salomon in Mannheim's own generation. (Salomon 1926a and 1926b) The experimental extrapolations beyond this base line took the form, first, of essayistic, programmatic speculation and, second, of exploratory moves beyond disciplinarity to interdisciplinarity. This complex of research and pedagogical practices governs his years in Frankfurt.

Without succumbing to opportunism, then, Mannheim designed his experiments in intellectual strategy in conjunction with the variety of occasions he addressed as public intellectual, professional sociologist, lecturer, or academic mentor. This was only rarely a passive adjustment to existing norms of conduct, since he frequently reconstituted the familiar norms and worked on ambiguities and conflicts to give occasions a new form. Yet this activity was constrained by the objectives he considered both achievable and appropriate to the situation. After his call to the professorship in Frankfurt, he had new responsibilities towards both the advanced students who followed him from Heidelberg in order to work with him towards their doctoral or habilitation theses as well as to broader constituencies unlike any he encountered in his seminars or service courses as Heidelberg Privatdozent and part-time instructor, notably in Alfred Weber's journalism

institute. (See *Verzeichnis der Vorlesungen.*)[1] Mannheim designed a number of partially overlapping but analytically distinct settings for the implementation of the various strategic variations in scope and manner that mark his thinking.

When Mannheim wrote to G. Jászi on 16 January 1933 that a decision to study with him in Frankfurt would offer "a rather intensive study group, close contact with the lecturers, but little dogmatic commitment," (CUL) he had in mind not only the programme of courses at the University but also a mix of formal and informal seminars that he organized, following Alfred Weber's example. In his memoirs, Jacob Katz testifies to the unique qualities of the relationship between Mannheim and his advanced students. Katz writes—with an apology for using a "grandiloquent" term—that after he registered for Mannheim's class and gained admission to his seminar "my hand never left his." (Katz 1995, 78) Mannheim's close attention to his doctoral students' projects is documented by a series of annotated progress reports preserved in Nina Rubinstein's papers (NR), together with photographs of the seminar where these were initially presented to fellow students and junior faculty. Reminiscences and photos indicate that these sessions often continued in the nearby Café Laumer.

Much of this group activity was perforce informal, since in 1930 both the economic and political situation made it too late for Mannheim to gain the kind of financial backing that had enabled Alfred Weber to expand his institute's offerings with the help of an interdisciplinary staff or to employ his students as research assistants on collective research projects. (Blomert 1999, 14–31) When Mannheim sought to supplement his sparse budget by an appeal to the Rockefeller Foundation, a primary supporter of Weber's Institute, the rejection was justified in internal Foundation documents not only by disagreement whether Mannheim's students would in fact steer clear of "historical philosophical studies," but also by the fact that "German public opinion" would be unhappy with aid given to an institution where "the atmosphere is international and Jewish." ("Social Sciences in Germany" [1932], RF 1.1/717/20/186, 19)

The distinction between formal and informal relations between students and lecturers at the time is somewhat misleading, since the audiences of formally scheduled lecture courses like Mannheim's included many students in other disciplines and visitors from town, especially women at leisure. There were no examinations in sociology, since it was not a subject that led to official credentials, although candidates for tuition wavers had to undergo some sort of nominal *viva*

1 The *Verzeichnis der Vorlesungen, Heidelberg. Abschnitt D: Staats-und Kameralwissenschaften* lists lecture courses for several years, including an introduction to sociology and a course on "General Sociology." Amalia Barboza has shared this information with us. It is puzzling that Reinhard Blomert's careful research of these Heidelberg years did not come upon records or recollections of such classes, although the likelihood that these notices were not simply offers that found insufficient takers is increased by the fact that they explain Nina Rubinstein's early exposure to Mannheim, for example, which could hardly have taken place in one of the specialized seminars discussed by Blomert (1999).

voce at the conclusion of certain courses. To gain admission to one of the tutorial groups or seminars sometimes loosely associated with the principal lecture theme, it was indeed necessary to be admitted by the Professor or perhaps his principal assistant, and proof of class registration was entered in the students' course books. Yet the seminars themselves were sometimes very large, the signatures in course books were pro forma, and the key remained the distinction between a small inner circle of assistants and active doctoral candidates and the other students.[2]

The record of Mannheim's actual course offerings—as distinct from catalogue listings—is not altogether clear. However, there is enough evidence, mainly in the materials archived at Keele University, to give a good idea of his plan (KMP). His first Frankfurt course in the Summer Semester of 1930, "General Sociology," was designed above all to make the case for a sociological, intellectually experimental "attitude" as constitutive of a mode of thinking uniquely appropriate, because of its therapeutic as well as analytical powers, to a society in cultural disarray (Mannheim [1930] 2001). Its intellectual design overall can be likened to Weber's "Vocation" essays, or, more precisely, to Mannheim's deliberately tentative attempt to devise a synthesis between the scientific and political vocations in "Politics as a Science." The manifest bid of the lectures for a broad audience and their forceful inspirational drive make this course different from the subsequent courses (insofar as they can be documented from available sources), which proceed in a much more discipline-focused way, interworking elements of formal, comparative, and historical sociology, with the familiar periods of the latter providing the overall organization.

Although the principal title of the first of these courses, "The Social Forms of the Present and their History," effectively covers all those for which Mannheim's own lecture notes remain, a striking feature of the classes, perhaps in recognition of an important part of their audience, was the emphasis on sociological issues otherwise often segregated in specialized courses on women and the family. The Summer 1931 course, for example, covers the period from antiquity to feudalism and focuses on concepts of family, tribe, and patrimonial rule. [3] For the Winter Semester 1931–1932 there are notes on "Theory and History of Social Classes. Problems of Mobility and the Intellectuals. Combined with an Analysis of the

---

2 It is unlikely that such registration was required for lecture courses in sociology, precisely because of the unconstrained condition of study in the field that was the subject of the emergency conference in 1932 to be discussed below.

3 There is a discrepancy between the university's calendar of courses, which announces lectures on "Cultural Sociology" for the 1931 Summer Semester, and the papers in Keele University's Mannheim archive, which contain detailed notes for the historical course described above, expressly dated in Mannheim's hand. Mannheim's draft schedule of offerings in the first years of his exile in England consists exclusively of topics in the sequence outlined above. It is not possible to exclude the possibility that Mannheim archived only those Frankfurt lecture notes that he used for the English series, but this seems unlikely. The questions concerning the archival evidence about the courses matter because of the difference between our account of Mannheim's Frankfurt teaching years and that offered in the interesting reconstruction by Amalia Barboza (Barboza 2006 and 2007).

Agrarian Domain and the Culture of Feudal Society;" and for the Summer Semester 1932, "The Emergence of Modern Society and Human Types. Combined with an Analysis of Urban Society and the Origins of Bourgeois Culture." Mannheim's Winter 1932–1933 course apparently dealt with the "Emergence of State Organization and Officialdom" and the course planned for the following semester, cancelled because of his April ouster by university implementation of Nazi decrees, was "Democratization of State and Society."

Apart from introductory comments on the reflexive "life-based" method intended to lead students into the materials and an occasional essayistic excursus, the lectures comprise quite technical historical and typological surveys, grounded respectfully in standard social-scientific and historical literatures. Mannheim's principal lecture courses typically combined a chapter in historical sociology with an introduction to a major theme in general sociological analysis, pedagogically grounded in current issues. His first course on social institutions, for example, focuses on the sociology of the family as the example best calculated to illustrate the sociological approach to institutions. He motivates the inquiry by citing the urgency of understanding changes in the family at a time when the institution is in uncertain flux:

> Everyone knows—because everyone talks about it—that the family is in crisis; that sexual morality is in crisis; that the frequency of divorce is a problem; that there is talk of an uprising of women, an uprising of youth; … that one can speak of a reproductive strike; that widespread psychic emiseration is being traced to the family (psychoanalysis); that there is hope of forming an altogether new human being. To be entitled to talk about these things, to form a judgment, one must know many things, one must be able to distinguish the essential from the accidental, and, in general, one must have given the matter much thought. (KMP. Reprinted as "The Social Forms of the Present and their History" in Mannheim 2001, 161–162).

Introducing the topic with an exercise in formal sociology, Mannheim situates the family in a distinct and autonomous human domain, centered on the erotic relations between men and women. He distinguishes it from the complex of activities that address economic needs and the need to impart meaning to the world and adds that "the economy provides the framework, but the erotic problem, as asceticism shows, is the one most central to humankind." (KMP) The family in its various forms, as well as such institutions as celibacy and prostitution, represent solutions to this central problem, and "every solution creates its distinctive sense of the body [*Körpergefühl*]."[4] Interpretations of the world, in turn, are vitally influenced by such feelings. The typology of forms opens up questions of historical variations.

---

4 The last two quotations are drawn from typewritten notes, evidently taken by an assistant, filed with Mannheim's lecture notes at Keele (KMP). Norbert Elias attended all of the lectures, and his subsequent work may be illuminated by more detailed review of the full lecture transcripts. Implausibly, Elias' biographer asserts that "Elias attended the

An example of decisive changes originating in this domain, is the eroticization introduced by the minnesingers of the eleventh century: "This attitude towards woman had revolutionary effects upon the whole of social life." (KMP) At a more general level, Mannheim introduces the analytical figure that plays a key role in most of his writings on women and, indeed, carries a lot of the argument in two of the dissertations to be considered:

> According to Marx, crisis arises out of a discrepancy within the development of social forces of production. In the development of the situations of men and women [as in Greece] … a discrepancy emerges in the development of psychic productive forces. Like all such disproportionalities, this leads to a crisis. (1931a, 25)

Mannheim's grounding of his lectures in what he presents as the contemporary form of such a configuration becomes clearer in the subsequent course, where, once again, he subjects an analytical theme from Marxism to a basic change in theoretical function. The principal element in social destabilization and transformation, he contends, is the upward movement of social group-formations.

The crisis of the family, according to Mannheim, begins with the dissolution of its patriarchal type. More specifically, however, problems are centered in difficulties afflicting women in their rise from patriarchal domination. The heading for Mannheim's first lecture—and thus presumably the overarching theme he announced at the beginning of the course—is "Woman as a Problem in Upward Mobility" (*Die Frau als Aufstiegsproblem*). Women's conflicts generated by these changes affect the family so profoundly, Mannheim believes, because they manifest themselves in frigidity and inferiority complexes that vitally damage the capacity of the family to solve the "central human problem" of the erotic. Applying a quasi-Marxist paradigm of contradiction—which becomes, in his hands, a concept of disproportionality—Mannheim traces the crisis to a discrepancy between women's actual situations and the ideology of domesticity that still governs their orientations. Amid profound social changes, women have moved into the work force or they have simply been made functionless in the home and left to devote themselves to self-cultivation or empty pursuits. Nevertheless women continue to accept a model of womanliness derived from a time when the household was a center of production, providing full-time occupation for wives and other females. Women belong in the home, according to these persistent norms; they justify themselves by founding intimacy; they cling to the everyday; and they relinquish all claims to public recognition or competition with men. Such doctrines persist in part because the everyday worldview is itself a product of the home, where women are locked up within the domain of consumption and as yet largely shut off from processes of rationalization. "Unworldly preachers and teachers" broadcast the ideology, and those who benefit from keeping women in confusion inculcate it less innocently.

---

lectures so as to be able to reassure Mannheim, whose native tongue was Hungarian, that he never made any errors in German." (Mennell 1989, 15)

Yet women cannot fulfill themselves in the domestic sphere. They are victimized by the stresses attending their rise, but they cannot and will not be left behind.

To analyze the constituents, causes, and consequences of upward social mobility, Mannheim traces the "rise of woman" from classical antiquity to the high middle ages, devoting several lectures to a detailed review of Tacitus on the Germanic tribes, largely in order to insist on the patriarchal nature of their family regime against fashionable claims about supposed matriarchal origins. Summarizing his analysis, he focuses on a distinction between fixed social arrangements and free space, which he finds variously combined in different phases of different societies. In the free spaces, he says, "social restratification takes place—this is where individuals who are becoming unattached from various strata meet one another … to consolidate into a stratum." (KMP) The sociological generalization about openings created when institutional constraints are loosened clearly applies to Mannheim's theory of the intellectuals (see Mannheim 1982, 256, 265–272), but in the present context it also identifies the locus of a new dynamic force among women.

Although Mannheim's historical survey does not extend beyond the middle ages, he extrapolates from his discussion of the lady of the manor to a characterization of the "lady" (*die Dame*), in the sense in which this type figures importantly in moderate feminist writings since the beginning of the century: "The type of woman arising among the legally married who is increasingly without functions in the social process of production and utilizes her new free time for the cultivation of her personality, as well as the cultivation of manners and the erotic sphere, we call the 'lady.'" (KMP)

In the historical lectures, Mannheim analyzes the effects of social differentiation upon the family. In the preceding semester too, Mannheim ascribed "revolutionary"—and paradigmatic—significance to redefinitions of women's identities during the high middle ages. Then, as noted, he focused on the role of the minnesinger in the genealogy of erotic consciousness. Now he cites new accumulations of power in the hands of nobility to explain the emergence of new patterns of division of labor in new household forms—those pertaining to the castle and the socage holding. Mannheim notes:

> This division of labor deprives the household, originally the site of production for all its needs, of ever more functions. The wife is first transformed into nothing more than the manager of production and then is abandoned to complete loss of function. She either seeks new functions or creates a new form for the free time now available. This ... produced two new types of women: the abbess and the lady of the manor. These are at once new social and new cultural types. (KMP)

Mannheim's shift from his discussion of the wife to the example of the presumably unmarried abbess is facilitated by the ambiguity of the German word for woman and wife, but primarily derives from his fluctuations between historical and typological analyses in the lectures, in line with his cautious modification of

Max Weber's comparative method: the changed status of upper class wives helps to explain the choice of alternative lives by women who might otherwise marry.

In this treatment of the "rise of woman," as in the comparable if less detailed pursuit of distinct epochs in the constitution of cultivated strata, Mannheim's lectures are animated by reminders of structural similarities between experiences he imputes to his audience and these earlier configurations. In the introduction to the second course in which he pays much attention to the condition of women, in fact, he develops a model of the dynamics of acquiring and expanding sociological knowledge actuated by processes of self-reflection. Expounding a notion of sociological "method" he follows Hans Freyer in calling for a "science for living" (*Lebenswissenschaft*) accessible only to persons who require its knowledge for the sake of their lives, Mannheim claims, "Anyone who has not as yet been perplexed by his own situation has no genuine access to sociology and should not pursue it." (KMP. Translation in Mannheim 2001, 166) He then challenges his auditors in their various characters as young people, women, and intellectuals. Young people who have not realized their parents' loss of authority and have thus missed the youth movement experience, he maintains, are not ripe for the sociological problem of generations. Women are addressed twice, and significantly each time anomalously associated with the supposedly anachronistic type of "the lady":

> Only someone who has experienced, as a woman or girl, how society gives her no room for effectiveness—how it enlightens and cultivates her, on the one hand, but provides no room for action—is afflicted with nostalgia and certain psychic illnesses that we will study in the history of the lady. Only someone who has experienced, as a woman, how one is received once as lady (a reminiscence of yesterday) and then again as colleague or competitor begins to recognize that this is a social situation and not a destiny for her sex. (KMP. Translation in Mannheim 2001, 166)

Mannheim closes with the group whose dilemma most immediately concerns himself:

> Only someone who notices, as *intellectual*, that he is, on the one hand, elevated above everything as someone who is educated, but that he is, on the other hand, nothing as bourgeois and worker, that he knows everything and does not know how to do anything, that everyone needs him and that he is nevertheless rejected,—such a person comes not only to a general theory of the powerlessness of the spirit but also recognizes it as the fate of a social layer and understands himself on the basis of the social situation. (KMP. Translation in Mannheim 2001, 166)

In sum, Mannheim says that sociological knowledge starts out from a crisis experienced in one's own life situation, and to his women students he imputes the ideologically-grounded crisis of "the lady."

The first step in the procedure requires the investigator to expose both her situation and self as social events, to dislodge inherited misinterpretations that

obscure new developments, as when an employed woman attempts to make sense of her situation by means of domestic morality. But this initial illumination of situation and self is still partial and abstract; it only opens the way to the sociological work to be done. Even when we correctly place ourselves in society, we see from too limited a perspective. We neglect diverse historical points of view, varieties of social standpoints, and the variability of the process whose moment we recognize. Social events are interwoven and coupled together; sociological method must master these problems. To illustrate the approach, Mannheim reviews dimensions of study for methodical progress beyond woman's starting point, after she has seen through the domestic ideology that first disoriented her.

As in his 1931 course on the family as representative social institution, he begins with the interconnections between family and prostitution: they are complementary, since historically prostitution solves the erotic problems left unsolved by marriage. The situation of the married woman, in short, cannot be illuminated without grasping prostitution as its extrapolation. The female family member stands in similar interaction relationships with structures of power and law, economy, and education. She must understand her situation as a function not only of the institutions that include her, but also of those that keep her out. Beyond the institutional framework of society, Mannheim distinguishes variability of human types, forms of experience, and values, always with a view to assisting a more nuanced and more historically specific contextualizing of the social phenomena under review. As diverse human types, to be understood as interlinked, he cites housewife, concubine, whore, hetæra, crone, working woman, and lady. He maps the erotic and cultural spheres by projecting the interrelationships among sensuous, sublimated, and repressed experiences, and he invites refinement in understanding the constitution and reconstitution of the instincts. Values are a function of differentiated moral codes, and male ideology appears as a distinct factor. The study that begins with an effort at self-clarification motivated by an experience of impasse, in sum, should eventuate in a structured view of a differentiated, interwoven and changing social universe, a comprehensive sociological vision.

In a recent series of exceptionably able writings, Amalia Barboza has reformulated this design as Mannheim's "distantiation method," emphasizing in her designation the initial step in the process of reflection, which Mannheim had elaborated in his introductory course (Mannheim [1930] 2001) and proposed there as the historical precondition for the rise of sociological thought. Our detailed study of Mannheim's new departures in research after 1929, as well as the work he fostered between 1930 and 1933, leads us to suggest an alternative interpretation, although Barboza's thesis clearly captures an important dimension of a complex body of work (Barboza 2005). Succinctly stated, our view is that Mannheim's paradigm of distantiation and self-reflection, is not a method but an answer to the "epistemological" question, "how is sociology possible?" As Mannheim makes clear in his 1921 dissertation, "Structural Analysis of Epistemology," (Mannheim 1953, 15–73) and indeed in all of his earlier writings on the modes of knowing, the sciences themselves are prior to reflection about their status as knowledge and

thus a matter of immanent development, each in its kind. On that view, the theory of knowledge is not a substitute for methods of knowing appropriate to the various inquiries, but a justificatory, legitimating inquiry that explains how something that is thought can be considered knowledge. It answers the Kantian question, "How is knowledge possible?" not "what knowledge is possible?" (Kettler and Meja 1995, 63) In the development of Mannheim's thought after the completion of his dissertation, he changed his mind on the uses of history in accounting for knowledge, but he did not abandon the distinction between the two questions, especially at the level of disciplinary method.

Mannheim's seminar series in Heidelberg, as noted above, culminated in a seminar on Max Weber and in his plan to write a book-length exposition and analysis of Weber's contributions to sociology, which he confidently characterized as the first such study to be attempted. It is not an unreasonable leap to conclude that young scholars in Heidelberg at the end of the 1920s and in Frankfurt at the beginning of the 1930s saw Mannheim's research group as the site for the further development of sociology in the Weberian mode.

Max Weber's legacy and the research group around Mannheim represent a mediated conjunction of inquiry into experientially grounded issues calling for clarification of values as well as the application of the strictest possible methods for understanding the empirical realities that condition an effective confrontation with such challenges. While Mannheim attaches a recurrent prominence both to the historical changes affecting social formations and their interpretation, a reminder of Mannheim's early conviction that his own "dynamic" sociology recognized the importance of historicity to a degree unattainable in Weber's "general" sociology, their actual studies in applied historical sociology do not in fact call on categories unavailable within Weber's frame of reference. As noted earlier, Mannheim effectively concedes the point in his "economic ambition" article, where he expressly cites Weber as authority for his analysis of the "fundamental shift" (*grundliegende Verschiebung*) in relations of power and economic constraints (Mannheim [1930] 1970 [1952] 642n8 [240n1]).[5]

This convergence on practical method does not mean that the problems that Mannheim and some of his students chose for investigation were necessarily taken from Weber, or indeed that they agreed with him in the selection of values requiring clarification through empirical inquiry. Mannheim's experiments in interpretation suggested a strategy for the selection of questions that mattered, and our review of the research programme in action will attend not only to the methodical proceedings and findings but also to clues to the negotiations between

5 In a letter to Fred Clarke on 17 January 1943, Mannheim goes as far as to say (in less than perfect English), "For what I am grateful to Max Weber's work is that it tought (sic) me how to combine history and its spirit with sociology." (In Mannheim 2003, 186) It should be said that the statement must be somewhat discounted because Mannheim is here drawing on the legitimacy of Max Weber in order to strengthen his argument against an English view that history, rather than sociology, is the foundational and synthetic study.

Mannheim and his research associates about the value-relevant questions they chose to pursue, an issue of special importance in his relations with his women students, who were less socialized into the culture of social scientific distance than the men.

The doctoral dissertations and other scholarly works generally credited to Mannheim's group, although in several cases completed only after his dismissal from his university position by National Socialist decree, define themselves as exercises in sociological analysis—to use a term present in several of the titles—blending concepts derived from Mannheim's cultural (or political) sociology with elements taken from one or both Weber brothers and applying them to materials from modern or contemporary history. Where they focus on intellectual productions, they subject them to an "extrinsic" rather than "immanent" interpretation, focusing on genealogies and functions rather than on substantive claims by the authors (Mannheim [1926] 1993), but they do not by any means limit themselves to the ideologies or social contexts that Mannheim explicates in *Ideology and Utopia*. The work adapts key strategies from Mannheim, but the researchers look for answers in their actual research findings. The range of structural issues addressed, moreover, suggests that "sociology of knowledge" is too restrictive a framing of the project overall.

A clarification of Mannheim's design—and an important aid in relating his broad pedagogical project to the more specialized focus of the research he fostered—can be gained from his detailed 1932 talk to fellow sociologists on "Current Tasks of Sociology," with special attention to the question of a standardized curriculum for the field (Mannheim 1932;[6] see Loader and Kettler 2002). The occasion was an emergency conference convened in Frankfurt by the influential Cologne sociologist, Leopold von Wiese, to counter the decline in student enrollments due to new compulsory examination regimes in cognate fields, which had been a prime source of students. The aim was a common front towards state educational authorities, defensively proposing such regimes for sociology as well, a project that would be hopeless without a common position as well on the core sociology curriculum and the qualifications required for teaching it, both of which were highly contested within the German Sociological Society. In the language of Pierre Bourdieu, the agenda represented an attempt to reconstitute the loosely bounded *field* of sociology as a *discipline*.

While resolutions on these matters were reserved to a meeting conducted under the strict control of von Wiese and limited to university teachers expressly contracted to teach sociology, Mannheim's comparatively high standing was recognized by letting him speak at length during a special session open to all. This context—and the slight but real bargaining power it granted Mannheim—must be kept in mind when reading the text, which is conditioned by Mannheim's rhetorical strategy. He acknowledges the need for a more formalized constitution of the field, for the sake of an enhanced bargaining position within the politics of university policy, but he

6 A section of this work has been translated in Mannheim 2001, 145–58.

seeks above all to prevent von Wiese from foreclosing options for the "innovative tendencies" that Mannheim saw himself as representing. (König 1987, 343–387)[7]

The two principal issues in dispute between von Wiese and his main competitors, Karl Mannheim and Hans Freyer, were, first, the relations between the formal sociology that von Wiese had extrapolated from Georg Simmel and equated with fundamental sociological theory as such, as well as the diverse and flexible modes of historical sociology practiced by the others, and, second, the curricular place of what was called contemporary studies (*Gegenwartskunde*) (Loader and Kettler 2002, 96–101). Mannheim sought to change the terms of both disputes by relocating them within a wider conception of the field, to which he would subordinate the discipline, if only because he thought that the support for sociology in the broader intellectual and political constituency for university policy rested upon this more expansive articulation of the sociological attitude. Mannheim opens and closes with Max Weber, in fact, contending that the work of this icon of German thought is unmatched by comparable achievements in any other country, and that this is a prime reason for the acceptance of sociology in Germany not only in the university but also in serious public discourse. Mannheim, in short, attempts to lay out the constitution of the *field* while expressly refusing to delimit more than a portion of it in the manner of the *disciplines* whose self-enclosure in subject-matter, concepts, problems, and method was already on the agenda of some other sociologists. (Bourdieu 1998; Stichweh 1994; Honegger et al. 2007) As a matter of political judgment as well as principle, then, he did not think that sociology should align itself with the university proponents of exclusively self-enclosed scientific disciplines.

Because we are primarily interested in distinguishing the modalities exemplified by Mannheim's professorial practices in different settings, our present purposes do not require us to delve into his disagreements with his colleagues. We instead examine Mannheim's expounding of his curricular design for sociology. At the outset, then, Mannheim distinguishes three aspects of the field: the disciplinary core, the application of sociology to other fields, and "cultural sociology" in a quite special sense of the term. (Lichtblau 2008)

The core corresponds to sociology as the specialized science of social relations, the discipline as such. This in turn Mannheim depicts as available in a formal, theoretical mode (as with Simmel and von Wiese), a mode of general and empirical comparative study (as with Max Weber), and a historicist mode, which radically individualizes its materials. Mannheim's breakdown here follows a typology of sociology that he had already offered in a posthumously published treatise written in 1922, when he was first considering the field, except that his treatment of the historical mode in the earlier text more nearly approximated to the social-historical approach to a comprehensive development from one epochal structure to another—"sociology as the study of the dynamics of history"—(Mannheim [1922–24 1982,

---

7 Amalia Barboza (2006) borrows the term but contests König's rendering of the innovations.

113–8; see Laube 2004), This approach that Mannheim here reserves to the third dimension of the field as a whole, the realm of cultural sociology, to be discussed below. His seeming concession in the 1932 talk, accordingly, that he had earlier been too close to a mode that was "historicist" in a sense that is in fact almost nowhere in evidence in his work is therefore puzzling—and perhaps even disingenuous. A likely explanation is, first, that Mannheim is taking additional distance from the strongly activist version of a historicist approach promoted by Hans Freyer, and, second, that his further work on Max Weber had shown him the openness to historical variability of Weber's ideal-typical method. Mannheim does not in 1932 take the mode grounded in history, in any sense, as a full competitor within the core of the discipline, but rather as a supplement to the comparative, typological work identified with Max Weber, approximating to Mannheim's management of the problem in his study of success. In the end, Mannheim maintains that all three of these disciplinary modes should be taught, in mutual interaction, with individual professors putting the greatest emphasis on the mode that is most congenial to them in their own work. Except for Mannheim's introductory course, the contents of his lecture courses, as documented by detailed lecture notes summarized above (and additional notes for the English-language versions of his first exile years), can be largely comprehended by this circumscription of sociology as a discipline. To judge by the dissertations and other writings imputable to Mannheim's research group, moreover, this disciplinary conception also regulated the bulk of its practical work. Yet if this was the core, the periphery was also always present—as hope, as possibility, as matter for conjecture and experimentation. The other two aspects of sociology as field as presented in the 1932 talk thus also had their appropriate settings and constituencies in Mannheim's teaching.[8]

The second of the three classifications is curiously heterogeneous, ranging from a sense of sociology that is no less familiar from the work of Max Weber than the method of ideal types to Mannheim's distinctive project of sociology of knowledge as a prime contributor to rational judgment. He speaks of the classification as a whole as the sociology of the various disciplines, but he divides it between inquiries into the interplay between the subject matter of sociology and that of such other studies as law or economics, the so-called hyphenated sociologies *(Bindestrichsoziologien)*, on the one hand, and, on the other, the sociology of knowledge, which addresses the social genealogy of the various types of knowledge, with a view to elucidating their respective constitutive perspectival limitations. Mannheim illustrates the two aspects by reference to law and its study. The social setting of the law, he maintains, does not arise within the immanent development of legal thought because the latter presupposes the state of the law

8 Mannheim adds to his overview an ad hoc subfield dealing with sociographics and statistics, but he cautions against American exaggeration of empirical reportage. "An eye for purely empirical findings" has to be complemented by a "constructive vision," which derives in turn from a cultivated capacity to ask fundamental questions about the interplay of social happenings.

as cultural objectification. Although it takes a sociologist to examine the social face of the law, such study also requires cooperation with legal scholars, since the sociologist knows too little about the legal structure. But the sociologist stands in another relationship to the legal scholar because of his insight into the limitations of questions asked by jurists. The normative focus of jurisprudence, Mannheim asserts, leads the discipline to disguise the concrete social processes behind its categories. This is where sociology of knowledge enters, voicing its defining question: "who speaks?" when a truth claim is made. From the answer to this question may emerge a novel measure of control over propositions constituting both specialized and everyday knowledge, Mannheim claims, capable of cleansing especially the latter from its present overlay of myth.

As this suggests, Mannheim here distinguishes between a mainly pedagogical and a more self-critical mode of the sociology of knowledge—dimensions that he had brilliantly intermixed in his essayistic *Ideology and Utopia*. The former corresponds to the study of "ideologies," properly so-called. While Marxism, for its own reasons, singles out political ideologies, he says—as he did himself in his book—the subject actually encompasses all the self-deceptions operative in everyday life, and its aim is, according to Mannheim, to complete the work of enlightenment and to enable present and future generations to live in truth, an achievable aim, which will in turn enable societies to govern and determine themselves. Mannheim's expose of the myth of "the lady," which energizes several of his lecture courses, as we have seen, illustrates this programmatic application of sociological knowledge, but it is essential to recall that the educational objective cannot be achieved unless the sociology is also disciplined and grounded in detail. Popularized versions of ideological awareness are not in themselves a part of the Enlightenment solution sought by this side of sociology of knowledge. Like other features of popular belief, they are a part of the problem.

When Mannheim turns to what he now calls sociology of knowledge in the stricter sense he denies that it presupposes or addresses "ideologies" in the sense of self-deceptions. Rather, it is concerned with uncovering particularistic limits underlying propositions constitutive of sciences, notably in their concepts, categories, and methods of inquiry. By its work of confronting and interconnecting these limited perspectives, sociology of knowledge serves as mediator (*Vermittlerin*), Mannheim says, towards a higher unity of human knowledge. The locus of mediation has shifted, it appears, from the political realm, where Mannheim had earlier situated it, to the realm of academic scholarship. The special and increasing significance of this function as "theory" figures ever more in all disciplines, so that the role of sociology of knowledge already recognized as indispensable vis-à-vis political and economic theories will find application everywhere. While it does not supercede an analysis grounded in epistemology, Mannheim concedes that it nevertheless serves the elucidation of the situation of thought. And sociology will use it to monitor itself.

While sociology of knowledge in the sense of ideology-critique provided Mannheim's lecture courses with their motivating themes, as we have noted, the

stricter version of this enterprise was reserved, above all, to a special forum for junior faculty and advanced students, whose distinguishing feature was precisely the problem-centered interdisciplinarity that Mannheim had come to see as the way to reflexivity, with sociology as facilitator of the negotiations constitutive of the process, as well as direct contributor.[9] Co-founded by Mannheim and his friend and future collaborator Adolf Löwe, the two-year "Workshop on Social History and History of Ideas: Early Liberalism in Germany," also involved the political scientist Ludwig Bergsträsser, and the historian Ulrich Noack—with Paul Tillich among those present periodically as guests. Student and post-graduate participants included Norbert Elias, Hannah Arendt and her husband, Günther Stern (later known as Günther Anders), Hans Gerth, Jacob Katz, and Hans Weil, several of whom developed their research in the context of the working group (Herrmann 1976). As far as can be judged from the compressed notes of workshop sessions left by Kurt H. Wolff, the seminar proceeded through by way of research reports by the less senior participants punctuated by informal comments and suggestions by the faculty in attendance.[10] Reflecting on the workshop at a later time, Mannheim described it as "a new pattern of research which I first tried to develop with research students in 1930 at Frankfurt University and have since continued, and which I should call Integrating Research. Its task is to combine different aspects of the same problem which previously have been dealt with only in water-tight compartments." (Introduction to Klein 1946, vii)

Mannheim casts a further light on the fluidity of this institution in a letter to Martin Buber, written at the end of December 1931. After thanking Martin Buber for a rewarding conversation about sociology of knowledge, Mannheim turns to another matter. He has recently formed a research group (*Forschungsgemeinschaft*), he reports, which is addressing itself to "the special problem of 'Liberalism and

---

9 Mannheim's latter-day inclination to see multi-disciplinary study as the operationalizing of sociology of knowledge in its most important scientific capacity explains his oddly ungracious introduction to Viola Klein's *The Feminine Character* (Klein 1946). The study itself, which had been mentored by Mannheim, represented a conscientious and ingenious application of the sociology of knowledge to the work of several important writers on the subject of women, but Mannheim addressed himself only to his hopes for problem-centered "integrative" studies across disciplinary boundary lines, rather patronizing the book he was introducing as a praiseworthy attempt to do single-handedly what would require a team (Kettler/Meja 1993, 37–8).

10 Wolff's notes dated 5 May 1932 (but possibly extending beyond that date) open with a report by Hans Weil. He makes an observation on the social distribution of "spirit" (*Geist*) and is evidently interrupted by Mannheim, who classifies a number of social loci of "spirit." Weil resumes his report until Löwe and then Mannheim again pick up a phrase for further analysis. Käthe Truhel and others also make brief reports to advance the inquiry, closely tied at this stage to Weil's earlier book on the emergence of the cultivated elite. The atmosphere is collegial and cooperative, and the work is more in the nature of sharing information than disputing interpretations (SAK, Bookcase 3.14a SS32; Bookcase 3.14a WS 32/33).

Jewry,' above all the question of the stands that different social strata assumed with regard to the aspirations for [Jewish] emancipation, and the kinds of existential influences as between Jews and non-Jews that can be shown to have existed at that time." "With regard to this working group," he continues, "I just want to say that I hope that it will remain together for sustained collective work and become a place of refuge for individuals who are working along these lines." (Martin Buber Nachlass, Hebrew University, Jerusalem, Arch.Ms.Var 350/File 473 Karl Mannheim)

Since the key to "integrating research" as an implementation of the sociology of knowledge programme is work on a common "problem," it is important to understand the reasoning behind the assumption that "early Liberalism" comprehended rewarding problems.[11] Mannheim's account of "sociology of knowledge in its proper sense" does not offer much help, although the project of sociology of knowledge as expose of ideology is clearly pertinent. This is clearly a dimension of Margarete Freudenthal's study of the changing status of women in the household, which was grounded in the workshop, according to her recollections, especially in view of Freudenthal's earlier involvement in groups determined to undermine conventional account of women and domesticity (Freudenthal 1986). Yet that is not the only face of sociology relevant to the conjunction of the genealogy of liberalism with the research interests of the group.

Mannheim's survey of the field includes a second unsystematic component, in addition to the subfields of sociography and statistics. Mannheim refers to it by the term for studies of contemporary events (*Gegenwartskunde*), but he narrows its scope to the development of interlinked social typologies that could serve to frame the individuals whose particular qualities are ever more opaque under conditions of division of labor and the attendant social differentiation. Such study is especially important, he suggests, to teachers, lawyers, and journalists, who require guidance in their encounters with diverse contemporary strata. This rationale bears not only on Freudenthal's revisionist account of contemporary domesticity and Jacob Katz's investigation of Jewish enlightenment and the ideology of assimilation but also on Käthe Truhel's inquiry into novel, transformative relations between social workers and bureaucrats and Hans Gerth's typology of social actors, notably "intellectuals," open to liberalism in its formative period, with its implicit comparison of present day types who are similar only on a formal view.

---

11 This question can be usefully raised about Mannheim's selection of "early conservatism" (*Altkonservatismus*) as the subject matter of his habilitation thesis. An analysis patterned on Mannheim's injunctions to his students about the reflexive moment in the selection of problems would pay special attention to the personal questions posed to Mannheim and others in his Budapest cohort in their recourse to themes from German neo-Romantic conservative thought in their critiques of the reform progressivism of their time, given the political—notably anti-Semitic—implications of such a posture in the Hungarian context. Inquiring into structural developments and possibilities of the ideology implicitly addressed such questions.

The motif of a retrospective of the beginnings of liberalism as viewed from its evident end points towards a broader field in Mannheim's sociological programme, taken as a whole, for which the study grounded in the orientation needs of practical social actors is only a practical point of departure. In seeking the wider context within which Mannheim located the selection of problems, as distinct from the actual work of sociological research it is necessary to return to his explication of the field and to attend specifically to the category that he treats as coeval with the tripartite division of the discipline and the sociology of other fields, including the sociology of knowledge. This is what he now calls cultural sociology (*Kultursoziologie*).

This portion of his curricular programme manifests a striking and consequential difference between Mannheim's earlier and later typologies of sociology. In his 1921 treatise, as briefly mentioned above, Mannheim listed "sociology as the study of the dynamics of history" as the superior type of sociology, in contrast to the useful but limited types associated with Simmel ("formal") or Max Weber ("general") a trifurcation that he then applied to parallel varieties of cultural sociology, culminating in "dynamic cultural sociology." The 1932 account reserves the concept of "cultural sociology" to a new formulation of the last of these options and it draws a clear boundary—in method, rigor, and aspirations—between it and the types of sociology assigned to the disciplinary core. (Mannheim 1932, 22–7)

Cultural sociology, he now proposes, represents an attempt to uncover the overall interconnectedness of social-spiritual phenomena. Whether these interconnections should be understood as expressive, causal, or "dialectical" is a matter for intellectual experimentation, he acknowledges, and he cautions against the dangers of boundless speculation and theoretical excess in such studies, but he insists that the task is nevertheless valid and essential, simply because "that is just the way the world is."

In elaborating this conception of cultural sociology, Mannheim does not neglect the special subject matter usually associated with inquiries under this heading, but his exposition of the relationships between social and cultural features, and especially his comments on method, depend heavily on metaphorical characterizations of the pursuit of intimations and intuited linkages. Above all Mannheim sees this as the locus of thinking about the "social dynamic as a whole." Approaches to the latter, like those identified with Marxism or Alfred Weber's *Kultursoziologie* or positivism, he maintains, have provisional character as hypotheses and have worth only insofar as they are empirically supported. He reiterates warnings against the danger of grandiose theorizing, but insists that it is necessary to start questioning someplace, even if one begins with ideas from philosophy of history. He proposes to move simultaneously from facts to systematic questions and from total perspectives towards facts. The intention of this "historical form of sociology" is not to engage in some battle of grand theories, whose unfruitfulness is illustrated by abstract discussions about dialectics and figuration (*Gestalt*) in history, but "to sharpen the vision and understanding of life in the direction in which one can

grasp the linkages—i.e., the interwovenness of events—in human phenomena." (Mannheim 1932, 27)

The vision of the age as marking the end of liberalism and requiring an understanding of its origins, development, and obsolescence is Mannheim's counterpart to Max Weber's prophecy of hyper-rationalism and the bureaucratic age, as highlighted by Salomon and others, and it is his counter to it as well. Much of his work in England is dedicated to the implications of this historical transition, but in his Frankfurt seminar and related teaching he offers the approach as another hypothesis to help generate problems for sociological research, which must, however, be carried on with the most rigorous applicable methods of empirical study.

Throughout, it seems, the point is above all the interplay between the kinds of thinking characteristic of the two logically distinct types of questions distinguished by Max Weber, with a view to their complementarity. These correspond, more or less, to the centers of gravity in the concerns of two types of social persons of knowledge. The "synthesis" between them of which Mannheim often speaks is not a fusion between intellectuals and scientists within the university—or indeed within the inwardly complex individual able to coexist in both worlds—but a bargaining structure, characterized by distance as well as collaboration.[12]

---

12 Clearly not all those who attended were prepared to risk much in negotiations with the group. It seems likely, indeed, that Hannah Arendt developed her lifelong distrust of sociology—and her identification of that discipline with Mannheim—in the course of her attendance in the Frankfurt workshop, precisely because this ad hoc (and non-curricular) "workshop" gave institutional expression to Mannheim's hopes for a philosophically contingent conjunction of "relevance" and "susceptibility to disciplinary control," (*Aktualität und Kontrollierbarkeit*), an unphilosophical way of proceeding that Arendt criticizes in her review of *Ideologie und Utopie* (Arendt [1930] 1990). Also see Baehr, Kettler as well as Kettler's digital editing of Arendt's marginal notes on *Ideologie und Utopie* (http://www.bard.edu/arendtcollection/kettler.htm). See also Arendt's contemptuous references to Mannheim in her postwar correspondence with Jaspers (Arendt and Jaspers [1985] 1992), 86, 135, 348–9, 531, 706). Yet it is interesting that she did attend the workshop after having written the review and that she did so after having decided to concentrate on her Rachel Varnhagen project, which is strikingly close in subject matter to the concerns of Weil, Gerth, Katz, and the other Mannheim interlocutors in the group. Her visits to the Frankfurt workshop were not her first encounters with Mannheim. She is listed as a registered student in two of his Heidelberg seminars in 1927–8, one on Conservatism and another on philosophy in the nineteenth century, a circumstance that testifies to the interest generated by Mannheim and the quality of the intellectual atmosphere around him (Blomert 1999, 427 n3 and 433n44). Hans Gerth remembered, however, "a scene of a terrible confrontation between Mannheim and Hannah Arendt" in one of those Heidelberg seminars. According to Nabuko Gerth (2000, 129), Gerth spoke of it as manifesting "such an improper reaction--ill-mannered behavior," although it cannot have had lasting effects, since Mannheim presented Arendt with a signed offprint of his 1929 "Competition" article. It is unlikely that details of Arendt's interactions with Mannheim can ever be reconstructed. Perhaps it was in fact more reciprocal than her later dismissive attitude would suggest.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 5
Norbert Elias and the Sociology of External Forms

The loose constraints and room for maneuver within the research group are manifest in the work of the participant who became the most famous of the group and whose office as Mannheim's assistant, advanced academic standing, intellectual resourcefulness, and helpfulness towards individual members gave him unusual weight in the negotiations constituting the research group. There is an awkward discussion in the literature about the balance of influences between Norbert Elias and Karl Mannheim, aimed above all against suggestions, which have in fact not been heard for several academic generations, that Elias was simply an epigone of Mannheim or that he is to be understood in some deprecatory sense as Mannheim's "student." Whatever may be the case for efforts to assess ultimate merits, such questions are obviated for our inquiry, since we work with the simple empirical fact of the Mannheim "group" and insist that different participants brought different weights to the negotiations, which makes it an empirical question about the group process to see how the shifting "platforms" and terms of reference were constituted from time to time. Elias was a uniquely potent factor, but other participants—notably the students—also brought resources to the table, and the work of none of them can be understood as a mere extension of Mannheim's thinking, a passive implementation of instructions.[1]

This is true even in the case of the student who came to Mannheim with perhaps the least preparation and scholarly temperament, Nina Rubinstein, and in whose case we have a remarkably complete record of detailed advice from both Mannheim and an early strategic suggestion from Elias—as well as her final text, to be discussed below, which reveals her insistence on her own experiences and her consequent independence within the general framework of the common project. (Rubinstein 2000; Kettler 2003)

As is the case with almost all of the texts that we have available to document the proceedings of Mannheim's workshop, due to the cruel disruptions and losses

1 Despite some rhetorical and speculative hostages to the campaign to vindicate Elias against the supposed misjudgment of intellectual history, the most meticulous comparison of the writings of Norbert Elias and Karl Mannheim is Richard Kilminster (2007). In the chapter on "Norbert Elias and Karl Mannheim" (40–71), Kilminster offers a thoughtful characterization of Mannheim's empirical work (64ff.). Although we have never reached complete agreement with him, the authors are grateful for Kilminster's open-mindedness and helpful communications over the years.

brought about by the Nazi era, Elias's published book on the *Court Society* [*Die höfische Gesellschaft*] is not identical with the habilitation thesis he originally submitted, under Mannheim's auspices. Some chapters were added to the original text—which had been rediscovered by Elias in 1966 but subsequently lost again—notably a long methodological introduction based on Elias's later reconceptualization of his approach to the conjunction of history and sociology, and there is a current of internal didactic commentary that evidently derives from the same revision, but the main substantive chapters do not appear to have been recast in terms of these reflections, and the original analysis can be reconstructed with some confidence.

A *tour de force* in its own right, the first substantive chapter, "The Structure of Dwellings as an Indicator of Social Structure," is reliably reported to date unchanged from the 1933 text. Its independent history and design connect it especially well to the research group. The story is also typical for the time. It begins when the *Revue Internationale de Sociologie* for January 1932 announced Professor Karl Mannheim of the Sociological Institute in Frankfurt as a contributor to the section on "*L'habitat humaine*" at the 1933 Congress of the Institute Internationale de Sociologie in Geneva, with a presentation on "the human habitat from the perspective of the social role of women and the domestic economy." (1932, 40,1) By the time of the meetings, however, Mannheim no longer had an institute or a home. His name appears in the official 1934 report of the Congress, with his new London affiliation, but he could not himself appear in Geneva. In his place, he secured an opportunity for two degree candidates from Frankfurt: Margarete Freudenthal, whose doctoral dissertation research provided the topic Mannheim had originally announced (Freudenthal [1934] 1986), and Norbert Elias, who drew on the just completed habilitation (Elias [1933] 1983). Their presentations in Geneva, so far as can be judged from the brief report in the *Revue* (1934, 143–4), brilliantly illustrate how common participation in Mannheim's research group could be developed in quite different directions, without loss of certain common points of reference.

Both undertake to explain, the rapporteur indicates, "correlations between types of homes and levels of social existence" of their inhabitants. While Elias focuses on the houses of French courtiers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, and concludes that "the residence represented the rank and function of its owner; it corresponded, moreover, to the nobility's manner of life: their relations of reciprocal hospitality, the requirements of luxury, of staff, of domesticity," Freudenthal, whose study we will examine later, contrasts proletarian and bourgeois homes by reference to the respective domestic economies, arguing specifically that "the mode of material existence varies with the economic role—inside as well as outside the home—of the woman." The differences between these two representatives of Mannheim's Frankfurt institute—the one stressing the proprietor's rank and primarily political functions and the other the household roles of women—are not explainable simply by the different historical and social

milieus they examine. They typify the diversity of work—and common empirical commitments—generated within Mannheim's working group in Frankfurt.

