

First Years at The New School

I first learned about The New School from Hans Gerth when I was a graduate student at the University of Wisconsin. Gerth, who had joined Wisconsin's Department of Sociology in 1940, had grown up in Germany during the heyday of Germany's Weimar culture and had studied with Karl Mannheim in Heidelberg and Frankfurt during the 1920s and early 1930s. He had known Hans Speier, Carl Mayer, Adolph Lowe, Hannah Arendt, Günther Stern (Arendt's first husband), and other scholars, some of whom later became the faculty at the University in Exile, later called the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science. Gerth had published essays in *Social Research*, the Graduate Faculty's journal. After his death, his essay on Max Weber's reception in America was published in *Politics, Culture and Society*. Gerth had an easy familiarity with other German exiles—Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, and Otto Kirchheimer, all from the Frankfurt school—who had set up the Institute for Social Research in Morningside Heights, near Columbia University. Gerth also introduced us to the work of Walter Benjamin and told us the story of how Benjamin had committed suicide at the French-Spanish border, believing he would be refused admission into Spain and concluding that the only alternative to suicide was death in a concentration camp. When Mannheim's *Ideology*

and Utopia was translated, Gerth's students in the faraway Midwest learned that there was a sociology of knowledge.

Hannah Arendt's *The Origins of Totalitarianism* was published in 1951. I heard about it from Gerth when I returned to Madison from Harvard for a summer visit. Gerth had read her book carefully and disputed her claim about the imperialist and colonial origins of European totalitarianism. When Gerth and Mills published *From Max Weber*, I already knew enough to know that it was a book I should read, even though I could not square its contents with the anthropology curriculum I was reading in Harvard's Social Relations Department.

I was one of hundreds of students at Wisconsin who were introduced to the sociological and philosophical literature of Weimar Germany by Gerth. When in 1978, I called Susan Sontag to inform her of Gerth's death, her first words were, "I don't know what would have become of me if I had not known him." She had never been a student at the University of Wisconsin, yet in a more powerful way, Gerth had educated her. While she and her husband Philip Reiff were students at the University of Chicago, they visited Gerth on weekends at his home not far from Madison where, sitting at Gerth's feet, they listened to the monologues he was famous for delivering to any audience of worthy listeners. Their encounter with Gerth was a turning point in their lives. As he did for other parochial American students, Gerth opened my eyes to an intellectual world that I barely understood, one that I admired out of all proportion to my ignorance of it. For good reason, I thought of The New School as an exotic place. Taking a job there at a salary too low to support my family seemed a small sacrifice for an opportunity to join the Graduate Faculty. I was eager to learn more about it.

Founded by the leading editors of *The New Republic* and dissident Columbia University historians and philosophers (Charles Beard, James Harvey Robinson, and John Dewey) in 1917, The New School for Social Research has always occupied an ambiguous place in the culture of New York City and the higher learning in America. Committed to social reform, social criticism, cosmopolitan internationalism, and cultural modernism, it was generously supported by New York's uptown wealthy German Jews and the lower Fifth Avenue Protestant elite, mostly Presbyterians. In its earlier years, it held to a policy of refusing to accept endowments on the grounds that they interfered with the intellectual independence of its faculty. Nicolas Murray Butler, then Columbia's President, never relented in his efforts to denigrate and even eradicate The New School because he regarded it as subversive of American values. The New School lived most of its history in an academic no-man's-land, outcast because of its image as an unconventional and radical, if not revolutionary, non-degree-granting experimental adult educational institution operating out of the rebellious milieu of Greenwich Village. Throughout its history, it specialized in harboring iconoclastic, independent-minded, critical thinkers. Some of these were unwanted by other universities. For instance, The New School hired Thorstein Veblen and W. I. Thomas, both fired by President William Rainey Harper of the University of Chicago. Veblen's economic writings offended John D. Rockefeller, the school's major benefactor. Thomas had allegedly bedded another faculty member's wife. When he was accused of the impropriety by Harper, he is said to have responded: "Well, I've tried them all, and they're no good." The school also hired Horace Kallen, a Jew fired by the University of Wisconsin for opposing the ideology of assimilation, as well as Alexander Goldenweiser and Bernard J. Stern, both

left-leaning anthropologists. But The New School also gave refuge to a whole coterie of remarkably talented and employable European intellectuals exiled by European fascist governments, including Hans Speier, Emil Lederer, Gerhard Colm, and Max Wertheimer. The New School was always in financial trouble and aroused the concern of its major patron, the Rockefeller Foundation, which thought The New School's faculty to be excessively foreign and Jewish.

The Graduate Faculty was only a small part of The New School for Social Research. While the school itself was founded as the first non-degree granting adult education center in the history of American education, the Graduate Faculty became certified in 1934 to grant advanced degrees (the MA and PhD degrees in anthropology, economics, political science, philosophy, psychology, and sociology). Later, the Graduate Faculty also offered a master's and doctoral degree in social science for candidates who had already achieved the doctorate. From its very beginnings, the Graduate Faculty elected its own officers, prepared its own budget, determined its own curriculum, and was solely responsible for hiring and firing faculty. The Board of Trustees of The New School for Social Research included a Graduate Faculty governing committee that guaranteed the autonomy of the Graduate Faculty within the larger structure of The New School. The Graduate Faculty's independence was established without objection from the New York State Board of Regents. Later, however, this arrangement was deemed illegal, and the Board's autonomous governing committee for the Graduate Faculty was abolished. But the original plan successfully instituted a relationship of simultaneous autonomy and cooperation between two entities with very different educational aims. Briefly, the Graduate Faculty could not survive without the financial backing of The New School for

Social Research, but it did not wish to be identified with The New School's adult education curriculum.

The adult division catered to thousands of non-degree students choosing courses from an academic cafeteria that contained offerings ranging from wine tasting to cooking, painting, ancient philosophy, and Shakespeare. Its professors were drawn from the vast array of talent in New York City. They were non-tenured faculty paid on a piece-work basis at the rate of fifty percent of each student's fee, whatever the tuition for a given lecture or course might be. The fee to attend a single lecture by a well-known public figure was usually ten dollars. Erich Fromm, in the 1950s, gave lectures attended by 500 paid subscribers and thus earned \$2,500 per lecture. It was a system that attracted celebrities and specialists in almost any field who, in turn, gave the school its cachet and cash. There were no tenured professors, few administrators, no medical insurance, no retirement costs, and no property taxes. The adult division thus had low overhead and high profit margins on the sale of its products.

By contrast, the Graduate Faculty's economics were exactly the opposite: high overhead in the form of fixed salaries for tenured professors and low income from tuitions and student fees. Because the Graduate Faculty never paid its own way, it was always the pariah division in The New School apparatus in the eyes of the school's administrators.

From the early 1920s to the mid-1950s, The New School survived on the strength, determination, and conviction of its leading figure, Alvin Johnson, a scholar-administrator-editor, reared of Danish Protestant immigrant stock and educated in heartland Nebraska. He was a university president who governed less by consensus than by a sense that his educational mission was righteous, an academic

entrepreneur who believed his creation of The New School provided its own vindication.

In one sense, The New School has always been cosmopolitan, the quintessential New York institution, especially in its rejection of cultural philistinism. But not even New York City, let alone the rest of the country, was prepared to receive the brand of European culture brought to it by political refugees escaping from fascism and Nazism in the 1930s. Alone among American universities, The New School under Alvin Johnson's direction had the foresight and courage to bring to the United States German, Italian, French, and Spanish intellectuals whose lives were endangered because they were unwilling to submit to the demands of totalitarian states. In 1924, in connection with his work on a projected seven-volume edition of the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, Johnson had traveled to Europe seeking scholars to make contributions to this project. There he met Emil Lederer and many other top European social scientists. It was on the strength of his familiarity with continental social scientists that, in 1933, Johnson was able to recruit the scholars who became the first faculty of the University in Exile.

But starting a school requires money. And Johnson became legendary for his unorthodox money-raising methods. A famous story recounts how he got a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation for the purpose of rescuing Europe's social scientists. As he walked uptown from West 12th Street to Rockefeller Center to meet with Rockefeller executives, he contemplated the amount of money he needed, raising the ante with each block he traversed. By the time he reached midtown, he had settled on a sum of five million dollars. To his surprise, the Rockefeller boys gave him that amount without a blink. This began the myth of Johnson's money-raising legerdemain. But the reality was that Johnson knew how to cultivate the loyalty of people with

money and influence. For example, he selected as the preliminary governing committee of the University in Exile Charles Burlingham of the New York Bar Association; Wilbur Cross, Governor of Connecticut; John Dewey, Professor of Philosophy, Emeritus, Columbia University; Felix Frankfurter, Professor of Law, Harvard University, later member of the United States Supreme Court; Ernest Gruening, Department of Insular Affairs, later Governor of Alaska and United States Senator from Alaska; Oliver Wendell Holmes, former justice of the United States Supreme Court; Robert M. Hutchins, President of the University of Chicago; Robert M. MacIver, Professor of Sociology, Columbia University; and Herbert Bayard Swope, a noted journalist and incomparable publicist who made and broke the careers of several New York luminaries in the early twentieth century. Among the Board of Trustees, headed by Ira A. Hirschmann, were Benjamin J. Bottenweiser, Elio Deming Pratt, Eustace Seligman, Hiram J. Halle, Howard M. Morse, and Francis T. P. Plimpton. Those were illustrious names and influential personages. Collectively, they made it possible for Alvin Johnson to make his claim on the Rockefellers for five million dollars.