It should be noted that Freudenthal expressed great friendship for Elias in her memoirs and thanked him especially for his helpfulness. Her final reference point nevertheless remained the judgment of Mannheim. As she doubtless overstated the case in her chatty memoir, "I naturally did what the boss wanted." (Sallis-Freudenthal 1977, 110) Elias's memoirs give no sign of any such assertions of superior bargaining power on the part of Mannheim. Perhaps Mannheim, notwithstanding all that has been said and written about his competitiveness, applied to Elias his own version of the generous respect he had received from Alfred Weber. Mannheim reminded Weber of the anecdote on the occasion of the latter's seventieth birthday:

> When a philosopher with a long beard [presumably Heinrich Rickert] wanted to force me, year after year, to think as he did, and when I then came to you to submit my work, I was struck by the fear that you would similarly control whether my thoughts reproduced yours. Then you said, to my great surprise: "I will read your work, but it has already been accepted, for you are an adult and must say what you think right." These sentences have had a lasting impact on me. It is only because of this experience that I overcame, from the outset, the teacher's dangerous inclination to attempt to form students in his own image. This attitude of yours is, however, simultaneously the explanation for the fact that you have spiritually independent students everywhere in the world, who, though they will always declare themselves for you in the depths of their souls, are much too independent to form a school in the usual sense, one that fights for one-sided principles or appears self-enclosed like a sect, unified by a dogma. (Mannheim 2001, 130–31)

Of course, no one is under oath when writing such a congratulatory letter, and good resolutions do not always govern practice, but Mannheim clearly did everything he could to gain acceptance for Elias's habilitation, although it was not a book he would—or perhaps could—have written himself; and he sought to provide him with the only assistance at his disposal, when he was effectively rendered impotent by the dependencies constitutive of his own exile existence, first, by providing him with the opportunity in Geneva, and, second, by inclusion on the team for the project for which he sought support from the Rockefeller Foundation. That project, proposed in 1933, in the first days of Mannheim's exile, was to have been a study of the social developments that had, in Mannheim's view, led to destructive changes in the function of liberal non-intervention and had undermined the structured reproduction of cultural elites and their publics, which the earlier liberalism seminar had shown to be fundamental for that formation, in favor of a vicious symbiosis of leaders and masses. (Kettler and Meja 1995, 178–81)

There is more than a family resemblance between the premise underlying this diagnosis of the catastrophe signaled by German developments and Elias's account of the dialectical interdependence between the cultural pattern of the court at the

time of Louis XIV and the constitution of royal power, its limitations as well as its supremacy. This becomes even more evident in the chapter on the "Sociogenesis of the French Revolution" that Elias added when he revised his book, since a key point in that argument might be restated as a change in the function of the court practices, which now rendered the court parties unable to respond to fundamental changes in the distributions of power in society, instead of enacting the measures essential to producing and reproducing the absolutist order. There is an implicit similarity between this thesis and Mannheim's later view of the obsolescence of the German elites—and of the culture that had formerly legitimated them. A key term for Elias in that analysis of discontinuity, as it was for Mannheim—and as it had been for the social theory tradition since Tocqueville and John Stuart Mill—was "democratization" in a sense only indirectly related to the equalization of political power (Mannheim 1934; Loader and Kettler 2002).

In the main body of Elias's study, however, as in Mannheim's earlier study of the striving for economic success, the focus is on the functionally effective reproduction and adaptation of a complex of actions, aspirations, and performances, epitomized in Elias's case by the epoch of the successful "court society" of seventeenth-century France and for Mannheim's 1930 study by the tense, contradictory, but manageable epoch of a gradual transition from a liberal capitalist to a bureaucratically planned society. Mannheim brought this approach with him to his Frankfurt classes. According to the notes of Mannheim's 1930 introductory course, the final class summed up the main point of the course in a discussion of the relations between psychological and sociological factors. The last example of these relations, a few sentences before the end of the lecture note, is a restatement of the argument in Mannheim's study of the striving for success, which is now characterized as a "functional view" and exemplified by a listing of the different motives to work operative in workers, academics and employees, and leading industrialists. The term "functional" is unavoidably used in two senses. The first refers to the sense common in "functionalist" sociology, which is hard to avoid because of the prevalence of such reasoning in the work of Mannheim and the research group. The second, however, refers to Mannheim's own preferred usage, where "function" serves in the manner of its mathematical application, where one set of relations are said to be a function of another. "The decisive thing," the notes state, "[is that] the motivations are traced to the social process." (Mannheim [1930] 2001, 78, 196n7) This theme is common to Mannheim and Elias and helped to found their congruent efforts.[2]

---

2 We depersonalize the authorship of the comments we cite because they are not found in the stenographic transcription of Mannheim's lectures but rather in a list of points uncovered in a different archival source—and the possibility cannot be altogether excluded that these notes originate in a tutorial conducted by Elias, as Mannheim's assistant, an uncertain surmise based mostly on some unexpected uses of psychoanalytical language in a matching document in the same source.

Mannheim and Elias certainly deal with different units of time and place but the work is similar in focusing on the dynamic processes that constitute the social configurations that Max Weber, above all, had classified and characterized. From this narrow comparative perspective, what Elias brings to the wider research project is, first, a curiosity and capacity for detail that stands in productive tension to Mannheim's more sweeping and occasionally more essayistic constructions, something that brings Elias consistently closer in the actual body of his work to the shared programmatic commitment to empirical grounding. Second, Elias has a more vivid awareness than Mannheim of the violence that social and political constitutions suppress, channel, and manage—and to which they are likely in time to succumb. While this insight enters most directly into the book that Elias wrote at a greater distance from the Mannheim group undertaking, *The Civilizing Process* (Elias [1939] 2000), it is manifest as well in the political realism that runs through the *Court Society*. Unlike Mannheim, Elias did not think that there was always somewhere a mutually advantageous, if also sometimes asymmetrical and provisional, settlement to be negotiated.

This intellectually consequential distinctive sensibility can be identified in an early, non-academic article on "The Sociology of anti-Semitism" by Elias, which the editor of the volume of Elias's *Early Writings* actually considers to be especially marked by the "influence of Karl Mannheim's work generally and his 1927 essay on 'Conservative Thought' in particular."[3] (Elias 2006, 78n1) The association is presumably manifest in Elias's identification of anti-Semitism with a "conservatism" that is itself a function of a constriction of "economic space" for segments of the population that had earlier been prepared to overlook the "otherness" of the Jews because of a shared liberal vision of economic opportunity and freedom. Under these changed conditions, Elias argues—consistent with Zionist convictions that could not have been further from Mannheim's own views—there is nothing Jews in Germany can do about anti-Semitism. They can accept with as much dignity as they can muster that they will be "degraded and debased," or they must emigrate to Palestine. If it indeed the case that the "conservatism" that Elias had in mind was the conservatism that Mannheim studied, then it should be noted that Mannheim considered this conservatism to be a constituent in the "synthesis" to be brokered by sociology of knowledge in its political form. That was not the case with fascism, which Mannheim had already put in a different, indigestible category in *Ideologie und Utopie*, and which he identified as a decisive presence in Germany in his 1930 lectures, after the very large Nazi gains in the elections of that year. Writing in 1929, Elias evidently saw no need as yet to separate fascism from the more widespread phenomenon of what he called conservatism. Yet Mannheim

3 The generally excellent editor errs in neglecting the differences among the German periodical version (Mannheim [1927] 1952, 134–190), its later English counterpart, and the full text of Mannheim's *Conservatism*. This matters only insofar as it obscures the regrettably unanswerable question whether Elias was familiar with the last of these texts, which is much richer than the abbreviated essays.

appears more hopeful, first, because he does not focus on the question of anti-Semitism when he considers the crisis of which he takes fascism to be a symptom, and, second, because notwithstanding his own experience of violent revolution and counter-revolution in Hungary, Mannheim was more inclined to see promise than ruin in the crises that he was ingeniously concerned to diagnose, just as he was more likely to see what he called "the irrational" as an opening to mystical communion or ecstasy rather than as opening to an explosion of violence.

These differences between Elias and Mannheim are, however, at the limits of their quite similar approaches to the functionally constructive interplay among the practices, psychological character formations, and decisive structural configurations that together produce and reproduce a constituted time/space variant. This is clear from a comparison of Mannheim's article on the striving for economic success with Elias's treatment of the *Court Society*, granted the important additional difference that Elias views the political structure as more important than the economic one. Like Mannheim, Elias selects Max Weber as his most important reference point among the classical masters, except that he expressly differentiates his political reading from the focus on the bureaucracy that he finds uppermost in Weber—and that Mannheim imported into his examination of economic "variability." Elias is quite clear, in any case, that his study begins, first, with Weber's suggestion that "'luxury' in the sense of a rejection of the purposive-rational orientation of consumption is, for the feudal ruling class, not something 'superfluous' but one of the means of its social self-assertion," (Elias [1933] 1983, 38–9) and, second, with his concept of the patrimonial state—"i.e., the state whose central organ is the king's household in the extended sense, that is, 'the court.'" (41)

Elias's first and most intriguing extrapolation from Weber's statement of the problem, without counterpart in any of Mannheim's publications or recorded lectures, is his inquiry into the articulations of the social relations comprehended by the court and the state over which it ruled in the spatial arrangements of the residences variously occupied by the king and the multiple social layers of his subjects. The aristocratic and bourgeois estates were fundamentally divided by the prime importance of space for "social," ceremonial life for the former, and the unimportance of this dimension for the latter, at least during the prime years of the "court society." Ingeniously drawing on the many blueprints included in the *Encyclopédie*, Elias shows that differences of rank, not only as between the nobility and even quite wealthy bourgeois proprietors but also within the aristocratic stratum itself, were expressed in the design of the Parisian *hôtels* in which the former were constrained by the norms of court etiquette to reside, when they were not at court. There are the differences in size and grandeur, of course, but also quite distinct hierarchical codes as to the physical accommodation of servants and their spheres of operation, the ceremonial rooms, the spatial division between husband and wife, the facilities for visitors of high station, and the like. Above all, of course, there is the extraordinary Court of Versailles, with its stratified accommodations for the King, his family, the various degrees of servants—from mistress to char—and vast numbers of the court nobility when they were in residence, all enunciating the

grammar of the King's centrality and the mesh of hierarchical relations in terms of his control over the "honor" that defined standing.

The eventual crisis of the system, Elias suggests, is foreshadowed and furthered by the undermining of this spatial idiom in the course of the eighteenth century, when bourgeois financiers and others built beyond the code, while members of the nobility, forbidden to take part in most commercial pursuits, ruined themselves in attempting to maintain their state, as the court and its nobles continued to adhere to an etiquette that ever less corresponded to the earlier correlation between prestige at court and access to power. In the language of Mannheim's sociology of knowledge (in the sense of ideology critique), we might speak of a growing objective discrepancy between the gestures comprising the courtly style or ideology and the actual relations of society, which renders the participants, in the absence of any corrective reflexive awareness, ever less able to comprehend their circumstances.

This mounting critical tension is not, however, the prime subject of Elias's study. He is more interested in showing the dynamics that produced and reproduced the structure during its most brilliant years, notably under Louis XIV. While the organization of space provided the setting for social life and registered the comparatively settled configurations from time to time, the dynamic relations reproduced their meanings and indeed must be understood in order to explain the spatial practices. Elias develops this analysis in a chapter named "Etiquette and Ceremony: Conduct and Sentiment of Human Beings as Functions of the Power Structure of their Society." (Elias [1933] 1983, 78–116) Drawing on memoirs and older histories attentive to such details, he shows the mediation of the dominant motive that had already been identified by Montesquieu—the striving for honor—through a wonderfully intricate routine of practices manifested in styles of observation, speech, and conduct, all focused directly or indirectly on the King. To make the aristocrats serve as supports of his power, since they are after all persons of great force in the wealth-producing countryside and military, the King uses his command of the prime symbolic resources, which all desire to share, to foster a constant measure of uncertainty and competition. The aspirations of the competitors, moreover, are conditioned by the qualities of mind and temperament required to succeed through these mediations. Elias conjures up a rich—and richly grotesque—account of the King's levée, his daily ceremonial arising from sleep, in order to illustrate the process. Although these activities have instrumental value for the King's power, Elias suggests, he does not regulate his control over the court process by instrumental calculations, since the first priority is the reproduction of the process itself. It was not enough to be a brilliant general, even if also of great family, if the maintenance of ceremonial competition pointed to the selection of a different favorite. The imperatives of the system are above utilitarian gains. This finding is not altogether unlike Mannheim's conclusion that the individual striving for advancement in the professional classes of which he speaks will not be distracted from pursuing the steps of the hierarchical and honorific promotion system by opportunities for enrichment by commercial means, since these undermine the

striving for recognition. The critical difference is that while Mannheim is trying to explain the inner constitution of various structures of economic activity, Elias is developing a theory of so-called "absolutist" power in a certain elaborated versions of patrimonial political regimes.

Although the longest chapter in Elias's book is a historical treatment of the "Sociogenesis of French Court Society," this introduces few new analytical departures. Elias highlights certain points in conventional historical accounts, which he dutifully reviews, concerning the loss of autonomous aristocratic power as a result of a debilitating civil war and an ultimate pacification at the center, as well as the expansion of the royal household to include specially skilled individuals drawn from the educated and ambitious bourgeoisie and rendered useful by a combination of dependence and minimal status. The preceding chapter contains the last of Elias's important sociological observations (also found in the legacy of Montesquieu), that the very circumstances that make the King great also limit him. He cannot seriously disregard the etiquette of the courtly life any more than the nobles, and this requirement puts limits on the decisions he can make and the powers he can exercise. The enabling system is also a system of constraints.

Since Elias was especially fervent in urging students to follow the line also laid down by Mannheim in his classes, according to which they were to ground their research in a discordance experienced in their lives, provided that they also found a suitable mode of distantiation for their studies, it would be interesting to know whether Elias applied this rule to himself, and, if so, what might have been his point of departure. A plausible speculation would focus on his sharp words, already anticipated in his earlier article on anti-Semitism, against people who imagined that civilization was unshakably established and that "barbaric" behavior was simply an aberration. In that context, an inquiry into the political-social genealogy of the mannered elegance of the classical age of courteoisie—and it transitory character—might be an especially attractive first step, and surely as duly distanced from the place in which he found himself in the frightening spectacle of his time. Of course that is a speculation, based unavoidably on his famous sequel to *The Court Society*, *The Civilizing Process*. That work, however, cannot be taken as product of the Mannheim research project, in any full sense, although, as Richard Kilminster (2007) has shown, there is no shortage of themes that recall Elias's work in the group, whether or not we want to class them as signs of "influence," as Kilminster does.

In view of Elias's close attention to questions of method, which we may presume to have been present in his original text, we shall probe somewhat more deeply into the underpinnings of his work. Despite some uncertainty about the provenance of even his most characteristic terms, we shall assume that the methodological reflections interwoven in the chapters that show least signs of later rewriting capture his thinking at that time, as well as pointing to considerations likely to have been discussed in the workshop. This exercise has the added value of shedding light on Mannheim's own reorientation away from Alfred and towards

Max Weber, culminating in the article on economic ambition and his Frankfurt class lectures in historical sociology.

The central concept in Elias's thesis is "figuration" (*Figuration*), which is akin to two terms, "formation" (*Gebilde)* and "configuration" (*Gestaltung*), both of which were used by Mannheim and Alfred Weber. All three men used the terms to designate the structural elements of a unified totality, and all portrayed these entities as contingent outcomes of historical developments and subject to structural change or deconstruction in the course of further historical development. However, there were significance differences. Although Alfred Weber and Mannheim, even at the time of their greatest convergence, differed on whether the configuration should be understood in terms of an organic unity or a competitive plurality, they both defined it at the time in terms of its ideational element rather than its sociological one. Weber held that it was the cultural-psychic configuration that gave meaning to the intrinsically meaningless concatenations of social and civilizational processes at any given historical moment. Mannheim, as he moved towards the sociology of knowledge from the themes of style and worldview among art historians, viewed socio-economic configurations as contexts for the world aspirations—and, increasingly, the clash of such aspirations and the concomitant interpretive practices—that defined them. The latter conception was a primary issue under discussion (and in flux) during the years when Elias worked with Mannheim.

Elias made a conceptual move that broke with what he may well have taken to be "idealist" ambiguities in Mannheim's terms of social analysis. He privileged the social figuration primarily as a structural-functional entity. In doing so he expressly situated himself closer to Max Weber, a shift that Mannheim had negotiated, as we have seen, in more nuanced—some might say hesitant—terms. Elias describes the figuration as follows:

> A princely court, a court society, is a formation consisting of many individual people. … It does not sound very convincing to speak of a "system of people." For this reason the concept of figuration is used here instead. One can say: "A court is a figuration of individual people" without doing violence to the words. … [T]he concept of a figuration has the advantage that, unlike that of a "system," it arouses the expectation neither of something closed on itself nor of immanent harmony. The term "figuration" is neutral. … Court society is full of tensions, but this does not detract from its character as a specific figuration of people. (Elias [1933] 1983, 141)

The figuration of the court, in which power was distributed to individuals, serves as a bridge between the royal household and the urban social field (41). Whether in the urban architecture noted above or the etiquette of the court, the purpose of these figurations was to distribute power. The etiquette of the court was not a rigid traditional structure but a constantly changing pattern to which individuals had to adapt to maintain their position. Thus it was at the same time objective and subjective. Individuals enforced the rules themselves by striving to master them at the expense of their competitors. They legitimized themselves

while at the same time legitimizing the figuration and the king's position at the head of it.

Elias described the behavior of courtiers as rational rather than traditional. It was necessary for them to calculate their strategies within the field in which they could anticipate the actions of others, who would also be proceeding rationally. Elias writes:

> In face of so "functional" a structure, the distinction between rationality of value and of function loses its clarity. The mechanism of etiquette was highly "functional" in conserving and securing the king's rule. In this sense it was a "purpose-rational" organization, not less so, at any rate, than the instruments of power produced by societies competing for money and professional opportunities. In both cases, though perhaps more nakedly in the former, "rule" is for its bearer an end and value in itself, or is at least based on values that seem self-explanatory. In this sense the instruments that secure this "rule" are both "purpose-rational" and "value-rational." (132)

This whole formulation is Max-Weberian. The orientation and behavior of individuals is at one with the larger field, just as the field of the physical sciences has no identity apart from the bits of matter that compose it. Elias is not interested in court etiquette as an expression of some larger meaningful totality, of an ideology or any other type of transcendent spiritual-psychic entity, but as a set of rules for rational individuals that at the same time enforce and legitimize relationships of power. Although the main Weberian source that Elias cites is *Economy and Society*, there is also a strong echo of *The Protestant Ethic*, but his comparisons are not to the "heroic" capitalist of the early modern era but to the stock market capitalist of modern times, who served no other god than the figuration itself.

Not only can we draw parallels to Max Weber but also to the Mannheim of "economic ambition" (or the striving for economic success) discussed above, who had begun to move beyond the left-to-right spectrum of ideologies (and utopias) that made him famous to focus on the more variously constrained behavior and orientations of groups in everyday life. As noted above, we are not attempting to designate who influenced whom but rather to portray a community of interest consisting of Mannheim and the young scholars around him at Frankfurt. Their empirical historical investigations were meant to elucidate the crisis-ridden present, which they saw above all as a crisis of liberalism, the worldview whose genealogy was the programmatic topic of the working group.

Chapter 6
Hans Gerth and Hans Weil: The Genealogy of the Liberal *Bildungselite*

The new emphasis of the working group can be seen in Hans Gerth, although he comes closest to the role of a disciple during his years with Mannheim and expressly designs his dissertation on early Liberalism as a counterpart to Mannheim's habilitation study of "Conservatism." At the same time, without denying his debt to Mannheim, Gerth's career in exile was defined by his substantial successes in the contest over the importation of Max Weber's legacy in America (M. Weber 1946).[1] According to the somewhat fanciful story Gerth told late in life, he had already been in search of Max Weber in 1927, when he came to Heidelberg, only to discover that the Professor Weber established there was Alfred, and that Max had been dead for seven years. He attended courses with Karl Jaspers, Alfred Weber, and Emil Lederer, but he found his teacher in the Privatdozent, Karl Mannheim, whose seminar on Max Weber he attended in his first year. In an awkward letter to Mannheim after the publication of *From Max Weber* in 1946, Gerth blamed the need to make concessions to his co-editor, C. Wright Mills, for the fact that he "could not express my gratitude and indebtedness to your Max Weber seminars at Heidelberg, without which, I am sure, I could not think the way I did." (N. Gerth 2000, 142)

Gerth claimed that he had impressed Mannheim at their first meeting because he had "Kant-Marx-and-Lukács at his fingertips," on the strength of his having found Lukács's *History and Class Consciousness* in a bookstore the previous summer and having used it as a "textbook" for the study of Kant, Fichte, Hegel, and others—doubtless a nostalgic reconstruction of an enthusiastic young man's perceptions. Two years later, in any case, at a joint seminar on Lukács organized by Karl Mannheim and Alfred Weber in order to talk through the differences between them that had erupted at the conclusion of Mannheim's talk on "Competition" at the meeting of the German Sociological Society in the precious year, Mannheim selected Gerth to deliver one of the two opening papers on Lukács's book in his joint seminar with Alfred Weber (Mannheim 2001, 109–132). Mannheim clearly thought highly of Gerth and made him his unpaid assistant soon after his arrival in Heidelberg. Gerth proudly recalled the help he provided in finding footnotes for *Ideology and Utopia*. When Mannheim moved to Frankfurt in 1930, Gerth followed, awarded a portion of Elias's assistantship stipend by Mannheim, and he attended Mannheim's lecture on sociology that year, as well as the working group

1 On the contested reception of Max Weber, see Scaff 2004.

on liberalism in 1932. Among the dissertations emerging out of that group was his study of "The Sociological-historical Location of the Bourgeois Intelligentsia at the Turn of the Eighteenth Century. A Contribution to the Sociology of Early German Liberalism." [2] (H. Gerth [1935] 1976; N. Gerth 2000, 127–33)

Gerth's special standing in the "unforgotten Liberalism seminar of Professors Mannheim, Löwe and Bergsträsser"—as he later referred to it—was cemented by his success in winning a competition adjudicated by Mannheim and Löwe in 1931 with a research essay that emerged from his work in that group: "On the Sociology of German Early Liberalism: Benzenberg and Buchholz: Two Representatives of Early Bourgeois Thought." The title and topic anticipated his later dissertation, although its contents deviated from it, at least in the sense that he devoted proportionally more attention to expounding the doctrines of his author than he was later to do. We have the article only in a reframed and renamed version, as he published it in 1954 (H. Gerth 1954). Interestingly, it is now titled "Friedrich Buchholz: Another Beginning of Sociology," and the newly added introduction emphasizes not the origins and limits of liberalism as a unique historical formation but rather a recurrent pattern of a rise of a science of society to provide orientation at a moment of epochal change, a phenomenon Gerth illustrates by characterizations of the settings addressed by Saint-Simon, Comte, Spencer, Marx, Tönnies, Durkheim, and—above all—Max Weber:

> However the final formulations of these great ones may come out, they all arise from a secular consciousness of crisis and the search for an interpretive orienting knowledge, which aspires to comprehend the problem of modern society as a whole and render it capable of discussion. (H. Gerth 1954, 666)

The ambivalence suggested by the contrast between the earlier and later titles need not be imputed to the undoubted changes in Gerth's thinking during the thirty years between the two versions, since Mannheim too, notably in his study of early conservatism, tried to capture the mode of thinking both as a historically constrained ideology and as a crucial moment in an invaluable, transhistorical style of thought. In his first set of Frankfurt lectures, then, he shows far more interest in the genealogy of sociology than in the emergence of any political ideology. And his 1932 conception of sociology of knowledge "in the proper sense," as we have seen, fixes these priorities. Correspondingly, when Hans Weil,

---

2 The dissertation had not been formally approved when Mannheim was forced to leave Frankfurt by the Nazis. Like the dissertation of Käthe Truhel, it was accepted by the Ernst Krieck, whose academic career was all under National Socialist patronage. Gerth is said to have recalled that he bought this acceptance by expunging references to Jewish contributors to liberalism, although, like Truhel, he was not restrained from acknowledging his debt to Mannheim. And Moses Mendelsohn does in fact appear on his list of prominent literary figures in Berlin. Cp. N. Gerth 2000, 134. For more on Mannheim and Krieck, see Loader and Kettler 2002, 199–200.

whose 1930 study of the rise of *Bildung* served as a recurrent topic and model in the early liberalism seminar, thought back on his work some years after Gerth's republication, he describes it as an attempt to reconcile Dilthey's conception of diverse *Weltanschauungen*, corresponding to different human attitudes and orientations, with a reading of historical cultural constellations in the social realm.[3] Weil speaks for all three when he emphasizes the importance, following the model of Max Weber, of grounding interpretations in evidence, and when he notes both the enthusiasm with which cultural interpretations were being sought and the urgency of digging ever deeper into the sources to avoid the facile theories that were rampant, and of recognizing that broad conclusions could only be sustained in these matters by discussion and dialogue (Weil 1967, vii–ix).[4]

If Elias played a special role in mentoring doctoral students in the disciplinary aspects of their studies, as seems probable, Weil appears to have supplied an important model for purposes of seminar discussion, with his work open for group dissection in a way that Mannheim's own writings could not be.[5] His concept of an elite of intellectuals as a distinctive social formation of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries works out details and differences in a general notion present in more general terms in Mannheim's early writings as well as elsewhere, and it plays an important part in the dissertations not only of Hans Gerth (where

3 See Herrmann 1976, 81n.11. The definition and scope of *Bildung* was a major field of contention during the Weimar years, and Weil's book played an important part in the later stages, providing key arguments, for example to the right-wing sociologist Hans Freyer, as well as to Mannheim, notably on the obsolescence of a *Bildung* grounded in aristocratic experience. See Loader and Kettler 2002. The contest about *Bildung* was carried into exile by the predominately Jewish refugee intellectuals, and Mannheim's own post-1933 diagnosis of cultural crisis—as well as his therapeutic scheme—belong to this discourse. See Kettler and Lauer 2005.

4 Weil's study originated as a Göttingen dissertation in 1927, although he credits Gottfried Salomon-Delatour with inspiring it; and it was selected by Mannheim as the volume after his own *Ideology and Utopia* in the series that he edited. Weil's 1930 preface is not quite consistent inasmuch as it asserts not only that the work was being published essentially as it was completed in 1927 but also that it "received important support and corrections from both the historian, Hermann Nohl, and Karl Mannheim." (iii–v) Weil cites three of Mannheim's works between 1926 and 1928 in his own work. Weil 1967, 4, 169, 216, 265–6. In any case, internal evidence in several dissertations as well as fragmentary student notes make it clear that Weil and his work played an important part in the working group on early liberalism. Gottfried Salomon-Delatour and Karl Mannheim had a complex relationship of cooperation and competition, both in Heidelberg and Frankfurt. See Henning 2006, 79–81. The intellectual convergences among writers of the immediate postwar generation underline the importance of distinguishing between the study of "influences" and the present focus on work in interactive research groups, although the lines of demarcation are porous. The relationships to iconic figures like Max Weber are something else again.

5 Ulrich Herrmann minimizes differences between Weil's and Mannheim's approaches, but it seems more accurate to recognize some productive tensions between them, both in method and in aspiration. See Herrmann 1976, 81n11.

citations of Jewish authorities are as sparse as possible) but also of Jacob Katz. It is tantalizing to speculate about possible connections between Arendt's work on Rahel Varnhagen, which was in progress during the period of her occasional attendance in the early liberalism seminar and her friendly, if not altogether uncritical review of Weil's book in 1931 (Arendt 2007).[6] As candidate for habilitation under Paul Tillich, Gottfried Salomon (Delatour), and Karl Mannheim, Weil cannot in any case be left out of a consideration of the intimate environment of the research programme that fostered the studies we are examining.

Weil situates his work in the shift from the prewar to the postwar climate among members of his own generation (b. 1898). In the years just before 1914, he recalls, there was great enthusiasm among them, as they met in the youth groups of the time, for the idea of individual development in the sense of the cultivation ideal of German classicism, but this goal of personality development lost force in the aftermath of the war, in favor of communitarian and collectivist projects of all sorts. His aim in the study, he suggested, was to understand the strengths as well as debilities of cultivation in the individual sense, and his procedure rested on the assumption that an account of the emergence of the ideal would show both its constituent elements and its constituencies. Like Mannheim in his paper on the striving for success, Weil ultimately had a pedagogical object in view.[7] The question of personality development, he thought, might be returning to the agenda, but that made it all the more urgent to grasp the capacities and limits of the classical model in order to prepare the way for subsequent inquiries into ways of fulfilling its most essential objectives under the new conditions.

Weil's concept of *Bildung*, in the sense of a recognized "principle," like Mannheim's concept of conservatism, was presented as a sequence of conjunctions or a "synthesis" of elements situated historically in distinct intellectual configurations and sources. Just as Mannheim begins with the intellectual currents he identifies variously with status consciousness (Möser), Romanticism (Müller), and aristocratic juristic and bureaucratic thought (Savigny), with special attention to the various ultimately unstable combinations among these elements, but with a prospect of a more lasting synthesis in the conservatism he identifies—but does not explore—in Hegel, Weil projects the emergent *Bildung* principle out of two quite dissimilar sources, the quasi-classical, activist aesthetic notion, identified with Shaftesbury, according to which individuals gain fulfillment by turning their lives into a work of art and the almost passive naturalism associated here with

6 This is in stark contrast to her vigorously negative review of Mannheim's *Ideology and Utopia* (Arendt [1930] 1990). For texts and analyses, see Kettler, "Arendt on Mannheim" <http:// www.bard.edu/arendtcollection/kettler.htm>.

7 Hans Weil was employed as Assistant and later Privatdozent in the Frankfurt Pedagogical Seminar in the Philosophical Faculty. The Seminar was headed by Carl Mennicke, who was in turn very close to Paul Tillich, who brought him there. See Lingelbach 2006. Weil's Habilitation was approved by a unanimous vote of the Faculty on the basis of the wide recognition given his *Die Entstehung des deutschen Bildungsprinzips*.

Rousseau, where individuals surrender themselves to a process of spontaneous unfolding. These currents can also be understood as transmutations of active and passive religious traditions in Germany—pietistic and Lutheran—but they come together in a dynamic but tense conjunction in the work of Wilhelm von Humboldt. There is a good deal of intellectual history in Weil's richly documented, refined account, but there is also always present some awareness of correlations between one or another of these configurations and a social-cultural constellation, and this side of the study culminates in his account of a new conglomerate social formation, an "elite" comprised of "intellectuals," whose power is clearly inferior to that of the primary elites of society but who nevertheless are able to institutionalize the *Bildung* principle that constitutes them, gives them a recognized function in the emerging sphere of public opinion, and enables them to reproduce their kind. Because this formation itself contains levels and subtypes, it exhibits the mix of elements in different proportions, but what stands out overall, according to Weil, is the comparative indifference to the sorts of public identity, actions, or objectives that marked the enlightenment figures or the French Revolution. The crux was self-elevation and mutual recognition as individual personalities, together with the elevation of certain figures as heroes of such achievements. What was precluded was any sort of political awareness or aspiration in the cultivated middle class or its affiliated social types in the "elite."

This conclusion recalls the larger question that Weil shared with Mannheim and others in the middle class, educated generational unit (to use Mannheim's terminology), disproportionally Jewish, which came of age during the war but which resisted the enthusiasms of the revolutionary cohort—the question of a political education that would induce and qualify the middle class to share and to moderate a democracy carried by masses under Social Democratic leadership. Max Weber posed a somewhat similar question in his own generation and looked to Britain and the United States for comparative insights, but his concept of the political vocation relied too much on the great statesman for a younger generation that trusted rather to popular movements, if blended with leadership groups and subjected to the discipline displayed by the Social Democracy. Marx's sardonic observation that the Germans attempted to do in the realm of ideas what the French achieved by their actions retained a certain resonance in this group. Mannheim's working group on early liberalism in Germany had this theme implicit in the background, from the standpoint of diagnosis as well as possible therapy.

In their work, however, and notably in Gerth's inquiries, there is a marked sense that only an unhappy convergence of historical accidents brought to naught a promising opportunity for a distinctive German liberalism that would have been closer to the achievements of the realistic Scottish Enlightenment of Adam Smith, Adam Ferguson, and John Millar than to any "metaphysical" French radicalism.[8]

8 The German reception of Adam Smith is a recurrent theme in Gerth's *Bürgerliche Intelligenz*, and his article on Buchholz cites his tribute to Adam Smith, as the 'philosopher' who "laid down the first foundations of the doctrine which is alone capable of maintaining

Insofar as it is possible to extract Gerth's original paper on Buchholz out of his 1954 reframing of the work, it was a thoroughly documented account of what he called a strikingly "realistic" understanding of the social conditions and promise of the German states in the period of the Napoleonic Wars and their immediate aftermath. The emphasis throughout is on Buchholz's insistence that the logic of "things" rather than the volitions of heroic individuals shape events, as well as on his appreciation of the structure and dynamics of "material" activities in the economic and political realms as the primary "things" to be grasped. Many of these factors, Gerth acknowledges, are identified in the writings of the cameralists and statisticians of the age, but Buchholz, in his view, stands out because he looks to a theory of society as a whole, highlighting new developments in the division of labor and the obsolescence of aristocratic or priestly hostility to manufactures and trade. Gerth credits him with anticipating Mannheim's expose of ideology in dealing with these doctrines, and especially with the recognition of these insights as a weapon in trumping backward ideas.[9] In the end, Gerth speaks with considerable respect of Buchholz's anticipations as well of the Comteian idea of a sociologically informed "true aristocracy" of knowledge to bring about a balanced and orderly course of social development.[10] When Gerth contextualizes Buchholz in his remarkably researched "sociology of German early liberalism," however, the emphasis is not on this extravagant prospect but on the convergences in styles of thought between literary intellectuals like Buchholz with the innovative and surprisingly autonomous bureaucracy of the period. And it is this emphasis on factors making for promising deviations from the Weberian ideal type of bureaucracy, anticipated in Mannheim's article on the striving for success, that runs through more than one of the most interesting products of the Mannheim research group.

In looking more closely at Gerth's dissertation, it is necessary to make some imprecise allowances for the conditions under which it was completed. Gerth was not the only member of Mannheim's research group to be examined after the establishment of the National Socialist academic regime in the university, but the pressure on him was intensified by the circumstance, first, that he was a non-Jew who hoped to make a career as academic or journalist in Germany, and,

social order and guiding the progress of development so that the public welfare remains secure." H. Gerth 1954, 678n2.

9 Gerth's view of Buchholz as an exemplar of a liberal "style of thinking" precisely by virtue of his anticipation of ideas developed by Karl Mannheim bears on the controversial question of Mannheim's own relationship to liberalism, at least as it was understood within his research community. See Kettler and Meja 1995.

10 Writing in 1954, Gerth cites Mannheim's posthumous *Freedom, Power, and Democratic Planning* as a parallel argument, with special emphasis on the treatment of social education. Gerth himself was responsible for the published version of this work, whose original manuscript may be held in the closed papers of Edward Shils at the Regenstein Library of the University of Chicago.

second, that his subject matter, the emergence of liberalism, was a topic of special ideological interest to the Nazi movement, especially inasmuch as its ideological transfiguration of German "classics" and other distinguished national figures who might form part of a detailed examination of liberalism—not to speak of Jews and other stereotyped enemies of the "movement"—imposed great caution. When an interviewer late in his life remarked that the dissertation effectively disregarded the relationship between Jews and liberalism, Gerth remarked: "That was deliberate. I removed everything from the dissertation that would have made it impossible for me somehow to gain my doctorate in Frankfurt."[11] (Greffrath 1979, 66)

Although this meant that Gerth never named Mannheim in his formulaic thanks to his teachers, his introductory paragraph makes it clear that the basic design derived from Mannheim's earlier studies of "early conservatism."[12] The differences between Gerth's study and his model show themselves above all in the comparative sketchiness of Gerth's structural analysis of the liberal style of thought, a feature that may be ascribed at least in part to considerations of prudence, especially when contrasted with the fascinated attention that Gerth had earlier paid to the writings of Buchholz, not to speak of his later dedication to Max Weber's thought. Yet Gerth was clearly less confident than Mannheim when it came to delineating structures of thought.

We begin with a closer look at this side of Mannheim. *Early Conservatism: A Contribution to the Sociology of Knowledge* was submitted to Emil Lederer, Alfred Weber, and Carl Brinkmann in 1925 as a Habilitation thesis. Since Mannheim was known as a philosopher, he was determined to show that sociology of knowledge needed not be a matter of speculations in philosophy of history, that this study could, rather, respect both the rigorous reconstruction of cultural-intellectual formations and the categories of sociological understanding. Notwithstanding an initial invocation of a construct whose constitution is rather speculative, the bulk of the work marked a kind of "empirical turn." (see Kettler, Meja and Stehr 1984) Mannheim presented three primary "tasks" for the sociologist of knowledge. First, one should ascertain the specific "morphology" of a style of thought (*Denkstil*), which is assumed to be an integral configuration of attitudes towards the main dimensions of human experience and action. Mannheim's reference to morphology points towards Alfred Weber, but the actual exposition and treatment of the configuration is not inconsistent with Max Weber's ideal type, since the saliency of the metatheoretical issues is low in this research. Next, one should

11 Gerth recalls his failed efforts to find a sponsor elsewhere, as well as the care imposed on him by his dealings with his two examiners.

12 Mannheim's work on conservatism took four different forms: his 1925 book-length *Habilitation* thesis (Mannheim [1925] 1986), its transformation into the much shorter article in Max Weber's *Archive* less than two years later (Mannheim [1927)1964), the English translation and modification (Mannheim [1927]1953, 74–164), and the incorporation of small parts into *Ideologie und Utopie* in 1929. In this chapter we have focused on the 1927 version, because that was Gerth's stated model.

find the historical manifestations of the phenomena variously comprehended by this postulated construct, in their diverse expressions and combinations, as well as the social roots within the broader sociological "constellation" in which the development came about. This includes tracking any changes in forms of experiencing (*Gestalt*) that occurred with the changing social destinies of the groups that can be shown to be the bearers of the constituent elements, as well as locating the "point of intersection" (*Knotenpunkt*) of these different groups, where they are brought by their different trajectories to convergent modes of self-articulation. The story of these configurations is a story of syntheses and departures in historical time. Finally, one should examine the "circle of radiation" of the style, how it fits into the totality of spiritual life within a certain spatiotemporal realm.

Gerth clearly relies on a number of Mannheim's key terms, including "style of thought," "morphology," and "constellation." When he replaces "point of intersection" by "point of coincidence," he expressly credits the reconceptualization to Mannheim's 1932 seminars (H. Gerth [1935] 1976, 84n11). The contrasting priorities—and possible implicit disagreements—between the teacher and the student manifest themselves in the absence in Gerth's work of more than a perfunctory or incidental characterization of the liberal style of thought as a composite totality, with a corresponding absence of inquiry into the methodological issues associated with this work. This could also be explained, of course, given the less ambitious scope of a doctoral dissertation, by Gerth's tacit acceptance of Mannheim's "structural analysis" of liberalism, which he develops while constructing the conservative counter-model. In effect, Gerth begins his study at the second stage of Mannheim's plan, with the considerations that justify the construct of liberalism left in a "black box."

His reasons for this appear to have been a compound of prudence, philosophical modesty, and an interest in reserving a complex of issues—notably issues arising out of the differences between Max and Alfred Weber, not to speak of Mannheim's experiments in phenomenology and the art-historical concept of style—that Mannheim himself largely put aside in the practical research programme he fostered among his associates and students in Frankfurt. Mannheim's own plans for a "Sociology of Spirit," a work first published after his death as a collection of essays and with its methodological chapter subjected to unspecified changes by loyal executors pledged to render his legacy relevant to Anglo-American sociological thought, suggest that the unresolved problems that become apparent in a comparison between Gerth's study of early liberalism and Mannheim's study of early conservatism were merely "bracketed," not abandoned. Because the difference between the terms of Mannheim's Frankfurt group research programme and his own longer-term theoretical agenda matters greatly to a more comprehensive understanding of Mannheim's work, we offer a brief excursus to suggest what Gerth put aside, notwithstanding his acceptance of Mannheim's "Conservatism" as model (see Backhaus and Psathas (2006); Barboza (2005); Kettler and Meja (1995); Laube (2004); Loader (1985; Loader and Kettler (2002)).

Mannheim begins the body of his essay by discussing the relationship of two terms, "traditionalism" and "conservatism." The former is a formal psychological characteristic of every individual's mind that is defined as holding firm to old ways. It is very much intuitive and purely reactive without necessarily having any political connotation. This depiction is borrowed almost directly from Max Weber (with attribution) and has the same ideal-typical quality as Weber's type of the same name. Conservatism, on the contrary, is a "structural configuration" (*Strukturzusammenhang*), a congruity of psychic and spiritual contents that is objective, spiritual, and historical and that is different from the "subjectivity" of specific individuals. The question for Mannheim is how to relate these two very different concepts. Weber's nominalism, which breaks the configuration down into is individual components, is unsatisfactory, as is "realism," which treats the configuration as a metaphysical entity completely divorced from individuals (Mannheim [1927] 1970, 412–5).

Mannheim proposes a third approach that would view the configuration as an objective spiritual structure, while at the same time grounding it in a dynamic historical existence. To accomplish this connection, he introduces another concept, the "ultimate intention" (*Grundintention*), which resides in every structural configuration and enables individuals to assimilate it as their own subjective experiential development (*Erlebnisverlauf*). This connection between individual subjectivity and a larger unified objectivity is similar to one that Alfred Weber proposed. And Mannheim describes the ultimate intention in the same kind of vitalistic language that Alfred uses, with terms such as "driving impulse," "living contents of the past," "center of lived experience," "morphology," "soul," and various compound words prefixed by "life": "germ," "sphere," "space," "attitudes" (415–6, 444–5). At the same time, the term derives from the language of mystical theology, which had intrigued Mannheim before he knew Alfred Weber, and which had been adapted by Edmund Husserl to the uses of phenomenology. It seems best to treat its use by Mannheim as a token of unresolved problems rather than as a sign of settled commitment.[13]

In the context of Mannheim's study of Conservatism, then, the "ultimate intention" of conservatism derives historically from traditionalism, which is in itself an ahistorical attitude. When the social reality to which traditionalism is applied becomes more differentiated, which occurs in a "class-like stratified" (*klassenmässig geschichteten*) society (423), conservatism constitutes itself as a distinct formation. Mannheim's determination to maintain some distance from Marxist formulations of this circumstance is evidenced by the inexactness of the reference to classes. Instead, he describes this setting as a sociological "constellation," a term he elsewhere attributed to Alfred Weber. Faced with such social differentiation, conservatism emerged among a social subset that experiences change as a painful disruption as a counter-position to the changes in modern society whose principal enacters,

13 Pierre Bourdieu's "habitus" serves a similar place-marker function in his more recent approach to a similar complex of difficulties.

historically identified with Enlightenment, had articulated their own fundamental intention as a liberal worldview (445–6).

The bulk of Mannheim's essay is dedicated to articulating the conservative worldview, as it emerged in the writings of men like Adam Müller and Justus Möser, and contrasting it with liberalism. He only briefly describes the concrete socio-economic structures of the time. The primary "social" group that he discusses is the "socially unattached intelligentsia," a term he attributes to Alfred Weber. This group came from the same social origins as the proponents of Enlightenment liberalism, but lacked the strong social connections of the latter, due to the absence of a significant bourgeoisie and their own economically precarious existence (454–5). Mannheim observes:

> It is very clearly evident how much the "intelligentsia" is a completely distinct sociological phenomenon, whose "actual sociological" (*realsoziologisch*) imputation is complicated, because of its extremely unstable social location and its economic rootlessness: … These free-floating intellectuals are the typical intellectual legitimizers, "ideologues," who can find arguments in favor of any political aspirations they serve. Their own position does not result in bondedness (*Gebundenheit*), but they have an extraordinarily refined sense of the collective aspirations around them. … The fate of the spiritual world is in the care of a stratum with no roots, or at least few roots, to which no position of class or rank can be precisely imputed, which does not create the bases for aspirations itself, but rather takes up something, takes up aspirations that are born by strata more intensely socially bound. (455, 457–8)

At first they are the bearers of the anti-modern literary current of Romanticism. Eventually they aligned with the traditional powers, especially the nobility, and articulated the political worldview of conservatism. In doing so they offered clarity and broadening of the aspirations of these groups.[14]

Mannheim's account and terminology provide the model for Gerth. As did his mentor, Gerth begins with a brief introduction in which he presents his central concepts. He defines his purpose as the investigation of the "situation" for the beginnings (*Ursprungssituation*) of liberal thought in Germany, by which he means the "constellation" of social "milieus" and groups that correspond to liberalism.

---

14 The large portion of Mannheim's study that is not included in the published article undertakes to compare several historical incarnations of conservative thinking whose genealogy and forms of thought diverge from to model highlighted in the treatment of Adam Müller. Mannheim actually wrote the segment devoted to Savigny, who is not related to the intellectuals made central to the "synthesis" between romanticism and estate-grounded defensiveness—but he only promised the culminating study of Hegel's synthesis. See Manheim [1925] 1986. It is an interesting but doubtless unanswerable question whether Gerth was ever shown the longer work or how much of it was presented in regular seminars, several of which were expressly dedicated to themes from the conservatism study. Like Mannheim in his treatment of Savigny, however, Gerth moves beyond intellectuals to officials in tracing the articulation of the worldview under study.

Again following Mannheim, he situates goals of this exercise in the sociology of knowledge, but omits the third of those offered in "Conservative Thought," the circle of radiation in the totality of spiritual life of a spatio-temporal realm. His study will, first, demonstrate that a "style of thought" existed, and second, to clarify the "morphology" and transformation of that style through its social background and the latter's "differentiation."[15] (H. Gerth [1935] 1976, 16)

Whereas the bulk of Mannheim's essay concerned the first of these two and its contrast to liberalism, Gerth places his emphasis on the second, the reconstruction of the sociological constellation in which liberalism arose, not only discussing the social roots of its proponents but also the "point of coincidence" of the different groups whose conjunction opens the way for one or another dimension of liberalism. In lieu of Mannheim's methodological reflections, Gerth briefly cites milieu sociology as a first approximation of his approach (following Mannheim's provisional use of that model in the success study) and then replaces it by a reference to Mannheim's more historical "structural sociology." To fend off possible criticisms, including especially a charge of Marxism or a risky competition with theories of racial souls, he disavows any intention of postulating either an ontological reality whose development is documented by the stadial account he offers or a vitalist energy at work beneath it all. It would be overly speculative to take these brief statements as implying also a rejection of remaining elements of Alfred Weber's thought in Mannheim's "Conservatism." The important thing to Gerth, it would seem, was to get free to develop his historical analysis.

Gerth's explication of liberal style of thought is accordingly also briefer than that offered by Mannheim in "Conservative Thought," although this seems clearly presupposed, as is Hans Weil's treatment of what Gerth calls "cultural liberalism." After a brief inconclusive exercise in specifying the lexicographical moment when "liberalism" emerged as a term for a political orientation or worldview, Gerth effectively relies on associations with familiar names and a characterization of the generational unit to which these persons belonged—the cohort born around 1770, who were of an age to cheer the storming of the Bastille. For purposes of the research, Liberalism is comprised operationally of the ideas to which they were variously open as they matured, and the sociological task is to account for that openness.

Gerth begins his empirical investigation with an examination of the economic background in late eighteenth century Germany, especially the merging of the bureaucratic state and market economy in what he terms mercantile absolutism. Rising agricultural prices spurred demands for increased and improved grain production, especially by cameralist professors and the ruling princes, resulting in technical improvements and agricultural science being imported from Britain. In the Prussian east especially, the patriarchal lord-peasant relationship was replaced by something more nearly resembling the capitalist owner-labor relationship. Grain merchants were more oriented toward freer export trade, while other retailers allied

15 The terms in quotes are ones used by Mannheim.

with the princes in weakening the restrictive guilds. The beginnings of the factory system and the influence of the Napoleonic civil code also weakened traditional economic forces. The first two decades of the nineteenth century witnessed a number of significant economic reforms, especially in the sphere of removing trade constraints, that anchored an alliance of the bureaucracy and commercial elements. However, this cooperation was not accompanied by a weakening of the political power of the state as in France and Britain, and the spokesmen for this liberalization of the economy were not a genuine stratum of entrepreneurs but rather the academic intelligentsia (20–28).

The bulk of Gerth's dissertation examines three "situations" that provided a "recruiting field" for a liberal intelligentsia: the Protestant parsonage, the university, and the position of private tutor. The emergence of liberalism is conjoint with the development of a public opinion prepared to receive the great quantity of writing generated by these social actors. By liberalism Gerth means not just economic liberalism—signaled above all by popularizations and adaptations of Adam Smith and equally available to both market participants and bureaucrats under certain conditions—but also a "cultural liberalism" that tied the refined bourgeois intelligentsia to an apolitical cultivated nobility, whether that be in the bureaucracy, the university, urban salons, or smaller courts such as that in Weimar. Cultural liberalism was centered upon *Bildung*, the cultivation based on historical-philosophical literature (44–5, 61) that Weil shows to have been epitomized by the intellectual and organizational designs of the Humboldt brothers.

Of Gerth's three situations, that of the university, and its preparatory schools, receives the most attention, the other two being complementary. The richness of detail and anecdote in this section of the work, it should be said, does raise some question whether the space devoted to it reflects Gerth's judgment about its relative importance or simply his lively curiosity and the availability of much information. Analytically, however, Gerth ties the emergence of the modern university during this time to the increased importance of the bureaucracy. As a place of convergence for professionally oriented nobility and bourgeois who lacked opportunities in the commercial realm, it offered the latter an avenue for social mobility. That attraction allowed it quickly to vanquish competing corporate institutions. As the demand for officials increased throughout the German states, so did the demand for qualified professors to train them, who in turn attracted students and revenues. Their increased prestige allowed the universities to claim a certain degree of autonomy in educational matters. From the 1790s on, the universities became places for research in and teaching of more technical knowledge (*Leistungswissen*), but this changed with the founding of the University of Berlin in 1810, and they increasingly became *Bildungsinstitute*, emphasizing philology and philosophy. As such, they not only provided legitimization for a broader spiritual leadership, but also opened that leadership to liberal ideas of a certain sort (33–8, 42–5). Under the circumstances of composition, it is not surprising that Gerth does not follow Weil in adding up the costs as well as the benefits of the displacement of more

technical and—above all—political dimensions of liberalism by the individualized celebration of cultivation.

Gerth broadens the view of this trajectory beyond the universities. The stratum of pastors, which was recruited from bourgeois strata, remained well interwoven (*Verflechtung*) with society, however, with the increasing prestige of the bureaucratic state and rationalism, the image of the clergy sank. This decline plus the heavy thumb of the nobility, as well as laxness in clerical training institutions, opened the door of the parsonage for liberalism (29–30). Intellectuals who were not called to the universities had some opportunities as private tutors. The prestige as well as the duties of individual tutors varied with the social status of their pupils. While being the tutor of a noble child meant more status, the duties consisted primarily of being a travel companion. Tutors of bourgeois children, conversely, were viewed primarily as communicators of professional knowledge. As the demand for this kind of knowledge increased, so did the prestige of the teaching in general and the competition for positions as a private tutor. However, those competitors were soon eclipsed by the rise of a new kind of teacher, that in the state preparatory school (*Gymnasiallehrer*) (51–60).

In addition to these three situations open to liberalism, Gerth also examines those bourgeois authors who were economically independent and participated in the growing literary market, especially in urban areas. A change in the author–publisher relationship, the increase in the number of retail bookshops, and the spread of the periodical press fostered the democratization of *Bildung* through the leveling and pluralism of knowledge, the inclusion of women, and the organization of oppositional strata—in short, the growth of a public opinion that served as a contrast to the older spiritual elites and that offered an entrée to liberalism. It was in public opinion, promoted by professional journalists, that the cultural liberalism of the intelligentsia and the economic liberalism of the bourgeoisie began to come together (61–71).

Public opinion had some effect as well on the social locus of liberal potential whose analysis is relegated to a mere tenth of Gerth's study, at the very end, but whose importance as a problem for Mannheim and his research group cannot be overestimated: the state bureaucracy. Unencumbered by anecdotal material, this brief concluding section of Gerth's dissertation shows signs not only of his careful study of Max Weber and Werner Sombart but also of his more specialized interest in the history of economic policy, especially in the agrarian sector, which is far more evident in his earlier paper on Buchholz.[16] In *Ideology and Utopia* Mannheim had identified the bureaucracy with a rigid ideology of "bureaucratic conservatism," but in his study of the striving for success he had introduced a more complex account of this social stratum, especially in weighing factors making for flexibility and innovation in this group notwithstanding the structural factors he had made the exclusive focus of his attention earlier. Gerth's treatment continues

16 Gerth had studied with both Lederer and Löwe. Beginning in January 1933, Gerth served as a research assistant at the World Economics Institute in Kiel. N. Gerth 2002, 41.

this line of inquiry, a theme that will be uppermost in the dissertation of Käthe Truhel, to be examined in the next chapter.

Gerth introduces the idea of a bureaucracy open to liberalism by citing situational factors they had in common with the intellectual types he has been examining: their university education, the exposure to the neo-humanism of the new *Bildung*, and the broadening effect of their travels, notably in England.[17] Officials inclined to publication would be in some measure responsive to the liberalism in the public opinion they sought to address. Where the offices deal with economic issues, the exchanges with merchants and the opening to their points of view will have their effects, Gerth thought, as will experience of the uncertainties afflicting themselves as well as their clienteles during the periods of war, defeat, and economic deprivation during the first decades of the nineteenth century. In this connection, Gerth makes an important theoretical point on the interplay between structural and other factors:

> It is decisive for these situational factors [*Lagerungsfaktoren*] that they are not aspects of bureaucratic organization [*Verbeamtung*] as such, but that they intrude into bureaucracy, which does not lessen their formative importance for bureaucratic liberalism [*Beamtenliberalismus*].[18]

Gerth rejects equally social analyses that reduce bureaucrats simply to their constituent class origins and the Hegelian claim, taken up by Sombart, that the bureaucracy represents the whole of politically organized society. "If we inquire into the emergence and the historical development of modern bureaucracy," he maintains, "we will find the elements that offered opportunities for entree to liberalism." (72) Among these Gerth notes that the bureaucracy was established by rulers to counter particularistic estates and corporations and that its professionalism anticipates a society indifferent to birth. To be elevated to officialdom, Gerth observes, tacitly recalling a major element in Mannheim's construction of liberalism as antithesis to conservatism, is to be in some measure abstracted from the existing social order and moved towards an order that has yet to appear. In the bureaucracies of the larger German states, it was a strict rule to separate officials from their home soils and the nature of the organization meant in any case that they would be introduced into a company of individuals whose diverse origins made for a certain social heterogeneity even if the class differences were not great. Foreigners played a major role in all the bureaucracies of the period, whether imported as specialists, especially from French officialdom, with its greater technical expertise, or simply in the movement from the German states with stronger universities and practical

17 Gerth speaks of the "widely typical trips to England, which always encouraged a liberal anglophilia." (72) This emphasis may be illuminated by recollection of the two terms Gerth spent at the London School of Economics in 1929 and 1930.

18 The idea of intrusion by situational factors counter to the ideal-typical concomitants of bureaucracy is a central theme in Truhel's dissertation.

experience to others. In any case, Gerth says, the foreigners were uprooted from the most immediate sources of conservatism and thus open to liberalism. Especially in this formative period, careers were measured by achievement and the specialized knowledge it required, and such rationalization once again worked in favor of liberalism.

Gerth acknowledges that there were important counter-trends, especially where rulers, acting on economic as well as political grounds, sought to recruit their officials from the nobility and to promote on the basis of status and reliability from the standpoint of the court. Yet such actions in themselves added to the liberalizing impulses among the bureaucrats of lesser social standing, with special emphasis on strengthening legal standing and security against arbitrary dismissal, which brought them on a common course with commercial classes and others on guard against arbitrariness: "At this point there is a coincidence between the demands for security in the bureaucratic estate and the market interests of the bourgeoisie in the direction of the *Rechtsstaat*, the separation of law and administration." (75) Converging with this was the interest in unification of law across national territories, a project where the practicalities of a mobile administration reinforced commercial interest, and where the new technical legal education provided tools of codification.

The situation is complex and varied. The stabilization of bureaucratic ranks and the forms of advancement worked towards a new kind of status consciousness and anti-liberal estate thinking. Gerth finally treats the remarkably liberal epoch in Prussian bureaucratic history as a special case, due in part to conditions of war and afterwards to circumstances undermining mercantilist public policy and the exceptional backgrounds of the key generation. Gerth's blend of general and particular is well illustrated when he observes:

> It was significant that the decisive men—men like von Stein, von Humboldt, von Hardenberg, Niebuhr and others—were not bureaucrats from their youth in the sense of Max Weber's ideal type, but that their education, which was as yet very little scholastic-authoritarian, their getting around on trips in various states and circumstances, the manner of their advance, etc. had not broken, but rather strengthened, their initiative and their will to responsible decision. (77)

In the end, many of the factors making for liberalism, notably the advance of bourgeois elements, were effectively suspended, but the logic of the new military formations sustained others, and the commercial unification of the nation foretold new strength for certain dimensions of liberalism, even if the role of the bureaucracy would be less supportive than during the years of the generation Gerth has as central focus.

Many parts of Gerth's dissertation are not as tightly argued as these pages, but the work as a whole exemplifies especially well the mode of analysis that Mannheim sought to foster and Mannheim's reasons for thinking of Hans Gerth as his most faithful and representative student. And this is true not despite the fact

that Gerth distanced himself from Mannheim's speculative pursuit of aims beyond the bounds of Max Weber's conception of social science, but precisely because he exemplified the inclusiveness of Mannheim's strategy and its solid "empirical" core. The epistemological differences between them were doubtless real, since Gerth showed no interest in moving into the outer reaches of neo-Kantianism and beyond, as Mannheim did, but the point of a research group is precisely to arrive at a practical common denominator for a programme of work while bracketing deeper inquiry: that is what distinguishes it from a school.[19]

19 An interesting sequel to Gerth's dissertation was his defense of Mannheim's *Ideology and Utopia* against the criticisms of his own fellow student, Hans Speier, at a meeting of the American Sociological Association in 1937. His statement on that occasion leaves no doubt about his command of Mannheim's argument, including aspects neglected in his dissertation, notably the explication of integral perspectival frameworks of knowledge. See Gerth 1985; Kettler and Meja 1995.

Chapter 7
Käthe Truhel and the Idea of a Social Bureaucracy

In keeping with the Weberian element in the research programme, and notwithstanding the parallel emphasis on diverse configurations in different epochs, participants in the working group were prepared to test the applicability of certain typological complexes and dynamics found in the decades under study in the period of early liberalism to their contemporary situations. There was an interest in comparability as well as historical development. The work of Käthe Truhel provides a striking example of resourcefulness with such a strategy. Kurt H. Wolff's sketchy and sometimes illegible notes (SAK) on the "liberalism seminar," as he called it, summarize a presentation by Truhel during the Summer Semester of 1932 on the "liberalization" within the aristocracy during the 1790–1840 period that marked the temporal boundaries of the seminar. She focuses on the conjunction of aristocratic status and employment in a bureaucracy that was open to both bourgeois and intellectual influences. Wolff's last curt note on her session is "officials as the reform party of the state." This theme connects Truhel's presentation not only with the studies of Weil and Gerth, as we have seen, but also with Elias's interests, as expressed in his own submission to the workshop, notably in the contrast between the German situation and the French reliance on selection mechanisms grounded in the gestures of the courtly society. The patterns captured so brilliantly by Max Weber's ideal type of the bureaucracy are always actualized, it seems to Mannheim and his students, in a locational context (*Lagerung*) that may condition, counteract, or offset the structural bias that they doubtless constitute.

In her dissertation, Truhel applies this pattern of analysis to a diagnosis of crisis in her own sphere of professional activity, as well as to an exploration of therapeutic possibilities. She examines two social formations in crisis. One is the bureaucracy of the modern parliamentary state and the other is the profession of social work. The crisis is defined by the political and other factors that require them to work together, notwithstanding antithetical structural tendencies. As may be anticipated from our earlier discussion of Mannheim's lecture courses, Truhel recognizes gender as a crucial element in the encounter between these professions. Claudia Honegger, who was the first to pay attention to the dissertations of Mannheim's women students, remarked of this study: "On closer examination, … [Käthe Truhel's] work is what we would today call the purest women's research." (Honegger 1994, 78) Looking ahead to the work of Mannheim's women students, including Truhel, we can say that while the principal analytical figure in their studies is the supposed discrepancy between ideology and situation, as in

Mannheim's work on related subjects, their uses of this figure are fresh, diverse and instructive. Despite differences among them, none of the women contrives a smooth synthesis to overcome the tensions they uncover. In defiance of the male ideology that portrays women as somehow in immediate, prerational communion with non-analyzable wholes, these women appreciate unresolved complexities in social relations and live with conflict, uncertainty, and even defeat.

Käthe Truhel was unique among Mannheim's women doctoral students in her focus on state institutions. Like the others, she was tutored to ground her study in questions arising out of personal experiences, but unlike the others, she had been directly involved with public agencies in her chosen career as social worker. This makes her study an especially interesting document of Mannheim's approach to the enterprise of "political education," which was such an urgent theme on the right as well as on the left in the late Weimar years (Loader and Kettler 2002; Kettler and Lauer 2005). But it also made her work especially vulnerable, at least in the short run, to the political changes that overtook it.

Truhel completed her dissertation early in 1933. By the time of her promotion in 1934, the work appeared to be a document of a bygone era. Karl Mannheim had been dismissed under the law to "restore" the civil service; the social workers who most inspired her had been denounced as aliens and enemies; and the complex interplay between partially professionalized, mostly female social workers and partially republicanized mostly male civil servants that was the subject of her studies was being replaced by a mobilization regime that she could not have known. At least one of her two examiners, moreover, was an ardent academic Nazi.[1] In the study as it was published, Truhel nonetheless followed Mannheim's intellectual lead, and loyally thanked her teacher (Truhel 1934, 1).[2] Our present interest,

1 Ernst Krieck's university career was wholly a product of the new regime, which made him rector within months of his cooptation. The primary reader of Truhel's dissertation was Heinz Marr, the long-time head of a business-funded organization for workers' welfare policy loosely affiliated with the university, who had served as extraordinary (associate) professor since 1926 and who was designated to deal with the affairs of the controversial sociology chair during the years after 1933. Originally close to certain Christian Socialists and intellectually active in the diverse group around the university seminar on philosophy and pedagogy, he had also been an active member of the Fichte Society, a conservative organization, whose annual meetings were devoted to topics in "national education" (*Nationalerziehung*) He shifted steadily to the nationalist right during the late Weimar years and clearly became acceptable to the Nazi administration of the university. (Hammerstein 1989, 126–8; Schofeld 2004, 651)

2 Truhel credits the key concept in her subtitle, *Sozialanalyse*, as well as her culminating argument about the graduated rapprochement between social work and bureaucracy (122), to Mannheim. In her "Foreword," Truhel also thanks him for the impulse, the sociological schooling, and "the interest as well as constant advice" that made the work possible. She also thanks Mannheim's protégé, Hans Weil, for a helpful seminar. That Mannheim and Weil were dismissed under the so-called law to preserve the civil service is especially ironic in view of the assumptions about formal rationality in the bureaucracy that inform of

however, is not only in her indebtedness but also in her independent contribution. The dimensions of modernity of special interest to Truhel were those that occupied all three Webers—Alfred and Marianne, as well as Max—and in these respects the historical continuities, at least in the wealthier countries of Europe and America, make it anything but anachronistic to attend closely to her analysis. A testimonial to this continuity is Truhel's contribution to a 1972 collection of feminist authors, in which she returned, with characteristic subtlety, to Marianne Weber's topic of the legal status of married women—and, incidentally, to a topic pursued by another of Mannheim's students, Viola Klein, whose postwar studies with Alva Myrdal she cites (Truhel 1972). As in her earlier work, Truhel starts with a legally fixed discrepancy between an ideological typologizing of a social location and the multiple possibilities opened by actual social development and political dynamics. In the later brief paper, what is at issue is the housewifely model of marriage embedded in German family law. She sees such marriage as tendentially obsolete, but respects the contemporaneity of the non-contemporary in women's diverse situations and seeks mainly a loosening of legal constraints, to permit men and women to negotiate their diverse choices among alternate models. The opening of fixed designs to the possibility of negotiated settlements is a basic motif in her earlier work as well.[3]

A striking feature of the dissertation is its organization, which Truhel herself highlights in her analytical table of contents. Tripartite in form, it follows a fashionably "dialectical" pattern of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis, with bureaucracy, social assistance (*Fürsorge*),[4] and social bureaucracy as the three Hegelian "moments." On closer examination, however, it is clear that Truhel does not bind herself to such a glib formula. The first two contrasting elements have their separate, historically concrete origins, and their conjunction is characterized as a historically determinate and unsettled "mixture" (*Vermischung*)—and expressly not as an integral "synthesis." (128, 139) The decisive models are provisional, open to chance, purposive action, and developmental recontextualization. The dialectical

---

dissertation. Truhel does take care to add that the dissertation was printed in the exact form in which it was completed in 1933, "just prior to the national revolution." Notwithstanding the disclaimer, Truhel displayed rare loyalty.

3 On negotiations as a factor in the structure of Mannheim's sociology and pedagogy, see Loader/Kettler 2002. The prevalence of what were later called "neo-corporatist" bargaining frameworks in Weimar political life is a standard topic, especially in the literature of labor law. For the field of social policy, see Heimann 1980; Steinmetz 1993; Kettler 1987.

4 The German terms *Fürsorge* and *Fürsorgerin,* which Truhel uses, convey the not-quite-dead metaphor of caring for someone, yet there is no practicable English equivalent, especially since "care-giving" and "care-giver" suggest quite a different activity in colloquial use. With misgivings, we have used variations on "social assistance" and "social work," as seems best, although neither retains any of the echoes that Truhel relies upon. "Social worker" should always be understood as feminine in gender.

design works as metaphor rather than as logical straightjacket or as formula for guaranteed resolutions. There is no "*Aufhebung*" in the Hegelian sense.

Truhel opens by pointing towards the familiar Weberian ideal type of the bureaucrat, identifying correspondences between this construct and the "life-and-operations space" of intermediate officials in municipal governments, her special focus, especially in their own typical, character-shaping interpretations of their vocational situation. This shared self-understanding of individual bureaucrats, Truhel notes, is increasingly discrepant from a rapidly emerging "crisis" of this officialdom taken as a whole, which is due to changing relations between the post-1918 state and its officials, consequential developments long hidden from the individuals in their routinized and sheltered work sites.

The "discrepancy between the vocational situation and vocational consciousness" of bureaucrats (32) manifests itself in conflicting forms of uneasiness as between higher and lower officials, and it points beyond the limited setting of the bureaucratic life-and-operations space to the broader context of changes in relations between state and society. While lower bureaucrats, the most rapidly growing segment, increasingly assimilate their situations to that of private and public employees and to the corresponding social forms of interest representation, higher bureaucrats angrily blame the new republican and social state and look to reclaim their status by reference to their vested rights. Historically, officialdom was an articulation of state authority, a status group sharing in the honor and domination of the state, if also at the cost of subservience within its internal hierarchy. Since the Revolution of 1918, however, the state—with its imperfectly established and parlously legitimated new democratic constitution—has steadily lost in esteem, while simultaneously expanding its scope and functions. The crisis of the bureaucracy, Truhel concludes—as she and her fellow students did with regard to the comparable transitional circumstances of Prussia during and after the Napoleonic Wars—is a function of a crisis of the state and authority, which has to be understood in turn in the context of the requirements of new developments in society. But this sociological analysis is not meant to endorse the familiar Marxist complex of relations as between superstructure and base: each of the multiple layers has its own dynamics and capacities for affecting events. The structural social analysis can clarify the issues in contention and identify possibilities, but it cannot anticipate the outcomes.

The social development that Truhel treats as especially symptomatic suggests the distance between her approach and the Marxist base-superstructure conception. The complement to her departure from the ideal-typical construct of the "purely bureaucratic" constituent derivable from the characteristic "life-and-operations space" of the local official is an analysis originating in a similar model of the "purely social" in the comparable space of the social worker, whose gender is specified as feminine in the term she chooses (*Fürsorgerin*). "Social" (*sozial*) in this context clearly refers to "social-mindedness" and not merely to the social (*gesellschaftlich*] as a domain distinct from the state. In the absence of a well-established ideal-typical account of social assistance, like Weber's model of

bureaucracy, Truhel attempts an original typological exercise, drawing on the programmatic writings, above all, of Alice Salomon and Mary Richmond, the German and American founders, respectively, of the approach generally associated with concepts of motherliness as the source and social diagnosis and therapy as the mode of social assistance, as well as on the descriptive and reflective published journals of two young German social workers. Once again, the analysis proceeds from the ideal type to a more concrete account of the conflict-laden state of the formation in contemporary practice, and then to a recontextualization of the latter account in a broader sociological diagnosis of the times, preparing the way for a consideration of the interaction, confrontation, and complementarities between local bureaucracy and professionalized social workers. To show the refinement of Truhel's treatment of some issues of renewed interest to current studies of women in the social services, it will be necessary to follow these parts of her analysis in greater detail.

From the outset, Truhel distinguishes between the relatively institutionalized design of bureaucracy and the comparatively fluid boundaries of social assistance: the one is a status and the other, a kind of action. Working her way down a logic tree of contrasts, Truhel arrives at an account of social work as a diagnostic and therapeutic activity, responding to the needs of distinct deprived individuals on the basis of a rational understanding of causes and effects, as well as a practical, experientially grounded capacity for judgment. At the same time, the activity involves non-judgmental human contact, grounded in the caregiver's affirmation of universal human potentialities. To establish the therapeutic relationship, moreover, it is necessary that the social worker courts acceptance by those who need care, that she foster a relationship of reciprocal friendliness. Even at this ideal-typical level of reflection, Truhel concludes, social work implies a disparity between the demands on the activity and the results achievable—and thus a capacity in the social worker for tolerating both stress and compromise.

When Truhel turns to a more concrete view of the formation in her time, the difficulties and tensions accumulate, even if she does not introduce the concept of crisis, as she did at the comparable point in her analysis of bureaucracy. Her opening move is to compare social assistance with other historical forms of giving "help," a term which she now introduces to characterize the activity, and which she breaks down into the distinction between "material" and "personal" help, where the latter refers above all to the strengthening of resistance that may be imparted by the inter-personal communication of helpfulness itself. As a kind of help, Truhel contrasts social assistance, first, with the spontaneous and unreflected help provided within an "intact" family, where the personal dimension is strongest, and, second, with that allocated within comparatively small, close-knit communities united by a shared "socialization" and "social control," as in the case of idealistic political groupings or early Christian churches, where the mode of help will typically be designed as well to reaffirm the terms of communion. Social work is likely to be more knowledgeable and effective in the material help it provides than the other forms of help, but it is also a mediated, unspontaneous transaction between

unconnected strangers, and inherently defective in the personal moment, which is nevertheless essential to it.

Although Truhel initially refers to social assistance as a kind of help that originates in the "mass" and is applied to the "mass," she quickly amends this characterization to note the vital fact of a consistent class difference between the givers and receivers. It is a meeting between privileged and disadvantaged, charged with the antagonism generated by the historic elements of charity and condescension hard to disassociate from the encounter. The awareness of class increasingly enters into the plan of help as well, further lessening the quality of interpersonal helpfulness, since the social workers' rational diagnosis increasingly refers the individual needs to abstractly conceived conditions afflicting collective social units, as with the poverty of the working class. As the objectives of the activity shift to the alleviation of general conditions, the measures taken are guided by scientific theories incomprehensible to the putative beneficiaries, and individual decisions are subjected to standards of what Truhel calls "justice," in relation to overall strategic designs. Justice in this context refers, for example, to rules of eligibility that public programmes establish in order to reassure tax paying citizens in their capacity as tax payers. Among other things, these criteria, effectively incommunicable across class lines, requires a distrustful review of claims, to protect against waste of programmatic resources, so that the encounter between social worker and client is experienced less as help than as snooping, or even police informing. The coercion (*Zwang*) that cannot be categorically excluded in any case from effective therapeutic pedagogy, according to Truhel, is all the more likely to be met with resistance under these conditions.

The ability of contemporary social workers to overcome these deeply rooted obstacles is inhibited by additional conditions of their activity. First, there is a division of labor between the helpers in the field and the agencies, anonymous to the beneficiaries, which make the actual decisions about awards of help, so that no transaction can be a complete act of help, at least in the material sense. Second, and central to Truhel's interest in this problem, these caregivers are unlike the nursing sisters and members of other older service orders, who are widely recognized as sacrificing the reward and status system of modern society. Social assistance is a profession—the first profession, Truhel says, produced by women for women. Far from being patterned on a model of individual self-sacrifice, the profession was designed by the women's movement, which originated it, as a way for the ablest women to enter the vocational structure of modern society with suitable educational status, adequate compensation, and social recognition. Truhel certainly takes (approving) note, in this context, of the special claims of congruence between women's traditional and natural disposition to maternal nurturing and the vocation of social work—following the theme of "maternalism" in her models—but she also emphasizes that women aspire to the same sort of individual fulfillment from this profession as men expect from their professions; and she fears that such hopes must serve as a distraction and a source of disillusionment. Beyond the individualist mentality of modern professionals, Truhel sees a pattern of liberal

individualization throughout society in the form of a mentality of rights and duties, so that the pedagogical-therapeutic—and occasionally coercive—relations constitutive of social assistance are in discredit as impingements of freedom and the activities of helping are restricted to measures supposed to "restore" independence and autonomy instead of knitting personal ties of helpfulness. This theme further enters by way of demands for help formulated or perceived as claims of right, by virtue of the guilt pervasive among caregivers, who are miserably aware of their class advantage over those whose deserts they are supposed to assess by standards of therapeutic "justice." The acute problem that Truhel diagnoses, in short, is that the steady improvement in the capacity to render material help is counterbalanced by manifold assaults on the personal dimension of help, without which it is hard to imagine the phenomenon itself. Yet that cannot be the end of the story.

In his *Defence*, the great Montesquieu defended his multidimensional theory of state and society with the contention that the critic he is answering "is acquainted with nothing but absolute quantities and … does not know the meaning of the terms, more or less." (Montesquieu 1777) This caution also applies to Truhel's analysis. When she steps back to place the state of social assistance in the wider sociological context of her times, she insists on an important distinction between function and form. The function of providing help and social assistance, which she considers perennial, was opened up to new social agents by the disruptive effects of urbanization, industrialization, and related phenomena on the family and other sources of help under earlier forms of socialization. As these new agencies take form, however, they share the impersonality of other institutions of the time. The demand for help in a richer sense persists, as manifested not only in the terms of reference of the new social work profession but also the parallel emergence of psychoanalysis, which serves members of the possessing class by "establishing, in exchange for money, personal ties to the patient" (90), which are like those between social worker and those she helps. Truhel also cites the holistic movement in medicine and the recent introduction of the problem of alienation as a concern for socialism, as well as a corresponding preoccupation in recent social research. Like the youth movement, "the women's movement also ceases to show only the liberal-individualistic side, which it displayed earlier, but simultaneously seeks to let the human being come once again into its own in a reified world." (90)

This is the context in which the women's movement created the first profession made by and for women. For its inspiring rationale, Truhel draws on Alice Salomon's seminal work on social work education, in the longest quotation in her work:

> Within a development that is one-sidedly directed towards the economy, in which all thinking and reckoning is addressed to the product, the performance, the mastery of nature, women want to work against the despoliation and destruction of human life, to give new validity in social life to the personal and individual, which are schematized and extinguished by economic rights. (A. Salomon 1927, 2, 234; Truhel 1934, 91)

Restating this social need and dedication, Truhel nevertheless returns to the paradox that the only forms of action available—organization and profession—are unlikely to be sufficient:

> So it appears that the exclusion of the human being from the dissolved society—which is bound together only by organizations according to purposes and interests but not by human beings in their wholeness—reaches a point where this lack is somehow felt as a dissatisfaction and there is a growing need to pay more attention to the concrete human being. But the forms that this need creates for its satisfaction … are the commonplace forms—and they can evidently not take any other form, in view of the state of society. It was characteristic for these forms, however, that, whatever functions they assumed, they were able to achieve the rational task but failed to reach the human being. The new profession of social worker, although it is still recognizable as a form of personal help, also shows signs of going the way of other professions that preceded it. There is the possibility that here too personal help will turn into nothing but social policy and insurance, that, corresponding to other formations of present-day society, the profession will ignore the concrete human being and fail to reach him. (91)

Truhel's account of the uncertain condition of social assistance in the context of modern social developments leads back to her treatment of the crisis of officialdom, since they have a common social locus, notwithstanding their different structures, and they raise conjoint questions about future possibilities.[5] The question becomes how these different and indeed in principle antagonistic formations may be coming closer to one another, precisely in their troubled states. She turns to the emerging phenomenon of the social bureaucracy.

The assumption of social service functions by local governments imposes collaboration upon two groups that differ far more drastically than is familiarly the case, as between the administrative ("inside") and field ("outside") workers in other public agencies. There is a confrontation between a stringently rationalized, formal activity and a profession requiring the personal investment of the agent, a socialization to hierarchy in relation to both colleagues and clients meets an orientation to establishing the greatest possible direct contact. For Truhel, this coming together does not, however, amount to subordination of the field worker to the administrator, whatever the formal table of organization. "An archetypical woman's profession," she writes, "penetrates into the realm of the intermediate official, typically a male domain. An activity that gains its realism and distinctive sense of problems from its orientation to the concrete individual human being is brought together with the intermediate official's activities, which are removed

5 Truhel had opened the discussion of the broader context as follows: "While the derivation of the purely bureaucratic element from the life-and-operations space of the communal official indicates that a changed society seeks new forms of state rule, the derivation of the purely social from the life-and-operations space of the (female) social worker can reach the substance of the social transformation underlying the crisis of the state and bureaucracy." (Truhel 1934, 88)

from [unprocessed] reality, indifferent to problems, and aimed at an abstract everyman." (94) In an unexpected recollection of Karl Mannheim's distinction between the settled world according to bureaucratic conservatism and the always unfinished realm of the political, as he develops it in *Ideology and Utopia*, Truhel writes: "The intermediate official is at rest and operates with the static of being; the social worker learns ever again and strongly the problematic character of the world." (95) While the one group accepts responsibility only within the ordered scheme of its instructions, the social worker must always respond to emergencies, which "is to be professionally focused upon the points where the world fails to add up." (95) Notwithstanding these basic incompatibilities, the two groups must work together more closely than such pairings as educational administrators and teachers, which may resemble them in some respects. Communal social service officials and social workers must handle the same individual cases; they pass their files back and forth. They are directly and unavoidably caught up in a process of transition to a mixed form, with serious consequences for each and for both.

At the first level of analysis, it appears that the conjunction of social work with local government agencies only exacerbates the ambiguities of the profession, intensifying the tendencies that undermine its rationale and hamper it in performance of its functions. Reconfigured as an activity necessary to avert dangers from the general public, in accordance with new social science findings, social assistance appears ever more as something other than help to individuals in need. If the awarding of social assistance in society at large had already become more anonymous, the introduction of funding from public revenues derived from mandatory taxation creates much more distance from the eventual recipient, especially since expenditures of such funds attempts to overcome taxpayer resistance by bureaucratically administered adherence to norms of strict economic rationality and principles of restitution. The inescapable element of coercion in social assistance assumes new rationales and forms. It is no longer personal and therapeutic, administered for the sake of the individual being helped, but instrumental to the maintenance of the programmes and to larger public welfare objectives, involving impersonal instruments of law, as in court mandated work obligations, liens against earnings, and the like.

Into her account of secular trends of the preceding decade, Truhel abruptly interpolates an account of the special surge of the movement towards impersonality due to the mass unemployment of the early 1930s. Non-public agencies close their lists in order to deal with the limited numbers they are able to help, while public agencies must limit themselves to the bare minimum for survival, imposing huge case loads on social workers and permitting nothing more than uniform mass processing.

These most recent developments converge with a longer-term shift whereby social assistance has gotten caught up in the crisis of the state. The language of the Weimar constitution creates a new public obligation to render assistance and generate expectations of rights. Through a process of what will be called

"juridification" (*Verrechtlichung*) by later generations,[6] and to the dismay of officials, this new status of social assistance gives rise to appeals mechanisms, as well as (in the neo-corporatist Weimar style) provisions for coparticipation by representatives of beneficiaries when rules are made and legal actions are considered. Together with the redefinition of "help" to refer to collective interests of public welfare, including the aims of public economic and security policies, these institutional changes make the strongest demands on the legitimacy of the state as a whole. But the class analysis of state power especially prevalent within the population most in need undermines this foundation, with restrictions and denials of assistance interpreted as self-interested actions by "the system" and by the class whose interests it serves. The historical role of municipal agencies as executors of punitive actions against the poor strengthens the distrust and the perception of whatever assistance is provided as nothing but a tribute exacted by the rising power—and threat—of working class organizations. Under these conditions, the tension between social assistance agencies and beneficiaries rises to the level of group hatred, something which may be present to the social worker in the mind but which confronts the bureaucrat in the threats, rage, and occasional violent assaults of the crowds in welfare offices, which lead in turn to demands by officials for batons and even guns.

Against this background, Truhel observes, the social work profession moves further in the direction of a vocational group organized for the protection of its collective interests, as witness especially the periodic localized campaigns to gain the protected status of officials (*Beamte*) for social workers. The recruitment of social workers changes too. While the first women in the field had defied conventions, current social workers are stepping into a well-paid and well-respected profession, which does not presuppose a special commitment or dedication. In sum: "The orientation to the individual concrete human being is changed into an orientation to abstract objectives, the fully rationalizable and organizable side of the professional activity is preferred, and the side of the function that was provided through direct human contact is neglected." (111) Truhel encapsulates the trend in some pessimistic language from both Alfred and Max Weber, although she also draws on Alfred Weber, with whom she had studied earlier in Heidelberg, to point forward, however cautiously, to a possible choice of an alternative "constitution" that is "less rational," "less marked by division of labor," and "less progressive," but that might offer resistance to the "rise of the gigantic apparatus" that would destroy all creativity and genuine work (A. Weber [1927] 2000, 105–5, 99; Truhel 1934, 111).

This hint is pursued through a reexamination of what Truhel now refers to as the social-bureaucratic space constituted by the penetration of social work in

---

6 Two excellent overviews of the debate in the 1980s are Voigt 1980 and Kübler et al. (1985). The introduction of co-participatory or neo-corporatist elements as a balance against juridification, which Truhel notes, is also a feature of the discussion fifty years later. The two periods were occasionally linked in the later discussion. See Kettler (2001).

the bureaucracy and marked by effects on the bureaucratic configuration. While the ambiguities in social work are exacerbated, they are by no means eliminated. Social work preserves a number of its distinguishing features, notably as a concomitant the continued practice of home visits. While there may be more of a police aspect to the relationship, entry and cooperation must still be won by persuasion in individual cases. Relying especially on the published diaries of two young social workers, Truhel emphasizes the importance of this outside work, where the capacity for human contact remains decisive, to the morale of the social worker. Then too, the social workers in public service have persisted in their ties to organizations of social workers in less bureaucratic settings, for the most part rejecting recruitment by associations of public employees or officials; and these social work organizations, restricted to women and remote from the style of trade unions, continue to be defined by world views, religious or secular, centered on ideals and practices of humanitarian help. This distinctive ethos is cultivated not only by lectures and meetings but also by forms of interaction and even of dress that lead to social workers being recognized as "different" within their agencies. Identification with these distinctive roles appears to be strengthened in fact by the change in recruitment from upper to lower middle class women and the inclusion of a small number of men, most of whom come from working class organizations of the youth movement. The social work function brings difference into the offices of the bureaucracy, constituting social bureaucracy as a new kind of space.

This presence, Truhel maintains, confronts bureaucrats with new experiences and novel demands. When social workers hold office hours, people speak to them in unbureaucratic ways; the files to be worked through between social worker and bureaucrat are full of individualized details; the requests and complaints to be processed are richly diverse and individualized. And the regulations do not permit the bureaucrats to escape all the particularity attending this function. Norms are elastic and the use of judgment and individualized remedies are expressly enjoined. In the social services, the bureaucrat no longer appears simply as a guardian of established order endowed with sovereign authority. He too must win over his clients. Truhel sums up the decisive point, with ramifications beyond the immediate context: "The mid-level communal official was never a negotiator, but for the official in the social bureau the art of negotiation becomes indispensable." (121)

Expressly crediting Mannheim's most systematic discussion of the links between existence and knowledge (*Seinsverbundenheit des Wissen*),[7] but drawing as well on published and personal anecdotes, Truhel classifies three distinct groups among the bureaucrats faced with this new situation, ranging from the immovably bureaucratic to the strictly social. The first group is simply uncomprehending and emits rage unless it is quickly removed. Truhel observes: "The meticulousness,

7 Truhel cites the opening pages of Mannheim's article on "Sociology of Knowledge" in Vierkandt's *Handbuch* (Mannheim [1931] 1969 [1968]), noting that "the following accounts are especially influenced by Professor Mannheim's sociology of knowledge."

order, and cleanliness of their own existence, determined by their bourgeois status and their activities in the bureaucratic apparatus, easily make the needy appear as nothing but antipodal to their own standards and therefore inferior." (123) These bureaucrats are incapable of broadening their perspectives.[8] Among the members of the second group, drawn mainly from the postwar generation, there is almost as little rethinking of their activities, but their practical responses show a change in the direction of a greater attentiveness to the individual help-seekers and a practical relearning under the influence of the new functions. And a third group undergoes a change in consciousness as well and ever more defines its tasks in the specialized language of social work, seeking to establish special careers within the bureaucracy, based on specialized training and exemption from the rotations normal among officials at this level. While social work in the public sector, in short, doubtless loses more of its character as personal help and tends increasingly towards social policy, the bureaucracy too is changed more or less markedly in the direction of social work. Instead of attempting to balance the accounts, however, Truhel underlines the tentative and tension-filled character of the social-bureaucratic complex: "Neither element succeeds in accommodating itself fully to the other. They do not achieve a synthesis**.** Rather, they operate side by side and are perceived as being in contradiction." (128)

The question is to find the best possible interpretation of this widely recognized conflict within the social bureaucracy. It has been seen with some justice as a clash between men and women. The rise of a shared polyglot language, however, as well as the improved relations among individuals across the most obvious divide suggest the need to look instead to a clash of designs and intentions not imputable exclusively to one or another group. Truhel lists a number of alternate formulations of the elements in convergence and conflict: the state and general interest against the rights of individuals, social welfare against individual help, orientation to abstract aims against action for others in their presence. She finds the best formulation, however, once again in the language of Max Weber: "'The postulate of substantive justice,' associated with an orientation to the concrete case and person," she writes, "'stands over against the rule-bound, cool objectivity and formalism that appears to be characteristic of every bureaucracy.'" (129, citing Weber 1978, 980)

The awareness of concrete, individual effects that the social worker brings to social bureaucracy serves as a corrective to bureaucracy, as a reminder that it is an instrument for public objectives, not an end in itself. The external agents bring back direct reports of failures to provide need, and "th[is] orientation to the concrete

8 Compare the concept of self-expansion in Mannheim motivational pedagogy. Truhel does make a passing reference to some in-service training courses as a supplement to experiential learning, although the passage is interesting only because among the five topics that are the subjects of a lecture series she cites as example is "social-political racial hygiene," (121) which reflects the fateful scientistic strand in Weimar social work otherwise disregarded by Truhel and by her own mentors. Schleiermacher 1998; Lehnert 2003.

human being serves as an indicator by which the damage and ineffectiveness of the bureaucratic machinery come to awareness." (130) Then too, both the needy and the press are quicker to speak up against social service agencies than against the agencies that more directly represent sovereign authority. Under these corrective pressures, bureaucrats are more likely to recognize that immediate fiscal consequences may be poor measures of the instrumental rationality of actions, that they cannot achieve their mandated objectives without having the courage to utilize the free play available in regulations in order to adapt judgments to specific circumstances, and that they must speed up procedures, against the normal habits of bureaucracy, in view of immediacy of the needy person. Such corrective consequences are by no means automatic. While social workers struggle daily within the agencies to mediate between formal norms and individual cases, they may also be required—as in a recent case cited by Truhel—to risk their positions in order to maintain the forms of organization that permit them to make an impact. Women's responsibilities cannot be limited to their immediate tasks, if their presence as social workers is to contribute to the correction of bureaucracy.[9]

As the outcome of her study, then, Truhel offers a three-point review of the stakes in the successful operations of social bureaucracy, as well as an assessment of the limits of this paradoxical formation. First, the bureaucratized process of social assistance, which is in any case destined to deal abstractly with mass constituencies, is helped to correct deviations from inclusiveness and relevance in its abstract norms by the recognition of concrete individuals that is insistently imported by social workers. Second, Truhel maintains that the process contributes to working through the crisis of rule that attends the shift from the authoritarian to the democratic state (*Volksstaat*). In evident adaptation of Hermann Heller's theory of social welfare policy as the prime new source of legitimacy,[10] Truhel maintains that the question is: "Shall rule in the future be in accordance with a mentality that nurses welfare and provides assistance (*wohlfahrtspflegerisch-fürsorgerische Gesinnung*) or by the old police-authoritarian principles?" All bureaucrats must in some measure adapt to this change of attitude, but social bureaucrats find it more readily available in their life-and-operations space, by virtue of their function; and there is evidence—at least in urban local governments—that the new mentality moves by contagion from its strongest point into the rest of the bureaucracy. Truhel extends the argument to the problem of authority (and the crisis of the state) in its most difficult form. While "coercion that strikes the individual as coldly

9 Young-Sun Hong argues that Truhel was "the only person to suggest that this contradiction between bureaucracy and personal help could be overcome. … She believed that the experience of this contradiction served as both a permanent corrective to the self-reifying logic of bureaucratic reason and a permanent stimulus to the individual social worker." (Hong 1998, 123)

10 For Hermann Heller's theory of sovereignty and legitimacy, see Müller and Staff 1984. Interest in Heller was renewed in part by the debates between Jürgen Habermas and Niklas Luhmann about the legitimacy crisis of the welfare state.

rational force" and "presents itself as a sovereign imposition in vertical forms of super- and subordination" is ever less understood and ever more rejected, she maintains, it appears both "possible and understandable," when it appears "as a corollary of help."[11] (137) For the bureaucrats themselves, third, Truhel sees social bureaucracy as a help in overcoming the crisis of officialdom, not only because of the new supports for the legitimacy of the state, which has been at the core of their self-assurance, but also because it provides newly challenging and satisfying work and a functional rationale for a less dependent form of organization, in keeping with a pattern discernible in such other formerly bureaucratic sectors as the postal services, whose approach to the character of a commercial enterprise provides a similar renewal.

But there is no happy end. The care for the individual may penetrate the sphere of the bureaucracy, but ultimately all bureaucracies, however modified, deal with masses in terms of generalities. Help to the individual will always be at the margin and insufficiently comprehended. Truhel writes:

> The tension between demand and achievement that is felt by everyone who works in the social bureaucratic space is more than a challenge to correct the bureaucratic apparatus. The contradiction between bureaucratic and social is not only a contradiction in anticipation of a possible synthesis, but also an unresolvable contradiction. (139)

The inherent and immovable limitations of bureaucratic organization illuminate, by contrast, the distinctive attributes and irreplaceable functions of "small groups, bound together by religious or secular commitments" as continuing factors in social assistance. This has been implicitly recognized, Truhel contends, in the creation of special units, even within the public service, to pursue unspecialized family-directed assistance without subordination to the bureaucratic routines of specialized programmes. The officials of communes should be better able than state officialdom to foster such spheres, since the communes originated as self-governed fellowships (*Genossenschaften*) and continue to interact with volunteers and others who are not bureaucratically organized. Truhel takes up a vision put forward by the leader of a Catholic social work group, whereby social assistance is eventually directed through decentralized district centers led by women, interacting with local populations, which come to be "our people" to the resident social workers. The idea is to strengthen all social entities, families above all,

---

11 Truhel notes a trend in some large cities towards abolishing a separate local police department, in favor of establishing an enforcement component within the diverse administrative units. For a striking example of changes that illustrate such a trend, see Fairchild 1987. A recent study suggests the sorts of "coercive" measures Truhel may have had in mind. A prime objective of the Catholic Social Work Association that Truhel repeatedly cites as exemplary, among others, was the enactment of legislation to permit the "pedagogical" involuntary internment of "endangered" adults, especially out of the milieu of prostitution. See Willing 2003.

where the impulse to unconditional and direct interpersonal help is present. Yet the social context remains defined by the larger systemic questions posed by the Webers and others about the effects of hyper-rationalization in society at large, and Truhel closes with an anxious and disproportionally modest plea:

> It becomes manifest at this point that in addition to a bureaucracy that is as little removed as possible from reality and that is constantly being controlled by the concrete individual case—which appears to be indispensable today for fulfilling mass tasks in the service of public corporations—families and clubs, settlements and neighborhoods of every kind have to step forward in order to achieve, on the basis of a different location and motivation, what the best bureaucratic organization can never achieve. (142)

For all the talk of crisis—and notwithstanding the apocalyptic mood among many of her fellow students—, Käthe Truhel writes as if there were quite a lot of time to work things out. In this, she is quite like her teacher, whose letter to the son of his own mentor, quoted earlier, indicates the tone he sought to set. She was also exceptionally responsive to his themes, notwithstanding her subtle mastery of her materials. As we have seen, Mannheim had already posed the problem whether the diversification of bureaucratic functions might not be opening up possibilities for rendering the bureaucratic mentality more reflexive and dynamic (Mannheim [1930] 1970 [1952], 675–81 [266–71]). Ten years later, in the "Planning for Freedom" segment of *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction*, then, Mannheim centers an account of changes in this direction within the social service on a citation of Truhel's dissertation, which, he notes, was written at his suggestion. His version of the conclusion is not identical with hers, but most elements are there:

> If the new type of social work is to be a success, the following social processes must be at work. Activities which were once widely separated must now be combined, official bureaucracy must be tempered with the charity of the primary groups. In addition, adequate training must be provided, the personnel should be wisely selected from classes (*sic*) which are not yet dehumanized and from sects and smaller groups in which affection and certain kinds of reserve are not felt to be mutually exclusive. Apart from that, a preference should be shown for the emotional type of human being who will do only work which has a purpose. (Mannheim 1940, 324)

The important differences are that the "training" that Mannheim desiderates is no longer specified as the social work schooling that Truhel identifies with Alice Salomon's pedagogical design and that he speaks of "classes" rather than of the women to whom Truhel imputes this capability.

In the setting of the Frankfurt research group, however, Truhel's work clearly belongs, first, to the preoccupation with bureaucracy, and second, to a recurrent motif in Mannheim's lecture courses, as we have seen, the "rise of woman."[12]

12 See especially Mannheim 2001, 163–168. The only dissertation written in England under Mannheim's influence, by Viola Klein, testifies to the continued importance of the

In addition to her dissertation, then, the studies by her fellow students, Natalie Halperin (1935) and Margarete Freudenthal (1986) also include inquiries into important issues in "women's research." Halperin writes on eighteenth-century German women writers of novels of sensibility, investigating the extent to which these should be understood as harbingers of female emancipation, while Margarete Freudenthal offers an ambitious treatment of the changing role of women in the domestic and moral economy of the household, differentiated according to historical periods and class, with special attention to the effects of rationalization and the consequent decline in domestic functions. Both studies touch on the prime themes of the early liberalism seminar, in that both take the households of German officials in the epoch centered on the French Revolution as their points of departure. Different as they are in method and materials, they represent variations on a common problem complex.

---

theme in Mannheim's teaching in the later years of his career. In the Preface to the first edition of her work, the author wrote, "The original idea and plan of this book arose out of the lectures and seminars of Dr Karl Mannheim, and were developed in frequent discussions with him." (Klein 1946) Her language changed in the second edition, for reasons suggested by Kettler and Meja 1993.

Chapter 8

Natalie Halperin and Margarete Freudenthal: The Genealogy of Women's Movements

If the main focus in the work of Weil and Gerth was on the interrelations between officials and relatively unattached intellectuals in the rise of liberalism in Germany, a complex we will also encounter in Katz's study of Jewish assimilation, Natalie Halperin and Margarete Freudenthal looked instead at the place of women in that process, open no less to the sources of dependence and inhibition as to signs of autonomous achievement. While Truhel's problem turns on the relations between men and women in the vocational sphere, Halperin and Freudenthal study women in marriages, and the locus of the activities they examine is first and foremost the realm of domesticity. As with Truhel, however, the changing boundaries demarking the gender-determined sites is an integral part of their studies. We begin with Halperin because she offers a critical reading of some widely-noted women's efforts, which she nevertheless finds to be without causal consequences for later movement towards the emancipation of women. While Freudenthal finds an important developmental trend in the materials she studies and offers a diagnosis that is complementary to Truhel's attempt to comprehend some of the features of what contemporaries like Hermann Heller were calling the "social state," Halperin's study eventuates in a caution about false models in the history that women use to make sense of their present situation and aspirations.

She opens with illustrative excerpts and summary characterizations of the literature of sensibility, drawing on letters by the authors as well as on novels, which are themselves typically in epistolary form. The classification of the genre she derives from some standard sources of literary history, whose authority she accepts. Instead of a formal definition, Halperin offers brief analytical comments on the examples she cites, highlighting the sentimental, lachrymose outbursts that epitomize the relations of friendship and love whose mild vicissitudes are the prime subjects of these writings. It is a literature of feelings about enactments of feelings. Halperin turns directly to her general sociological premise: "Sensibility ... is ... the symptom of a specific mode of demeanor and experience within specific social groups on the grounds of specific social conditions." (Halperin 1935, 7) Although the formula is primarily sociological, the use of the term "symptom" is a sign of the psychoanalytical elements in Halperin's interpretation.

Mannheim ended his introductory course in Frankfurt with the problem of relating psychological explanations to sociological ones, and he joined this topic to the question of biographical inquiry as a method for sociological understanding. The lecture protocol states:

> In a few years, we may see more clearly the stretches across which the sociologist can and must apply psychoanalysis and, obversely, where the sociologist must help the psychoanalyst, since the latter lacks the tradition to see social functioning as well as the functioning of the inner apparatus of the soul. (Mannheim [1930] 2001, 74–5)

In the seminar on methods in sociological research taught jointly by Karl Mannheim and Norbert Elias in the Winter Semester of 1932–3, according to Kurt Wolff's incomplete notes, Halperin made a presentation based on the opening pages of a dissertation draft, framed by a brief statement on "socio-biography" made by Elias. Wolff's partly illegible notes are tantalizing, but they do not suffice to give a clear sense how far the methodological issues were taken up in depth and how far the issues were treated by concrete comments on examples brought to the group, but the latter seems more likely, to judge by the respective lengths of interventions by teachers and students, as well as the records we possess (SAK, Bookcase 3.14a). Since Nina Rubinstein managed to save her documentation of her interactions with Mannheim and the seminar, we can see that in addition to comments during the class meetings, the professor provided annotations in the margins of submissions. The students also followed up in writing on issues raised during the seminar presentations. Norbert Elias made his own suggestions to her, probably after a seminar session, but these took the form of a separate letter, rather than notes on the paper itself (Elias to Rubinstein, June 13, 1932. See Kettler and Meja 1993, 21–22; also in NR 39/2.1, 18–19). While we lack the documentation to display the process in Halperin's case, we can assume that she too went through a whole series of consultations not only with Mannheim but also with Elias, as well as quite possibly with other members of the research group.

Halperin's structural analysis of the character-type associated with this literature of sensibility builds on a pattern that she presents in psychoanalytical terms:

> Such [overwrought moments] have been artificially contrived [by these authors] within the sphere of their own lives for the satisfaction of certain yearnings, and they portray an ephemeral encounter as a genuine fulfillment, without really looking at it—all of which has more to do with discharging blocked emotions than with the reality of the person who provides the occasion. (Halperin 1935, 8)

Citing Mannheim as her source for the formulation, she observes that sexuality is a field strewn with taboos and inhibitions for these people, too disturbing for the holiday atmosphere that prevails in the encounters. There are men as well as women involved in this style. Halperin's list includes Goethe, Klopstock, the brothers Jacobi, and Herder, but as the men mature, she contends, they almost always move beyond the conditions hospitable to such sensibility: "A combination of security in financial matters and the absence of absorbing commitments, together with personal disappointment—which betokens a failure to adjust to reality—facilitate the rise of sensibility as a state of mind." (8) As men enter the positions of authority and responsibility entailed by marriage and especially as

they enter upon the structured striving for success in career or profession, they cease to be open to sensibility. Halperin identifies a cohort of women, in contrast, who remain all their lives in such conditions.

After displaying some statistical tables containing demographic information about female authors in general at that time, she focuses on four rather well-known authors, whose sociological attributes correspond to the great majority overall. Financially secure, they are daughters as well as wives of officials in the upper ranks, a status that also provides a measure of prestige; they were educated beyond the norm of their class, albeit with an eye to the marriage market; and they are dissatisfied with their marriages and with the asymmetrical circumstance that they cannot abreact their feelings at home, as the husband can. Above all, they are caught up in the severe social controls of small residence (or university) towns, which they cannot evade, if only because their reputations help or hinder their husbands' careers. "They can draw back," Halperin writes, "only inward, into the soul, into the 'nature' of gardens and forest paths, or to far-away places."

Halperin labels the characteristic response by women a "wifely" one, and she sees it as a prime constituent of a "broad female intelligentsia marked by its sensibility … for which psychic problems and books take on an existential meaning." The letter written in the pathetic and confessional language of intimate but de-eroticized friendship is the paradigmatic form of expression, in their literary productions as in their lives. After sampling a number of letters, notably letters to a friend about emotion-filled visits with others, Halperin focuses on the puzzle posed by such texts, where there is often a blatant contrast between the intimacy on display, in both forms and contents, and the actual distance on several dimensions between the parties involved in the correspondence as well as in the narratives the letters contain. She cites, first, a failure of the immediate surroundings to provide satisfaction; second, the circumstance that all actions at home fall under the imperatives of duty, especially in the light of the power of gossip; third, the riskless projection of all hopes onto someone safely far away; and, finally, the extraordinary discharge of feelings, intense but without consequences, if somehow they manage a visit. She sums up:

> The distant friend is the refuge. We can be open with him because he is outside our everyday life, because we do not really know him—nor, in order to avoid disappointment, would we want to do so, and because, in any immediate sense, we have nothing to fear from him.

Turning to the novels themselves, she finds that they serve as a counterpart to a life where women are subject to the control of their husbands and to a long catalogue of duties and expectations, increasingly codified as rules in authoritative handbooks of conduct.[1] The striking thing, according to Halperin, is that the

1 Halperin quotes Mannheim again, without supplying a source: "A norm arises through a natural play of forces. It is enunciated as law only when it has been shattered or

imagined world of the novel is not one where conduct is less hampered and satisfactions are less assiduously denied, but rather a world where all the rules imposed by authority or force of circumstance in actual life are recast as decisions, voluntarily taken for the sake of a higher morality. In short, "the novel of sensibility provides the ideological superstructure" for this form of life. Except for these women's unexpectedly gentle and forward looking concepts of education, their modes of conduct and literary undertakings do not move them in any way beyond the authority of fathers, husbands, and repressive norms of social control. Whatever the intrinsic merit of the writings—the question on which Halperin defers to literary scholars—their activities are self-enclosed and without promise.

Halperin seeks to put her findings in perspective by looking at representative eighteenth-century women authors in two other categories. First, she treats a number of writers whose books are classed as novels of realism rather than sensibility. In these novels, which are by no means morally adventurous, the world of work appears and sexual desire has its place and its effects. They are stories of families, with their births and deaths, and the striving for success in their different forms and generations. At the level of sociological grounding, Halperin situates the authors in bourgeois household roles within families engaged in commerce or manufacture, such that the women are themselves participants in the family economic activities and that any writing they do is during time torn away from other duties and of necessity dedicated to the income it can provide. Picking up a thread of the working group's discussion with Max Weber, Halperin distinguishes two types of rationalization. Officials, she contends are subjected to rationalization ordered from above and adapted to the needs of bureaucratic organization. This leaves a residue of free time and energy, for which there is no outlet except in compensatory activities.[2] The entrepreneurs' rationalization, in contrast emerges from the pursuit of their own goals and the striving to enhance their performances. For them, the realm of feelings is also subject to discipline and purposive control, but it is then forthrightly expressed, not left free floating in search of expression, as was the case with the female novelists of sensibility.

Halperin next turns to a brief study of two exceptional cases, the "classical" authors, Sophie von Brentano and Caroline von Wollzogen, both living in Weimar at the time of Goethe. She discusses their writings in a tone of absolute enchantment, as providing the first genuine women's inclusion in literature. While "the hero of sensibility is always standing by, always ready to give in, to deny himself, to be defeated, the human beings that Sophie von Brentano thought up and rendered poetic win their happiness through battle and strife." Yet these exceptional cases are isolated in their time, the products of the idiosyncratic conditions in that court. Halperin's conclusion is somber:

---

doubted." (Halperin 1935, 29)

2 As we have noted above, Mannheim made a similar point in his 1930 essay on the striving for economic success.

> It would be an error to consider the lively authorial activities of women in the 18th Century in general as the beginning of women's emancipation. As we have seen, writing was not a genuine confrontation with their lives for most of these women, not an assault on traditions, and not really a vocation or activity. On the contrary, it was an acceptance of their helplessness, a surrender, and a passive evasion of reality. (61)

Halperin closes on a courageous political note: "Emancipation begins only where the necessity for active intervention—the independent forming of our lives—announces itself to woman, where the security of her existence becomes shaky, and capitalism compels her to take an active part in the struggle for existence." (61) These judgments recall to mind that the members of Mannheim's research group do not by any means form a unified political body. Some were actively engaged in various political associations, often adhering to competing groupings. Mannheim hoped to create a non-partisan zone of political truce through the working norms of the group, and there are no indications that he failed, no hints of political cleavages that disrupted the work.

In one of his earliest publications in Germany, Mannheim set forth a programme whose effects can be traced in the design of the research group. The question in that piece on "Science and Youth" is whether the university curriculum should be oriented strictly to the codifications that various sciences [*Wissenschaften*] had achieved. Mannheim argues that a dramatic redirection of the educational function is itself indispensable to rejuvenating sciences that are in danger of sclerosis. The academic disciplines must teach in a way that lets them learn from youth. He tells three stories to identify the critical problem, sketches of students who arrive in the university inspired by burning questions generated by their prior commitments to the movements of the times and who are stopped short by a disciplinary course of studies that requires them to forget their questions and to subordinate themselves to the present questions and methods of their respective sciences. Mannheim reports that his first student comes from the activist political movement, the second from a religious-mystical community, and the third from a intimate involvement in art—that all three arrive in the university, in short, with profound experiences and insights. What they are required to do in the faculties of social science, philosophy, and art history, however, ignores or disparages what they bring. Mannheim finds this a cruel waste, but he is, nevertheless, like Max Weber, not at all satisfied with a romantic gesture on behalf of youth and its supposed vital rootedness in fellowships devoted to ultimate mysteries and missions. He is in fact ambivalent about such external, extra-scientific formations. Their ideas, after all, may be nothing more than faded shadows of obsolete notions, he cautions, and they are in any case bound to be vague and unfocused. Besides, youth is destined to mature beyond the attitudes appropriate to these intense involvements. The universities are quite right to initiate the students in the sciences, he concludes, but they must also open the sciences to the urgencies of youth. Work in education should be a source of regeneration for scientific work (Mannheim 2001, 99–104; Loader and Kettler 2002).

This argument about both education and research can be traced in the case that Mannheim made for contemporary studies (*Gegenwartskunde*) in 1932 as well as in his practice. Truhel and Halperin can be read as probing questions they brought to the university not only as women with certain problematic life-experiences (a conception elaborated above in connection with his lecture courses), but also as adherents to various groupings that elucidate these experiences in a political way. Behind Truhel's dissertation stands not only her experience as social worker but also her sympathies with—and perhaps even membership in—certain organizations of Social Christianity. Halperin's conclusions hint at likely participation in women's activism in the context of one or another socialist movement. And Margarete Freudenthal comes to her studies as a veteran of quite a different approach to women's questions. Simply restated, the norms of the research group gave recognition to the ideologies the students brought with them, but it sought to relativize (but not to dismiss) their various questions and angles of attack. The resultant body of research work, Mannheim hoped, would be comparable and cumulative, notwithstanding the clash among the ideologies and the exclusivity claims of them all. In this context, it is especially interesting to note that Mannheim compelled Freudenthal to initiate an interview project of fifty current households, even as she was immersed in her historical studies. When she protested that this would over-burden her, he answered, according to her recollections many years later, "No, it will be especially useful for your theoretical discussion if you know how the practical household managements around you actually look, not only for the sake of continuities but also for the sake of changes in the configurations." (Sallis-Freudenthal 1977, 110) In this case, perhaps because of Freudenthal's earlier active engagements in ideological movements, Mannheim went especially far in introducing reality-testing into the dissertation process, if only as a complement to a historical study.

Freudenthal's ideological provenance is in groupings dedicated to rationalizing women's household work through technology, design, and reorganization. For Freudenthal, "politics" was overshadowed by questions of "home," *polis* by *oikos*. That this need not imply female "domesticity" in a traditionalist ideological sense is evident from the affinities between such non-political politics and the welfare state, increasingly important to Mannheim's own thinking, and clearly present in Truhel's work. Freudenthal's dissertation may be understood as a study in household management in Aristotle's sense, with special emphasis on the institutionalized art of acquisition rather than the external political ramifications of the domestic unit. The household is examined, first, as the locus for meeting physical needs, and, second, as woman's counterpart to man's political school for moral cultivation through participation in governance. While Freudenthal does not challenge the ultimate authority of the husband or the wife's responsibility for "making" a home during most historical phases, just as they appear in the household account books

that are her principal sources, she does not ignore variations in household authority according to differences among classes, nor changes over time.[3]

Freudenthal credits women with gradually overcoming elements in the constitution of the household harmful to themselves, culminating in the ideological changes wrought by the women's movement, moving towards "the time when both spouses work together to handle household matters with skill and planning." The concomitant expansion in women's outside employment propagated the "'Earnings and Consumption Community,' that incorporated all members of the family,"[4] which based itself on enhanced women's self-respect and men's recognition of women as bargaining partners (Freudenthal 1986, 169). But these developments were limited to the middle class, Freudenthal acknowledges, and they are soon overwhelmed by the Depression. The new thesis generated by the doctoral research and intended to be tested in the unfinished habilitation work foresees a convergence between bourgeois and proletarian households, with both organizations ever more closely attached to the "important final links in the chain of household, woman, and family—that is, to the state and to the political transformations of our time." (172) Freudenthal never had the chance to explain whether she meant by this projected recontextualization of the household a universal extension of the welfare state dependencies she finds in the twentieth-century proletarian family or a shift towards a socialist order. In either case, the overturning of male political-legal privileges or the expansion of women's civic roles in public space did not figure in her analysis. The disparity between ideology and experienced life within the domestic sphere remains at the center.

The household accounts of the Goethe family between 1760 and 1830, a time when the father enjoyed the status of a higher official, surprisingly provide Freudenthal not only with a "classical" starting point but also with a normative ideal, at least in two senses: first, the wife's ideology is actually congruent with her productive activities and scope of operations, and, second, her work is—and is recognized to be—complementary to that of her husband, "balancing" his contributions to the family. Freudenthal claims moreover, that the underlying "Biedermeier" ideology was as much the product of the woman as of the man. The ideals of such congruence, achievement, and reciprocity control her analysis. Her analytical design is straightforward and even schematic. Subject to some unevenness owing to differential access to data, she carves out comparative studies of class differences at historical intervals, contrasting the "typical" attributes of household management, housewife, and family. After a comparison of the bourgeois urban

3 In her appreciation of Freudenthal's dissertation, Rutschky writes against stereotyped misjudgments that Freudenthal's failure to challenge the domestic division of labor makes her work obsolete for feminists. Citing Helge Pross's (1976) study of German housewives for evidence of women's actual experiences, she argues that radical critiques of housework are oversimple and imperceptive (Rutschky 1986, xix–xxii).

4 Freudenthal's label for the new family form may well have been a term of art in the feminist ideologies of the time.

household of the poet's family with a contemporaneous rural household, her case studies include: (1) urban and rural bourgeois, as well as urban proletarian households, around 1860; (2) urban and rural bourgeois households between 1865 and 1890; and (3) proletarian and urban bourgeois households around the turn of the century. Wherever possible, she draws on quantitative budget information, but she adds an extensive appendix of descriptive excerpts from memoirs, naturalistic literature, and similar materials. This practice signals unwillingness to depend on analytical abstractions alone to communicate the insights acquired through the inquiry, and it will also reappear in the works of Nina Rubinstein and of Mannheim's only English advisee, Viola Klein. A residual ambivalence may have been transmitted by Mannheim himself, given his own past misgivings about "scientism," but Freudenthal is as certain as Mannheim where the weight should finally be placed. Her study aspires to nomothetic science.

In a theoretical introduction, Freudenthal maintains that her study applies the general sociological law that human beings are shaped by the interplay between their social origins and their spheres of operation and that they are either damaged or impelled to remedial action when the "discrepancies" between the two factors are severe. Women at home are conditioned, first, by the ideologies and material expectations they bring to the household and, second, by the structure of the household itself, as defined by social (and husbandly) standards, technical means and financial resources. The various historical types of women at home are defined by the diverse constellations of these two classes of factors. The spiritual and psychic life of the family is a function, according to Freudenthal, of "the relation between the respective contributions of husband and wife ..., which determines the degree of harmony or conflict in the family—subjectively, for the woman's sense of self-esteem, and, objectively, for the mutual relations among family members." (1986, 6) Although Freudenthal collects interesting materials about rural and proletarian families, these serve primarily to underline the importance of class variations, since her attention—at least until the speculative conclusion about class convergence—is focused on the urban bourgeois family. The central "discrepancy" is the one that affects women in the middle of the nineteenth century, when the "lady" (*die Dame*) appears in her modern form; and the response of prime interest to Freudenthal is the women's movement and its ideological effects on households, women and families.

The pattern emerges at the middle of the nineteenth century, according to Freudenthal, although the full consequences first manifest themselves during the two subsequent generations. The household changes from a production unit to a consumption unit: processing and manufacturing for family needs are externalized, with concomitant changes in the size, location, and furnishing of homes, as well as in relations with employees. Cultivation and sociability are also transferred from the domestic sphere into a mass-organized public domain that is, according to Freudenthal, "the strongest manifestation of the democratic idea and liberalism, the strongest expression of the bourgeoisie, as it establishes itself and everywhere puts its power and importance on public display." (47) The latter development

provides women with opportunities for utilizing the leisure created by the former. But there are problems:

> Since the woman, brought up under the old family constitution and bred to the old ideology, affirms the old society and its ideals as a whole, a disproportionality emerges between her actual situation and her ideology. While her actual situation is increasingly removed from the domestic and private sphere, her ideology still forbids her any kind of public activity. (48)

At the first stage, this tension is awkwardly sustained. The new "industry" provides for a "merely puerile and useless organization of her leisure time," (48) and she is denied satisfying occupations inside or outside the house. Freudenthal challenges feminist writers who contend that emancipation begins with leisure. Moreover, she carefully distinguishes between middle-class households containing the "lady" who suffers directly under this ideology and those whose financial resources are too sparse to free the housewife from full-time domestic functions. In the latter, the effects of the new dispensation are most strongly felt by the daughters and other female relatives who can no longer be put to productive use in the home.

The women's movement draws on both types. But recruitment depends on ideological mobilization. Freudenthal points out that the old domestic ideology had changed its provenance by the mid-nineteenth century. Originally shaped jointly by men and women in response to the needs of the household, "it was now upheld primarily by men," and only accepted by women because of their customary submissiveness to tradition. The new ideology is a creative achievement by women during the following years. In search of functions, they broaden and deepen their sphere of operations, both inside and outside the household, and they redefine their roles, overcoming the crippling disproportionality. Freudenthal gives equal weight to the tendency in the women's movement that presses for access to education, careers, and public life and to the competing tendency, that she links especially to the less prosperous women bound to the household, rationalization through consumer education and domestic science. But it is the latter that captures her imagination:

> This ideology seeks to bring the necessities of the household, i.e., of consumption, in accord with the extra-domestic apparatus of production, and to replace the obsolete habituation to the home production skills and frugality with scientific knowledge about the quality of consumption goods and financial planning. (162)

Mannheim's eagerness to have Freudenthal survey class-variable consumption and household management patterns fits into his increasing involvement in controversies about marginal utility economics through his association with Adolph Löwe, as well as the agenda of his "liberalism" seminar, where her research programme was worked out. "Sociological economics" challenged

demand curves premised on the supposed preferences of an ahistorical economic man and, according to a fellow-student in the seminar, many years later, Mannheim "was now attacking (in terms of the theoretical basis) both Marxists and ... the school of liberal economists of the marginal utility school." Yet this did not imply a categorical rejection of rationalization. In the essay on the "striving for economic success," it will be recalled, while arguing that thoroughgoing rationalization of economically-relevant conduct makes it possible to dispense with ideological controls in domains once stringently regulated, Mannheim cites an example pertinent to our present inquiries:

> The changed evaluation of sexuality affords a good example of the eclipse of the ideological element. Sexual behavior patterns which appear morally indifferent to us carried an enormous charge of moral relevance in earlier times because earlier societies were compelled to impose a strict ideological regulation on sexual conduct, the effects of which would otherwise have been explosive. In our society, however, changed institutions (such as the greater independence of women) largely neutralize those potential effects. As social organization becomes more "rational." the ideological element loses weight. (Mannheim [1930 1970 [1952], 247n1)

Freudenthal's analysis is less functionalist, as she expands on the progressive interactions of changes in household constitutions, women's movement ideology and female types, with restructuring in marital relationships as result. It is interesting to compare her views with Mannheim's treatment of the relations between ideology and the standing of women while addressing an audience Dutch students in Amsterdam in 1932, just as Freudenthal was pursuing her project. His topic was mostly about intellectuals and his aim was to show that social formations other than the classes identified by Marxists also had to become aware of the ideologies that misled them, but he turns to the consciousness of women for a graphic example.

"Everywhere ... we see woman," Mannheim says, essentializing a concept that he treats elsewhere as socially differentiated, "becoming conscious of her own being. She has begun to reflect on herself." (Mannheim [1932] 1993, 89) She had been thought about before, of course. Everyone has always known about women: what they are able and what they are obliged to do. But these were the thoughts of men, expressing the preferences of "her partner, or, rather: her opponent". "Man ruled and spoke his mind, while woman lacked a consciousness of her own and accepted his thoughts about her as binding on her, both in her spiritual life and in her conduct." Now this has changed. The central fact revealed by Marxism about thinking in the economic sphere applies to all social relations: all social groups interpret all others from their own points of view, generating misleading ideologies. Once woman recognizes that she has not been governed by her own thoughts, that action appropriate to her position cannot be adequately guided by the designs of those who benefit from imposing an ideology on her, "she attempts to live as a new, independent person." (89)

The general insight into ideology is necessary, according to Mannheim, but it is not sufficient. Turning to psychoanalytic language, he insists that there are "inhibitions" that obstruct full consciousness and corresponding action; many women, in fact, "talk a great deal about emancipation, but merely in order to abreact their inhibitions, without bringing themselves to act." These inhibitions are a function of specifiable social situations, and they can be countered by a "socioanalysis" that clarifies their sources and operations. Sociology cannot tell whether a society wholly free of such inhibitions is possible, but Mannheim assures his listeners that "there are various signs that point to the possibility of working towards" (89) a condition where there are far fewer than at present. In this respect, Freudenthal's findings coincide with Mannheim's 1932 characterization of women's achievements as a product of small changes pressed forward on localized sites.

In considering the relations between situation and ideology, Freudenthal may also be usefully compared with Marianne Weber, four of whose books are in her bibliography. Writing about the links between advanced capitalism and developments in family law, the latter insists that the effects are neither direct nor unequivocal. Capitalism does indeed influence ideology formation, but it may as easily foster tendencies resistant to the new economic developments as harmonious with them. More precisely, she contends:

> The effect that highly developed capitalism produces on family life as such is only in posing a "problem" for ideology—i.e., for spiritual tendencies—which they endeavor to "solve". Because the inner structure of the family is a matter of relative indifference to capitalism, the economic requirements of our political economy permit ethical ideals in this sphere comparatively free play. (M. Weber 1907, 282–3)

Yet in his lectures Mannheim too drew a line between the social formations that are a direct function of economic development and the changing place of women in the family. Interestingly enough, however, Freudenthal scarcely addresses the principle that Mannheim emphasized as central to that relationship. The erotic has a secondary place in these marriages or their problems. Freudenthal does point out that during the years of family crisis after mid-century, when the discrepancy between women's ideology and reality was greatest, husbands virtually absconded from the families, marrying out of commercial calculation and living outside the home and away from their troubled or frivolous wives. But Freudenthal defines the crisis by contrast with her point of departure, the preceding Biedermeier integration, which, after all, epitomized the ideal of woman as the source of a diffuse family love, all-consuming cleanliness, and a full larder—sweet and busy helpmate to the patriarchal male (Weber-Kellerman 1983, 48–66). For Freudenthal, household management issues remain uppermost in the reconstitution of the family relationship in the more comradely present, even when they can no longer be contained within the individual household. Reintegration depends on restoring

equivalency of effort and its recognition. The erotic dimension offers neither hindrance nor opportunity. Mannheim is less certain.

More puzzling than Freudenthal's neglect of the ambiguous "erotic" issue, so difficult to keep apart from a cultural sequestering of women, is her categorical indifference to the legal issues historically so important to the bourgeois women's movement whose general orientation she otherwise shares. Even if she thought that Weimar legislation had effectively met women's legal grievances and that domestic science education needs were now uppermost, it is curious that someone who spent years assisting her husband in legal research should not have paid some attention to property in the constitution of households during the periods covered by her study. The neglect is serious too, because, even in its legal form, the property issue provides an important surrogate for the analysis of power relations in the family. As Marianne Weber's extended 1907 treatment of marriage law shows, liberal legal theory can function as a critical political theory of domination. Constructively, Weber's theory offers debatable but nuanced proposals for institutionalizing the middle-class marital "community" that remains Freudenthal's own resolution of past discrepancies.

Freudenthal depends exclusively on ideology and functional imperatives, and her analysis slights power. In adopting Mannheim's central analytical figure of the discrepancy between ideology and actual situation, she became implicated in his two-front struggle against Marxism and individualist liberalism. Like Mannheim himself, she could not develop a political theory of the social liberalism that she shared with him,[5] let alone generate the feminist deviationist doctrine (Unger 1985; Olsen 1983) that may have been required. During the Weimar period, German feminist debate was increasingly hemmed in by the same polarization between "bourgeois" and "proletarian" thought that Mannheim sought to challenge in Amsterdam (Mannheim [1932] 1993), with "bourgeois" thought moving yet further from political contents, even in the limited form of individualist liberalism, because of the rising importance of nationalist elements in the movement and the consequent need to find common, non-political ground (Greven-Aschoff 1981 corrects Evans 1976). In analyzing the new middle-class family of the 1920s Freudenthal thus lacks a detailed and power-conscious alternative comparable to Marianne Weber's individualist legal analysis. And in projecting the Depression-induced reconstitution of all households into dependencies of a welfare state, she never saw the problem that Mannheim opaquely formulated in 1930 as "the question of the possible utilization and moulding of bureaucratic contemplativity"

5 "Social" or "new" liberalism was institutionally grounded in such reform organizations as the *Gesellschaft für Soziale Reform* (Ratz 1980). John Dewey was the foremost American voice of "social" or "new liberalism:" "The belief that mutual aid, not merely mutual forbearance, marks the good society is crucial to the new liberalism. To make liberalism a more reform-oriented political theory, its proponents attack the individualism of classical liberalism." (Damico 1978) See especially Dewey [1930] 1962 and [1935] 1960. Cp. Collini 1979, 13–50, and Sklar 1988, 33–40.

(Mannheim 1952, 270) to counter oppressive bureaucratization. But that does not deny her accomplishments.

Freudenthal creatively elaborates an important impulse generated by Mannheim's work. In her insistence on treating the household domain where most women historically find themselves as an arena in which a strategy for the rise of women had to be devised, she marks an important turn from the false alternative of mythologizing or scorning the work of most women. She uncovers aspects of women's lives that Mannheim himself could probably not have distinguished. But her rigor brought her up against the limitations of his emphasis on legitimation by efficient functioning and self-esteem. It is not surprising, in view of the emotionally undernourished and politically myopic theory of the household that resulted, that when they were all forced to choose a place of exile, Freudenthal herself quickly sought a less utilitarian "home"-land as locus for self-reference and development, as witness the title of the memoir of her way to Israel, "I have found my land." (Sallis-Freudenthal 1977)

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 9
Jacob Katz: Sociology of the Stranger I

Jacob Katz was a Hungarian Jew from the village of Magyargencs. Strictly orthodox and a supporter of a religious Zionist organization, he began his stay in Frankfurt, while preparing for university admission, in one of the city's yeshivas, which also provided him with sanctuary during his university studies.[1] Katz was first attracted to Mannheim by his reputation as a "an interesting and stimulating lecturer." He writes:

> At the very first class I knew beyond doubt that here was the person from whom I had most to learn. … I enrolled in the course and asked to join his seminar, and to use a rather grandiloquent phrase, thereafter my hand never left his—that is, until Mannheim was banished from Frankfurt with the rise of the Nazi party. (Katz 1995, 78–9)

He was able to earn his doctorate in 1934, after Mannheim's departure from Germany, because of the professional and "fair" attitude of the historian, Georg Künzel, to whom Mannheim had sent him.[2] Although Nazism had not yet permeated university culture as it would in the following years, and although doctoral education was less public than that at the undergraduate level, it is still remarkable that a Jewish student, who had previously had a Jewish mentor and who was writing about Jewish assimilation and citing Jewish sources, could successfully finish his degree. He certainly helped himself in the opening paragraph of his forword by astutely claiming that he was analyzing an era that had ended with the Nazi seizure of power (Katz [1935] 1972, 199). His was an autopsy rather than a diagnosis, allowing Nazi sympathizers to read it as they did the later exhibits of "degenerate" art and music. Accordingly, his Jewish sources were largely descriptive and were interspersed with "acceptable" sources such

1 In addition to Mannheim, the teachers he recalls in his memoirs include Paul Tillich, Max Wertheimer, Theodor W. Adorno, Max Horkheimer (whose course he fled because the teacher "lacked any inspiration"), and a number of history and literature teachers.

2 Künzel also promoted Margarete Freudenthal, another Jewish "orphan" of Mannheim. In the case of Katz, good will combined with luck to secure him a second reader. Künzel coopted a Jewish Orientalist, G. Weil, who normally would have had no qualifications in this field, and whose dismissal, delayed because of his military service, took effect on the day after the *viva voce*. Katz arrived in Palestine in 1936, in keeping with plans he had already made in 1930. He taught in the Sociology Department of Hebrew University, headed by Martin Buber, and he was one of the most prominent Israeli historians of the modern diaspora, operating throughout within the framework of a sociological approach, not uncontroversial among his peers (Katz 1995).

as Heinrich Grätz's caricaturing history of the Jews and Werner Sombart's rather anti-Semitic *The Jews and Economic Life* (which used Grätz as its main source). He was also wise enough not to cite the recently dismissed Mannheim (whose name would have raised red flags in a way that the other Jewish sources did not), even though his influence pervades the work.

Katz notes that Mannheim took an interest in the personal life of his advanced students, and certainly he had more in common with Katz than with other students

> The two of us shared a common Hungarian-Jewish background although we came from opposite ends of the spectrum. … Mannheim's knowledge of Judaism was scanty, but he was much interested in its problems, especially in the role played by Judaism in the emergence of modern society. … One of the most interesting seminars that Mannheim conducted, together with a number of other teachers, concerned the rise of liberalism. One of the groups dealt with the Jewish factor; and when I joined the class, I found their work already in progress under the direction of one of the more senior students. When this student left the university, I took his place—and thus was born the idea for my dissertation on the assimilation of German Jewry.[3] (Katz 1995, 78–9)

Mannheim's expressions of "interest" in the "life" of Jacob Katz, as well as his interest in problems of Judaism, as reported by Katz, would have been integral to their discussions of ideas for the dissertation. It was a cardinal principle of Mannheim, as noted, that individual study had to begin as an exercise in self-clarification, focusing precisely on an aspect that is experienced as problematic, primarily because of a clash between institutionalized social expectations, articulated in prevalent ideologies, and the concrete social experience of the individual. Mannheim would have been fascinated by Katz's profound immersion in the practices and supportive community of orthodoxy, and he would have learned or surmised that Katz, as he reports in his memoirs, experienced some strain between that essential part of his life and the world of the university student, and especially his encounters with assimilated Jews. A secondary principle in the design of students' projects was the selection of a topic possessing structural similarities to their own "life" problems, but simultaneously remote in time or place. Katz's study accordingly focuses on the eighteenth century.

Katz's ambitious dissertation on the origins of Jewish assimilation and its ideology ([1935] 1972, 195–276) shares with Gerth's dissertation the focus on the same era and social group—the German *Bildungsbürgertum* in the late eighteenth century and early nineteenth centuries. Both men are willing to accept the depiction of the ideal, or ideology, of liberal *Bildung* as presented at length by Hans Weil in his book on the topic (Weil [1930] 1967) and also by Mannheim in "Conservative Thought." But here the comparison stops. As we have seen, Gerth's work is a sociology of reception: which groups, given their socio-political location were most receptive to the new ideology? Katz, however, is similar to Elias in focusing

3 This group was the aforementioned "Working Group on Social History and History of Ideas: Early Liberalism in Germany."

on the function of ideas rather than their origins and reception. He explicitly argues that the contents of the ideology were less important than its function (Katz [1935] 1972, 199–200). While Weil's book is cited prominently, it provides information about the content and origins of the ideal, and Katz seems to see no need to replicate that research. We can look elsewhere, even beyond Elias, for the conceptual design that informs the dissertation. Katz cites a range of German sociological greats, Max Weber, Georg Simmel, Ferdinand Tönnies, Werner Sombart, but the prime influence on his work is that of Mannheim, for it is Mannheim's work that helps to frame the argument and even the methodology. This relationship is complicated by the fact that, as we have demonstrated, Mannheim's own work was not a static entity, but rather a developing process with Max Weber playing an increasing role. Given this fluidity, Katz, was not the lock-step disciple of Mannheim, but rather borrowed from him as he saw fit while rejecting other elements of his thought.

The dissertation is divided into three parts dealing with the pre-assimilation period, the transitional "neutral society" and its ideology, and the later period of assimilation and emancipation. The most important of the three is the transitional period, where Katz demonstrates his functional methodology.

Katz argues that in the pre-assimilation period two separate communities existed, Jewry (*Judentum*) and Germandom (*Deutschtum*), each with its own distinct culture centered upon a religion.[4] The two cultures were the expression of a certain order consisting of traditional estates or ranks (*Stände*). The members of these communities were "bound" (*gebunden*) to their own community and, thus, had no significant cultural interaction with members of the other one (216–7). As long as that situation prevailed there could be no assimilation.

Katz argues that there were two elements of this pre-assimilation world that might have appeared to be precursors for assimilation, but in fact were not. The first was the advocacy of toleration by some members of the Christian community. This attitude did not lead to assimilation because it was always tied to conversion. Here Katz's position is not completely in accord with Mannheim's 1930 lecture course on the "Introduction to Sociology," which he almost certainly did not attend. Mannheim said:

> Tolerance is the first stage in the distantiation of phenomena. The state of being addressed by religion and morality is replaced by an altogether different attitude towards these objects, by a distantiation, through which a change in function comes into being. The following must be added: anyone who comes from a bounded worldview will be horrified by the situation of distantiation from the last things, treating them as variable. They will find it an act alien to life, exterminating everything. (Mannheim [1930] 2001)

---

4 For this reason, Katz tends to use "German" and "Christian" interchangeably when discussing this earlier period.

While Katz certainly agrees with the assertion that distantiation and religious orthodoxy are incompatible, here he posits a form of toleration that did not lead to distantiation. He uses as an example Jud Süss, who was able to enter the world of the royal court. However, Süss never entered Christian culture, because he was never fully accepted by the society that supported that culture. He became a neutral creature—a man without significant cultural interaction; his interaction was confined to the economic sphere. In short, he was a "stranger" in Werner Sombart's sense of the term and not in Georg Simmel's, in that he was not even a marginal participant in the Christian culture (Katz [1935] 1972, 220–2).[5]

The second element was that of economic interaction. Those Jews who, unlike Süss, did retain strict adherence to Jewish laws could interact with Christians solely in the economic sphere precisely because of their ties to that "foreign" culture, which guaranteed a certain economic reliability. They appeared as more attractive business partners for Christians than were than were the latter's fellow believers, who were not so strongly bound to their own religious laws. Here Katz cites Max Weber in three ways. First, he accepts Weber's distinction between action among members of a group and that with others outside the group. Second, he accepts Weber's contention that successful economic action is calculable and that the Jews' ties within their culture made them more predictable and reliable to Christian outsiders. Third, this claim is similar to Weber's assertion that membership in certain American sects increased one's business credibility, because it guaranteed a certain reliability. Rather than business relationships being the force that initiated assimilation, they actually promoted cultural separation. Therefore, these individuals, because they played no role in bridging the cultural divide, could not be seen as path-breakers in the assimilation process (220–225).

If there was any element in the Jewish cultural community that served as a pre-condition for assimilation, it was one at the very center of that culture. The highest calling for young Jewish males was not success in business but educational qualification for the rabbinate. This goal of learning, or *Bildung*, a dedication to the world of spirit, would be of great use in the transitional period, when *Bildung* an important social category. Because Katz's work deals so centrally with religion, we should take the opportunity here to reiterate that we have translated the German term "*Geist*" as "spirit" and its adjectival form "*geistig*" as spiritual. Alternative translations are "mind" and "intellectual," so the term has a strong rational component, in contrast to its current American implications.

Katz writes that Jewish assimilation began only with the appearance of a new social order. In describing that order he offers a different approach from that of Gerth, who investigated specific social groups that were attracted to the ideal of

---

5 Simmel's stranger occupied a position at the margins of a culture, giving him a certain distance and objectivity, but he was still tied to the culture. Katz's stranger remains part of a separate culture. One could argue that Simmel's stranger represents a more pessimistic view of the assimilation era rather than the pre-assimilation one. Katz does cite Simmel here, but not his essay on the stranger. See Simmel 1950, 402–8.

Bildung and that would form at least part of the *Bildungsbürgertum*. Katz examines how the latter group prepared the ground for Jewish assimilation. In other words, his main argument begins where both Gerth's and Weil's leave off. Katz makes two very strong points when discussing the beginnings of Jewish assimilation. First, he argues that initially Jews did not begin to assimilate within the entire German culture, but only within a new socio-cultural enclave in that realm. Second, he argues that the initiative came not from Jews but from this transformed sector of German culture. Both Jews and Christians interacted in this sector not by Jews abandoning their culture, but by their being received not as Jews or Christian converts but as humans. For this reason, the bulk of the dissertation is dedicated to a discussion of the new "neutral society" and its ideology.

In constructing his case, Katz relies primarily on Weil for the empirical information about the *Bildungsbürgertum* at the heart of this new order. One can also see elements from Max Weber, although not as many as in the discussion of the traditional cultures. However, the structure of his argument, the functional component, is based on Mannheim's *Ideology and Utopia*, even though that book is never cited. More specifically, he uses Mannheim's concept of the socially free-floating intelligentsia as his model, even to the point of adopting some important terms, while changing the characteristics of the social groups examined.[6] That said, one must remember that *Ideology and Utopia* represents, among other things, Mannheim's attempt to address concerns of Max Weber, especially as expressed in Weber's vocation essays.

Katz begins his examination of the assimilation process with the "great occurrence" of the eighteenth century, the spiritual and social strengthening of the middle class (*Mittelstand*) in conjunction with royal absolutism. The growth of the officialdom and the corresponding weakening of the old estate society elevated the social status of those possessing the bureaucratic qualification of *Bildung*. The "spiritual elite" that resulted was composed primarily from three groups: individual nobles, rising strata of the *Bürgertum*, and privatized notables. The loosening of ties of these groups to the old estate social order combined with the individualization of the economy to create a new social order, whose constituting principle was participation in "spirit" and "culture." This new social order offered entrée to the values of Enlightenment individualism, or liberalism (226–9).[7]

6 The similarities between Katz's analysis and Mannheim's sociology are noted not only by Katz's grateful acknowledgment of the teacher who gave him his handhold in the alien world of secular social sciences but also by numerous commentators on Katz. Benjamin Ze'ev Kedar stands out among the latter because he specifies several important points of contact. First, he notes that Katz "took up Mannheim's ideas about the socially unattached intelligentsia." In that connection, then, Kedar also points to a broader conception of a "neutralized social form," which figures importantly in Katz's work, if also in a skeptically amended version (Kedar 1998, 79–86).

7 Katz attributes this information to Weil, who in turn cited Friedrich Meinecke's *Die Idee der Staatsräson*.

At this point Katz brings the Mannheimian model of the intelligentsia into play. First he argues that this new social order did not replace the old estate order at this time, but rather existed alongside it. The individuals who made it up had loosened their ties with the old estate groups but were not unified by social bonds (*Bindungen*) as the old groups were. Nevertheless they felt connected (*verbunden*) with one another and retained a loose connection (*Verbundensein*) to other members of the elite. The distinction between bound and connected is one Mannheim made in *Ideology and Utopia*, and Katz's description of the new spiritual elite resembles his mentor's socially free-floating intelligentsia. Members of both groups retained connections to their original groups but were not bound by those groups' worldviews. Instead they formed a distinct medium in which they exchanged ideas as individuals. In both cases the original groups, while possessing strong social roots, were largely defined by their worldviews, or "ideologies."

There were differences between the two men. Mannheim's groups were essentially political, corresponding to the major parties of Weimar. Katz's were broader and were defined by religion. Mannheim viewed the intelligentsia more as a medium through which the political groups could communicate, while Katz emphasized the spiritual elite as an enclave within one the two original groups, Christendom. Accordingly Katz argues that the original impact of the Enlightenment in Germany was not the creation of a religious space outside of the traditional religious opposition but rather involved a shifting of Christian theological thinking. The sections on the structure and ideology of the spiritual elite within the growing *Bildungsbürgertum* describe a "natural religion," that of humanity, which was portrayed as the basis of all religions, including Christianity and Judaism. It was this natural religion that could overcome the gap between the two rather than replacing either (258–60). Another difference between Katz and Mannheim that influenced the others was the latter's focus on the present with a projection into the future, while Katz's presentation is strictly historical.

The longest section of the dissertation is dedicated to the "ideology" of the new socio-cultural order and its receptiveness to Jewish intellectuals as well as the response of those thinkers. Briefly stated, the ideology of the new neutral society was that of the Enlightenment with its emphasis on the universality of human nature, reason and rights. All of these emphasized the individual as a "person" who was connected to other persons beyond the traditional collectivities of family, estate, church, vocational corporation, and nation.[8] This universality and connection of individuals occurred in alternative collectivities—humanity, the state, or civil society, which in turn were not mutually exclusive (241–2). What all of the latter had in common was the ideal of *Bildung*, which replaced the declining idea of progress (230). Katz notes that this neutralized society provided for a separation of theory and praxis. While its members could be separated in their

8 Katz observes that "nation" was used in the sense of "people" during the pre-assimilation period. Hence the Jews were referred to as a nation. Only later did "people" (*Volk*) become the prominent term (208).

practical activities as members of different groups, they were united in the realm of spirit through their sharing of the Enlightenment values. There was no attempt to create a unity of "life-forms." (246)

While Katz (like Mannheim) was not completely consistent in his use of terminology, he essentially argues that individuals were "bound" (*gebunden*) to the old collectivities, meaning that they had no real perspective beyond that of the group. In the new neutral society, they were more loosely "connected" (*verbunden*) to the groups they came from as well as to one another. They were able to gain a wider perspective through interaction with one another, because they interacted solely as individuals no longer "bound" to the groups from which they had emerged. Since the currency for exchange of perspectives was *Bildung*, any individual who possessed this was accepted as a participant regardless of the group from which they came. The space created by the neutral society is parallel to that in which Mannheim's socially free-floating intelligentsia operated.

Intertwined with this discussion of ideology is an account of the first stage in the assimilation of Jews. Katz argues that in this stage, assimilation and certainly emancipation were not the goal of those Jewish individuals who participated in the neutral society. Also the initiative did not come from them, but from and small section of the Christian culture that subscribed to the new Enlightenment ideals. There was no assimilation of members of the Jewish culture into the Christian culture, but rather the interaction of some members of each culture in this neutralized space initially carved out by Christian enlighteners as individuals.

The early Jewish pioneers in assimilation thought of themselves as members of the Jewish culture and as participants in the neutralized realm of Enlightenment spirit. These two identities could coexist because they were not seen as antithetical to one another as were the Jewish and Christian cultures. It should be reiterated that the Jews were neither accepted into nor entered into the neutral society as "Jews" but rather as individuals capable of and willing to participate in a spiritual exchange. Because *Bildung* played such an important role in Jewish religious culture, there was a bridge to those Christians who had modified their beliefs to emphasize *Bildung*. They, in turn, would have a modifying effect on the Jewish culture.

Katz uses Moses Mendelssohn as his primary case study. Mendelssohn was a biblical scholar within the Jewish community before entering the neutral society. His dedication to *Bildung* within the Jewish community served him well when he participated in the neutral realm. However, when he entered the neutral society, he retained ties to his Judaism. He did not attempt to assimilate himself within Christian culture and society, but rather to exchange ideas with other individuals in spiritual matters. Thus, he was very different from Jud Süss of the pre-assimilation period, who made a complete break with the Jewish culture to enter the courtly world. However, this contact with the neutral society and its Enlightenment culture did weaken the grip of the traditional community on Mendelssohn. While he retained his connection to Jewish society and culture, he became less bound to that culture. In Mannheim's terms, he achieved a certain degree of distantiation.

As he recognized the value of the non-Jewish spirit of Enlightenment culture, as he tried to make the spirit of the Jewish culture more representative to the outside, he helped to destroy the social and cultural encapsulation of that culture. He did not seek to abandon his Jewishness, but rather to expand on its possibilities (244–8, 266). In doing so, he became an agent for change.

Mendelssohn's emphasis on a general *Bildung* over a strictly Talmudic version, and of an ideal of humanity that extended beyond that of Jewry were strengthened by other Jewish Enlightenment thinkers, such as N.H. Wessely. With this proposed "double-ideal," it became necessary to counter negative opinions about Jewry in the larger society, especially when the reproaches were in accord with the ideal of humanity. Accusations that Jews were superstitious and ignorant, that they lacked morality were seen as an affront to Jewish honor. Accordingly Jews began to view Judaism in a new way and to attempt to bring it more in line with the larger cultural values of humanity. For example, they opposed the use of the "Jewish-German" dialect (249–56) in the same way that later assimilationist Jews would oppose the use of Yiddish.

This continuing reassessment of Jewry took place in response to what Katz terms "social-historical changes" (257), namely the continuing growth of Enlightenment (liberal) values through the vehicles of the middle classes and the state. Katz emphasizes that this only reached fruition in the nineteenth century. While he does not discuss the specifics of this development, one thinks immediately of the dramatic economic development and political unification as two factors. As a result, Christianity became a less important factor in defining Germandom, replaced by a sense of "nation." And that nation was defined as a unity of individuals who "culturally and linguistically were equally shaped." (263) It was only then that assimilation moved from a small number of intellectuals being integrated into the neutral society to a mainstream Jewish movement as Jews began to abandon their identity as "Jewish" and think of themselves as "German." It was only with this later development that the desire for assimilation was accompanied by the desire for emancipation, full citizenship rights including that of *Bildung*. Katz emphasizes that those Jews who participated in the Enlightenment culture of the neutral society did not see themselves as setting the stage for the later fight for emancipation (265). Thus, while Katz documents a chapter in the development of liberalism in Germany, he rejects the linear, Whiggish version of that development found lacking by Mannheim in *Ideology and Utopia*.

In short, Jewish assimilation and emancipation were reactions to the powerful socio-cultural changes taking place within the larger German society. Without the replacement of the old traditional divisions by a new liberal unity, the nation, and the accompanying the willingness of Christian Germans to view Jews as fellow national citizens, as something other than as "Jews" (non-Christians), assimilation could have never occurred. But Katz also notes that these accomplishments did not come automatically, that there remained oppositional forces and that full assimilation was something for which Jews had to strive.

Katz's powerful dissertation demonstrates the empirical historical use of Mannheim's concept of the intelligentsia. In demonstrating the latter's value as a historical type akin to Max Weber's types, he helps rescue that concept from its denunciation as an idealist escapism.

The primary relationship between the two, especially from Katz's point of view, was that between teacher and student, and the Karl Mannheim as teacher during the Frankfurt years appeared above all in the guise of empirical-historical sociologist, with philosophical conundrums very much on the periphery, and quite possibly invisible to someone who came to university with Katz's sharp distinction between the sites of his scientific training and the sites of his cultivation (and with the supportive network to sustain the difference). We turn, then, to some similarities between Katz's structure of analysis and the teachings of the "scientific Mannheim" of the Frankfurt classroom.

The main conceptual elements in Katz's study of assimilation are the emergence of the *Bildungselite* in the eighteenth century, the correlation between a new social formation of "intellectuals" within this setting and Enlightenment or liberal thought, the importance of concrete settings of conversation and sociability, the shift of perspective from one generational unit to the other, the motif of social advancement, and, overall, the identification of sociological analysis with the identification of "functional" relations rather than substantive ones. Each of these elements corresponds to a major theme in Mannheim's lecture courses, as they also figure in Katz's most frequently cited source, Hans Weil's study of *Bildung*. In both cases, the themes are applied as analytical tools in historical sociology, rather than being theoretically developed, as they are in Mannheim's published writings.

In both Mannheim's publications and his classes, as in a large manuscript study of intellectuals left unfinished at his death, Jews who have left the community of the faithful always figure in Mannheim's recitations of the miscellaneous social elements who are collected in the emergent *Bildungsschicht* between the mid-eighteenth and early twentieth centuries. Yet he never separately addresses Katz's distinctive questions about the processes that led to their departure from the Jewish community and to their acceptance within the programmatically "spiritual" (*geistig*) social groupings of non-Jews. Katz's starting point within the ranks of the orthodox opens questions about Jewish assimilation that are analogous to the questions opened about the self-evidence of other aspects of liberalism by the revival of conservative thought, which Mannheim had entered into for purposes of his seminal study of Conservatism, five or six years before his meeting with Katz.

To clarify the special character of Katz's intellectual negotiations with Mannheim, it is worthwhile to contrast it with the only other distinctly Jewish contemporaneous reception of Mannheim we have been able to find, a quite long review of Mannheim's *Ideology and Utopia* by Rabbi Ignaz Maybaum in a Zionist periodical (Maybaum 1929, 693). Maybaum is highly favorable in his assessment of the book, although he is markedly selective in the segments he recombines in his account of its argument. Disregarding Mannheim's concept of "total ideology" as an embodiment of Mannheim's culminating claim that all social knowledge

is perspectival in structure and that consequently a "science of politics" must somehow mediate the ideological conflicts to generate a "synthesis" in the form of a shared realism, a corresponding moderation of conflict, and its transmutation into a negotiation of contrasting interests, Maybaum emphasizes the contrast between ideologies and utopias that Mannheim develops in portions of the three essays unsystematically joined in the book, notably in the essay on utopia that is located at the end, without in fact serving as the conclusion of a cumulative argument, as Mannheim himself notes. The unified plot that Maybaum imposes on *Ideology and Utopia*, then, involves the difference between intellectuals trapped in backward-looking ideologies by ignorance, the psychology of interests, or manipulative design, and intellectuals possessing the energy and insight to define the world by utopias, which have the capacity to validate themselves in practice by energizing action to implement their visions. Maybaum's sole criticism of the Mannheim he extrapolates and praises is that his review of utopias fails to recognize Messianism, where Maybaum would situate the intellectuals of Zionism. Two small points, to close this excursus. First, it should be noted that Mannheim's "amplification" of his utopia concept in his 1930 course eliminated the ambiguity on which Maybaum's reading rests: "utopia" now appears simply as a preliminary stage in the process of distantiation from unproblematic, "primitive" interpretations of experience. Second, on the other hand, it should be said that the positive assessment of the "mission" of intellectuals that Maybaum did share with Mannheim and that doubtless first attracted him to *Ideology and Utopia* did not give way when most Zionist discourse after 1933 concentrated single-mindedly on "salvation through physical work and the accompanying disdain for pursuits requiring brain instead of brawn." (Boas 1981, D1014) He warned "dejectedly" against the abandonment of *Bildung,* according to a historian of the Jewish publicistic in Nazi Germany.

The important point arising out of the brief comparison between Maybaum's and Katz's relationships to the work of Karl Mannheim is that while Maybaum read Mannheim for political theses grounded in sociological interpretation, Katz dealt with Mannheim above all as teacher, very much in the sense of value-free social science. We have called attention to a surplus dimension, where Mannheim intended sociological studies also to provide orientation through self-clarification, but it seems clear that this dimension mattered much more to Mannheim than to Katz, whose orientation was not problematical. There was a certain asymmetry in their shared enthusiasm for Katz's project, but there is no reason to suppose that these differences affected the work. As noted earlier, Mannheim wrote to Martin Buber in the hope of finding a sponsor for the workshop subgroup that Katz headed, in order to provide a haven for others engaged in sociological studies of Jewish questions. It remains noteworthy nevertheless that Mannheim conducted himself in his own sociological studies throughout as an "assimilated Jew" in Katz's sense. He never addressed the topic, except insofar as he recognized the importance of Jews in the recruitment of the post-liberal intelligentsia.

Chapter 10
Nina Rubinstein: Sociology of the Stranger II

Nina Rubinstein's dissertation on political émigrés resembled Katz's in that it comes very close to Mannheim's own experiences and questions, expressly treated in this case as a problem in the sociology of the stranger, in the sense of Georg Simmel. Since we know that Rubinstein had drawn on Simmel in the very first prospectus of the project and that she had arrived in Heidelberg without any background in sociology, it is safe to assume that Mannheim himself had proposed that theoretical framing. Mannheim had already written on the subject of political emigration, but only in Hungarian exile periodicals and in an epistolary voice quite far removed from his subsequent sociological writings—once in a two-part "Letter from Heidelberg" in 1921–2, and another time, in 1924, in two "Letters from Emigration." (Mannheim 1985; see Loader 2007) The former writings are an exercise in cultural reportage, grounded in the standpoint of an outsider who is enabled by his standing as intellectual émigré not only to recognize his kinship with all agents of the "spirit," regardless of nationality, but also to gain a distinctive insight into the limits imposed on the others by their local ties. In the latter article, Mannheim appears in a political guise that is nowhere else present in his writings. He insists that none should be accounted genuine members of the political emigration from Horthy's Hungary who do not rest their continued absence on the unbridgeable distance between their own worldview and that of the regime.

There is no indication that Rubinstein ever knew of these occasional pieces, but their existence—and the implicit signal they provide of Mannheim's supra-scientific stake in Rubinstein's researches—is a reminder that the achievement of sociological distance could be a demanding task for all agents in the research relationship, especially in view of the programme of generating research problems out of intimate experiences and the basic questions they raise. In the case of Rubinstein's study of political émigrés, the personal dimension left marks on the scientific design and execution. There is a grim poetic justice in the fact that the near-completion of this project in April of 1933 coincided with events that tore open the basic material and conceptual premises of Mannheim's Frankfurt research group, plunging all the participants into contexts where the Weberian vocation simply could not comprehend what they had to think and to do. Biographies swamped sociology.

Nina Rubinstein was born in 1908 to a young Jewish couple who had escaped arrest as political activists in Latvia, and she lived on domestic terms among Menshevik political émigrés for many years. Rubinstein's exile studies were thus in fact lifelong and experiential, but our interest is focused on the dissertation

completed in April 1933 under Mannheim's active supervision, and in regular contact with Norbert Elias and others in the research group. The dissertation, written between 1930 and April 1933, dealt almost exclusively with the aristocratic émigrés at the time of the French Revolution, although it bears some traces of Rubinstein's abandoned original plan to compare that cohort with the White Russian émigrés after 1917. Her earlier sketches, which survive in her personal archive, are more revealing than the final text about the Russians and they offer vital clues for understanding Rubinstein's reasons for revising her scheme, quite apart from the undoubted objective difficulties in the way of a Jewish daughter of a socialist household gaining the cooperation of this anti-socialist and anti-Semitic milieu. Her additional reasons for abandoning the plan to study Russians will concern us later.

As Mannheim's last doctoral graduate, then, Nina Rubinstein received her degree *magna cum laude* from the Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe University in Frankfurt long after the events that disrupted the lives of her generation, 42 years after Mannheim's death (Rubinstein 2000). Rubinstein had arrived in Heidelberg in 1928 to study political economy under Emil Lederer. In her second semester, however, she fell under the spell of Karl Mannheim's sociological seminar. Mannheim encouraged her to begin work immediately on her dissertation project, a study intended to draw on her life-experience in the Russian emigration. She was on the point of completion when Mannheim was dismissed on April 13, 1933. An undated letter from Mannheim to Rubinstein, written just before his abrupt departure for Amsterdam about a week later, illustrates Mannheim's relationship with his students. He writes:

> I have not written you until now because I knew nothing certain about the matter of the dissertation. Even today, I know nothing definite, but I do know a bit more. At the Ministry, I was requested to continue accepting dissertations prepared under me. But this goes against the general rule that suspended professors are not allowed to carry out anything of an official nature. The Philosophical Faculty is supposed to confer about this at the beginning of the Semester. Until then, you will simply have to wait. But basically I do not think that anything untoward can happen to you. If worst comes to worst, you will offer your work under [someone else]. But I believe that, as a student so close to the end, you have a right to bring your studies to their conclusion.
>
> Besides, you must not complain. As a sociologist, you are called upon to understand what is happening and to allow events to run their course. Relinquish the habit of thinking about the long run. That no longer suits these days. One merely feels aggrieved and neglects the most urgent things. These are the reasons why I myself cannot answer your question about what I am planning to do. For the moment, I remain at my post as a Prussian official. No running away, certainly not yet. After one has worked so long on emigration, one is duty-bound to a certain sense of proportion. Noblesse oblige. My advice, in short, complete the work, await the beginning of the semester, and hand in whatever is accepted there. (NR. Also in Papanek 2000, 24)

Rubinstein never saw Mannheim again, and her "right" remained unrecognized until 1989. The surviving manuscript of the dissertation, evidently submitted as Mannheim had advised, was rescued from Mannheim's office by a brown-shirted classmate, who unexpectedly heeded Rubinstein's pleas when the Sociological Institute was sacked at the beginning of the 1933 summer semester. Rubinstein took the papers with her when she fled to Paris in June 1933, joining her family and other Menshevik emigrants there. Left behind in the family apartment when they hastily fled once more in June 1940, the manuscript was saved by a neighbor, who secreted the refugees' books and papers in her native village during the Occupation and forwarded them to New York in parcels after the war. Rubinstein had submitted her dissertation proposal at the Sorbonne during her Paris stay, but was evidently refused; and she had been accepted with scholarship in a doctoral programme at the Graduate Faculty of the New School in 1941—the so-called University in Exile—where she studied with several of the same professors who had been her teachers in Frankfurt, but she abandoned the undertaking shortly before completion of the course requirements, apparently because she despaired of preparing a new dissertation, given the economic hardships of exile for herself and her family. By the time her papers unexpectedly arrived from Paris, Nina Rubinstein had entered upon her life's vocation as a linguist, culminating in professional service as a United Nations simultaneous interpreter until her retirement. The belated awarding of her degree so many years later came about through the combined efforts of several North American and German scholars.[1]

Rubinstein's thesis is indeed about political emigration, but her study focuses on the aristocratic émigrés of 1789 rather than her own case. A political emigration in the full sense of the term, she maintains, only emerges in its pure form when the most characteristic and predominant refugees fleeing from a successful revolution are collectively compelled to undergo a radical change (*Umbruch*) in expectations, orientation, and manner of life. The turning point occurs when they recognize their displacement as lasting. They must now orient themselves to a search for livelihood and for ways of preserving their social identities without their former resources. Correspondingly, they cease denying the reality of the revolution, abandoning the

---

1 Rubinstein was strongly supported in her effort to complete her studies by Paul Tillich, with whom she had studied philosophy in Frankfurt and who became a close friend in New York. The New School faculty member with whom she took most courses, and who subsequently employed her on his wartime project for the Office of War Information, was Hans Speier, whose own dissertation had been effectively supervised, according to his memoirs, by Karl Mannheim at Heidelberg (although Mannheim was not authorized then to be the formal sponsor). In 1937, Hans Speier and Hans Gerth nevertheless clashed about *Ideology and Utopia* at the American Sociological Society meetings. See below. For the biography, see Papanek 2000. The successful effort to gain a belated examination for the degree at the Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe University was the work of Claudia Honegger, David Kettler, and Hanna Papanek. For the faculty, the academic sponsor of the Promotion was Iring Fetscher, and the examiners at the *viva voce* also included Jürgen Habermas, David Kettler and Heinz Steinert. See Kettler 2000.

ideological illusion that they need only wait out a mutiny. Such an experience, Rubinstein maintains, is common to the French and Russian aristocratic exiles and constitutes a genuine "political emigration."

Rubinstein constructs an ideal-typical scenario for the political emigrant. After an initial period of disbelief, when the political émigrés imagine that their normal life has simply been suspended, as on a holiday, the emigration as a whole abruptly recognizes that there can be no return and, after a sharp break, its members enter an enclosed space where they can only reproduce old convictions and ways, even if they pragmatically interact with their host environment to earn a living. The social formation is sustained, above all, by practices of sociability set in scene by the women. If political émigrés survive to return, as many French aristocrats did, they are demanding, estranged and disappointed, unable to contribute to the new reality they did nothing to bring about, and ignored by those active in shaping the new times. It is a sad and dreary story, as she tells it, and remote in both manner and matter from the therapeutic designs of her greatly admired teacher, Karl Mannheim.

Nina Rubinstein's studies in emigration (her *Exilforschung*) represent a cautionary tale in three respects. First, her contribution to the theory of political emigrations calls attention to an aspect of exile that militates against the insight often credited to the outsider, a consequence that troubled her from her first engagement with the subject. If being a "stranger" in the sense of being encapsulated within a political emigration may inhibit insight, as Rubinstein suggests, then the realism of the political work of her "family" in the Russian Menshevik emigration could be threatened. Second, the theoretical insecurity in the restrictions she consequently puts on the scope of her own theory of the political emigrant—and the potential for personal pain in its unrestricted uses—call attention to limits of reflexivity. In the case of Nina Rubinstein, we see the inhibiting effects of love and loyalty. Critical distance is not always an uncontested good. Identity is not comprehended by social location alone. Third, and most important, however, neither of these cautions simply dismisses common claims about the epistemological and transformative consequences of reflexivity. Rather, they suggest that the insights we have in mind when we speak of reflexivity are always costly, qualified, conditional, and limited—an imperfectly negotiated settlement rather than a revolution. In this respect, the reflexivity of exiles is but an aspect of the overall process of acculturation and shares its messy incompleteness (see Krohn et al. 2000).

Of more immediate theoretical interest, from the standpoint of understanding the research strategies of Mannheim's group, is Rubinstein's conception of the mix of material and subjective cultural factors forming a "political emigration" and generating its ideology. Following Norbert Elias's pressing advice, she begins by searching for the decisive shift at the point of the aristocrats, entry into the world of vocational livelihood. Elias wrote in 1932:

> It seems to me that your work will be done correctly only if you understand and make clear, [first], that the attitude of the aristocracy is made intelligible and is forced on it by

> its social location, and [second], that in emigration the aristocrats are eventually brought face to face with a world whose entire bearing and motivation is at first new and literally incomprehensible to them. It is a world where people have to work. The principal task of your dissertation is to reveal the process by which the traditional attitudes of the aristocratic emigrants slowly crumble, as they are compelled to adapt (more or less awkwardly) to ways of behavior which are essentially foreign to the aristocrats. (Letter of June 13, 1932. In RP, 39/2.1, 18–19)

But Rubinstein's research findings lead her to deviate from Elias's analysis:

> One might have supposed that … economic pressure would lead to integration into the social structure of the host country, upon which [the emigrants] depended for their livelihood. That this was not the case, however, decisively characterizes emigrant society. The emigrants may have worked as shoemakers or tailors, but they kept themselves apart from the occupational groupings in their host country. In their view, there was no doubt that they had nothing in common with the others, that they remained themselves, aristocrats, what they had always been. (Rubinstein 2000, 186)

This followed from the unique importance of the household for the emigrants. "Vocational and private domains remained separate," (137) she finds. "Sociable and social contacts are in general the presuppositions for the existence of the sociological formation "emigration," Rubinstein insists, "social life ... was an end in itself, it comprised their life." (140) Implicit are some provocative suggestions about the special role of women in the emigration, a formation so symbiotically bifurcated between outer vocational roles and inner group life. The women commonly led in both dimensions: they were the principal breadwinners as well as resourceful impresarios of sociability. A seemingly male-centered political formation proves to be a phenomenon of a woman-led household. But Rubinstein does not elaborate the potentially feminist implication of her reversing the conventional view. Instead, she stresses the emigration's institutionalization of a discrepancy between social "reality" and ideology. Limiting the scope of the Simmel-derived Mannheim theses ascribing privileged opportunities for ideological detachment and mediation to the outsider, Rubinstein counters that political emigration creates "a total estrangement, a complete disconnection from the historical present."

In interviews conducted in 1986, Rubinstein did not remember details about the division of labor between Mannheim and Elias, but she was certain that the dissertation topic was concerted between her and Mannheim at the outset of her studies with him in Heidelberg. "My interest and attention were concentrated on the dissertation from the time I met Mannheim." Elias was helpful and "nice," she recalled, but he remained in memory as "insecure" in comparison to Mannheim (NRI, October 31, 1987). Dirk Raith offers reason to question her memory on this point. In an exceptionally able analysis of Rubinstein's work in relation to Elias's project on *Die höfische Gesellschaft*, he makes a strong case that her consultations with Elias were more important than she recalled, given certain parallelisms

between her characterization of the aristocrats in exile and his account of the self-enclosure of the courtly society before the Revolution (Raith 2000). Apart from the debilities of age, a reason for Rubinstein's failure to recall the extent of her indebtedness to Elias is not only her deep admiration for Mannheim but also the unresolved distance between the project as she and Mannheim originally conceived it—as a distanced approach to her own experience in the political emigration of her "family"—and the eventual study of émigrés of a qualitatively different kind. Elias, it might be said, helped her to solve a problem that was not actually her problem. The key is the question of the conditions under which the political émigré as "stranger" gains superior insight into social structures and prospects.

In every draft of her work, including her very first memo, Rubinstein states that her work is a contribution to the sociological theory of the stranger. Rubinstein's point of departure is Simmel's seminal excursus "The Stranger," which is summarized as follows by Claudia Honegger:

> Being a stranger "is an altogether positive relation a distinctive form of interaction" because the stranger is an element in the group itself, an element whose inherent situation entails a position that is simultaneously external and engaged. This position of the stranger has an even more acute effect on consciousness when he remains settled in place rather than departing from the scene of his activities. And Simmel adds: "The classical example is provided by the history of European Jewry." (Honegger 1993, 181, citing Simmel 1950, 408)

Rubinstein does not question the main outlines of this perception, but she poses the special problem of the émigrés**,** a population that becomes settled without becoming properly engaged with the group that is its host.

The representative émigrés never stop looking backward in their ideology, she finds. They narrow their vision to the partial reenactments of old ways, now domesticated in spheres of private sociability and rendered immune from change by a wall between the material world of events where the emigrants must satisfy their wants and the spiritualized world where they indomitably act out the ossified gestures that give meaning to their fates. "It renders human beings sterile [and] kills their creative capacities...," she writes, "remaining alive, they no longer take part in life." (Rubinstein 2000, 149) "In the last analysis," Rubinstein grimly concludes, "this involves a mental life largely divorced from its material basis—an artificial existence that may well appear lifeless to the others in its environment." (204)

In short, Rubinstein's thesis is that those she calls political emigrants in the full sense lack the distance, discernment, and social creativity credited to the stranger in society by the sociological tradition from Simmel and Sombart to Mannheim himself, whose missionary intelligentsia are after all strangers of a sort, epitomized by the Jews of his own generation in Budapest. Rubinstein concludes that these general expectations about the strategic advantages of the stranger do not apply to the situation of the political emigrant, as a type of stranger. Her argument is complicated, however, by a certain indecision about the extent

to which members of the intelligentsia are ever political émigrés in the sense of her thesis. In the protocol of a seminar held on 15 February 1933, two weeks after Hitler came to power and two months before Mannheim's dismissal, where she presented a abstract of her dissertation for final review, Rubinstein raises the problem of possible exceptions to the mass of typical emigrants, especially the progressive reformers among the French constitutionalists in exile and the Russian revolutionary exiles. At this point, she breaks out of the impersonal format of the protocol she prepared afterwards to insert a note to Mannheim, in parentheses: "This raises the new problem of the intelligentsia, about which I would very much like to speak to you!" (NR) This unresolved issue haunts the work.

Rubinstein's drafts and memos record a variety of efforts to specify the distinction between "real" political émigrés subject to ideological ossification, on the one hand,—what she called the "consciousness of the declassed" in her earliest notes and labeled "*le transformation idéologique ... des vaincus*" in her proposal to the Sorbonne in 1934—and the exiles, on the other, who remain capable of renewal and insight. The closest she came to a principled solution depended on a distinction between reactionary and progressive strata, with the former "anchored in the past" and the latter dispensed from this fixation. Yet there are difficulties with all of these analytical attempts, even apart from the literary evidence of Rubinstein's vivid intimate identification with portrayals of emigrant helplessness, especially among activist intellectuals. Rubinstein concedes that even the progressive political emigrants who share the revolution's rejection of the past are ensnared in an antiquated picture of the future, they fail to grasp the foreclosure of possibilities by the revolutionary change they cannot accept. The issue becomes moot by the time she prepares her abstract for the Sorbonne, since she there proposes to extend the purview of her study to the emigrants from Nazi Germany and speaks in despair of a successful "revolution" that is regressive and that paradoxically produces a cohort of the "defeated" selected from the most "progressive" groups.

In examining the literary evidence, we limit ourselves to a passage from one of Rubinstein's preliminary studies to show how difficult she found it to sustain the hard line of separation between her Russian Jews and the aristocrats, which would have been required if she were whole-heartedly to accept Elias's proposal of her study as a sequel to his study of the "courtly society." She repeatedly segues from the aristocrats to the socialists, emphasizing that intellectuals and politicians are as 'physically' tied to their country as landowners, even if they have a comparatively cosmopolitan capacity for earning their sparse livelihood abroad. According to Rubinstein, the intellectuals are among those who suffer most from emigration. "How dreadful it is for politicians, literati, and authors," Rubinstein writes, "to sit around in cafes, impotent and fettered, debating the fate of their land, prophesying, year in and year out, the downfall of the ruling regime—at first, perhaps, out of genuine belief and later, out of habit or fear, as one clings to a straw." It is their helplessness that most moves Rubinstein. And something else:

> How painful and bitter for a socialist who fought against the old regime side by side with his present foe, who endured Czarist prisons, Czarist expulsion and emigration, and who is now once again imprisoned or compelled to flee abroad, who is once again a "traitor" to his land. The intellectual suffers in both spirit and intellect. He may be better able to accommodate himself to external circumstances because he is more likely to be cosmopolitan. He may be able to find a field of activity, even in strange lands, by means of which he can earn a living. But inwardly he languishes, he bleeds to death. He is cut off from the land from which he drew his spiritual forces, the land for whose well-being he had worked, struggled, and suffered. (NR; also in Raith 2000,47)

Rubinstein's emotional ties to her extended "family" were too great to permit the self-distantiation that Mannheim recommends as first step in his method; instead she took distance by subdividing the topic and choosing the category furthest removed.

It is misleading to dwell exclusively on the unsettled social-theoretical yield of Rubinstein's inquiry, because a remarkable feature of the work is her personal interrogation of her sources. Her extended quotations let readers listen to the emigrants' voices in her company, devising a shared experience to ground the author's interpretations. The exposition is more literary than scientifically distanced. To use one of Mannheim's own distinctions, the study seeks to display (*aufweisen*), not prove (*beweisen*) its contentions. The heart of the work, then, comprises Rubinstein's encounters with the documents of the emigration, mostly memoirs and letters by aristocrats. And the surprising feature of this facet of the text is the empathy—almost affection—between Rubinstein and her sources, especially the women letter writers. In an interview, Rubinstein acknowledged that she "humanized" her subjects and explained, "I never was a scientist. I never claimed to be one." (NRI) Understanding results from reflection on concrete materials, and the presentation of such materials takes time, requires empathy, and precludes the levels of abstraction that systematized study entails.

Rubinstein's methodological ambivalences raise an additional problem about her fidelity to Mannheim's methodological lectures. Mannheim maintains, it will be recalled, that sociological inquiry begins and ends with a recursive move to self and situation, but he insists that between these two reflexive occasions comes theory-oriented study of the sociological "network" in which the social fact of personal crisis is embedded. Rubinstein's relationship to this design is not fully resolved. Despite the consonance between her life and political emigration in its everyday meaning, she denies that her analysis applies to the Menshevik emigration that formed her identity:

> I grew up in the circle of Mensheviks. I knew them on a different level [than the political]. … [For several], I was substitute family. The circle were my friends: they made up my patria on wheels. This expression is one I made up, as an answer to questions about my

"homeland," which was never in Russia, Germany, France, or the U.S.[2] (NRI, October 31, 1987)

To a question probing her evident identification with her subjects, she objected, "The letters I was using were written by aristocrats who were wholly alien to me, so there was no direct carry-over. There was a sense of common experience of being uprooted, etc., but no concrete comparisons between these aristocrats and our Russian Jews."[3] (NRI, December 17, 1987)

In a conceptual preface to the dissertation, Rubinstein excludes economic and religious emigrants from consideration. These are the progressive "strangers" whose contributions to social change in their host environments have been, in her view, overgeneralized by scholars like Werner Sombart. But she also distinguishes the ideal type of political emigrants she is investigating from politically motivated emigrants who do not, like these, represent social strata defeated by successful class revolution. She puts aside those who escape after failed revolutionary attempts, as well as others fleeing persecution for their progressive politics. The former group expressly includes emigrants like her father, who had to leave Russia after the Revolution of 1905, and the latter is illustrated by a list ranging from Marx to Martov, the Menshevik leader who led the circle based in Rubinstein's family home. Because these emigrants remain involved in the political life of their native land, Rubinstein postulates, they have no need for radical reorientation or reconstitution of their ways of life; there is no émigré consciousness or ideology. It might seem that Rubinstein's dissertation is not, after all, the exercise in self-clarification that the external parallels between its topic and her situation so strongly suggest.

We think it important to refine the picture. To judge by the other topics, Mannheim and Elias often advised students to achieve the distance requisite for sociological analysis by choosing historical subjects as a context for their self-clarifying investigations. Rubinstein adds a categorical boundary line. Two considerations

---

2 Rubinstein agreed with a scholar's characterization of the Menshevik circle in exile: "In a sense they were a family more than a political faction, *nasha partiia* (our party), a group whose personal, emotional political, and ideological ties went back twenty years or more." Williams 1972, 226. "These people are realities for me," she commented, "We lived in the same house."

3 Rubinstein's original plan was to include aristocratic refugees from the Russian Revolution, and she made a start by soliciting interviews through advertisements in "White" newspapers, but then abandoned the comparative side of the project, with the consent of Mannheim and Elias. The theme of Jewishness would need to be further addressed in this context. Rubinstein was astonished to learn that Mannheim had associated with Christian religious circles in both Germany and in England. "But he was a good Jew," she protested. As noted above, Freudenthal's eventual estrangement from the identity fostered by her work for Mannheim arose from her increasing Jewish—and Zionist—consciousness. The issue was complicated for Mannheim's generation in Hungary. See Gluck 1985 and Kadarkay 1991.

lead us to go behind her own statements to find stronger links between her study and her experience than she acknowledges. First, the distinction between historical winners and losers among emigrants introduces Marxist criteria otherwise alien to her thought; she accepts, in effect, the Menshevik reading of the Berlin contingent as simply the foreign delegation of a revolutionary force engaged in the unfinished revolution in Russia. The stable constitution of the discrepancy between objective and subjective conditions in her writings on the subject, the absence of a sense of "crisis"—except from the perspective of strangers to whom "it may well appear lifeless"—and the empathy with personal reports about the inner life of emigrant families all speak against such a "progressivist" framework of analysis. Second, Rubinstein did not in fact believe that the Menshevik emigrants remained part of Russian political reality after 1917. "I cannot imagine," she admitted in retrospect, "that any of them really thought that they would ever go back." In answer to questions about the point of Menshevik political activities, she shows the conflict between her personal feeling for this "family" and her inability to relate to their doings as something alive:

> They were politicians, and this was … their life. There was [their newspaper], after all, and it appeared for fifty years, and may do so still … It is all so long ago, and the people are all so long dead, and I was personally such very close friends with the leaders, with Abramovich and Dan. I do not believe that I ever had a political conversation with them … They were my friends … Being actually pretty much an apolitical person I never read the [party newspaper]. But to me [their political activity] was indisputable.. It was their life content, and it *had* a purpose. I took that for granted. If they do it, they must be right. … I knew them personally, and I knew how they considered themselves, and I couldn't put them at the same level as the French nobles and their behavior, and how they became emigrants. It was different. (NRI, 17 December, 1987)

Nina Rubinstein's dissertation, in short, ran the danger of exposing her innermost identity as historically obsolete, according to Mannheim's standards of timeliness and functionality. She sought to safeguard her analysis against yielding such a conclusion, and would not, in any case have considered the verdict binding on her. Implicit in her story, then, are challenges to Mannheim's own progressivist historicism and questions about the adequacy of socioanalysis for the exploration of woman's identity. But these issues are generated only by Rubinstein's sensitive testing of Mannheim's approach. We recall that Mannheim's sociological method starts out from a crisis experienced in one's own life situation and from the structural analyses that it generates are designed to culminate in self-knowledge and self-command. Sociological inquiry must begin and end with a recursive move to self and situation, according to Mannheim.

From the standpoint of Mannheim's project as sociologist and teacher, the question is whether Rubinstein used the resources of structural sociology to gain sufficient clarity about herself and her own identification with the Menshevik emigration to transcend its ideological constraints and to choose among the

courses of action open in her time. Distance, understanding, openness to practical synthesis are the key terms in Mannheim's design. Mannheim's quite remarkable mentoring of Rubinstein arose out of his hope that she would make an important statement about exile on the foundation of her own need to make sense of the experience. Yet Rubinstein detached her study from her experiences, at least in the final version of the dissertation, defining her subject matter so as to exclude the political emigration that encompassed her own life—a move that enabled her to make a remarkable contribution to the line of inquiry initiated by Elias. Such are the dynamics of a research group.

As we have seen, her ideal type of political émigré excludes politically motivated emigrants who are not, as she puts it in uncharacteristically Marxist terms, representative of social strata defeated by successful revolution. Not included, thus, are people like her father, who must escape because they have taken part in a revolution that has failed, and, second, people like her Menshevik "family," who are fleeing political persecution in their homelands. Because the political emigrants among whom she lives are not political emigrants in the sense of her study, they do not exhibit the telltale need for radical reorientation or reconstitution of their ways of life. Above all, there is no restrictive émigré consciousness or ideology. We submit that this move can best be understood by shifting our frame of reference from Nina Rubinstein as a student of Karl Mannheim to Nina Rubinstein as a loving daughter of the Menshevik extended family. She declined the offer to transmute herself into a political educator because she could have made the experiment only at the cost of a painful disruption in her self-defining attachments. More than that, the break would have been on terms deeply hurtful to the people she cared for most. Our point is not to expose Rubinstein as somehow lacking in the intellectual seriousness to carry through the reflective exercise postulated by Mannheim. The difficulties identified in this case are integral to the larger ambitions of the Mannheimian project. The question is, ultimately, how the distanced, critical, typological view constitutive of the sociological perspective can orient and galvanize the passionate human being, profoundly tied in relations of love and loyalty. "What is the relationship between me and my dissertation?" she asked herself during an interview in old age, "That is what is unclear to me."

While it is important to explore the variable limits within which individuals subjected to the vicissitudes of Mannheim's era could sustain their commitments to the asceticism of the sociological vocation, in the Weberian sense, it is equally important to recognize the effectiveness of the dynamics within the research group and the powerful effects of its collective practices. To follow Rubinstein's work through the series of memoranda and seminar reports between 1930 and 1933, all with their marginal comments by Mannheim, Elias, and Rubinstein herself, as she made note of feedback, is to gain a unique appreciation of the process. Much of the time, Mannheim's remarks simply take the form of querying an assertion by saying in effect, "Does it?" inviting Rubinstein to think again, to find more information, to shift from narrative to analysis. In his letter of 1930, Elias is more

directive, in his enthusiasm about his own fresh work on the courtly society and his conviction that Rubinstein's project could converge with his own to mutual gain. But it is a collegial intervention rather than an authoritative one. In short, the ethos of the research group permitted the participants to negotiate their own ways, with mediation and coaching, in the borderland between their lives and their scientific efforts, although it also encouraged them to move to that risky region.

Chapter 11
Individual Projects and Orphans

To do full justice to Mannheim's research programme, it is necessary, first, to take notice of some students who negotiated their doctoral projects directly with Mannheim, in the more conventional way, and, second, to examine the cases of several junior members of the research group whose subsequent work, having been cut short by the events of 1933, cannot be treated with full confidence as documenting the research group process. The first group includes Hans Speier, Wilhelm Carlé, and Frieda Haussig;[1] and the second group, Kurt H. Wolff and Gisèle Freund. Ernst Kohn-Bramstedt is a special case, since he was able to rejoin Mannheim at the London School of Economics and to complete a dissertation on a topic directly in line with the Frankfurt group project, in which he had taken part. The aim of our present survey of these scholars' beginnings with Mannheim cannot be more than an acknowledgment of the inevitable partiality of our model of a research programme actualized in a research group, and thus an acceptance of the multiple relations constitutive of academic work.

Hans Speier earned his doctorate at Heidelberg in 1928, two years before Mannheim's appointment at Frankfurt qualified him to examine candidates for that degree, but he maintained throughout his life that he had been Mannheim's

1 There are a number of other individuals whose dissertations evidently originated under the supervision of Mannheim (seconded by Norbert Elias) in Frankfurt, but whose names we have not found in the records of Mannheim's advanced seminars or in the reminiscences of the individuals here assigned to the research group. Perhaps further research would require a revision of our present disposition to think of them as having become *de facto* as well as *de jure* the students of Mannheim's successors, Heinz Marr and Ernst Krieck. Wilhelm Gollub defended a dissertation on Nietzsche's theory of art in February of 1936, and Wolfgang Brobeil, a month later, on the category of the *Bund* in sociology. Since both topics were charged with the highest interest for National Socialist ideology, it is unlikely that the studies reflected much of the Mannheim research orientation (*HyperElias* <http://hyperelias.jku.at/EliasTheses_1933.htm>). The compiler of this information consistently credits Norbert Elias as co-director of all the dissertations for which Mannheim was responsible, but we consider this a misreading of the doubtless plentiful evidence of Elias's intellectually rich helpfulness to candidates, since he was never in a position to aim their work at anything except meeting Mannheim's criteria and standards. To recall the words of Margarete Freudenthal, who was perhaps closer to Elias than any of the other students, and more volubly grateful to him, when Mannheim set her a survey project to parallel her historical research: "I naturally did what the boss wanted." (Freudenthal 1977, 110)

"first doctoral student."[2] (Speier 1989, 6) Speier, in fact, had been one of the early members of the group of students who became fascinated by Mannheim during his time as instructor in Heidelberg and attended his lectures and seminars. One part of that group, including Speier, came from Emil Lederer, the political economist who was especially supportive of Mannheim, and another, from Karl Jaspers, the philosopher, with whom Mannheim had himself studied and who was anything but an enthusiast for his work. While a number of these students—including Elias, Gerth, and Rubinstein—then followed Mannheim to Frankfurt and formed the core of his research group, others bade him an affectionate farewell through a theatrical production in which he is satirized as the Socrates of Aristophanes' *Clouds* (in Woldring 1986, 396–403; see Kettler and Meja 1995, 121–3).[3] Speier's dissertation was a study of Ferdinand Lassalle's philosophy of history taken as a way station on the road from Hegel to Marx (Speier 1929, 61, 103–27 and 360–88; condensed transl. in Speier 1954, 142–177). In his opening footnote, he cites Mannheim's first published articles on sociology of knowledge as the source of his method, and in his second note, he credits Georg Lukács as an important source of his substantive interpretations, with the proviso—parallel to Mannheim's own—that Marxism cannot be exempted from a sociological reading as ideology. Nevertheless, the work itself is largely an exercise in intellectual history, addressed above all to the persistence of Hegelian thought in Lassalle's generation and the subsequent failure to develop a practical theory of capitalism and revolutionary change, as Marx did. In an autobiographical memoir, Speier noted that he had hurriedly written this dissertation in order to cut short his studies because of his father's illness; and in a somewhat bitter letter very late in his life he complained that "Mannheim did not even care about my dissertation." (Letter to Ruth Ludwig, nd [1986], HSP and AA)

Speier's study is not without its merits, but it cannot shed much light on Mannheim's distinctive designs. Above all, as Speier made clear in an exceptionally pointed critique of *Ideologie und Utopie* published in the year of Mannheim's appointment in Frankfurt, he distinguished sharply between Mannheim's theory of ideology and his theory of the intellectuals. While he viewed the former as a valuable refinement of Marxist categories, which permitted exploration of developments rendered obscure by the clichéd analytical vocabulary of orthodoxy, likening it to Max Weber's sociology of religion in addressing matters that Marxist thought ignores, he considered the latter as an ideology derived from

2 On a review of Speier's published and unpublished papers, leaving aside his numerous technical studies, one can say that he never stopped thinking of himself as in some way a dissenting Mannheim student, someone who formed himself on the basis of an unfinished conversation with Mannheim. Speier [1937] 1985; [1969] 1989, 35–49, and materials in the Hans Speier papers (HSP).

3 Outstanding in this group were Richard Löwenthal, who was promoted by Werner Sombart in Berlin, with a thesis on Marx's theory of cycles, and Boris Goldenberg, who wrote on the sociology of the prewar Social Democracy under Alfred Weber.

the hypostatization of "spirit" in the obsolete *Bildung* of the pre-industrial era (Speier [1930] 1990). It is safe to say that the students who came to Mannheim in Heidelberg from Emil Lederer shared a conception of his classes as a place where they could explore Marxist ideas, secure in Mannheim's openness and stimulated by his own explorations of the terrain between Max Weber and Georg Lukács. Much changed when Mannheim came to Frankfurt.

During the years of transition, Mannheim was able to promote one student, who had already completed much of his work in Heidelberg, and to bring another to the point of the oral examination for the degree before his forced retirement. Like Speier's thesis, their work appears to be rather the product of individual projects, only distantly related to the battery of studies oriented to the Weberian themes of typological differentiation and rationalization in the development and crisis of modern society.

This does not, however, mean that Weber's model was irrelevant to these graduates. In the case of Wilhelm Carlé, in fact, his project was very probably designed in the context of Mannheim's teaching at the Heidelberg Institute for the Journalistic Medium, where his "Seminar on the Sociology of Public Opinion and the Press" in the Summer Semester of 1929 featured several student reports on Max Weber's 1910 prospectus for a collective research project on the press (Averbeck 1999, 214).[4] At the outset of the dissertation, then, Carlé cites Max Weber's plan as authority for his own far more modest case studies of the sources and effects of *Weltanschauungen* in the press Carlé 1931). Weber figures as well as legitimating figure in a 1929 article by Mannheim on the incorporation of research of the journalistic medium into the university, although he represents a rather more general principle on this occasion. In addressing an audience of newspaper proprietors, whose support for the Heidelberg Institute was essential, Mannheim is eager to show that, while the study of the press is put on the agenda by the conditions and mental habits of modern life, such study should follow the example of Max Weber in the similarly generated formation of sociology by refusing simply to follow a "somewhat shallow and trivial" American model. Weber had shown how to deepen his new discipline by letting it arise from the context of life and questions as they confronted him. Mannheim's thesis on this occasion is that the study of the journalistic medium should be understood and institutionalized as an aspect of the convergence between academic study and lived reality, which is programmatically anticipated in much recent philosophy but enacted most productively in sociology, both as basic discipline and as method in other studies. Mannheim concludes with a plea for

4 Carlé's participation in Mannheim's class is not certain, but Averbeck's speculation that he had been directed to Mannheim in 1929 by the Heidelberg professor to whom he had originally addressed his request for promotion makes perfect sense. Averbeck, 347n.12. His matriculation in Frankfurt after Mannheim's appointment would otherwise be hard to explain. The Second Reader on Carlé's dissertation was Max Horkheimer. The authors gratefully acknowledge Dr. Averbeck's help.

> a sociology that is, on the one hand, in a position to absorb the problem complex of philosophy arisen out of the new life situation, and to do so by way of mediation, and, on the other, sufficiently elastic, holding itself constantly ready to be impregnated by unmediated empirical reality. From the perspective of the science of journalism, however, it is precisely at the topic of a sociology of public opinion where this attempt at integration can be undertaken. The analysis of the structure of public opinion is simultaneously a philosophical, historical, sociological and journalistic phenomenon. The investigation of its problems effectuates the reciprocal penetration of practice and university science that we called for just now in merely programmatic terms. (Mannheim 2001, 108)

In the conjunction of concepts—*Weltanschauung*, public opinion, sociological investigation—Carlé's title appears to pay tribute to key elements in Mannheim's rationale, especially since Mannheim had cited Dilthey's concept as outreach from the side of philosophy towards the practical phenomena of everyday thought. Yet the work itself eschews the "deeper" issues that Mannheim adduced in an address that had its own reasons for invoking symbols of high *Bildung* against the vocational preferences of his audience. Carlé provocatively chooses exactly the opposite strategy in introducing his work. He compares the happy state of the political economist who has statistical market research at his disposal when he wants to study the price cycle for copper, for example, with that of the philosopher who has no way of addressing a comparable question about "the market value of the Kantian ethic" in the practical thought of different social strata. Philosophers would refer the questioner to the sociologists of knowledge (situated between the political economist and the philosopher), who would concede the importance of the question but also admit that their inquiries have not yet refined the methods or accumulated the data necessary to the task of explaining the sources and dynamics of such distributions. Carlé offers his study as a contribution to the data collection requisite to further development of sociology of knowledge, a claim that Mannheim conceded in his favorable assessment of the dissertation as a "good" contribution to contemporary investigations in sociology of knowledge (Averbeck 1999, 347 n. 11).[5]

Carlé looks to the press as articulator of "public opinion," and he uses his findings about the deep differences among newspapers (and presumably their readerships as well) to challenge from the outset the notion of public opinion as a single entity with a uniform voice and authority. Carlé's procedure consists of three distinct analytical steps. First, citing Weber, he essays an ideal-typical construction of the various "collective political ideas" of groups in the contemporary political field. Although he refers to Mannheim's "styles of thought" in refining his conception and cites *Ideologie und Utopie* as well as Mannheim's

5 Max Horkheimer agreed with this evaluation. Carlé's acknowledgments thank not only Mannheim and Horkheimer, but also Gottfried Salomon (Delatour), Frederich Pollock, and Leo Löwenthal, as well as the Institute for Social Research as a whole.

study of conservatism, he avoids the terminology of ideology in this context. Carlé, moreover, distinguishes several configurations that Mannheim does not recognize. Conservative-aristocratic, liberal-democratic, and Marxist-socialist styles are joined by the "catholic-clerical" and "*völkisch*-nationalist." Carlé expounds these ideal types in somewhat eclectic manner, drawing on different types of authorities from case to case, with Mannheim especially important in the account of conservatism but Carl Schmitt figuring large in the treatments of both catholic and liberal thought. Max Weber is also an important reference, especially on religious ideas. The depiction of Marxism depends more than any of the others on primary sources. In the end, however, Carlé emerges with a defensible survey of the Weimar ideological field on the eve of the 1930 elections, which saw the great electoral breakthrough of the Nazi Party.

His second step is a characterization of ten newspapers—ranging from the organs of the Communist and Social Democratic parties to the *Völkische Beobachter,* with attention as well to interest group, world press, and local media—in terms of their ownerships, partisan sponsorships, distribution figures, and readerships. His attempts to record quantitative as well as qualitative data require a good deal of ingenuity, in view of the confidentiality of proprietary information at the time. It is important to Carlé's analysis to be as precise as possible about the social composition as well as likely party affiliations of the readership, since he sees the project as aiming towards an understanding of the causal interaction between media and constituency when it comes to the production and reproduction of the respective political ideas, but it is fair to say that the work does not advance far in that direction.[6]

The strongest component in the study, then, is the qualitative comparative analysis of the coverage given by all ten newspapers to two widely-reported stories of the decade, first, the assassination of Foreign Minister Walther Rathenau on June 24, 1922, in the context of furious Rightist attacks on his policy of accommodation with the victors of the First World War, and, second, the trial in February 1928 of an adolescent entrapped in a bizarre misadventure of sex, murder, and suicide in a middle-class setting. Carlé works with a good deal of sophistication, no less ready to detect treatments that do not accord with the professed or imputed political identities of the newspapers, that the ideal types would predict, than he is to excavate new insights into ideal-typical elements by their articulation in specific cases. A major, not unexpected finding relates to the closeness of the Social-Democratic newspaper to the readings of events in the Liberal-Democratic press, but there are also effective probes into other situations. In the end, the research yields quite a persuasive political topography of the Weimar press and poses a number of courageous questions about the relations between this state of affairs and the actuality of political ideas on the social ground.

---

6 "Carlé failed to put the textual analyses and the structural analyses of the readership into a meaningful common context," is the blunt judgment of Averbeck, who has also reviewed the contemporary critiques of Carlé's effort (Averbeck 1999, 353).

Mannheim cited Carlé's dissertation among the empirical, sociographical efforts of his Institute, in his 9 April 1931 reply to a round-robin inquiry on this subject circulated by Ferdinand Tönnies at the end of 1930. He characterizes the study as follows:

> [Carlé's study] sets itself the task of tracking the image of the Rathenau assassination and the Steglitz student trial in treatments by the press, whereby he constantly also poses the question about the readership being addressed by the newspapers and about the web of interests present in the background. (in Laube 2004, 608)

It is interesting, first, that Mannheim chooses to slight, perhaps only in this context, Carlé's counterpart to his own structural analyses of key ideologies. Second, Mannheim does not put this completed piece of work but a different study in the first place in his reply. This was to have been a "Sociological Structural Analysis of the Elections in the Saarland," a project he credits to "a man who takes an active part in the party life of the territory," and which he curiously expected "satisfactorily to solve this difficult problem, at least to a degree." (608)

Mannheim's third example, presumably also a dissertation project that never materialized, refers to a comparative study of international students, which is to examine a "great number of cases" in order to ascertain "how the experience of being foreign takes shape in them and what effects it has on them." Fourth comes another project whose large sample is expressly characterized in identical language, but whose topic is social mobility (*Aufstieg*) through *Bildung*, with the focus on the effects on individuals of their recourse to one of the many new institutions established by the Weimar Republic to offer alternatives to the established educational qualification scheme. Mannheim links another project to this, relating to changes in pedagogy arising from adult education, assuring Tönnies that this too "will not be dealt with purely theoretically, but on the basis of specifying the facts that directly present themselves empirically as concrete cases." (608)

Of the dissertations we have taken as representative of Mannheim's research project, as institutionalized especially in the advanced formal and informal seminar groups, Mannheim lists only that of Nina Rubinstein, which he describes quite narrowly as a comparison of the source materials available from the emigrations produced by the French and Russian Revolutions, a description matched only by some pages of statistical estimates on the social origins of émigré groups. Interestingly, Mannheim follows his very brief reference to Rubinstein with a caveat that these projects are all very "risky," whose success he cannot "guarantee." His *pièce de résistance*, however, is his report on what we know to have been the planned sequel to Margarete Freudenthal's dissertation. He speaks of it (alone) as an "expressly sociographic work," but also notes—as in the case of the Saar electoral study—that the researcher is an insider: "a lady who belongs to the women's movement." The work is expected to treat the most recent changes in the household in the sense of "The Structure of the Household as Sphere of Operations of the Housewife," on the basis of survey results from Baden and Württemberg.

Mannheim's decision to close the list with this project, with its grounding in public statistics, underlines the fact that he was clearly eager to present his institute as especially forward in exploring these descriptive and statistical methods. This was not simply a matter of advertising. In 1932, he employed a "scientific secretary" for the Seminar, Greta Kuckhoff, who writes in her memoirs that she applied for the position when she learned that Mannheim "was interested in becoming acquainted with the new techniques of social research that had established and proved themselves in the United States." Kuckhoff was uniquely qualified, since she had just returned from two years with Edward A. Ross in Wisconsin, the last year as his assistant. She lacked a degree, however, having interrupted her studies with Sombart in Berlin (concentrating on Max Weber) during the 1920s, where she had been admitted without academic high school qualifications. Mannheim agreed to inquire about a special dispensation to permit her doctoral promotion if she proved herself "a scientific personality," a reply she resented because she had already passed her preliminary doctoral examinations at Wisconsin. She speaks of her difficulties sorting the library, most of whose topics were unfamiliar, "except for the few American books on behaviorism, pragmatism, and ecology—words that were barely known at the time." (see Kettler and Meja 1995, 133; Kuckhoff 1972, 106)

In his letter to Tönnies, Mannheim adds that he and his assistant, Norbert Elias, will begin some unofficial instruction in sociography, and he continues with a further claim to leadership in this field. In this connection, he refers to his convening a meeting of colleagues from several disciplines as well as some townspeople to discuss the uses of statistical methods and questionnaires in sociology. A working plan was laid out, he reports, and future meetings are planned. Reinhard Laube plausibly associates this gathering with the "closed circle" in which Mannheim, according to a newspaper article he published in two newspapers in the weeks just prior to Hitler's designation as chancellor, circulated a questionnaire on questions relating to individual management of the "spiritual crisis" of the time (Laube 2004, 609n; Mannheim 2001, 168–73).

Mannheim's own example of a "sociographic" exercise shows something of the distance between his conception of empirical methods and their contemporary design and implication in the United States, to which he refers as a source of inspiration. The context of the questionnaires is provided by a vigorous argument that the "spiritual crisis" of which everyone speaks is poorly understood, first, when it is approached purely from the standpoint of intellectual history as an abstractly "spiritual" matter, second, when it is made the subject of moral preachments, and, third, when it is viewed simply as an "evil" that can and must simply be suppressed. Considered from a sociological point of view, Mannheim contends, the "crisis" is a function of the practical efforts of individuals to break through obsolete modes of thinking and acting in order to adapt to new circumstances of life. Mannheim continues:

> The insight that the process of the spiritual crisis is not a process of "the spirit as such," but that it must be linked to the concrete change in the situation of the individual ... brought me to the idea of gathering some sample survey data in this connection, by means of a questionnaire. ... I was not concerned with acquiring indicators of the extent of the spiritual crisis, but with observing the ways in which the individual copes with the spiritual problems posed by life. (Mannheim 2001, 171)

He asks about the spheres where beliefs and values have been shaken and where they remain firm, as well as about situational changes in their lives. "Finally the question was raised about the form and manner in which the individuals after a spiritual reorientation now give form to their lives, how they coped with the 'spiritual crisis.'" Mannheim concedes that such a small survey could claim no special reliability but claims, first, that it "nevertheless had the value of bringing phenomena … considerably closer." Second, "it became clear that the experiences that the individual in his psychic isolation cell believes to be altogether personal and his alone are common to many." And, third, he feels confident enough to assert that his "sociological surmise" about the situational sources of "crisis" has been "confirmed." (171–2)

Mannheim's loose handling of issues that were already familiar in contemporary discussions of empirical method and induction is indicative of the auxiliary function he assigns to this type of research. It contributes to the reality-testing of theoretical claims, but no more than historical inquiry. As with Max Weber, quantitative data are welcomed, but mainly in support of qualitative accounts. Looking back at the studies he cites that were actually completed, quantitative data are assembled for the purpose of establishing points that do not prove, in the case of Carlé or Rubinstein, to be central to their primary arguments. Carlé cannot make his data on the social composition of readerships work in his analyses, and Rubinstein deals only incidentally with the émigrés whose numerical preponderance she shows. Mannheim's conjoint discussion of sociography and statistics in his 1932 account of the tasks of sociology, as noted earlier, treats them as categories of subjects that are of interest not as systematically distinct units of sociology as a field but as a merely technical category. Distinguishing between the aim of sociology to develop "constructive views" and the desirability of sharpening the eye for "purely empirical findings" about social conditions, he leaves no doubt about the instrumental value of the latter but warns that "in America the overbearingness of the descriptive and quantitative method has led to an obscuring of interconnections and to a deadening of the sensibilities for a constructive grasp of the actual." (Mannheim 1932, 29) At the same time, Mannheim praises the *Polish Peasant* of Thomas and Znaniecki, as well as the Lynds' *Middletown*. The danger corresponding—but not equivalent—to the American overvaluation of their "art of grandiose reportage" is that structural views will lead observers "to treat facts observed in generalities as precise data" or to form dubious combinations out of "hypothetical approaches." He is firm, but also markedly restrained in his advocacy of sociography:

> In this way, one hypothesis supports the other and one plays with play-coupons to which no reality corresponds. As a counterweight to the excesses of purely constructive thinking, the acquisition of the method of precise description, the application of numerical results, and quantitative proceedings in general are very desirable. (29)

He praises the rise of vocational surveys and hopes for a precise account of "intellectual groupings" without which, he says, "neither the cultural configuration of an epoch nor its political differentiation and leadership can be understood." His conclusion, nevertheless remains clear:

> Only if sociography is called upon *in support of* constructive reflections, on the ground of a vision of the social circulation of complexes of events—but not if it obscures, as an end in itself, the fundamental thematic of social happenings—is it really justified. (29)

Empirical methodology is equivalent to "sociography" for Mannheim, and its function is topological and descriptive. Sociology as such depends on theory in the context of historical understanding.

The dissertation of Frieda Elisabeth Haussig converges with these questions of method, although the conceptions of topology and description at issue here are remote from the American reference point invoked in the discussions of "sociography," and "theory" is treated as a highly problematic competitor of "history." Haussig writes on the nineteenth-century publicist, Wilhelm Heinrich Riehl (1823–1897), whose claims as a pioneer of a distinctly German mode of social inquiry were receiving renewed attention at the time, not only by the practitioners of the *Volkskunde*, which had long claimed him, but also by certain sociologists, notably Hans Freyer. Haussig herself, an older student (b. 1897) who had been a nursery school teacher and social worker before qualifying for university and whose project was probably underway before she joined Mannheim in Frankfurt, had also studied with Freyer in Leipzig; and her work evidences both the affinities and tensions between her two primary mentors (Haussig 1934).[7] Her dissertation was completed in time to be approved by Mannheim in December 1932, but her oral examination was in the hands of his successors and the publication was in 1934.

---

7 In her acknowledgments (72), Haussig also mentions a semester in Heidelberg and thanks Karl Jaspers as well as Freyer and Mannheim. Our assumption is nevertheless, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, that Haussig was not a member of the "Mannheimer aus Heidelberg," who followed Mannheim to Frankfurt in order to attend his classes and to work closely with him. It should be noted that Haussig thanks Mannheim separately for "the support of my work in sociology of knowledge," after including him with the others in her general acknowledgments. If the manuscript was not simply printed as originally submitted, this double appreciation may represent a mild protest against Mannheim's ouster. On Mannheim and Freyer, see Loader and Kettler 2002, 110–18.

The extension of the project across the divide of January 1933 is especially worth noting in this case because there is at least one surprising political passage that may represent a later insertion. Having rehearsed Riehl's argument that the proletariat can be reintegrated into the *Volk* only if industry is returned to patriarchal organization and workers resume their due place within the ethical constraints of family and the great "estates," she writes: "Riehl here anticipates a development that would be attacked (*in Angriff genommen*) by an energetic (*tatkräftig*) regime seventy years later as the most important task of the German people."[8] (Haussig 1934, 35) This stray express endorsement of a prime bit of National Socialist ideology is an anomaly in the work, but it is not altogether inconsistent with one strand in the study. Its appearance serves as a reminder of the striking distance from current political motifs in almost all of the dissertations we have examined, especially in view of the highly politicized times and the known political commitments of the other writers. Such distance was more difficult for someone attempting to negotiate simultaneously with Mannheim and Freyer.

Mannheim's relations with Freyer were complex. On the one hand, as noted earlier, they were allied against Leopold von Wiese in promoting both historical and contemporary studies in sociology, with a view to their implications for political education as well as for the design of the discipline. Mannheim, moreover, actually adopted Freyer's trademark expression of the "life-based method" (*lebenswissenschaftliche Methode*) appropriate to sociology (Mannheim 2001, 163–8). Yet Mannheim also treated the proto-Fascist trend as his dialectical opposite in his 1930 introductory lectures in terms that clearly included Freyer as well as Martin Heidegger and Carl Schmitt (Loader and Kettler 2002, 109–38).

Mannheim's ultimate opposition to Freyer is epitomized in a passage of his 1932 report on the sociology curriculum. Alluding to favorable references to his own theories of ideology and utopia in Freyer, he comments disdainfully on the flamboyant climactic sentence of Freyer's major work (Freyer 1930, 207) in order to distance himself from fascist volitionism and decisionism:

> Interesting as we may find the attempts to extend our argument about the existential connectedness of thinking by tendencies employing the doctrine to legitimate their ever more questionable principles, we also consider certain conclusions that have been drawn from it to be dangerous. And when this theory goes so far as to give rise to the

---

8 Haussig inserts a reference to Riehl's *Bürgerliche Gesellschaft*. Most of her citations refer to the second edition, which was published in 1864. Of course, a round number like 70 years cannot be taken too literally. Both Freudenthal and Gerth speak of making minor adjustments in their dissertations in order to satisfy final examiners in the Nazi period. Gerth claims to have deleted excessive references to Jews. Freudenthal reports in her memoir that she eliminated several passages too strongly reminiscent of Marxism from her introduction, "on the advice of [the historian, Georg Küntzel, who was one of the examiners in lieu of Mannheim], who meant me well. … I also added something about the 'ties of the woman to what was in the blood, the Volk, and religion and about the eternal values of marriage and the family'." (Sallis-Freudenthal 1977, 123–124) The claim seems exaggerated.

> exaggerated assertion that “a will that is true is sufficient ground for true knowledge” (“*Wahres Wollen fundiert wahre Erkenntnis*”), the door has been opened to every kind of arbitrariness in theory. Who would not step into the intellectual arena armed with the conviction or pretense of “a will that is true”? And who in such a situation would not be pleased to be excused in future from having to make a properly substantiated case and to be permitted, instead, to invoke his inspiration and genuine conviction? Taken this way, the task imposed by insight into the reality of the existential connectedness of thinking is misdirected, because the insight no longer serves self-criticism and distantiation from existential bonds, as originally intended. Instead, it legitimates every kind of partisanship. (Mannheim 1932, 40; see Muller 1987, 182–3)

Haussig’s dissertation raises the questions at issue between Mannheim and Freyer not merely because of a single judgment in a sentence with uncertain provenance but because of a certain ambivalence throughout about the significance of the basic misunderstandings she uncovers in Riehl’s grasp of social reality, when taken in relation to the political “will” (*Wollen*) that animated his studies. Her closing pages, although unresolved, point in the direction of Freyer’s resolution of the tension between reason and will.[9] Ending her book with an uncritical exposition of Riehl’s approach to the culminating category of the *Volk*, taken as a collective phenomenon and as both organism and work of art, she writes:

> So there is little left in Riehl of the contemplative personality ideal [that was central to liberal nationalist predecessors like Arndt]. ... The concept of personality has become strongly activated; it is oriented to social and political action. The element of will formation is decisive. The demand of the hour is resolution (*Tatkraft*) not contemplation! (Haussig 1934, 62)

Haussig does reiterate an earlier judgment of a “discrepancy between the objective state of things and [Riehl’s] subjective evaluations,” due to his inconsequent placement of modern categories of analysis on a grid of associations derived from his social location, but this follows a remarkable celebration of his qualities and worth, in terms that would also figure large in Freyer’s world. He is supposedly distinguished by “Resolution, determination, courage and strength of will, seriousness and responsibility... partiality for ethical qualities ... strong everyday realism, pleasure in the simple, plain, as well as a fateful condition of being bonded to the ordinary people in their groups.” The term “*Tat*”—deed—is embedded in a number of the words with quite ordinary English equivalents, and the undertone of those recurrences in the political language of the time can be

9 Freyer’s position is itself qualified by his distinctions between politics and philosophy, as well as his adaptation of the Saint-Simonian distinction between “critical” and “natural” phases in social history. See Loader and Kettler 2002.

epitomized by noting that *Die Tat* was a prime periodical outlet of the cultivated Weimar Right.[10]

The aim in calling attention to this strand in Haussig's work is not by any means to dismiss the work or to call into question Mannheim's judgment in approving the dissertation. Apart from the principal purpose of clarifying the tensions in the book, the circumstance suggests something about the persistence of civil intellectual links across even the most profound political (and even "racial") divisions among the educated in the months before Hitler's chancellorship and the imposition of the mobilization regime, a circumstance that is also important for understanding the demoralizing impact of exile on many.[11] In speaking in 1930 of proponents of Fascist "reprimitivization"—albeit at the "sublime" level of a Heidegger, Schmitt, or Freyer—Mannheim tells his class how essential it is to open oneself to this position both in order to understand its "relative truths," social functions and appeals and in order to recognize the full complexity and difficulty of the mode of encountering the social world at a distance that is constitutive of sociology (Mannheim 2001, 40–42). As Haussig presents Riehl's sociology, it exemplifies a programmatic rejection of precisely that distance; and this alone would have made Mannheim more than eager to have her do the study, provided that she herself found a way of gaining sufficient distance from her subject. As noted, this succeeded only in part, notwithstanding her conscientious recourse to sociology of knowledge exercises at intervals in the work.

Haussig divides Riehl's intellectual career into three phases. The first phase, beginning in his student years and continuing as freelance writer and wanderer through the South German countryside, was devoted largely to travel and literary work; the second phase saw Riehl as journalist in a comparatively self-enclosed area of villages and small towns, a base from which he wrote novels and well-received popular books on the conditions of what he called, following the new language imported somewhat earlier from the Scottish moralists, civil society.[12] In his third phase, Riehl was established as professor and literary personality in Munich, enjoying the patronage of the court. Haussig's sociology of knowledge passages profess closeness to Mannheim's approach, especially in his study of Conservatism, but she is more comfortable, as a rule, with biographical

10 "The word…*Tat*…[is] among the most recurrent in Freyer's writings of the 1920s and 1930s. [It expresses] the voluntaristic thrust of his thought, the belief that knowledge could never provide the certain basis of action, and indeed that it was only the decision to act that made knowledge possible." (uller 1987, 107)

11 These phenomena are commonly subsumed under the heading of the supposed delusions of those who were to be exiled, especially the Jews, but such an approach devalues the judgment of some extraordinary individuals and, perhaps more important, misses the transformations achieved by mobilization. Among other things, these misunderstandings render the problem of "return" incomprehensible. See Kettler 2008.

12 Riehl was born one hundred years after Adam Ferguson. He died in the year of Haussig's birth.

circumstances and intellectual proclivities than with macro- or micro-sociological frames of reference. Still, as the title of the work suggests, she has a thesis about Riehl as a sociologist of that "intermediate estate" (*Mittelstand*) whose small-town ethos and convention-bound practices were threatened in his lifetime not only by the formless proletarian masses of what in his view is mislabeled the fourth "estate" but also by the industrial and metropolitan bourgeoisie, taken as a class rather than estate, along with the agencies of the bureaucratic state, which he sees as its political counterparts.

The ambiguity in this thesis arises from Haussig's recognition that the idea of this intermediate estate is at least as much a function of Riehl's "reform" programme as it is of his sociological realism, so that she never resolves the question whether the "*mittelständische Soziologie*" of her title refers to a sociology grounded in a concrete social perspective or to a social programme. Like Hans Gerth in his article on Buchholz, Haussig is interested in the genealogy of a kind of sociological "realism." Unlike Gerth, however, and drawing on Mannheim's conservatism study, she finds that the "cultural will" to such an aspiration by no means adheres only to the liberal line of development. There is a complementary current among writers drawn to the conservative readings of events, a tendency that eschews what it considers to be unduly rationalistic theoretical framings of historical circumstances. Discussing Riehl's framing concepts, Haussig presses the case that they are meant to refer to empirically-given configurations, derived from observation and description. She expressly contrasts his design with a Weberian ideal type. Yet she finds Riehl unable fully to execute his programme because of the Romantic structures of experience and thought that he acquired as a young man. If there are no rationalistic abstractions, she observes, there are nevertheless elements of wishful thinking, which lead to an idea of society that lacks contact with contemporary development.

Riehl seeks out essences in the phenomena he describes, she asserts, but his descriptions resemble pictures floating in air, sustained by his hopes for reform. He cannot give an adequate scientific account because in fact he does not study history in sufficient depth. Having said all this near the beginning of her study, Haussig nevertheless goes on to expound Riehl's accounts with manifest sympathy and to remain uncertain to the end whether and how far the defects in Riehl's realism actually compromise his contribution to social thought. There is a sense, in fact, in which she regrets his lessened immersion in an idealized peasantry and small town middle class at the time of his eventual move to the intellectual universe of Munich, although the former orientation was arguably, by her own measures, most subject to wishful pictorial thinking. As he speaks ever more in the terms of the cultivated, with their focus not on customary collective identities but on vocationally conditioned qualifications, his idea of society increasingly loses, she says, its "beautiful concreteness." (Haussig 1934, 41) Jerry Z. Muller writes:

> The evaluative attitude of the sociologist toward his society was for Freyer not only a moral necessity but an epistemological one. ... At the core of the sociological concepts

> through which reality is comprehended lies a will to change reality in one or another direction. Sociological perspectives, Freyer wrote, were thus necessarily "utopian" in Karl Mannheim's sense of orientations that attempt to transform the present in the direction of one's own wishes. In *Ideologie und Utopie* ... Mannheim had hoped that the sociology of knowledge would provide a tool with which intellectuals ... could ... transcend the partisan perspectives of the present. Freyer did not believe that intellectuals or sociologists could attain such transcendent impartiality. Our perception of what is, he taught, cannot be divorced from our sense of what ought to be. (Muller 1987, 168)

The drama of Haussig's perennially inconclusive negotiations between Mannheim and Freyer appears manifest.

Close in spirit to Riehl's endorsement of the programme of restoring the working class to its supposed place in the patriarchally organized "estate" of labor, as quoted above, is her defense of Riehl against the charge of being a reactionary because of his subordination of women. This effort occasions a general statement about the better understanding in her own time of the interweaving between actual tendencies and the historical intention [*Wollen*] through which they are perceived:

> Everything depends on this intention. All the forces of the personality collect in it. This intention stands in direct relationship to existence; it constitutes itself in the existential layer; yet not through itself alone, divorced from the social, political and spiritual realities outside of itself, but in confrontation [*Auseinandersetzung*] with these realities. (Haussig 1934, 49)

This enables us to understand Riehl's idealization of submissive womanhood, she asserts, in a less judgmental manner. Haussig's intervention on this issue is especially striking in view of the important role of women's emancipation in Mannheim's lectures as well as in key works emanating from the research group.

What made it possible for Haussig to balance her evident sympathies with an activism of the right with Mannheim's predominant research premises, we surmise, was, first, his willingness to take risks—even if not in the context of his primary research programme—with the boundaries between theory and practice, as explored in the existentialist line (not to speak of his earlier initiation in the activist "so-much-the-worse-for-the-facts" Marxism of Georg Lukács), and, second, his principled conviction that every ideological perspective has access to some aspect of human knowledge, even if also ultimately not on its own terms. It is ironic that Haussig's refrain about Riehl, in her more critical moods, concerns his inability to choose between the romantic conservatism that animates his social vision and gives it immediacy and force, on the one hand, and, on the other, his adjustments to the world of a newly conservatized liberalism derived from a bourgeoisie that has separated itself from the earlier adventurism of the innovative generational alliance between civil servants and intellectuals. *Mutatis mutandis*, that is her situation between her two mentors.

Haussig organizes her exposition of Riehl's sociological thought, following his own systematization, under the headings of civil society, estate, family, and *Volk*, with a main line of division now drawn chronologically across these categories at the point of his acculturation to the intellectual world of Munich, which she sees as roughly congruent, in the wider world, with the reorientation and reintegration of the German bourgeoisie and intelligentsia after the failure of 1848. To round out our account of the issues raised by Haussig's dissertation for our understanding of the limits of Mannheim's research project, we shall identify one or two themes under each heading, along with the changes they underwent at the point of supposed discontinuity in his development. It should be noted that Haussig had to undertake a massive effort of constructive interpretation, notwithstanding her programmatic fascination with immediacy, since Riehl was a "writer" in the German sense, a professional who earned his livelihood by his pen in the context of a newly emerging "public" whose coherence and boundaries were unformed. Whatever his professorial title, he was a social essayist and novelist, with far less interest in systematic thought or reflections on method than his later commentators possessed. Haussig pays attention to this micro-sociological dimension mainly when she contrasts the interplay between writer and public during Riehl's years as journalist in a comparatively closed and static community with the changed situation when he writes for a wider, more indeterminate public of individuals defined above all by their regard for *Bildung*.

According to Haussig, Riehl's unique emphasis on civil society as frame of reference originates in his rejection of the primacy accorded to political institutions by supporters of "the modern leveling police- and official-state," epitomized by Prussia (11). In contrast to Hegelian theory, then, the claims of civil society, in its diverse corporate elements, are in no sense to be understood as transcended by the norms implicit in the abstract concepts of market and state. More precisely, the corporate element accorded highest priority, at least in Riehl's writings before Munich, is paradigmatically the estate [*Stand*] insofar as it retains and reproduces its unreflected ethos [*Sitten*] and practices as laid down by history, in the sense of time immemorial. The only estate that fully meets these requirements, in Riehl's first design, is the peasantry. For the aristocracy, he concludes, its historic estate norms are already a matter of deliberate loyalty to family legacies and therefore subject to deviations, especially as the aristocracy is drawn from the land to the courts. In the bourgeoisie, the estate mode is steadily undermined by class identities and behaviors, with only the intermediate stratum in non-industrial small towns keeping alive the hope and possibility of estate structuring of commercial and craft activities. The so-called fourth estate, associated first of all with property-less workers, cannot be an estate at all, according to Haussig's account of Riehl, but must somehow, insofar as its functions are indispensable, be integrated into the estates properly so-called.

Two things are especially striking about Haussig's treatment of this phase of Riehl's "sociological" writings. First is that she highlights Riehl's focus on the "proletariat of spiritual work [*Geistesarbeit*]," which takes up all but one of the

five sections on the so-called Fourth Estate in his book on civil society. Mirroring an inverted Marx to an astonishing extent, Riehl maintains that the *litterateurs* of the German Grub Street inject a revolutionary political consciousness into the new mass of uprooted workers: “This literary tribe [*Literatentum*] sees the salvation of the world in the revelations of socialism and communism because it is indeed only therein that its own salvation, its political influence on the masses, is supplied.” (36) Intellectuals in the guise of artists join the same campaign, even more clearly consigned to this deviancy by their separation from the world of handwork. When Haussig eventually expresses her misgivings about Riehl’s later writings, she implies that its shortcomings can be explained by Riehl’s own migration from the world of the journeyman local reporter to that of the intellectuals around the Bavarian court (notwithstanding his loathing for one of his prominent associates there, Richard Wagner). The fascination with intellectuals is certainly consistent with the interests shared by Mannheim and the members of his research group, but the harsh judgment of the emerging independent intelligentsia is anticipated only in the skepticism about the “unattached intellectuals” as inconstant ideologues that Mannheim expresses in his study of conservatism. Haussig’s preference for Riehl’s earlier views of this matter is clearly linked to her ambivalence about his deficient realism in those writings: programmatically, she behind the direct and unreflected view.

The second striking feature of her interpretation is nevertheless, as noted earlier, Haussig’s clear recognition of Riehl’s inability to see important features and trends in the society of his time. She speaks especially of Riehl’s helplessness and incomprehension in the face of the Fourth Estate, but indicates as well that his hopes for the bourgeoisie are disconnected from trends of economic development widely understood since the belated reception of Adam Smith in Germany. Some of these aporia were supposed to be countered in practice by suitable “reforms” in social policy, notably with regard to the peasantry and working population, but others were to have been ameliorated by adjustments in Riehl’s approach. And these changes she distrusts more than his misperceptions.

Riehl retains the term “estate” in his revisions in the 1860s, but the medieval estate and its unreflected ethos cease to serve as models. The estates now are constituted by typical modes of thinking, which are in turn a function of diverse vocational conditionings. Haussig does not note that this brings Riehl closer to Max Weber, especially as received by Mannheim himself in his 1930 work on economic ambition, but not only Mannheim but also Freyer drew on this source. For Haussig, the important thing is that Riehl now sees things more nearly as they appear in “the common social ideal of modern cultivated populations,” a shift she attributes not only to Riehl’s own change in status and location but also to the manifest establishment and success of an order comprising diversified work, industry, and entrepreneurship. Society is correspondingly less ordered by “historical” legacies of judgment and practice and the political dimension is accorded new legitimacy as deliberate decisions are seen to be more important in both private and public lives. Haussig observes that the animus to Prussia that had entered prominently in

Riehl's anti-political position now appears obsolete to him, given the realities of Prussian leadership in the German national mission. The state is the expression and articulation of the *Volk*, whose healthy potentialities can no longer be left to the care of embedded cultural usages, although they must be permitted to thrive on their own, once the state has devised measures to impede their further deterioration. The interpretive motif that becomes ever clearer in Haussig's reading is that Riehl represents after all a kind of conjunction of conservatism and liberalism, tracking the course of disillusionment after 1848 and the revival of a new national vision, with more and more of the features central to liberal views coming into view, but always, so far as possible, within a conservative regulative frame. With this motif, Haussig comes close to the common preoccupation with the genealogy and vicissitudes of liberalism shared as well by almost all participants in Mannheim's research group.

This must not be overstated, however, since Haussig is quite different in her sympathetic rendering of Riehl's view of the family, notably the status of women, as well as her evident celebration of his vision of the *Volk* constituted by the common emotional will to unity of a differentiated people.[13] Her discussion of the *Volk* in the dual senses of the ordinary people and the people as collectivity with special qualities and mission does not add much to the discussions of civil society and state in Riehl, but her account of his theses about women in the family require some elaboration, if only for the sake of comparison with the work of Truhel, Freudenthal and Halperin examined above. Haussig's views are too complex to sustain a simple contrast between their feminism(s) and her anti-feminism.

First, she treats Riehl's emphasis on the family as conservator of moral usages (*Sitten*) by virtue of the supposed natural conservatism of the woman as itself a prime example of the increasingly "theoretical" character of his thought, as he loses his contact with the immediacy of rural and small-town life, as well as his trust in it. Haussig cites Riehl's claim that "the contradiction between men and women establishes as a natural law the dissimilarity (*Ungleichartigkeit*) of human callings and thereby also social inequality and dependency" and remarks that this theological dictum is wholly out of keeping with his ordinary way of thinking. Second, she notes with unease that Riehl gives a political function to the inner spiritual quality of family relations. Citing his introduction of a political vocabulary to speak of finding a counter to "revolution" in the family, she observes that "the discussion of a spiritual problem must fall into excess [*sich übersteigern*] if it loses

---

13 It should be noted, however, that Haussig's dissertation abruptly ends with the assertion that the personality of the *Volk* is ultimately forged by its multiple particularistic constituents; "The personalities of the *Volk* in the widest but also in the most profound and naturally necessary senses," reads the last sentence, "are the nations—the tribal and natural peoples." (63) The plural number in that sentence cuts against other political resonances of the work and is reminiscent, in fact, of the formula in the preamble to the Weimar Constitution, where the collective author is described as "the German *Volk*, unified in its tribes."

contact with political reality." (45) Third, then, on a point that amounted to the complete opposite of Mannheim's programme, she quotes Riehl as saying, "The first step towards the political education of a people appears to me to be sought in leading the female sex back completely to its own natural qualities." (46)

Haussig notes uneasily that this substitutes in effect a volitional spiritual achievement for the spontaneous rightness of the estates in which he has lost faith. The ideal now appears as something that can only be achieved in terms of bourgeois levels of consciousness; he expressly refers to the peasant woman as still "half a man." The reconstituted family, which has to be brought into being, now appears as the source of moral standards and energy, penetrating state and nation. Haussig clearly finds fault in this mediated programme, but she also appears intrigued by it. She notes the promise of patriarchalism to displace the fourth estate by reintegrating workers in wider families and, more generally, she sees its aptness as a way of countering the amorality of capitalism, which cannot itself be rendered ethical. Let the economy suffer if the family can prevail. This is the context, then, in which she invokes the primacy of a constructive will in confrontation with reality and cautions against simple dismissal of Riehl's programme as "reactionary." She urges that it be read as part of his larger project of dealing with the bourgeoisification and atomization of society, in which he is himself increasingly caught up. "It is an oppositional tract," she concludes, "against this process of disintegration." (52)

And the evaluation of a tract, in keeping with the special links between knowledge and volition in public performative discourse according to Freyer, is not restricted to its cognitive adequacy. Riehl's highly charged "sociography" consequently receives a patient and indeed welcoming reception from Frieda Haussig in her surprisingly subtle testing of the limits of the intellectual apparatus that Mannheim's had constructed for his study of conservatism.

Haussig's approach is illuminated by comparison with another dissertation developed under Mannheim, a work that situates itself directly at the center of both substance and method of the Frankfurt research programme while dealing with the same historical period as Haussig. It is perhaps not surprising, given the disruptions of the times, that this dissertation also could not be examined by Mannheim, except that in this case it was Mannheim's lack of professorial standing in the London School of Economics that required his loyal student and fellow émigré, Ernst Kohn-Bramstedt (anglicized to Ernest K. Bramsted), to seek sponsorship from Mannheim's colleague—and increasingly irritated rival—Morris Ginsberg. To anticipate the question whether there is any similarity between Freyer and Ginsberg as counters to Mannheim in the two projects, it seems safe to say that Bramsted did not materially revise his orientation to the Frankfurt working group. If anything, the cooperation with Ginsberg—whom Bramsted thanks for having suggested the topic, which is odd in view of its clear antecedents in the work of Gerth, Weil, and others of that cohort—may have confirmed him in his own inclination to keep his distance from Mannheim's more expansive philosophical ambitions for cultural sociology, since these were anathema to Ginsberg (Kettler

and Meja 1995, 182–8).[14] But that inclination is already evident in a methodological article on the sociology of literature that Bramsted published in 1931, soon after his arrival in Frankfurt. There is nothing in Bramsted to resemble Haussig's view of the inner connection between the cognitive and performative dimensions of social interpretation.

When Bramsted comes upon Riehl in Munich during his examination of nineteenth-century German literature in the context of relations between aristocracy and middle class, he simply designates him as a "conservative sociologist," while noting his place in a circle of literary intellectuals assembled by Max II under the ideological auspices of what Bramsted calls "courtly liberalism." While he credits Riehl's observations on the aristocratic sources of middle-class social politeness, on the revival of what a later generation called "family values," and on the modernity of "philistinism" as a cultural posture—and notes his idealization of peasants, craftsmen, and the "gospel of labor" as well as his detestation of the libertinism of the proletarian intellectuals—he does not find Riehl's reading of the society of the time remarkably original or nearly as interesting as the typifying accounts present in the novels that are the center of his attention. Riehl was one of a number of "scholars who were semi-poets" that Max II favored. Hailed as a prophet by reaction, "not without justification," according to Bramsted, he was nevertheless less easy in their company than amid the affirmative cultivation of his fellows, whether moderately liberal or "free conservative," in the Munich Circle around the Wittelsbach Court (Bramsted 1964, 191, 202, 217, 325–31).[15]

Bramsted's distanced account shows the clear distinction he maintained between the sociological issues he hoped to explore at the instance of the writers he was studying and questions about the intrinsic merits of their writings. Even apart from the Weberian methodological principle that he honored by this separation, he relied on Mannheim's distinction between "immanent" and "sociological" dimensions of interpretation, as he set it forth in 1926 (Mannheim [1926] 1993). More clearly than his Frankfurt associates in their German dissertations, Bramsted attached himself to this pair of authorities. Max Weber is cited ten times, at least two times in connection with basic conceptual tools adopted from him—the concept of ideal type, the difference between class and status (and the historical difference between societies shaped by estates and by class); Karl Mannheim is cited nine times, even more often in a similarly fundamental role; no other sociologist is cited as a conceptual model more than once, except Pareto, and the two references are in a context where Bramsted opts for Mannheim's version of elite theory in preference to that of Pareto. Ginsberg appears once, as author of a background chapter on changing perceptions of class in current sociology. We have not been concerned in this study with influences but with negotiations, especially within a research group given its shape by exchanges among participants, where

14 According to students of both, the competitors kept their conflicts from them.

15 Bramsted's revision of his original 1937 text is mainly bibliographic, except that he pays some special attention distinguishing his views from those of Georg Lukács.

the orientation to the common enterprise can be implicit in the work, and the individual contribution can presuppose the recognition of the project as a whole (with the help of the authority of the senior figure). In a curious way, Bramsted's concentration of citations represents a more lonely undertaking to vindicate the work in conjunction with authorities that must themselves be rendered legitimate. That is also the explanation for his securing a brief but generous foreword from the English historian of modern Germany, G.P. Gooch. However clear the continuities with the Frankfurt research group, Bramsted's book is a work of exile.

The work follows a compound theme of the Frankfurt seminars, the ideological relationship between German conservatism and liberalism in conjunction with the distinctive relationship between aristocracy and bourgeoisie in a country without revolution or comparable sharp breaks of social continuity. Bramsted's book differs from many of the Frankfurt theses in its source material—nineteenth century German social novels by authors such as Gustav Freytag and Theodor Fontane as well as popular magazines such as *Gartenlaube*. This source material allows him to present these ideologies not in their theoretical forms but in terms of how they are personified in representative characters of the novels. He examines these works to glean the attitudes of the conservative aristocracy and the liberal middle classes toward one another and other groups such as the Jews. He finds that there was not only antagonism between these social units but also rapprochement.

Especially informative for the present study is Bramsted's introduction, dealing with the sociology of literature, at least part of which he published in a German journal while at Frankfurt (Kohn-Bramstedt 1931). We will examine the German work first. There he echoes Mannheim's "Conservative Thought" without citing it by noting that there is no need for a sociology of literature until the field of literary studies is no longer taken as unproblematic (*selbstverständlich*). As questions arise about the status of the field as a "strict science," its relationship of the field to social formations is more sharply examined. Such an investigation, then, connects two familiar areas, society and *belles lettres*. While an immanent approach considers the work as a unique spiritual structure within the arts, a sociological one examines the relationship of the production of the work to the individual or collective existence of the artist—its "existential function" (*Seinsfunktion*) (Kohn-Bramstedt 1931, 719–20). In examining the relationship between these two aspects, he surveys various approaches, especially those dealing with the late eighteenth century. Echoing the findings of Hans Weil and Jacob Katz, he writes that the emergence of a cultivated stratum (*Bildungsschicht*) was dependent on the eclipse of the aristocratic criterion of birth as a major status determinant and the emergence of bourgeois confidence. The latter would decline at the end of the nineteenth century, which meant that the social field in which the *Bildungsschicht* prospered was a historically limited one. He adds that the writers and poets of this period, despite the aforementioned "hidden ties" (*heimlichen Bindungen*), could be described as "a socially unattached stratum of intellectuals," attributing the

term (as did Mannheim) to Alfred Weber (725). This group is contrasted with the worker poet, who was "clearly bound to a certain social location."[16]

In the final section of the article, Kohn-Bramstedt turns to his fellow working group member, Hans Weil. After praising Weil's general approach (and noting that the book was in Mannheim's series), he looks at a specific instance, the "*Sturm und Drang*" movement, which conclusively broke the privilege of court art. Weil attributes this movement to the decentralized intermediate stratum (*Mittelstand*) that was also of interest to Haussig in her treatment of Riehl, and to the status restrictions on gifted sons of this stratum. As a result those artists emphasized the individual "creative genius" in a manner similar to romantic vitalism, using categories such as "life" and "people" (*Volk*). The observation of the socially incongruent position of the early intellectuals is common to the Mannheim group, including Haussig, although its implications and mandates are differently conceived. Bramsted, in any case, moves somewhat away from Weil in emphasizing that literature cannot simply be reduced its functional role as expression of social location but also has an enduring value. The genius of Goethe's *Werther* can be recognized even by those who are now at a social distance from it (729–31). Distance provides not only insight into the social roots of a literary work but also an appreciation of its socially unattached value. This brings him back to the distinction between immanent and functional approaches, giving each its due, but content not to resolve the differences.

This earlier article appears more concerned with mapping out the parameters of the sociology of literature rather than devising an actual strategy for empirical research. That would change several years later with his dissertation. There, in his introduction, he addresses two basic issues. First, he defends the use of the social novel as a sociological source. He argues that characters in such novels play a role similar to that of Max Weber's ideal types. This literature "describes typical ways in which people of different classes or groups behave think and feel." (Bramsted 1964, 2) These characters, like ideal types, are constructs against which individual cases can be analyzed.[17]

The second basic issue is the use of class as an analytical category. Here he distinguishes between "class situation" and "class in the making," terms he borrowed from a then unpublished Frankfurt manuscript by Mannheim.[18] The

---

16 Here he cites Mannheim's Ideology and Utopia. A page later, in discussing the reception of literature, he rejects the concept of "entelechy" (akin to Alfred Weber's vitalism) and opts instead for Mannheim's theory of generations (726).

17 Following in the spirit of his article, he acknowledges that non-sociological perspectives on literature are also valuable, and again cites Mannheim's 1926 distinction between immanent and sociological interpretations (4).

18 The German version of Mannheim's essay has been lost. However, an English version has been published as "The Problem of the Intelligentsia," in Mannheim 1956. Here the translation of the terms differs slightly, "class position" and "class consciousness" (106–7).

former means simply "the determination of the place of individuals or groups in the whole of society." (7) Class consciousness occurs when people in the same situation "react similarly to it and join in common action." The latter thus contains an intentional component that the former does not. Phenomena such as class hatred, parvenu behavior, and snobbery are not so much objective facts as complex attitudes, and Bramsted, like Mannheim and Weber, focuses on them.

In distinguishing between the aristocracy and the middle class in the nineteenth century, Bramsted relies on Max Weber's distinction in *Economy and Society* between status and class. He notes that even in capitalist society, aristocratic prestige based on status did not disappear. This situation resulted in a compromise between the two groups in which both rapprochement and tension played a role. In Germany, for example, the middle classes both hated and imitated the aristocracy (8–11). One of his examples of this comes from the novel *Eysen* by Georg von Ompteda, which portrays the relationship between the son of a Berlin machine manufacturer and a noble family (246–9). The industrialist has wealth (the basis of class) but also seeks status from non-capitalist sources. The first time he presents a calling card he presents himself as "*Dr Jur. et phil. Heinrich Gideon, Leutnant der Reserve im Dragonregiment Graf Schwerin*." Here he relies on bourgeois status of being *gebildet* plus the pseudo-aristocratic status of being a reserve officer. By the second time he presents his card he has purchased a noble title, no longer relies on bourgeois status, and is "*Heinrich Freiherr von Gideon, Leutnant der Reserve*." The last time we see the card, he has purchased an estate from an impoverished noble family and even married the daughter. Now he is "*Heinrich Freiherr von Gideon auf Pölze*," with no hint of the capitalist class basis of this traditional status. He is able to acquire this status only because the noble family wishes to recover a part of its former wealth. Both sides are forced to overcome initial class prejudices to achieve their aims, thus combining both compromise and tension. Here Bramsted examines conduct determined by attitudes by moving beyond the ideal types of class and status to show us a complex interaction of the two in "actual" cases, even if those cases are artistically imagined. Bramsted views Ompteda as an aristocrat who had gained a certain distance from his status group and is able to see the advantages of such a merger (292).

A much shorter second section, which deals with the place of the writer in society, follows up this theme. Bramsted argues that the intellectual has greater freedom of action than the non-intellectual (284). The case he made for the relatively socially unattached position of the romantics of *Sturm und Drang* is now extended to literary movements in the nineteenth century. But at the same time such writers do not stand completely apart from social connections, because while striving for individualistic expression they have to take into consideration the market for their works. Echoing what Mannheim had said earlier in "Conservative Thought," Bramsted writes that because these artists are not bound to any social group, they are not restricted in their choice of alignment. Although they are concerned with the immanent value of their works, they realize that those works have to have appeal to others within a social field (298–9, 308–9). This situation adds a simple

social mechanism to the constitution of his earlier distinction between immanent and functional approaches.

Overall, it may be said that in writing his long and detailed treatment of the German novelists whose writings are his primary subject matter, many of them unknown to his own likely readership, he shifts steadily from the discipline of sociology, in the terms of Mannheim's 1932 classification, towards the enterprise that Mannheim called sociology of the different disciplines, with history and literary studies being the references here. Bramsted's intervention in the posthumous publication of an unfinished Mannheim book manuscript suggests that Mannheim's writings had become documents for him, not in the ambitious sense of "documentary meanings" that is central to Mannheim's cultural sociology but in the straightforward historian's sense of a text whose importance is historiographical. At issue is the conflict between Bramsted and Gerth about the editing of the book that eventually appeared as *Freedom, Power, and Democratic Planning*. As far as can be ascertained from available sources, Bramsted protested when Hans Gerth and Adolph Lowe made changes and additions to remedy shortcomings in Mannheim's argument, especially in the analysis of certain political and economic issues, and to "make a good book." (N. Gerth 2002, 180) Rather than taking this as a sign of a disciple's piety, we see it as a respect for the integrity of a historical document, whatever its weaknesses. If Frieda Haussig's work is torn between two closely related but nevertheless distinct approaches to the discipline of sociology and its extrapolation in the sociology of culture, jeopardizing Mannheim's attempt to devise a sustainable balance by temporizing with the most difficult issues, Bramsted effectively resolves the situation in a Weberian direction, with nothing left in brackets.

Another of the younger Mannheim students, Kurt H. Wolff, followed precisely the opposite course. To judge by the lecture notes found after Wolff's death, he cannot have missed any courses or seminars offered by Mannheim, beginning with the 1930 introduction to sociology and including the liberalism seminar. It is unclear, however, whether he had actually begun a doctoral dissertation before he sought refuge in Italy from the National Socialist domination of the university. Since he wrote on Mannheim's sociology of knowledge from the standpoint of its philosophical as well as sociological implications, a topic unlikely to be acceptable as a doctoral project to his professor, it is almost certain that his diploma thesis was wholly a product of his exile. Wolff's lifelong management of precisely this legacy, however, makes his career important as a counter-example to those who punctuated their tenure with Mannheim with a study along the lines of the Weberian facet uppermost in the research programme.

In the Summer Semester of 1930, at the age of 18, Kurt H. Wolff arrived at the Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe-University of Frankfurt from nearby provincial Darmstadt, replicating the move from the small town to the metropolis, which he later cited as paradigmatic for the distance requisite for sociology of knowledge. Among his first classes was an "Introduction to Sociology" taught by the newly

appointed young "star" of German sociology, Karl Mannheim. The first three lectures of the course opened Wolff to his lifelong vocation.

Mannheim began by distinguishing the subject matter, method, and "attitude" [*Einstellung*] constitutive of sociology, and he made it clear that it was the explication and clarification of the last of these that was the principal aim of his teaching. Clarification, not inculcation, since the experiential basis was already present, he thought, in the generation seated before him and had only to be brought to awareness. To epitomize the sociological attitude, Mannheim quotes an unnamed French writer on Henri Saint-Simon:

> Silent in the midst of all this noise, judging others without being himself judged, both mondaine and spendthrift, more by system than inclination, he lived fifty years in the span of one. He plunged into life, instead of stepping in. He used and abused everything in order to be able to allow for everything in his calculations ... He infected himself with the illnesses of the century. A completely experimental life. (Mannheim [1930] 2001, 8–10)

Nothing speaks directly to such an individual. This attitude, in turn, presupposed an experiential distance from a lifespace of self-explanatory, unquestionable meanings. What sociology shows was that such distance need not be a fate to be passively suffered, but that it can be an enactment in its own right, an achievement.

To understand Kurt H. Wolff's sociological project, it is necessary, we think, to listen at some length to Mannheim's commentary on the passage, as the young student must have heard it:

> The distantiation becomes both broader and deeper. There are no contents with regard to which a doubt could not arise, where reflectivity could not come into play. Religion, state, society, morals—all are subjected to the attitude of distance from life. This broadening is uncanny. The deepening consists in the fact that distantiation affects not only the objects of the external world and social forms, but increasingly also the sphere of the self. One gradually begins to speak of the ego as of a third person. ... One gets into position to speak of life as of an it. The apparatus of thinking and living moves into the distance. Psychological ways of examining our feelings manifest themselves. The process goes further and thought itself is put at a distance. Sociology of knowledge comes into being. One does not even identify oneself with the thinking one has used to become acquainted with oneself. One puts it at a distance, one moves it away from oneself. ... One is separated from the act of performing, and one can no longer identify oneself with an earlier allocation of meaning. An altogether peculiar relationship comes into being. Its highest intensification is when even this experiencing ego is suddenly put as a distance, viewed as an it, and separated from us. ... It is a consciousness of self that is always only a spectator of itself, that views itself from the outside. This ironic possession of self is the endpoint of this act. One's relationship to self is as disjointed as to all forms: an ego that is spectator to itself (*sich selbst zuschaut*). To put it differently, one experiences oneself as something that could well be different.

> One is only a possibility of oneself.[19] This feeling of life arises with the process whereby an unambiguous interpretation of the world—that was more or less present in an unambiguous grouping—disappears. What is the next development? The point of departure has been shown. One experiences oneself as something that could also be different. That is decisive. That means that one incorporates the variability of the self-relationship into the experience. Searching gives way to experiencing. ... The person whose reflexivity fulfills a need of life is the authentic model here. (Mannheim [1930] 2001, 20–22)

To live and to work fully according to this "authentic model" became, to use another term common among Mannheim and his students, Wolff's mission.[20] One of Wolff's very last writings was originally a contribution to the volume in which these late-discovered lecture transcripts were published (Wolff 2000). He called it "The Two Secret Poets." One of the poets was himself, and the other was Mannheim. And the mark of the poet, on this reading, was a capacity to withstand the process of bottomless relativization without succumbing to a reductionist "nothing but." Using a term that retains its non-technological meaning in German, he speaks of the "lability" that is common to the age and to the poet, who falls and falls through all levels of pretended meaning until he reaches some ground, if only a provisional one. He credits Mannheim with the concept, although he acknowledges that it is not to be found in his written works; and on the strength of this identification expresses the hope that for Mannheim as for himself this relatively absolute ground is poetic.[21]

Curiously, Wolff forgets an incident that is documented in his personal files. Mannheim had asked the students in his seminar to respond to a questionnaire about their attitudes towards sociology. In that context, in order to counter emotional indiscipline, he had evidently conveyed the sense that lability was to be put behind them. Notwithstanding his admiration for Mannheim, the young Wolff wrote him a solemn note to the effect that if he could not be labile like a poet as well as disciplined like a sociologist, he would abandon the latter for the former and ask for the return of his confessional questionnaire. Obviously, the issue was clarified between them, since Wolff closes the article he wrote some 70 years later with the avowal that "Mannheim was an irreplaceable and unmistakable part" of himself, without which he could not imagine his own being.

In the course of Kurt H. Wolff's American career, and especially in his endless settling of affairs with Mannheim's sociology of knowledge (see Kettler and Meja

---

19 Mannheim explores this theme in his play, *Die Dame aus Biarritz*. In Ludes 1997, 49–76. See Kettler and Meja 1993, 5–7; Laube 2000, 276–277.

20 In a letter to a group of his closest Frankfurt students, the group that had followed him from Heidelberg, Mannheim writes "We shall have to transform the sociology of function ever more into a sociology of mission." See discussion in Kettler 2000, 296.

21 For a happy conjunction of "poetic" samples from both Mannheim and Wolff, see the joint publication of Mannheim's "*Dame*" and a literary essay by Wolff, along with a number of his strong pencil drawings in Ludes 1997.

1985), it became clear just how seriously he took both his poetic aspirations and Mannheim's cautions against premature leaps beyond disciplined critical analysis. Wolff's favorite quotation from Mannheim, repeated one last time in his very late essay, was "Whoever wants the irrational in the place where the clarity and sobriety of understanding must still rightfully reign, is afraid to confront the mysterious in its actual lair." (Mannheim [1928] 1993, 437) His reception of Mannheim's sociology of knowledge makes every effort to meet standards of rigorous scientific procedure. Unlike the American sociologists who sought to transmute the impulse they receive from Mannheim into a research programme fully consistent with other dimensions of American sociology, however, Wolff always tried to maintain the opening to the place beyond clarity and sobriety, to have even sociologists confront their limits, as they nevertheless do their work. This loyalty to Mannheim's project emerges best by comparison with the other Mannheim receptions, which quickly relegated him to the status of interesting precursor.

Recognition as a pioneer in a new field of empirical investigation would doubtless have gratified Mannheim. He claimed this status; he adapted his work so as to find understanding among practitioners of the "scholastic sociology" he had earlier portrayed somewhat acerbically. Nevertheless he insisted upon publishing his own alternative introduction to *Ideology and Utopia*, when it was translated in 1936. In his "Preliminary Approach," he first situates Socrates within the "great surge of skepticism" that accompanies democratization in Athens and then asks rhetorically, "Was it not, furthermore, the great virtue of Socrates that he had the courage to descend into the abyss of this skepticism? And did he not overcome the crisis by questioning even more radically than the Sophists and thus arrive at an intellectual resting point which, at least for the mentality of that epoch, showed itself to be a reliable foundation?" Somewhat mysteriously, Mannheim adds, "It is interesting to observe that thereby the world of norms and of being came to occupy the central place in his inquiry." (Mannheim 1968, 9) The mystery is soon solved because this passage is only the first of several indications of Mannheim's belief that the crisis of universal distrust can only be countered by radical doubt, and that this doubt will paradoxically eventuate in a new ontology and in a new foundational science of being. From this point of view, sociology of knowledge is not a positive discipline with consequences for methodology: it is philosophy carried on by more appropriate means.

This is the motif to which Kurt H. Wolff's mediation sought to give expression, life, and relevance. Wolff's intervention sought reorientation and reconstitution of sociology by direct appeals to the human beings who function as sociologists. Wolff finds Mannheim important above all for his ultimately "tragic" struggle with relativism, his recognition of the crisis of reason in the world. Mannheim's central problem is thought to be philosophical, not only in the sense of methodology or epistemology but also in the sense of the ultimate "logical" issue that Hegel mistakenly claimed thought to have solved through his dialectical deduction of the movement between subjective and objective spirit, culminating in the ultimate reconciliation at the level of the absolute. Mannheim's questions are

seen to revolve around Nietzsche's ghastly discoveries, now confirmed by the manifest discrediting of all claims to speak with the authority of reason in the spheres of utmost importance to human action. The exposure of such claims as "rationalization" and "ideology" itself proceeds by rational means, of course, at first embodied in shrewd political assaults and eventually in the two genealogical inquiries of psychoanalysis and sociology of knowledge. For Wolff, Mannheim's sociology of knowledge epitomizes the courage to reshape and to pursue this destructive course without abandoning the goal of finding a new affirmation.

To avoid misunderstanding of this second line of reception, it should be emphasized that Wolff was not content to spin out metaphysical suppositions to resolve these gravest of all doubts. He was strict in his understanding of the work that sociologists of knowledge must do, and generous in his appreciation of quite detailed examples of the empirical craft. The point is not to encourage speculation, but to foster reflexive attention to the meanings of the work that sociologists of knowledge professionally do, locating it in the context of purposes that need to be subserved by knowledge and of problems that must be handled wisely. If knowledge is what our sociological analyses show it to be, what is the point of our showing it and what follows from our awareness? These are the kinds of questions that Wolff regarded as central to Mannheim's sociological project and that Wolff asked to be received as integral to the tradition of inquiry initiated by Mannheim.

It should also be emphasized that Wolff was not satisfied that Mannheim answered his own questions well. He was not a disciple. His criticisms may be epitomized with the help of a figure from Robert Musil's *Man Without Qualities*. Like Mannheim himself, Musil's protagonist reflects on his preference for essays. But he makes a crucial distinction that Mannheim may be said to miss. He discriminates between an essayism that is marked by a fierce concentration on exactness, refusing to say what cannot be said in an exact manner, and an essayist that uses the essayistic form as a license to ramble. When Wolff observes that Mannheim ultimately lost his concentration on the perplexing necessity for reason in the world, he is in effect noting Mannheim's wobbling from the one type of essayism to the other. And when Wolff himself insists on his theme of "surrender and catch," (Wolff 1976, 1988, 1989) he is bending every effort to improve on his teacher. It might seem disproportionate to counterpose the academically fecund first reception of Mannheim to Wolff's more idiosyncratic challenge to the discipline. But intellectual weight is not to be measured by reams of paper or miles of printouts. Teaching by example and by precept remains the core of intellectual transmission.

In the 1945–46 academic year, Kurt H. Wolff offered an ambitious year-long graduate seminar on sociology of knowledge at the Ohio State University, where he had finally found a regular position, after ten difficult years in Italy and America.[22] The émigré group at Ohio State was small and even more beleaguered

22 Kurt Wolff treasured Karl Mannheim's letter of reference, written at the time of Wolff's forced emigration from Italy in the Spring of 1939. Mannheim's recommendation is

than others in the small core of comparatively cosmopolitan intellectuals who slowly collected there in the postwar years. Arthur Salz, a liberal controversialist and economist of the Weimar years, provided the meeting place, where Wolff could also foregather, slightly later, with the Germanists, Oscar Seidlin and Dieter Cunz. Wolff's successful initiative with this seminar, which retained six to eight students throughout the academic year, stands in contrast to Arthur Salz's perennially empty economics classes at Ohio State.[23]

Wolff's design of the seminar was multi-faceted, uncompromisingly theoretical (except for the empirical student projects), and self-consciously reflexive. A noteworthy feature was a book-length record (300 single-spaced pages in small type), entitled *The Sociology of Knowledge: A History and a Theory* (LWP, AA) [24] and comprising not only extensive lecture and discussion notes, but also periodic reports on student research projects and, most important, feedback from living authors, who were routinely sent transcripts of seminar reports of their work. In a number of these latter cases, there are also records of seminar discussions of the rejoinders.

The most consequential of these exchanges was with Karl Mannheim, whose *Ideology and Utopia* served as the culminating topic of the first semester and as primary syllabus of problems for the second.[25] In the context of the course,

---

interestingly qualified: "As I haven't seen him for years, I can only testify from my knowledge of him during the time we worked together. At that time I knew him as a very gifted man with genuine intuition and deep enthusiasm for his work. His peculiar gifts are both in the field of immediate observation and in the realisation of the sociological implications of everyday facts. For any kind of research which is based not only upon routine work but upon personal qualities of the observer, he would be a success." Unaddressed letter of May 21, 1939. AA. Mannheim's avoidance of Wolff's qualities as theorist may have been tactical—but then again, maybe not. In any case, the focus is on Wolff as cultivated and sensitive qualitative interpreter, itself perhaps not the best recommendation for the American sociological world, as Mannheim understood it. Mannheim's invitation to Wolff, seven years later, to contribute a book on sociology of knowledge to the International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction indicates that he considerably broadened the terms of his approval.

23 Salz's salary was subsidized by the Lazarus family, whose department store empire was based in Columbus at the time. For the Ohio State exile group and its allies, see Kettler 2005. The present study presented here does not dwell on the exile dimension of the negotiations—virtual and literal—among Mannheim, Wolff, and the various American sociologists.

24 Page numbers in brackets refer to this manuscript.

25 Topics and authors leading up to Mannheim were sorted under two principal headings, "Philosophic Backgrounds of the Sociology of Knowledge" and "The Development of the Sociology of Knowledge." The former covered, among others, Nietzsche, Pareto, and Sorel (the "Irrationalists"); Comte, Mill, Durkheim, Gumplowicz, Jerusalem ("The Positivists"); "the psychological school"; Hegel, "the Romantic Attitude," Feuerbach, Marx-Engels, Dilthey (the Historical School"). Under the second heading, Wolff included sessions on representatives of "biologism," positivism, "vulgar Marxism," Antipositivist Marxism (Georg Lukács, Max Adler, Siegfried Marck, and Emil Lederer),

Wolff is quite stern with Mannheim. His exposition is grounded on the *Handbuch* article on "Sociology of Knowledge," (Mannheim [1931] 1969 [1968]) which he characterizes as "his latest draft of his conception of sociology of knowledge contained in his *Ideology and Utopia*." (65) Wolff sums up the criticisms that already punctuate his exposition with three principal objections. First, he notes that Mannheim fails to specify the kind of "knowledge" that is comprehended by the "perspectives" subject to the characteristic treatment of the sociology of knowledge, although certain "formal" dimensions appear to be excluded. Second, he follows Merton and von Schelting in animadversions against the numerous equivocal formulations of "social determination," ranging from "direct causation" to a "kind of 'emanationist' relation between social conditions and thought," (71) with other imprecise possibilities in between. Third, he agrees with von Schelting that Mannheim's "relationism" is, strictly speaking, only a verbal evasion of the relativist vicious circle but he prefers Merton's more "constructive" "attempt at saving what is valuable and tenable," and promises to implement a "third attitude," closer to Merton than to von Schelting, in his own theory (72).

For present purposes, the noteworthy thing is Mannheim's letter in response to these notes, and the students' comments on it. After compliments to the "courage" of the group's "pioneering venture," Mannheim says that he must limit himself to one point, which proves to be the charge of self-contradiction in the matter of "epistemology." Mannheim first defends the presence of "contradictions and inconsistencies" in his papers on the grounds that he deliberately develops his themes to their conclusion, even if it leads him to contradictions "because ... in this marginal field of knowledge we should not conceal inconsistencies ... but our duty is to show the sore spots in human thinking at the present stage." The underlying problem is that "our most advanced empirical investigations ... show that the human mind with its whole categorical apparatus is a dynamic entity," while "our predominant epistemology derives from an age, the hidden desire and ideal of which was stability." "If there are contradictions," Mannheim concludes, "they are not due to my shortsightedness but to the fact that I want to break through the old epistemology radically but have not succeeded yet fully." (213–214)

Mannheim does not disarm this group of candidate sociologists. As Wolff points out, at least three of the six endorse von Schelting's logical rigorism,

---

as well as major segments on Max Scheler, Alfred Weber, Alexander von Schelting, and Mannheim. Strictly speaking, the section on "Development" did not end until the beginning of the second semester, with Ernst Grünwald, whose comprehensive book on the Sociology of Knowledge Wolff hoped to displace. Among the "contemporary contributions to the sociology of knowledge" studied in the second semester were those of Arthur Child, Gerard DeGré, Virgil Hinshaw, Thelma Z. Lavine—the latter two instigated by Wolff—C. Wright Mills, Louis Wirth, H. Otto Dahlke, Pitrim A. Sorokin, Robert K. Merton, Gwynne Nettler, and Frederick Mosteller. The items listed in the table of contents under "A Theory of the Sociology of Knowledge," included not only the final pages but also theoretical comments throughout the text. The commentary on Mannheim frames most of the second semester.

insisting that contradictions in a work must concentrate the attention of the author until they are resolved and faulting Mannheim's temporizing formulas. One or two are more permissive, notably one student who constructively suggests that John Dewey has obviated Mannheim's dilemma by shifting from the supposed "epistemological" problem to adherence to scientific norms and another, who urges a frank acceptance of relativism, citing literature on its practical uses for scientific progress. Wolff limits himself to suggesting this classification, to posing as research problem in sociology of knowledge the factors leading some to respond in a "more sympathetic-emotional than literal-critical fashion," and to pointing forward to his own theoretical efforts to dispose of the problems "in a manner similar to the one suggested by [the student] in his references to Dewey." (263) Like the American commentators on Mannheim discussed above, the students cannot relate to Mannheim's celebration of the "sociological attitude" of experimentalism, which communicates more directly to Wolff, notwithstanding his sincere efforts to adapt his own judgment to the strictures advanced by von Schelting, Merton, and his students. When Wolff comes to the conclusion of his own theoretical effort at that time, whose outlines have been suggested in the earlier section of this paper, he unexpectedly reverts to themes of Mannheim's 1930 course:

> Partly the lack of time referred to more than once, partly the nature of the author, are responsible for the form in which the theory of knowledge here appears. As a partial excuse, which itself, however, is stimulating in its "reflexivity," it may be pointed out that many parts of this theory ... are more "attitudinal" than "cognitive," or are nearer "intuitional" than "scientific" knowledge. (286–287)

Wolff's persistent openness to an approach that he sees strewn with difficulties that he cannot address in accordance with the rules he professes may be explained finally by his "note on the educational-cultural function of the sociology of knowledge" (285), which comes down to the claim that "a person [who] gets into the habit of considering his own ideas and knowledge in relation to their sociocultural backgrounds ... is proceeding along the path of increased awareness and secularization." In the end, it is very much about *Bildung*, the great theme of the Weimar years (Kettler and Lauer 2005).

Not surprisingly, then, the story of Wolff's *The Sociology of Knowledge: A History and a Theory* epitomizes the contrast between Wolff and Mannheim's American sponsor, Louis Wirth. In December, 1945, and April, 1946, Wolff sends the two installments of the manuscript to Wirth, in the context of pleas for help in securing some foundation funding to allow him to write a book instead of teaching extra summer courses to meet his family's pressing economic necessities. In the second of the letters, Wolff also proudly reports that "yesterday Mannheim, in a very complimentary letter, asked me whether I would consider writing a book on sociology of knowledge for his series." Wirth is unsparing:

> As to your contemplated book on the Sociology of Knowledge, I have not the slightest idea of what you would plan to do in it. I hope that you are not planning to publish the minutes of your seminar. I assume that you are attempting to develop the ideas that came up in the seminar more or less systematically. The difficulty, I find, with the field is that there is so much talk and so little actual research that we tend to make the field a critique of one another's ideas, but I know few people who are actually, modestly enquiring into some little phase of a problem and doing some empirical research on it. (LWP)

Wirth closes by telling him, in effect, that he would not support an application to the Social Science Research Council, where he has a decisive voice at this time, except for an empirical study. Wolff's reply in June 1946 first tries to cast the matter as a simple disagreement as to the priority of theoretical or empirical work, but closes in realistic dismay:

> I am ... sorry that I cannot count on your support if I should decide to apply for SSRC support. I wonder, in case this should come up, whether I might mention you as reference to a publisher who might become interested in the book? E.g., Prentice-Hall—or so they wrote and told me—made a "market survey" and found that there wouldn't be enough demand for a text for graduate courses in the sociology of knowledge. Others might make a similar survey and, in the course of it, ask you. I should like to know what your answer would be. (LWP)

There is no reply from Wirth on file.[26]

Like Karl Mannheim in England, Kurt H. Wolff had to invent his own American career. His translations of Georg Simmel, a writer who separated his scientific and poetic-essayistic designs in a manner deceptively attractive to influential American sociologists, gave him a professional standing and leeway that his work on sociology of knowledge alone could never provide. And the hospitable setting of Brandeis University after 1959, where the terms of negotiation between exiles and Americans were completely different than almost anywhere in American academic life, was of critical importance. In the end, Wolff could even complete the Loma study, which Wirth had originally sponsored, and of which he had despaired, although the finished version stands as a monument of the distance

26 The Louis Wirth Papers (LWP) contain several syllabi and related outlines on the subject of "sociology of knowledge." One of the later drafts expressly rejects the "misconceived" idea that the discipline is about "knowledge" rather than the conditions of sociation of ideological groupings. It can count as "a genuine sociological science" only "if not confused with epistemology and social metaphysics," if it pursues a "psycho-sociological" and not "socio-philosophical" approach. Perhaps because of the departure of Edward Shils, who had evidently drafted most of Wirth's earlier statements on the subject, Wirth clearly abandons his earlier interest in Mannheim.

between Wirth's demands and Wolff's inclinations. Mannheim would have been fascinated by the brilliant display of the qualities he had first seen in Wolff, although he would no doubt quickly have pressed Wolff to reflect on the conditions that led him to make just these experiments. Wolff would have loyally added another layer of reflection to the many already on display.

The question of his former students' loyalty weighed heavily on Mannheim in exile. After reading a critical review of *Ideology and Utopia* written by Hans Speier, Mannheim wrote to Louis Wirth in 1939: "It keeps happening these days ... that the next generation is glad to be lifted into the saddle by us, TO LIVE BY OUR INSPIRATION, and then, FOR CAREERIST REASONS, will know nothing more of it and DENY A PERSON AT THE NEXT BEST OPPORTUNITY." ([LWP, emphases in original]; see Kettler and Meja 1985) Two years earlier, Mannheim struck a similar note in a 1937 letter to Hans Gerth, who had loyally represented him at the sociological meetings where *Ideology and Utopia* was under discussion—and under attack: "I am proud of you in every respect, and I am convinced that our relations will remain genuine. I need this all the more, since I have had to get used to the fact, all too often, that those who value me become 'resentful' [English in original] just in order to hide this."[27] (in Mannheim 2003, 206)

These excerpts provide the context for Mannheim's flattering invitation to Wolff to contribute a book on sociology of knowledge to Mannheim's International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction, notwithstanding Wolff's agreement with many criticisms made by Robert K. Merton, as recorded in the seminar document, which formed the basis of the invitation. There are three likely explanations for the difference between Mannheim's reaction to Speier and to Wolff. First, Mannheim was obviously much more secure in 1946, when he had finally attained a professorship and when he was editor of a widely-read series, which boasted of its openness to controversy. Second, in a 1941 letter to Edward Shils, Mannheim distinguished sharply between Merton's criticism, which he called "really honest," and the criticisms made by Alexander von Schelting.[28] (in Mannheim 2003, 260) The third explanation, however, brings us closest to the bond between Mannheim and Wolff. Writing to Gerth in April 1938, as Gerth is getting his footing in America thanks to Louis Wirth, Mannheim asks him to report on both the light and dark sides of the American situation, as they might affect Mannheim himself. "Do you think that I would be crammed into a university sociology department as a sociologist, or is there a foundation [*hat das Boden*] for what I do and how I do it?" (in Mannheim 2003, 215) Kurt H. Wolff was one of the people on whom Mannheim was sure he could "build," as the German saying has it, whatever his criticisms. Wolff recognized that Mannheim was not only a

---

27 Hans Speier was one of the critics on that occasion. See Kettler and Meja 1985 and 1994.

28 This came in a letter thanking Shils for his article on both *Ideology and Utopia* and *Man and Society* (both of which had in fact been translated by Shils) in *The Journal of Liberal Religion*.

sociologist. As he brashly wrote to Mannheim in his first year as a student, he would not remain in the class if Mannheim did not respect his “lability” as both aspirant sociologist and poet. Wolff’s very late “Two Secret Poets” provides the decisive metaphor for their bond. As for the research group, Wolff was a witness, we think, rather than a participant, too much of an outsider to engage with the common project. Hence the seeming paradox that while Wolff was perhaps the most loyal to Mannheim, in the sense of his widest philosophical hopes, he was also among those who were furthest removed from the research programme of the Mannheim group in Frankfurt, in proof of which we can draw on the published segments of his dissertation on Mannheim whose central concerns are with the theory of knowledge.

Gisèle Freund was a witness in a different sense, inasmuch as her best-known connection with the Mannheim group takes the form of the photographs she took during 1932. There are pictures of Mannheim and his students in the Café Laumer not far from the University, there are pictures taken in the seminar rooms, as students listen to a presentation by a colleague, and there are also classical photos of the world immediately around this group—the 1932 May Day speeches as well as a parade of fraternity youths in their dueling costumes. And a group of well-dressed, attractive-looking people with their hands raised in the Hitler salute. Wolff’s notebooks contains a page-long presentation on the social origins of photography that doubtless documents a talk by Freund in the workshop on method largely conducted by Elias, as she was beginning her project. She is telling about the origins of photography as an activity of the sons of the petit bourgeoisie. With wit or naivety she observes that there are no sons of clergy among them, as there are in the counterpart group in Germany, since priests do not have sons. Adapting the realism that arose among the artistic Bohème, although they are not accepted by them, they are hostile to the pretentious bourgeoisie but not opposed to society, where they hope to advance.

It is hard to know what direction her work might have taken if she been able to continue it in the place and setting where it started. There is something startling in the suggestion of a new mode of expression for that *Mittelstand* and its intellectuals, which is also a cause of unease in the group’s inquiries into compromised forms of liberalism in both Germany and France and in their best understanding of the Nazi constituency. Important, nuanced questions might have been explored in the context of the group. As things turned out, however, the dissertation was clearly not finished when she fled to Paris in March of 1933; and the work that she was permitted to submit for promotion to the doctorate at the Sorbonne in 1936 is broken and disjointed. As with Elias’s habilitation script and the dissertations of both Gerth and Bramsted, the generally available text has uncertain provenance. There is a version published in French, German and English after 1974, but it covers many developments after 1936 (Freund 1974a, 1974b, 1976). Although it is said to contain the dissertation in the first hundred pages, we know from a limited 1936 publication of that text in France that this is not strictly speaking the case (Freund 1936). The uncertainty matters because the later work makes only

the most fleeting reference to Mannheim and draws on Walter Benjamin's writings for some of its orientation instead. Moreover, the original dissertation practically breaks off its social analysis of photography in order to cover in some detail a scattering of questions that appear to have been set by her French supervisors, notably a review of litigation about the extent to which photography counts as art from the standpoint of the jurisprudence that protects art from unlicensed duplication. Attached to this is a similar review of controversy and legal action concerning the production and circulation of visiting-card sized photos of nudes. Apart from rather commonplace remarks about the extent to which everything is subject to commerce in capitalist society, these reports lack social analysis. Insofar as there is a thesis overall, it is that photography democratized the portrait, which is presumably relevant to the general change to a society where status is displaced by class. Gisèle Freund's career as sociologist was over before it could really begin—as was true as well in the cases of all the women who had initiated research under Mannheim in Germany: Freudenthal, Halperin, Haussig, Rubinstein, and Truhel.

Chapter 12

The Unfinished Business Between Karl Mannheim and Max Weber

In 1935, speaking to a meeting of British sociologists about "The Place of Sociology," Karl Mannheim illustrated the uses of "systematic sociology" by citing the insight it can provide into such distinctions as those between "closed" and "open" groups, with the former being distinguished, as a result of their self-enclosure and exclusion of new ideas, by the eventual "entrenchment of a deadening, stultifying tradition." (Mannheim [1936] 1953, 205) Our examination of the research group around Mannheim never considered it to be anything but an open group, a site of negotiations among individuals brought into in a common enterprise whose design, both as to matter and method, is itself subject to tolerated deviations and bargained adjustments. There are asymmetries in bargaining power within the group, inasmuch as participants possess varying degrees of authority within the institutional frame of their activities, but even at the extremes—the relations between professor and beginning doctoral candidate—there is no unidirectional flow of power, if only because of the professor's ambitions in the wider competition in which the achievements of the group around him is a prime counter. In the German system at the time, it was a fairly straightforward matter for doctoral candidates to take their dissertation project to a different professor or even to a different university. More important than such external limits on power for the quality of the interaction within the group was Mannheim's strategic decision to seek a common research idiom in the authoritative but contested legacy of Max Weber.

Mannheim's first publication after his arrival in England was a retrospective article entitled "German Sociology (1918–1933)," expressly offered as a kind of obituary on the occasion of the field's "collapse," albeit with the proviso that this need not be permanent. Speaking for his own cohort of sociologists, he writes: "The man on whose work the younger generation could fall back most safely is Max Weber, whose formulation of problems and whose manner of empirical investigation have become representative."[1] (Mannheim [1934] 1953, 218) Mannheim values Weber above all, in this context, because his meticulous historical work was always related to the present, so as to aim at a "diagnosis of the present situation." "He realized," Mannheim adds "that the destiny of any society depended upon the texture of its organization and on the transformation and adaptation of the human mind." If the "idealistic school of sociologists"

1 On Mannheim's claim to be representative of his generation, see Kettler 2003.

takes Weber's *Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* as making a case for the autonomy and causal primacy of the human mind, this cannot in any case, according to Mannheim, be the last word:

> If we take into account the whole of Max Weber's work, … then we come to that conclusion which constitutes the standpoint of the younger generation of German sociologists, namely that … we cannot separate spheres of economic and social change on the one hand from the sphere of change in mental development on the other. The greater art of the sociologist consists in his attempt always to relate changes in mental attitudes to changes in social situations. (Mannheim [1934] 1953, 219)

Mannheim, in short, initiated his research group into a common "standpoint" which was itself sufficiently contested to allow for many differences and adjustments while excluding all "closed" orthodox political or scholastic alternatives (Mannheim 2001).

On Mannheim's reading, the prime value-relevance around which Max Weber's work was organized is his projection of a "crisis of culture" associated with the social developments attending the rise of capitalism and the modern state.[2] Beginning with Mannheim's own study of the historically and socially diverse modes of ambition, taken as a prime factor subject to change as a result of modernity, we can situate the studies we have examined around this loosely defined center point. Elias explores the functional conditions for the rigidities built into the "courtly society" of prerevolutionary France, rendering it fatally incapable of blending its political rationality with the social rationalities attending the new capacities and needs of the commercial age. Gerth and Weil find openings in the slower developing German states for a more adaptive conjunction between intellectuals and agents of social and political power, at least for the comparatively short term. Truhel's study can be seen as an application of findings common to the studies by Gerth, Weil, and Mannheim, in that she explores the consequences of recontextualizing bureaucrats in settings where the ideal-typical configurations of the passively instrumental ideal type are opened to offsetting factors to yield a less rigid practice. The novel factor of central interest not only to Truhel but also to both Halperin and Freudenthal is the emergence of women as independent factors in social life. Freudenthal, like Truhel, sees the possibility of new adaptations in the sphere she considers, as well as the operations of a new dynamic that holds promise of rendering social relations less harsh. For Katz, in contrast, the new development is problematic. The new class of social actors he studies comprises assimilated Jews admitted to the intellectual stratum, although, like Halperin, he questions the genuineness and longevity of the adjustment. Rubinstein's émigrés are outsiders, like Katz's assimilated Jews, and they are similarly precluded from contributing to genuine openness and capacity for collective learning. Looking at the collective work from this distance, the striking thing is how closely it tracks

2 On "value-relevance" and historical diagnosis in Weber, see Zaret 1980.

Mannheim's acceptance of Weber's diagnosis of a crisis along with his distinctive and familiar insistence on the promise as well as pain in that moment of stress and disorientation.[3]

It was Mannheim's hope to reconstitute his research group in England for the purpose of pursuing this line of inquiry, now that its projections had been so dramatically crystallized by events in Germany. In the first months of his emigration from Germany, accordingly, Mannheim initiated a correspondence with the Paris office of the Rockefeller Foundation, in search of a large stipend to fund a study of "The Sociological Causes of the Cultural Crisis in the Era of Mass-Democracies and Autarchies." (RF, RG1.1/401S/73/969) The research was to be conducted by an interdisciplinary working group of émigrés, some of them his contemporaries, but most taken from the cohort of his Frankfurt students. For the interdisciplinary core, Mannheim proposed the psychologist, Theodor Reik, the social historian, Alfred von Martin, the political scientist, Sigmund Neumann, and the legal sociologist, Franz L. Neumann—scholars of Mannheim's own generation, several of whom had been close to him in Heidelberg or Frankfurt. Franz Neumann, in fact, after a career as labor lawyer in Weimar, had begun work on a second doctorate at the London School of Economics, with Mannheim as influential second reader (Neumann 1986).[4] The "young social scientists," on Mannheim's list comprised five members of his Frankfurt working group, as well as a close associate from his Heidelberg years: Ernest K. Bramsted, Norbert Elias, W. Falk, Hans Gerth, Svend Riemer, and Albert Salomon (Woldring 1987, 40). A certain similarity to—and continuity with—the Frankfurt workshop organization is clear, except that the participants would now be dependent on the project for their livelihood in exile, and the project as a whole would be dependent in turn on the financial support of an agency whose own agenda was unrelated to the cultural-political design that had given Mannheim his foundation in Frankfurt.[5]

Like the social scientists centered on Max Horkheimer's Institute for Social Research and its counterpart at Alvin Johnson's New School in New York, the group that Mannheim hoped to found was expressly intended, first, to serve as a focal point for "German Sociology" in exile, giving institutional form to Mannheim's distinctive vision of the field, as well as, second, to serve as well as a collective bargaining agent for negotiations with the "American Sociology" that Mannheim recognized, even before his emigration to England, as prime

---

3 On Mannheim's distinction between Weber's pessimism and the hopefulness of his own generation, see Kettler and Meja 1996.

4 This published version of the 1936 dissertation does not include Neumann's acknowledgment of his debt to Mannheim. See Kettler and Meja 1995, 196–7.

5 For an account of the Prussian government's design for sociology, see Loader and Kettler 2002, 50–64, 177–82. A 1934 Report on the Rockefeller Social Science Program can be found in the Rockefeller Foundation Archives (RF) 3/900/22/70.

competitor and resource. [6] Mannheim's attempt failed, although the proposal was by no means dismissed out of hand, and it merits some attention here mainly because the project itself confirms the importance to Mannheim of the emphasis we have placed throughout on the various institutional forms of learning, notably the inter-disciplinary working group. Mannheim's failure in this matter, moreover, also sheds light on the conditions of his earlier success, notably the "open group" as a forum for collaborative inquiry familiar in Germany and the availability of Max Weber as a recognized common patron.[7]

Mannheim's research proposal turns on what he identified as Weber's central theme, the diagnosis of a "cultural crisis," a concept that, in Mannheim's usage, depends on a disjunction between "culture" and "barbarism," with the former concept comprehending capacities for reflecting upon and communicating meanings within organized social entities in terms congruent with "Christian-Humanist" values and practices, in some or many of their diverse modalities, as well as with the progressive rationalities of modern productive and social technologies. The question is why the culture that brilliantly managed this balance during the nineteenth century was now in a potentially fatal crisis. In a section headed "What do we want to know?" Mannheim first recapitulates familiar markers of the great progress in production, communication and scientific rationality characterizing the modern age, but then speaks of the "onset" everywhere "of counteracting negative forces." "Turn where we will," he writes, "we see a gradual psychic and spiritual regression; a radical decline of the general level of culture; and a universal and hopeless lack of counsel and guidance." (Mannheim, "The Sociological Causes of the Cultural Crisis in the Era of Mass-Democracies and Autarchies. Outline of Research Project." [RF, RG1.1/401S/73/969, 4])

To address this question, Mannheim contends, it is necessary, first, to understand the social conditions on which culture in this sense depends, second, to understand why those social conditions are ever less present, and third, to ascertain whether anything can be done to offset the decline. He proposes to begin with a series of historical studies, offering a list that puts a new gloss on the research programme of the Frankfurt Liberalism workshop, with the relationship between court culture and bureaucratization (Elias and Rubinstein) as well as the non-aristocratic culture

6 An excellent summary statement of his plan by Alvin Johnson is in a letter to Alfred Cohn (10 February 1939), RF, RG1.1/200/338/4029. Mannheim was invited to join the founding New School group, whose first recruiter was his German academic patron, Emil Lederer, but he evidently made his participation conditional on an arrangement that one source, doubtless exaggerating, characterized as "a school of social thought that revolved around his own ideas." Rutkoff, and Scott, 99–100. See Kettler/Meja 1995, 190n9. In 1940, when the London School of Economics prevailed on the Rockefeller Foundation to help it find a place for Mannheim during the war years, Mannheim again turned down an offer of an initial two-year term at the New School, funded by the Foundation. RF, RG1.1/401S/73/969.

7 Kettler and Meja 1995 argue that Mannheim missed an opportunity to do more in this direction with the legacy of John Stuart Mill.

of social minorities in the liberal era (Gerth, Weil, Freudenthal, Haussig, Katz, Bramstedt, Freund) occupying an important part on a list that also extends back into the medieval ages and forward to the era of modern mass democracy and dictatorship (Truhel, Carlé). The analytical sections were to focus on the last two historical units, whose conjunction is an important part of Mannheim's argument. This phase of the study was to be divided between the cultural concomitants of unorganized and organized social factors, with the former subdivided into the study of elites, publics, and the "embedment" of both in the social structure as a whole. The study of organized social factors then was to deal with various steering mechanisms, all comprehended under the concept of planning, but including the diverse effects of various forms of organization, in schooling as well as in the acquisition of knowledge. Methodologically, Mannheim hoped to call on a variety of specialized disciplines, notably psychology, and he lists four classes of methods, beginning with what he calls the "theoretical-constructive" method and extending to historical, comparative and various "empirical" techniques familiar from American practice. The sociologist, however, had to serve as coordinator, since it was his field that generated the questions.

In formulating the proposal, Mannheim made it clear that he expected the research to find a major source of culture in the constitution of elites, notably the three or four varieties of intellectual elites, as well as the formation of publics, with the critical difficulties arising out of mass-democratization and its implicit proliferation and destabilization of elites. Mannheim had already made this argument in an article completed before his emigration, in the context of inquiring into forms of political education capable of building on the liberating elements in democratization, but now the question was about cultural planning in a new, technical sense (Mannheim 1956, 171–246; see Loader and Kettler 2002, 183–8). And the plan for a research group implied an opening up of the thesis, subjecting it, at the least, to subtilization, as was also true of Mannheim's original account of the competition between liberalism and conservatism.

Mannheim's inability to convey the sense of this type of open research organization to the officers of the Rockefeller Foundation undercut the substantial initial appeal of his proposal to at least some of them. John Van Sickle, writing to the New York office from Paris in May 1934, cautiously suggests that "Mannheim is on the track of a problem that is fundamental to any understanding of the international relations of today," and closes his six-page report with the judgment that "the proposal is appealing both because of its potential importance and because it would provide an excellent type of training for younger scholars and help to salvage some of the exceptionally able younger German scholars who have not yet been taken care of." Some months later, however, he records a minute that the more senior officials are firm against reconsidering Mannheim's plan, especially because it is, in their view, "merely an individual piece of research, even though a number of people cooperate in sub-ordinate capacities." The only organizational design that the Rockefeller Foundation would consider required prior sponsorship by an academic department and some headway under these auspices, since this

would provide prima facie evidence that the "undertaking, if more amply financed, would exercise a constructive influence upon the general development of British historical (*sic*) research."[8] It is interesting that a research plan called "Studies in Democracy" that Mannheim submitted in 1941 to the Publications Committee of the Royal Institute of International Affairs was similarly perceived, even by the committee member most friendly to the extensive, interdisciplinary design, who said that he "would like to see it funded … but only if the proposal were that Dr Mannheim should run a seminar of young research workers, who might fairly be regarded as his disciples, and whose function would be to enable him to paint a larger canvas than his individual brush could cover (a relation something like that of Rubens' pupils to Rubens)."[9]

No less important than Mannheim's difficulty in making his proposed multilateral if also asymmetrical research organization credible to American and English research administrators was the unavailability of an iconic figure like Max Weber to stand in for interdisciplinarity and for the interplay between "theoretical" and "empirical" layers of analysis. In all records of the Rockefeller Foundation, beginning with a survey of German social science institutions in 1932, reinforced by a profile supplied by Joseph Schumpeter in 1933 and extending throughout the correspondence between the London School of Economics and the Foundation about Mannheim during the later 1930s, Mannheim is seen as someone engaged in "philosophical-historical" research and accordingly marginal to the substantive priorities of the Social Science programme (Kettler and Meja 1995, 190–91). The result was a self-fulfilling prophecy, in a manner of speaking, since the programmatic article on "The Crisis of Culture in the Era of Mass-Democracies and

8 Memorandum, dated Paris, 4 May 1934 and Minute, dated New York, 12 November 1934. Both documents are in RF, RG1.1/401S/73/969. See Kettler and Meja 1995, 179–82. Bronislaw Malinowski, who was Mannheim's strongest supporter at the London School of Economics and who urged his cause in a visit to the Paris Rockefeller Foundation office in December, 1934, accepted this department-centered institutionalist approach, but clearly has a different assessment of the potential effects of Mannheim's project:

> Malinowski feels that the whole of the sociological programme of the London School of Economics needs reconstruction and that it would gain greatly if its interests could be centred upon a definite problem, so far as the research programme is concerned. It was from this point of view he had been particularly interested in Mannheim's proposal.

Tracy B. Kittredge to John Van Sickle, 21 December 1934. File number as above.

9 At the urgings of A.D. Lindsay, Mannheim was commissioned to prepare a plan of research and responded with fifteen single-spaced pages, "Studies in Democracy: A Research Plan" (Lindsay Papers, University of Keele Archives), encompassing ten vast topics and a scheme for "an organic synthesis in which the group work as an entity and try to agree on the scope of the work, the methods to be used, and to watch the natural ramifications of the problems rather than their traditional departmental aspects." The topics ranged across functional, idealist, psychological, historical, structural, and cultural approaches, with a list of questions for each, and the plan ended with the theme of "democratic reconstruction." Lindsay Papers. See Kettler and Meja 1995, 280–1.

Autarchies" that he published in *The Sociological Review* in April, 1934 became the springboard for his speculative and over-ambitious advocacy of "planning" instead of serving, like the 1930 paper on economic ambition—and as it might also have done—to stimulate a multi-disciplinary research programme.

The setting for these difficulties is, of course, the condition of exile, which did indeed leave Mannheim and his cohort with some bargaining power insofar as they shared in the prestige of German science and benefited somewhat from the moral authority of their status as victims, but which left most of them largely helpless when it came to the structuring of scholarly work. That is one respect in which Mannheim's principal competitors in emigration, the groups around Horkheimer and the New School, had a decided advantage, by virtue of the independent funding of the former and the extraordinary support of a well-connected sponsor in the latter case. To put this in terms of Mannheim's largely self-explanatory typology of elites, the exiles overwhelmingly lacked leverage at the level of political and organizational elites and consequently had to depend overly much on their conditional access to "scholastic" and "artistically-religious" ones (RF, RG1.1/401S/73/969, 9). In Mannheim's case, his bids to the "scholastic" elites in both England and the United States proved disappointing, and the recognition he received during the last seven or eight years of his life was dependent on his acceptance among a hospitable but very self-assured segment of the elite whose function was "to translate society itself into symbols and pictures," the evangelical Christian circle organized around the Moot and concerned with the "Crisis of Christianity." This led to a stereotyping of his role into that of "the sociologist" serving as secular auxiliary to the principal publicistic and inspirational undertakings of the group. Mannheim's English publications are clearly marked by these circumstances (Kettler and Meja, 1995, 251–88; Loader 1985, 149–58).

Under these circumstances, the other members of the group had to make their own ways, drawing on their individual resources and opportunities to build their own intellectual careers. As noted earlier, the conditions of social research in both Germany and emigration effectively excluded almost all of the women from continuing their scientific work. Truhel and Haussig returned to the ranks of social workers, as far as can be ascertained; Freudenthal remarried in Palestine and worked in her husband's business; Rubinstein served as translator at the United Nations; Halperin lived a domestic life in American exile; and Freund became a prominent photographer.[10] The stories of the male members of the group are richer in scientific yield, although none escaped the costs of exile. It is fair to

10 Mannheim served as mentor, if not as formal supervisor, of Viola Klein's dissertation on "*The Feminine Character: History of an Ideology*" in the last years of his life. Although the work was an application of Mannheim's "sociology of knowledge" approach to some principal social science writers on women, Mannheim treated its substance with considerable coolness in the introduction he agreed to write and he interestingly put prime emphasis on the continuity between Klein's design and the interdisciplinarity that he had pursued with his students in Frankfurt. This is not the place to probe deeper into the

say, moreover, that all can be seen to have learned from the time with Mannheim, notwithstanding their common course of taking some distance from him. Norbert Elias had the most extraordinary career, gaining enough recognition to be accounted as having founded a prominent school, but not until after some twenty-five years of obscurity. Hans Gerth published a collection of texts by Max Weber that has served as a prime documentary source in American sociology for over sixty years, as well as an essayistic textbook that addressed the Weberian question of "character and social structure" in a manner much reminiscent of the social-historical method of Mannheim's working group, although both publications were done in collaboration with C. Wright Mills, an American sociologist and publicist, who gained greater professional benefit from the publications. Jacob Katz had a brilliant career as a historian at the University of Jerusalem, while Ernest K. Bramsted arrived at a respected position in the history department of the University of Sydney. Wilhelm Carlé and Hans Weil did not have noticeable academic careers in American exile, although Weil published an inspirational book on education during the war years. Hans Speier was a key figure in the New School circle and then, after wartime government service, gained a key organizational role as head of the RAND Corporation, a prime agency of government research during the Cold War years. Kurt H. Wolff, as noted, differed from the others in making Mannheim's "sociology of knowledge" the center of his life-long investigation. Except in the case of Wolff, remarkably enough, there is no evidence that any of the members of the group engaged in intellectual exchanges with Mannheim after they separated from him. Exile totally disrupted the dynamics of the group, and its legacy was widely scattered.

Our objective in reassembling its components has been to provide a wider context for the promising exercises in retrieval that are presently under way. The striking thing about them is the extent to which they engage precisely the texts that are closest to the manner and matter of the research programme we have examined. In March 2006, for example, Anton Sterbling and two collaborators organized a conference on Karl Mannheim, with a view especially to considering the meaning of his work for research on Eastern Europe. Especially striking in the proceedings is the attention paid by contributors to Mannheim's studies of generations and intellectuals, both approached precisely within a frame of reference congruent with Weberian sociology (Balla, Sparschuh and Sterbling 2007).[11] There are more philosophical studies as well, of course, notably a review of the methodological extrapolations from Mannheim's writings in sociology of culture initiated by ethnomethodology and recently renewed by Ralf Bohnsack, Amalia Barboza,

possible links between Mannheim's conservative associations and his declining interest in the advancement of women. See Kettler and Meja 1995, 294–314.

11 See especially the articles by Johannes Weiß, Vera Sparschuh, Sigita Kraniauskiene, Miklos Havelka, Marek Czyzewski, Frank Ettering, and Anton Sterbling.

and others.[12] In numerous publications and conference presentations, moreover, Sighard Neckel has built on Mannheim's study of "success" (*Erfolg*) (Neckel 2001 and 2002). In our view, these current receptions would be strengthened by the fuller understanding of Mannheim's complex and complementary research strategies we have sought to provide—and by familiarity with the research results of the group he formed and animated during his short years in Frankfurt, which we consider to be the most fruitful and most wrongly neglected period of his career.

12 For an overview of Bohnsack's extensive work along these lines, see his contribution ("Wissenssoziologie als Methode: Mannheims Beitrag zum Paradigmawechsel") to Balla, Sparschuh and Sterbling 2007. See also Barboza 2006.

This page intentionally left blank

Bibliography

Arendt, H. ([1930] 1990), "Philosophy and Sociology," in V. Meja and N. Stehr (1990), 196–208.

—— (2007), "Review of Hans Weil, *The Emergence of the German Principle of Bildung*," in Arendt, *Reflections on Literature and Culture* (Palo Alto, CA: Stanford), 24–30.

Arendt, H. and Jaspers, K. ([1985]1992), *Correspondence 1926–1969* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich).

Averbeck, S. (1999), *Kommunikation als Prozess: Soziologische Perspektiven in der Zeitungswissenschaft, 1927–1934* (Münster: Lit).

Backhaus, G. and Psathas, G. (eds) (2006), *The Sociology of Radical Commitment: Kurt H Wolff's Existential Turn* (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books).

Baehr, P. (2001), "The 'Iron Cage' and the 'Shell as Hard as Steel': Parsons, Weber, and the *Stahlhartes Gehäuse* Metaphor in *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*," *History and Theory* 40, 153–169.

Balla, B., Sparschuh, V. and Sterbling, A. (eds) (2007), *Karl Mannheim. Leben, Werk, Wirkung und Bedeutung für die Osteuropaforschung* (Hamburg: Krämer).

Barboza, A. (2005), *Kunst und Wissen. Die Stilanalyse in der Soziologie Karl Mannheims* (Konstanz: UKV).

—— (2006), "Distanzierung als Beruf: Karl Mannheims soziologischer Ansatz als 'Innovationstendenz' der deutschen Soziologie," in Barboza and Henning 2006, 232–255.

—— (2007), "Die verpassten Chancen einer Kooperation zwischen der 'Frankfurter Schule' und Karl Mannheims Soziologischem Seminar," in R. Faber and E. Ziege (eds), *Das Feld der Frankfurter Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften nach 1945.* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann), 63–87.

Barboza, A. and Henning, C. (eds) (2006), *Deutsch-jüdische Wissensschaftsschicksale. Studien über Identitätskonstruktionen in der Sozialwissenschaft* (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag).

Blomert, R. (1999), *Intellektuelle im Aufbruch: Karl Mannheim, Alfred Weber, Norbert Elias und die Heidelberger Sozialwissenschaften der Zwischenkriegszeit* (Munich and Vienna: Carl Hanser).

Blomert, R. et al. (eds) (1997), *Heidelberger Sozial- und Staatswissenschaften; Das Institut für Sozial- und Staatswissenschaften zwischen 1918 und 1958* (Marburg: Metropolis).

Boas, J. (1981), "German Jewry's Search for Renewal in the Hitler Era as Reflected in the Major Jewish Newspapers (1933–1938)," *Journal of Modern History*, 53 (On Demand Supplement), D1001–24.

Bourdieu, P. (1998), *Vom Gebrauch der Wissenschaft. Für eine klinische Soziologie des wissenschaftlichen Feldes* (Konstanz: UVK).
Bramsted, E. (1964), *Aristocracy and the Middle-Classes in Germany: Social Types in German Literature 1830–1900* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
Bruun, H. (1972), *Science, Values and Politics in Max Weber's Methodology* (Copenhagen: Munksgaard).
Burger, T. (1987), *Max Weber's Theory of Concept Formation* (Durham: Duke University Press).
Carlé, W. (1931), *Weltanschauung und Presse. Eine Soziologische Untersuchung* (Leipzig: Hirschfeld).
Collini, S. (1979), *Liberalism & Sociology: L.T. Hobhouse and Political Argument in England 1880–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
Damico, A. (1978), *Individuality and Community. The Social Thought of John Dewey* (Gainesville: University Presses of Florida).
Demm, E. (1999), *Von der Weimarer Republik zur Bundesrepublik. Der politische Weg Alfred Webers 1920–1958* (Düsseldorf: Droste).
Dewey, J. ([1930] 1962), *Individualism Old and New* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons).
—— ([1935] 1960), *Liberalism and Social Action* (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons).
Elias, N. ([1933] 1983), *The Court Society,* trans. E. Jephcott (New York: Pantheon).
—— ([1939] 2000), *The Civilizing Process: Sociogenetic and Psychogenetic Investigations*, trans. E. Jephcott, rev. ed. E. Dunning, J. Goudsblom and S. Mennell (Oxford: Blackwell).
—— (1990),"Notizen zum Lebenslauf," in *Norbert Elias_über sich selbst* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp).
—— (2006), "The sociology of anti-Semitism," in Elias, *Early Writings*, ed. R. Kilminster, transl. E. Jephcott (Dublin: University College Dublin Press), 77–83.
Endreß, M. and Srubar, I. (eds) (2000), *Karl Mannheims Analyse der Moderne. Jahrbuch für Soziologiegeschichte 1996* (Opladen: Leske + Budrich).
Evans, R. J. (1976), *The Feminist Movement in Germany 1894–1933* (London and Beverly Hills: Sage).
Fairchild, E. (1987), "Women Police in Weimar: Professionalism, Politics, and Innovation in Police Organizations," *Law and Society Review*, 21, 375–402.
Freudenthal, M. (1986), *Gestaltwandel der städtischen, bürgerlichen und proletarischen Hauswirtschaft* (Frankfurt/Main: Ullstein).
Freund, G. (1936), *La Photographie en France au Dix-Neuvième Siécle* (Paris: Maison des Amis des Livres).
—— (1974a), *Photographie et Société* (Paris: Editions du Seuil).
—— (1974b), *Photography and Society* (Boston: Godine).
—— (1976), *Photographie und Gesellschaft* (Munich: Rogner & Bernhard).

Freyer H. (1930), *Soziologie als Wirklichkeitswissenschaft: Logische Grundlegung des Systems der Soziologie* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner).
Gerth, H. ([1935] 1976), *Bürgerliche Intelligenz um 1800. Zur Soziologie des deutschen Frühliberalismus* (Göttingen: Vandenkoeck & Ruprecht).
—— (1954), "Friedrich Buchholz. Auch ein Anfang der Soziologie," *Zeitschrift für die gesamte Staatswissenschaft* 110, 665–92.
—— (1985), "Speier's Critique of Karl Mannheim," *State, Culture and Society* 1, 198–208.
Gerth, N. (2000), "Karl Mannheim and Hans Gerth," in Endreß and Srubar (2000), 127–44.
—— (2002), *"Between Two Worlds," Hans Gerth. Eine Biographie, 1908–1978. Jahrbuch für Soziologiegeschichte 1999/2000* (Opladen: Leske +Budrich).
Gluck, M. (1985), *Georg Lukács and His Generation, 1900–1918* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
Greffrath, M. (ed.) (1979), *Die Zerstörung einer Zukunft. Gespräche mit emigrierten Sozialwissenschaftlern* (Reinbek: Rowohlt).
Greven-Aschoff, B. (1981), *Die bürgerliche Frauenbewegung in Deutschland 1894–1933* (Reinbek: Rowohlt).
Halperin, N. (1935), *Die deutschen Schriftstellerinnen in der zweiten Hälfte des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Quakenbrück: Handelsdruckerei C. Trute).
Hammerstein, N. (1989), *Die Johann-Wolfgang-Goethe-Universität. Frankfurt am Main. Von der Stiftungsuniversität zur staatlichen Hochschule.* Band I. *1914 bis 1950* (Neuwied: Alfred Metzner).
Haussig, F. (1934), *W.H. Riehl. Ursprünge der mittelständischen Soziologie in Deutschland* (Koblenz: Görres).
Heimann, E. (1980), *Soziale Theorie des Kapitalismus. Theorie der Sozialpolitik* (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp).
Henning, C. (2006), "'Der übernationale Gedanke der geistigen Einheit'. Gottfried Salomon (-Delatour), der vergessene Soziologe der Verständigung," in Barboza and Henning (2006), 42–94.
Herrmann, U. (1976), "Vorwort," in H. Gerth ([1935]1976), 7–15, 81–83.
Honegger, C. (1993), "Jüdinnen in der frühen deutschspachigen Soziologie," in M. Jansen and I. Nordmann (eds), *Lektüren und Brüche. Jüdische Frauen in Kultur, Politik und Wissenschaft* (Wiesbaden: Hessische Landeszentrale für politische Bildung), 178–195.
—— (1994), "Die bittersüße Freiheit der Halbdistanz. Die ersten Soziologinnen im deutschen Sprachraum," in T. Wobbe and G. Lindemann, *Denkachsen. Zur theoretischen und institutionellen Rede vom Geschlecht* (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp), 69–85.
Honneger, C., Jost, H.-U., Burren, S., Jurt, P. (eds) (2007), *Konkurrierende Deutungen des Sozialen. Geschichts-, Sozial- und Wirtschaftswissenschaften im Spannungsfeld von Politik und Wissenschaft* (Zürich: Chronos).
Hong, Y. (1998), *Welfare, Modernity, and the Weimar State, 1919–1933* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Huff, T. (1984), *Max Weber and the Methodology of the Social Sciences* (New Brunswick: Transaction Books).
HyperElias <http://hyperelias.jku.at/EliasTheses_1933.htm>
Jansen, C. (1997), "Das Institut der Außenseiter. Inneruniversitäre Spannungen und Öffentlichkeit," in R. Blomert et al. (1997), 25–54.
Kalberg, S. (1994), *Max Weber's Comparative-Historical Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press).
Kadarkay, A. (1991), *Georg Lukács: Life, Thought and Politics* (Cambridge, MA and Oxford: Basil Blackwell).
Katz, Jacob ([1935] 1972), "Die Entstehung der Judenassimilation in Deutschland und deren Ideologie," in J. Katz, *Emancipatation and Assimilation. Studies in Modern Jewish History* (Westmead: Gregg International).
—— (1995), *With My Own Eyes* (Hanover, NH: Brandeis University Press).
Kedar, B. Z. (1998), "Soziologische Geschichtsschreibung: Jacob Katz als Schüler Karl Mannheims," *Jüdischer Almanach 1998/5758 des Leo Baeck Instituts* (Frankfurt am Main: Jüdischer Verlag), 79–86.
Kettler, D. (1967), "Sociology of Knowledge and Moral Philosophy: The Place of Traditional Problems in the Formation of Mannheim's Thought," *Political Science Quarterly* 82, 399–426.
—— (1971), "Marxism and Culture," *Telos* 10, 35–92.
—— (1987), "The Reconstitution of the Welfare State: A Latent Social-Democratic Legacy," *Law and Society Review* 21, 9–47.
—— (2000), "Wie kam es zu Nina Rubinsteins Promotion?" in Rubinstein (2000), 74–85.
—— (2001), *Domestic Regimes, the Rule of Law, and Democratic Social Change*, (Berlin and Cambridge MA: Galda & Wilch Glienecke).
—— (2003), "Self-Knowledge and Sociology: Nina Rubinstein's Studies in Exile," in E. Timms and J. Hughes (eds), *Intellectual Migration and Cultural Transformation* (Vienna and New York: Springer), 195–206.
—— (2003b), "The Secret of Mannheim's Success," in E. Demm (ed.), *Soziologie, Politik und Kultur. Von Alfred Weber zur Frankfurter Schule* (Frankfurt/Main: Peter Lang).
—— (2005), "The Symbolic Uses of Exile: Erich Kahler at Ohio State University," in A. Stephan (ed.), *Exile and Otherness* (Oxford and Berne: Peter Lang), 269–310.
—— (2007), "Das Geheimnis des bemerkenswerten Aufstiegs Karl Mannheims," in Balla, Sparschuh and Sterbling (2007), 149–67.
—— (2008), "Erste Briefe: Ausverkauf des Exils?" *Zeitschrift für Ideengeschichte*.
Kettler, D. and Lauer, G. (eds) (2005), *Exile, Science and Bildung: The Contested Legacies of the German Intellectual Emigrants* (New York: Palgrave-Macmillan).
Kettler, D. and Loader, C. (2004), "Temporizing with Time Wars. Karl Mannheim and the Problems of Historical Time," *Time & Society* 13, 155–72.

Kettler, D. and Meja, V. (1985), “Settling with Mannheim: Comments on Speier and Oestereicher,” *State, Culture and Society* 1, 225–37.

—— (1993), “Their ‘Own Peculiar Way’: Karl Mannheim and the Rise of Women,” *International Sociology*, 8, 5–55.

—— (1994), “‘That typically German kind of sociology which verges towards philosophy’: The Dispute about *Ideology and Utopia* in the United States.” *Sociological Theory* 12, 279–303.

—— (1995), *Karl Mannheim and the Crisis of Liberalism. The Secret of These New Times* (New Brunswick: Transaction).

—— and Meja, V. (1996), “Legal Formalism and Disillusioned Realism in Max Weber,” *Polity* 28, 307–31.

Kettler, D., Meja, V., Stehr, N. (1984), “Karl Mannheim and Conservatism: The Ancestry of Historical Thinking,” *American Sociological Review* 49, 71–85.

Kilminister, R., (2007), *Norbert Elias. Post-philosophical Sociology* (London and New York: Routledge).

Klein, V. (1946), *The Feminine Character. History of an Ideology* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

König, Renè (1987), *Soziologie in Deutschland* (Munich and Vienna: Hanser).

Kohn-Bramstedt, E. (1931), “Probleme der Literatursoziologie,” *Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung* 7, 719–31.

Kracauer, S. ([1929] 1971), *Die Angestellten* (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp).

Kraus, K. (1952), *Die dritte Walpurgisnacht* (Munich: Koesel Verlag).

Krohn, C.-D. et al. (eds) (2000), *Exile im 20. Jahrhundert. Ein Internationales Jahrbuch.* Bd. 18 (Munich: edition text + kritik).

Kübler, F. et al. (1985), *Verrechtlichung von Wirtschaft, Arbeit, und Sozialer Solidarität* (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp).

Kuckhoff, G. (1972), *Vom Rosenkranz zur Roten Kapelle* (Berlin: Neues Leben).

Laube, R. (2000), “Mannheims ‘Kategorie der Bürgerlichkeit’: Bürgerlichkeit und Antibürgerlichkeit im Spiegel der Suche nach der ‘wirklichen Wirklichkeit,’” in Endreß and Srubar (2000), 263–91.

—— (2004), *Karl Mannheim und die Krise des Historismus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).

Lederer, E. and Marschak, J. (1926), “Der neue Mittelstand,” in G. Albrecht et al. (eds), *Grundriss der Sozialökonomik*, 9, 1 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck), 120–41.

Lehnert, E. (2003), *Die Beteiligung von Fürsorgerinnen an der Bildung und Umsetzung der Kategorie “minderwertig” im Nationalsozialismus* (Munich: Mabuse).

Lichtblau, Klaus (2008), “Der Streit um den Kulturbegriff in der Soziologie” in R. Faber and F. Hager (eds), *Rückkehr der Religion oder säkulare Kultur? Kultur-und Religionssoziologie heute* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann), 55–72.

Lingelbach, K. (2006), “Die Aufgabe der Erziehung in der weltweiten Strukturkrise des Kapitalismus,” in M. Brumlik and B. Ortmeyer (eds),

Erziehungswissenschaft und Pädagogik in Frankfurt—eine Geschichte in Portraits (Frankfurt/Main: Johann Wolfgang Goethe Universität), 13–28.

Loader, C. (1976), “German Historicism and Its Crisis,” *Journal of Modern History* 48 (On-Demand Supplement), D85–119.

—— (1985), *The Intellectual Development of Karl Mannheim* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

—— (2007), “Karl Mannheim’s Heidelberg Letters,” in Balla, Sparschuh and Sterbling (2007), 129–147.

Loader, C. and Kettler, D. (2002), *Karl Mannheim’s Sociology as Political Education* (New Brunswick: Transaction).

Ludes, P. (ed.) (1997), *Sozialwissenschaften als Kunst* (Konstanz: UVK).

Lukács, G. (1915), “Zum Wesen und zur Methode der Kultursoziologie,” *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 39, 216–22.

Mannheim, K. ([1922–24] 1982), *Structures of Thinking*, transl. J.J.Shapiro and S. Weber Nicholsen, ed. D.Kettler, V. Meja, N. Stehr (London and New York: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

—— ([1924] 1970 [1952]), “Historismus” [“Historicism”], in Mannheim (1970), 246–307 [in Mannheim (1952), 84–133].

—— ([1925] 1986), *Conservatism: A Contribution to the Sociology of Knowledge*, trans. and D. Kettler and V. Meja, ed. D. Kettler, V. Meja and N. Stehr (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

—— ([1926] 1993), “The Ideological and Sociological Interpretation of Intellectual Phenomena,” in Mannheim, *From Karl Mannheim* (New Brunswick: Transaction), 244–59.

—— ([1927] 1970), “Das konservative Denken,” in Mannheim, *Wissenssoziologie. Auswahl aus dem Werk*, ed. K.H. Wolff (Berlin und Neuwied: Luchterhand), 408–508.

—— ([1927] 1953), “Conservative Thought,” in Mannheim, *Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology*, ed. P. Kecskemeti (London: Routlege & Kegan Paul), 74–164.

—— ([1928] 1952), “The Sociological Problem of Generations,” in Mannheim (1952), 276–320.

—— (1929] 1969), *Ideologie und Utopie* (Frankfurt/Main: G. Schulte-Bulmke).

—— [1930] 1970 [1952]), “Über das Wesen und die Bedeutung des wirtschaftlichen Erfolgsstrebens” [“On the Nature of Economic Ambition and Its Significance for the Social Education of Man”], in Mannheim (1970), 625–87 [Mannheim (1952), 230–75].

—— ([1930] 2001), “An Introduction to Sociology,” in Mannheim (2001), 1–78.

—— ([1931] 1969 [1968]), “Wissenssoziologie” [“The Sociology of Knowledge”], in Mannheim (1969), 227–67 [Mannheim (1968), 237–80].

—— ([1931–2] 2001), “Lectures on Method,” in Mannheim (2001), 158–68.

—— (1932), *Die Gegenwartsaufgaben der Soziologie* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

—— ([1932] 1993), "The Sociology of Intellectuals," transl. D. Pels, in *Theory, Culture & Society* 10,3 (August), 69–80.

—— [1933], Letter to G. Jászi, 16 January 1933, in Oscar Jászi Papers, Columbia University Library, Rare Books and Manuscript Library (New York).

—— [1934] "The Crisis of Culture in the Age of Mass-Democracies and Autarchies," *Sociological Review* 26, 105–29.

—— ([1934] 1953), "German Sociology (1918–1933)," in Mannheim (1953), 209–228.

—— ([1936] 1953), "The Place of Sociology," in Mannheim (1953), 195–208.

—— ([1936] 1968), *Ideology and Utopia* (New York: Harcourt, Brace).

—— (1940), *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

—— (1952), *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*, ed. P. Kecskemeti (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

—— (1953), *Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology*, ed. P. Kecskemeti (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

—— (1956), *Essays on the Sociology of Culture*, ed. E. Mannheim and P. Kecskemeti (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul).

—— (1970), *Wissenssoziologie*, ed. K. Wolff (Neuwied: Luchterhand).

—— (1985), "Heidelberger Briefe," in E. Karádi and E. Vezér (eds), *Georg Lukács, Karl Mannheim und der Sonntagskreis* (Frankfurt/Main: Sendler), 73–91.

—— (2001), *Sociology as Political Education*, ed. D. Kettler and C. Loader (New Brunswick: Transaction).

—— (2003), *Selected Correspondence (1911 to 1946) of Karl Mannheim, Scientist, Philosopher, and Sociologist*. Ed. E. Gabor, with assistance of D. Banki and R.T. Allen (Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen Press).

Mannheim, K. and Weber, A. ([1928] 2001), "The Intellectualism Dispute," in Mannheim (2001), 109–29.

Maybaum, I. (1929), "Ideologie und Utopie," *Jüdische Rundschau*, 101/102, 693.

Meinecke, F. ([1922] 1948), *Schaffender Spiegel* (Stuttgart: K. F. Koehler).

Meja, V. and Kettler, D. "Karl Mannheim", in Scott J. (ed.) *Fifty Key Sociologists* (London and New York: Routledge).

Meja, V. and Stehr, N. (eds) (1982), *Der Streit um die Wissenssoziologie*, two volumes (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp).

Meja, V. and Stehr, N. (eds) (1990), *Knowledge and Politics. The Sociology of Knowledge Dispute* (London and New York: Routledge).

Mennell, S. (1989), *Norbert Elias. Civilization and the Human Self-Image* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell).

Merton, R.K. ([1937] 1968), "The Sociology of Knowledge," in Merton *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press), 510–542.

—— ([1941] 1968), "Karl Mannheim and the Sociology of Knowledge", in Merton *Social Theory and Social Structure* (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press), 543–562.

Merz-Benz, P.-U. (1990), *Max Weber und Heinrich Rickert: Die erkenntnis-kritischen Grundlagen der verstehenden Soziologie* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann).

Montesquieu, C. (1777), "Defence of *The Spirit of the Laws*," *The Online Library of Liberty* (Liberty Fund <http://oll.libertyfund.org>).

Müller, C. and Staff, I. (eds) (1984), *Der soziale Rechtsstaat. Gedächtnisschrift für Hermann Heller 1891–1933* (Baden-Baden: Nomos).

Muller, J. (1987), *The Other God That Failed: Hans Freyer and the Deradicalization of German Conservatism* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Neckel, S. (2001), "'Leistung' und 'Erfolg'. Die symbolische Ordnung der Marktgesellschaft," in E. Barlösius et al. (eds), *Gesellschaftsbilder im Umbruch. Soziologische Perspektiven in Deutschland* (Opladen: Leske & Budrich), 103–117.

—— (2002), "Ehrgeiz, Reputation und Bewährung. Zur Theoriegeschichte einer Soziologie des Erfolgs," in G. Burkart and J. Wolf (eds), *Lebenszeiten. Erkundungen zur Soziologie der Generationen* (Opladen: Leske & Budrich), 103–117.

Neumann, F. (1986), *The Rule of Law. Political Theory and the Legal System in Modern Society* (Leamington Spa, Heidelberg and Dover: Berg).

Oakes, G. (1988), *Weber and Rickert: Concept Formation in the Cultural Sciences* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

Olsen, F. (1983), "The Family and the Market: A Study of Ideology and Legal Reform," *Harvard Law Review* 96.

Papanek, H. (2000), "'Patria auf Räder': Nina Rubinstein, 1908–1996," in Rubinstein (2000), 10–37.

Perels, J. (ed.) ([1954] 1984), *Recht, Demokratie und Kapitalismus* (Baden-Baden: Nomos).

Pross, H. (1976), *Die Wirklichkeit der Hausfrau* (Reinbek: Rowohlt).

Ratz. U. (1980), *Sozialreform und Arbeiterschaft* (Berlin: Colloquium Verlag).

Raith, D. (2000), "Nina Rubinsteins Beitrag zur Soziologie des Fremden," in Rubinstein (2000), 40–72.

Revue Internationale de Sociologie (1932), 40, 1; (1934), 42, 2.

Rubinstein, N. (2000), *Die französische Emigration nach 1789: Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie der politischen Emigration*, ed. Dirk Raith (Graz and Vienna: Nausner & Nausner).

Rutkoff, P. and Scott, W. (1986), *New School. A History of the New School for Social Research* (New York: The Free Press).

Rutschky, K. (1986), "Foreword" to Freudenthal (1986).

Sallis-Freudenthal, M. (1977), *Ich habe mein Land gefunden* (Frankfurt/Main: Knecht).

Salomon, Albert. (1926a), "Max Weber," *Die Gesellschaft* 3, 131–153.

—— (1926b), Reviews of Karl Jaspers, *Max Weber. Eine Gedenkrede* and Marianne Weber, *Max Weber. Ein Lebensbild*, *Die Gesellschaft*, 3, 186–90.

Salomon, Alice (1927), *Ausbildung zum sozialen Beruf* (Berlin: C. Heymann).

Scaff, L. (2004), “Max Weber and the Social Sciences in America,” *European Journal of Political Theory* 3, 121–32.

Schleiermacher, S. (1998), *Sozialethik im Spannungsfeld von Sozial- und Rassenhygenie* (Hussum: Matthiesen).

Schofeld, B. (2004), *Wirtschafts- und Sozialwissenschaftler in Frankfurt am Main* (Marburg: Metropolis).

Simmel, G. (1950), “The Stranger,”in G. Simmel, *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, ed. K. Wolff (New York: Free Press).

Sklar, M.J. (1988), *The Corporate Reconstruction of American Capitalism, 1890–1916* (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press).

Speier, H. (1929), “Die Geschichtsphilosophie Lasalles,” *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* 61, 103–27, 360–88.

—— ([1930] 1990), “Sociology or Ideology,” in Meja and Stehr (1990), 209–22.

—— ([1937] 1985), “Karl Mannheim’s *Ideology and Utopia*,” *State, Culture and Society*, 1, 183–97.

—— (1954), *Social Order and the Risks of War* (New York: Stewart).

—— (1986), *German White-Collar Workers and the Rise of Hitler* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

—— ([1969] 1989), “Mannheim as Sociologist of Knowledge,” in Speier (1989), 142–177.

—— (1989), *The Truth in Hell and Other Essays on Politics and Culture, 1935–1987* (New York: Oxford).

Steinmetz, G. (1993), *Regulating the Social. The Welfare State and Local Politics in Imperial Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).

Stichweh, R. (1994), *Wissenschaft, Universität, Professionen. Soziologische Analysen* (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp).

Truhel, K. (1934), *Sozialbeamte. Ein Beitrag zur Sozioanalyse der Bürokratie* (Sagan: Benjamin Krause).

—— (1972), “*Die Doppelbelastung der Frau. Ein Vorschlag zur Erleichterung*” in Ellen Gregori (ed.), *Stimme der Frau* (Bellinghausen: Hinder + Deelmann), 28–36.

Unger, R.M. (1985), *The Critical Legal Studies Movement* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Verzeichnis der Vorlesungen der Badischen Ruprechts-Universität zu Heidelberg für das Winterhalbjahr 1925/1926 bis Sommersemester 1930, <http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/VV1925WSbis1930SS/0094>.

Voigt, R. (ed.) (1980), *Verrechtlichung* (Königstein: Athenäum).

Wagner, G. and Zipprian, H. (eds) (1994), *Max Webers Wissenschaftslehre* (Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp).

Weber, A. (1913), “Programme m einer Sammlung ‘Schriften zur Soziologie der Kultur,’” in A. Weber (2000), 379–380.

—— ([1921] 2000), “Prinzipien zur Kultursoziologie. Gesellschaftsprozess, Zivilisationsprozess und Kulturbewegung,” in A. Weber (2000), 147–86.

—— ([1923] 1999), “Die Not der geistigen Arbeiter,” in A. Weber (1999), 601–38.

—— (1927), *Ideen zur Staats- und Kultursoziologie*, in A. Weber (2000), 34–117.
—— (1999), *Alfred Weber-Gesamtausgabe*, ed. E. Demm (Marburg: Metropolis) 7.
—— (2000), *Alfred Weber-Gesamtausgabe*, ed. R. Bräu (Marburg: Metropolis) 8.
Weber, Marianne (1907), *Ehefrau und Mutter in Rechtsentwicklung* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
Weber, M. ([1919a] 1946), "Science as a Vocation," in M. Weber (1946), 129–56.
—— ([1919b] 1946), "Politics as a Vocation," in M. Weber (1946), 77–128.
—— ([1920] 1946), "The Protestant Sects and the Spirit of Capitalism," in M. Weber (1946), 301–22.
—— (1946), *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, ed. H. Gerth and C. Mills (New York: Oxford University Press).
—— (1949), "'Objectivity' in Social Science and Social Policy," in M. Weber, *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, ed. E. Shils and H. Finch (New York: Free Press), 49–112.
—— ([1922] 1978), *Economy and Society*, ed. G. Roth and C. Wittich (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).
—— (2002a), *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*, trans. S. Kalberg (Los Angeles: Roxbury).
—— (2002b), *The Protestant Ethic and the "Spirit" of Capitalism and Other Writings,* trans. P. Baehr and G. Wells (New York and London: Penguin Books).
Weber-Kellermann, I. (1983), *Frauenleben im 19. Jahrhundert. Empire und Romantik, Biedermeier, Gründerzeit* (Munich: C.H. Beck).
Weil, H. (1967), *Die Entstehung des deutschen Bildungsprinzips*, 2nd ed. (Bonn: H. Bouvier).
Williams, R. (1972), *Culture in Exile* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
Willing, M. (2003), *Das Bewahrungsgesetz (1918–1967). Eine rechtshistorische Studie zur Geschichte der deutschen Fürsorge* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
Woldring, H. (1986), *Karl Mannheim: The Development of His Thought* (New York: St. Martin's).
Wolff, K.H. (1976), *Surrender and Catch: Experience and Inquiry Today*. Boston Studies in the Philosophy of Science vol. 51 (Dordrecht and Boston: Reidel).
—— (1988), "The Idea of Surrender-and-Catch Applied to the Phenomenon of Karl Mannheim," *Theory, Culture and Society* 5, 715–34.
—— (1989), *O Loma! Constituting a Self (1977–1984)* (Northhampton, MA: Hermes House).
—— (2000), "Die beiden geheimen Dichter," in Endreß and Srubar (2000), 145–8.
Zaret, D. (1980), "From Max Weber to Parsons and Schutz: The Eclipse of History in Modern Social Theory," *The American Journal of Sociology* 85, 1180–1201.

Index

Adler, Max, 180
Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik, 91
Arendt, Hannah, 4, 70, 73, 88
Averbeck, Stefanie, 155

Barboza, Amalia, 58–9, 64, 67, 194,
Benjamin, Walter, 185
Bergson, Henri, 24
Bergsträsser, Ludwig, 70, 86
Berlin, University of, 96
Bildung, 12, 20, 23, 34–5, 41, 47, 86–9, 96–98, 132, 134–40*,* 155–6, 158, 167, 172, 182 *see* education
Blomert, Reinhard, 14, 58
Bohnsack, Ralf, 194–5
Bourdieu, Pierre, 66–7, 93
Bramsted, Ernest K. (Ernst Kohn–Bramstedt), 153, 170–5, 185, 189, 191, 194
Brentano, Sophie von, 120
Brinkmann, Carl, 91
Brobeil, Wolfgang, 153
Buber, Martin, 70–1, 131, 140
Buchholz, Friedrich, 86, 89–91, 97, 165
Budapest, 23, 71, 146
bureaucracy, 5, 12, 14, 39–41, 44–54, 71, 73, 78, 80, 88, 90, 95–99, 101–105, 108–117, 119–20, 128–9, 135, 165, 188, 190

capitalism, 14, 25, 38, 48, 53, 121, 127, 154, 170, 188
Carlé, Wilhelm, 153, 155–8, 160, 191, 194
Catholic Social Work Association, 114
Child, Arthur, 181n
chiliasm, 30–31
Clarke, Fred, 65
Cohn, Alfred, 190
Comte, Auguste, 86, 180
conservatism, 5–6, 25, 27–30, 33, 41, 49, 71, 79, 86, 88, 91–5, 98, 109, 139, 157, 165–6, 169, 171–2, 191
constellation, 18–19, 23, 36, 87, 89, 92–5, 124
crisis, 4, 6, 8, 11–12, 23, 43, 60–63, 80–81, 84, 86–7, 101, 104–5, 108–9, 113–5, 127, 148, 150, 155, 159–60, 178, 188–9, 192–3
Cunz, Dieter, 180

Dahlke, H. Otto, 181
DeGré, Gerard, 181
Dewey, John, 128, 182
Dilthey, Wilhelm, 25, 87, 156, 180
distantiation, 12, 31, 64, 82, 133–4, 137, 140, 148. 163, 171
Dostoyevsky, Fyodor, 42–3
Durkheim, Emile, 86, 180

economics, 2–3, 5,–6, 11, 14–15, 33–55, 58, 60, 65, 68–9, 76, 78–80, 82–3, 90, 94–9, 107, 109–110, 120, 125–7, 132, 134–5, 138, 142, 145, 149, 154, 156, 168, 170, 175, 180, 188, 193
education, 6–7, 12, 14, 34, 46, 50–1, 55, 64, 66, 69, 89, 98–9, 102, 106–7, 109, 120–2, 125, 128, 131, 134, 158, 162, 170, 182, 191 *see Bildung*
Einstein, Albert, 29–30
Elias, Norbert, 12, 34, 60, 70, 75–85, 87, 101, 118, 133, 142, 144–7, 149, 151, 153–4, 159, 185, 188–90, 194
Engels, Friedrich, 180
exile (political emigration), 1, 3, 12, 23, 36, 59, 68, 77, 85, 87, 129, 141–51, 158, 164, 172, 175, 179–80, 183–4, 189, 191, 193–4

experimentalism, 9–10, 23, 28, 32, 41, 45, 47, 57, 59, 65, 68, 72, 92, 151, 176, 182, 184

Falk, W., 189
fascism, 1, 6, 27, 29, 31, 79, 80, 162, 164 *see* National Socialism *and* Hitler
Ferguson, Adam, 89, 164
Fetscher, Iring, 143n
Feuerbach, Ludwig, 180
Fontane, Theodor, 172
Frankfurt, 1–3, 10–11, 14, 20, 30, 32, 34, 39, 45, 57–9, 65–6, 70, 73, 76–8, 83–8, 91–2, 115, 117, 131, 139, 141–3, 153–5, 161, 170–173, 175, 177, 185, 189–90, 193, 195.
Freud, Sigmund, 43
Freudenthal, Margarete, 71, 76–7, 116, 117, 122–9, 131, 149, 153, 158, 162, 169, 186, 188, 191, 193
Freund, Gisèle, 153, 185–6, 191, 193
Freyer, Hans, 31, 63, 67–8, 87, 161–6, 168, 170
Freytag, Gustav, 172

Gartenlaube, 172
generation, 1–5, 13, 26–27, 41, 63, 87–88, 95, 99, 112, 124, 139, 146, 154, 173, 176, 184, 187–89, 194
Geneva, 76, 77
Gerth, Hans, 20, 70–73, 85–7, 89–101, 117, 132, 134–5, 143, 154, 161–2, 165, 170, 175, 184–5, 188–9, 191, 194
Gerth, Nabuko, 73
Ginsberg, Morris, 170–1
Goebbels, Josef, 27
Goethe, J. W. von 118, 120, 123, 173
Goldenberg, Boris, 154
Gollub, Wilhelm, 153
Gooch, G.P., 172
Grätz, Heinrich, 132
Gumplowicz, Ludwig, 180

Habermas, Jürgen, 113, 143
Halperin, Natalie, 116–22, 169, 186, 188, 193
Hardenberg, Karl August von, 99
Haussig, Frieda Elisabeth, 153, 161–171, 173, 175, 186, 191, 193
Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, 13–14, 24, 85, 88, 94, 98, 103–4, 154, 167, 178, 180
Heidegger, Martin, 162, 164
Heidelberg, 3, 9, 14–15, 18, 20–21, 34, 57–8, 65, 73, 85, 87, 110, 141–3, 145, 153–5, 161, 177, 189
Heisenberg, Werner, 29–30
Heller, Hermann, 113, 117
Herrmann, Ulrich, 87
Hinshaw, Virgil, 181
history, 4–5, 7, 10, 16, 18–21, 23–31, 33, 35–37, 39, 44, 46, 48, 51–2, 54, 57, 59–68, 70, 72–3, 76, 81–4, 86–9, 91–9, 101–5, 110, 116–17, 121–4, 129, 131–2, 136, 138–40, 145, 149, 153–4, 156, 161–2, 165, 166–8, 170–72, 175, 187–8, 190–92, 194
Hitler, Adolf, 11, 147, 159, 164, 185, *see* National Socialism
Honegger, Claudia, 101, 143, 146
Hong, Young-Sun, 113
Horkheimer, Max, 4, 131, 155, 156, 189, 193
Humboldt, Wilhelm von, 89, 96, 99
Hume, David, 33
Husserl, Edmund, 93

ideal type, 16–8, 40, 47, 52, 68, 90–91, 93, 98, 101, 104–5, 144, 149, 156–7, 165, 171, 173–4, 188
ideology, 1, 5–7, 25, 27–9, 33, 37, 38–41, 46, 49, 54, 61, 63–4, 66, 69, 71, 81, 84, 86, 90–91, 95–7, 101–3, 120, 122–8, 131–3, 135–7, 139–40, 144–7, 149–51, 154, 156–8, 162, 166, 171–2, 179, 183
Institute for Social Research, 156, 189
intellectuals, 2, 5–7, 12–13, 19, 27, 33, 45, 52–3, 59, 62–3, 71–3, 87–90, 94, 96–7, 117–9, 126, 135–40, 146–7, 154, 166–8, 171–3, 180, 188, 194
International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction, 180, 184

Jaspers, Karl, 73, 85, 154, 161

Jászi, G., 11, 58
Jews, 12, 27, 58, 71, 79, 86–91, 117, 131–42, 146–9, 162, 164, 172, 188
Johnson, Alvin, 189–90

Kalberg, Stephen, 16
Kant, Immanuel, 33, 65, 85, 156
Katz, Jacob, 58, 70–73, 87, 117, 131–141, 172, 188, 191, 194
Kedar, Benjamin Ze'ev, 135
Kilminster, Richard, 75, 82
Kittredge, Tracy B., 192
Klein, Viola, 70, 103, 115, 116, 124, 193
Kracauer, Siegfried, 50
Kraus, Karl, 27
Krieck, Ernst, 86, 102, 153
Kuckhoff, Greta, 159
Kuhn, Thomas, 33
Küntzel, Georg, 162

lady, concept of, 62–4, 69, 124–5, *see* women
Landauer, Gustav, 31
Lassalle, Ferdinand, 154
Laube, Reinhard, 159
Lavine, Thelma Z., 181
Lederer, Emil, 14, 21, 50, 57, 85, 91, 97, 142, 154, 155, 180, 190
liberalism, 1, 5–6, 12, 24, 28–30, 70–73, 77–79, 84–99, 101, 106–7, 116–7, 125–6, 128, 132, 135, 138–40, 157, 163, 165–6, 169, 171–2, 185, 191
  Frankfurt working groups, seminars on, 11–12, 14, 58–9, 70–71, 73, 77, 82, 84–8, 90, 92, 94, 101–2, 116, 118, 120, 125–6, 131–2, 140, 142, 147, 151, 153, 158–9, 170–71, 175, 177, 185, 194
life, 16, 18, 20, 24–5, 28–9, 32, 35, 44–6, 49–54, 60–61, 63, 72, 92–3, 95, 120–21, 124, 133, 137, 142, 146, 162, 173, 176–8
Lindsay, A. D., 192
London School of Economics, 98, 153, 170, 189, 190, 192,
Löwe, Adolf, 70, 86, 97, 125, 175
Löwenthal, Leo, 156
Löwenthal, Richard, 154
Luhmann, Niklas, 113
Lukács, Georg, 4–5, 13, 35–6, 41, 4–5, 57, 85, 154–5, 166, 171, 180

Malinowski, Bronislaw, 192
Mannheim, Karl
  Die Dame aus Biarritz, 177
  Conservatism, 27–8, 91, 94
  "Conservative Thought," 79, 91, 93–5, 132, 172, 174
  "The Crisis of Culture," 192
  Freedom, Power, and Democratic Planning, 90, 175
  "German Sociology (1918–1933)," 187–8
  "Historicism," 23–4
  "The Ideological and Sociological Interpretation of Intellectual Phenomena," 66, 171
  Ideology and Utopia, 2–5, 7–11, 17, 28–9, 31, 38–9, 41, 48–9, 66, 69, 73, 79, 85, 87–8, 91, 97, 100, 109, 135–6, 138–40, 143, 154, 156, 166, 178, 180–81, 184
  "An Introduction to Sociology," 30–31, 59, 78–9, 86, 118, 133
  "Lectures on Method," 11
  Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction, 115, 184
  "On the Nature of Economic Ambition and Its Significance for the Social Education of Man," 3, 33–55, 65, 83–4, 193
  "The Problem of the Intelligentsia," 173
  "The Sociological Problem of Generations," 26, 178
  "The Sociology of Intellectuals," 126
  "The Sociology of Knowledge," 9, 30, 111, 181
Marck, Siegfried, 18
Marcuse, Herbert, 4, 39
Marr, Heinz, 102, 153
Marschak, Jakob, 50
Martin, Alfred von, 189
Marx, Karl, 8, 21, 36, 44, 46, 52, 57, 61, 85–6, 89, 149, 154, 168, 180

Marxism, 5–8, 18–19, 21, 31, 34, 36, 44, 46, 52, 57, 61, 69, 72, 85, 89, 93, 95, 104, 126, 128, 149–51, 154–7, 162, 166, 168, 180 *see* socialism *and* Lukács
Maybaum, Rabbi Ignaz, 139–40
Meinecke, Friedrich, 23, 135
Mendelssohn, Moses, 86, 137–8
Mennell, Stephen, 60–61
Mennicke, Carl, 88
Merton, Robert K., 9, 34, 38, 181–2, 184
Middletown, 160
Mill, John Stewart, 78, 190
Millar, John, 89
Mills, C. Wright, 85, 181, 194
Montesquieu, Charles-Louis Baron de, 81–2, 107
Möser, Justus, 88, 94
Mosteller, Fredrick, 181
Muller, Jerry Z., 165–6
Müller, Adam, 28, 88, 94, 113
Munich, 164–5, 167, 171
Musil, Robert, 179
Myers, Gustavus, 47
Myrdal, Alva, 103

National Socialism (Nazism), 1–2, 11, 15, 27, 66, 60, 76, 79, 86, 90, 91, 102, 131, 140, 147, 157, 162, 175, 185 *see* fascism *and* Hitler
Neckel, Sighard, 195
neo-Kantianism, 100
Nettler, Gwynne, 181
Neumann, Franz L., 189
Neumann, Sigmund, 12, 189
New School for Social Research, 143, 189–90, 193–4
Newton, Isaac, 33
Niebuhr, Reinhold, 99
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 8, 36, 42, 44, 153, 179–80
Noack, Ulrich, 70
Nohl, Hermann, 87

Ompteda, Georg von, 174
Oppenheimer, Josef Süss (Jew Süss), 134–7

Pareto, Vilfredo, 171, 180
philosophy, 2, 4–5, 7, 9–11, 13, 23–25, 28, 33–4, 39, 58, 72–3, 77, 89, 91–2, 96, 121, 139, 154–6, 163, 170, 175, 178, 183, 185, 192, 194
Pinder, Wilhelm, 26, 27
The Polish Peasant in Europe and America, 160
political,
commitments, 10, 32, 53, 89, 94, 121, 141, 144, 147, 149, 162, 157
conditions (Germany), 6, 58, 67, 89, 101, 103, 138
education, 2, 7, 10, 12, 50, 102, 122, 170, 180, 191
function, 76, 169
judgment, 49, 67
meanings, 53, 71, 93, 122, 145, 162–3, 175
power, 38–40, 49, 78–9, 96
processes, 4–5, 7, 9, 12, 14–5, 23, 27, 29, 103, 122–3, 136
science, 1, 7–9, 11, 79, 140
sphere, 53, 56, 69, 90, 109, 168, 170
structures, 41, 80, 82, 98, 105, 149, 161, 165, 167, 193
theory, 2, 6, 128–9
Pollock, Friedrich, 156n
Pross, Helge, 123

Raith, Dirk, 145, 146, 148
RAND Corporation, 194
rationalization, 14, 29–30, 39–40, 43–6, 51, 61, 99, 115–6, 120, 125–6, 155, 179
Reik, Theodore, 189
Reimer, Svend, 189
reprimitivization, 31, 164
research group, 1, 3, 32, 34, 65, 68, 70, 75–78, 87, 90, 97, 100, 115, 118, 121–2, 141–2, 151–4, 166, 168, 171–2, 185, 187–9, 191
research programme, 1–3, 9, 11–15, 21, 33, 65, 92, 101, 125, 153, 166, 170, 175, 178, 185, 190, 192–4
Revue Internationale de Sociologie, 76
Richmond, Mary, 105

Rickert, Heinrich, 77
Riehl, Wilhelm Heinrich, 161–71, 173
Rockefeller Foundation, 58, 77, 189–92
Ross, Edward A., 159
Royal Institute of International Affairs, 192
Rubinstein, Nina, 12, 58, 75, 118, 124, 141–52, 154, 158, 160, 186, 188, 190, 193

Saint-Simon, Henri, 164, 176
Salomon, Albert, 57, 73, 189
Salomon, Alice, 105, 107, 115
Salomon-Delatour, Gottfried, 87–8, 156
Salvation Army, 19
Salz, Arthur, 180
Savigny, Friedrich von, 88, 94
Scheler, Max, 20, 33, 181
Schelting, Alexander von, 181–2, 184
Schmitt, Carl, 31, 157, 162, 164
Schmoller, Gustav, 14, 41
Schumpeter, Joseph, 192
Séchelles, Marie-Jean Hérault de, 42
Seidlin, Oscar, 180
Shils, Edward, 90, 183–4
Siebeck, Paul, 20, 34
Simmel, Georg, 4, 24–5, 67, 72, 133–4, 141, 145–6, 183
Smith, Adam, 89, 96, 168
socialism, 6, 10, 28–30, 51, 53, 107, 122–3, 142, 147–8, 157, 168 *see* Marxism
Sociological Institute (Frankfurt), 76, 143
sociology,
  cultural, 13, 15, 18–20, 25, 59, 67–8, 72, 170, 175
  of knowledge, 1, 2, 6–7, 9–11, 27, 29, 37, 66, 68–71, 79, 86, 91, 111, 154, 156, 161, 164, 166, 175–84, 193–4
Socrates, 154, 178
Sombart, Werner, 97–8, 132–4, 146, 149, 154, 159
Sorel, Georges, 180
Sorokin, Pitrim A., 181
soul, 18–20, 41–6, 48–50, 60–63, 77, 83–4, 93, 95, 118–9, 124, 190
Speier, Hans, 50, 100, 143, 153–5, 184, 194
spirit, 18–20, 26–7, 39–40, 63, 65, 70, 72, 77, 84, 92–7, 124, 127, 13441, 146, 148, 159–60, 167, 169, 172–3, 178, 190
Steinert, Heinz, 143
Stendhal, Henri-Marie Beyle, 42, 43
Stern (Anders), Günther, 70

Die Tat, 19, 164
Tillich, Paul, 10, 70, 88, 131, 143
Tönnies, Ferdinand, 17, 86, 133, 158–9
Troeltsch, Ernst, 20, 33
Truhel, Käthe, 70–1, 86, 97–8, 101–17, 122, 169, 186, 188, 191, 193

utopia, 24, 27, 30–32, 84, 140, 162, 182

Van Sickle, John, 191–2
Varnhagen, Rahel, 88
Vierkandt, Alfred, 9, 11, 29, 111
  Handbook of Sociology, 9, 11, 29, 111, 181
vitalism, *see* life
vocation, 11, 45–6, 48, 52–3, 59, 89, 91, 104, 106, 117, 121, 135–6, 141, 144–5, 151, 156, 165, 168–9

Wagner, Richard, 168
Weber, Alfred, 3, 9, 13–15, 18–21, 23–4, 32, 35, 39, 41–2, 44–6, 48, 52–3, 57–8, 66, 72, 77, 82–3, 85, 91–5, 103, 110, 115, 154, 173, 181
Weber, Marianne, 103, 127–8
Weber, Max, 1–3, 5–9, 13–14, 16–21, 23–5, 31–42, 44, 46, 48, 51–3, 57–9, 63, 65–8, 72–3, 77, 79, 80, 83–7, 89, 90–3, 97, 99, 101, 103–4, 110, 112, 115, 120–1, 133–5, 139, 141, 151, 154–7, 159–60, 165, 168, 171, 173–5, 187–90, 192, 194
  Economy and Society, 3, 16, 17, 19, 51, 84, 174
  "Politics as a Vocation," 31, 53
  The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism, 36, 41, 84, 188
  "Science as a Vocation," 7–8

Weil, Hans, 70, 73, 86–9, 95–6, 101–2, 117, 131–3, 135, 139, 170, 172–3, 188, 191, 194
Weimar Republic, 8, 11–13, 23, 46, 49, 87, 96, 102–103, 109–10, 112, 120, 128, 136, 157–8, 164, 180, 182, 189
  Constitution of, 169
Wertheimer, Max, 131
Wessely, N.H., 138
Wiese, Leopold von, 24, 26, 66–7, 162
Wirth, Louis, 10, 181–4
Wolff, Kurt H., 70, 101, 118, 153, 175–85, 194
  The Sociology of Knowledge: A History and a Theory, 180–82
Wollzogen, Caroline von, 120
women, 4, 10, 40, 58–64, 66, 70–71, 76, 99, 101–8, 110–129, 144–5, 148, 150, 158, 162, 166, 170, 186, 188, 195–6, *see* lady
World Economics Institute, 97
worldview, 4–5, 23, 25–7, 61, 83–4, 93–5, 133, 136, 141

youth, 4, 27, 60, 63, 88, 99, 107, 111, 121, 185