The original University in Exile faculty included nine professors: Emil Lederer (its first dean who had been a Full Professor at Berlin University where he occupied the chair previously held by Werner Sombart), Frieda Wunderlich, Karl Brandt, Hans Speier (its first secretary), Max Wertheimer, Arthur Feiler, Eduard Heimann, Gerhard Colm, and Erich von Hornbostel. The University in Exile faculty members' conception of sociology, for instance, included philosophical schools, political theory, politics, and political economy.

Karl Mannheim had been invited to join the original faculty, but he disappointed Lederer by rejecting the invitation and choosing to stay in England. Mannheim already had a reputation in the United

States, and his presence would certainly have added luster to the new faculty. His refusal was considered a blow to this fledgling group.

Beginning in 1934 and continuing throughout the 1940s, faculty appointments were selected from among other émigré scholars, including Hans Staudinger, Jacob Marschak, Kurt Rietzler, Arnold Brecht, Leo Strauss, Max Ascoli (student of Benedetto Croce), Carl Mayer, Albert Salomon, Hans Neisser, Erich Hula, Kurt Goldstein, Salomon Asch, Julia Meyer, and Alfred Schutz. One American, Horace Kallen, a student of American pragmatism, was added as a gesture to the faculty's host country. With the addition of these and other new appointments, the faculty was constituted into five departments: sociology-anthropology, economics, psychology, philosophy, and political science.

A myth has since circulated that the Graduate Faculty was primarily or even entirely Jewish in its composition, but this was hardly the case. It was made up primarily of Germans and German Jews. The Jews among them—at least those I later met—were indistinguishable in their social character, cultural styles, or their secular attitude from the Germans. When I joined the Graduate Faculty in 1960, it still observed only two calendar holidays—Washington's and Lincoln's birthdays—signifying the faculty's acceptance of American political values. On principle, it observed no religious holidays, a standard established by the original faculty in 1933. The Graduate Faculty was meant to be an aggressively secular institution upholding Enlightenment ideals of scholarship and inquiry.

Indeed, the secular idealism of the Graduate Faculty was expressed in its original constitution ratified by the faculty and the Board of Trustees in 1935. Article I reads:

In order to assure the continued application, in the conduct of its affairs, of those principles of academic freedom and responsibility that have ever been the glory of The New School, it shall be a condition of the appointment of every member of the Board of Trustees, every regular member of the Faculty, the President, and every member of the administrative staff of The New School that he: (a) accept the obligation to follow the truth of scholarship wherever it may lead, regardless of personal consequences; (b) shall not be a member of any political party or group which asserts the right to dictate in matters of science or scientific opinion; (c) bind himself, both individually and when acting collectively with others in all official action, especially in recommendations and elections to the Faculty in promotion of members thereof, to be guided solely by considerations of scholarly achievement, competence and integrity, giving no weight whatsoever to scientifically irrelevant considerations such as race, sex, religion or such political beliefs as present no bar upon individual freedom of thought, inquiry, teaching and publication.

The ideas in this statement had their origins in experiences that Graduate Faculty members had had in Germany, especially on the issues of race and political affiliation. The Nazis routinely dismissed anyone they thought politically unreliable or anyone who didn't accept the Nazi party's political philosophy or its versions of academic

standards. The refugees' idealism was rooted in the pre-Nazi German University and perhaps in their adherence to the values articulated in Max Weber's essay, "Science as a Vocation." But the statement also revealed some misconceptions about how university presidents and deans in American universities think about and use their authority.

I certainly agreed then, and still agree now, with the high-minded ideals in this statement, though they are regularly violated in practice. As The New School rationalized and professionalized its administration, the clarity of its originating principles, including those governing research and scholarship, often got blurred under the pressures of organizational exigencies, administrative demands, the multiplicity of competing truths, and ideologies.

The University in Exile had set itself up as a self-governing, democratic institute for graduate studies in the social sciences. This operating conception was an extension of The New School's original *modus operandi*, but it was also a child of circumstance as much as it was Alvin Johnson's creation. Its members' experiences with fascism committed the faculty to the political defense of freedom. Their European training had inculcated in them an interdisciplinary attitude toward the social sciences. In the 1930s, its faculty taught and wrote passionately about issues that had directly touched their lives.

From the beginning, the faculty's intellectual orientation was focused on social theory in the traditions of Kant, Hegel, Marx, Weber, Durkheim, and Simmel, with attention to phenomenology, Gestalt psychology, and classical political theory in the Straussian tradition and on political economy that addressed problems of unemployment, labor, the work force, state finance, and monetary and fiscal policies that had their origins in Weimar economic planning right after the First World War. The integrating theme that gave a

common intellectual ground to these diverse approaches was German fascism, the rise of Hitler, and the social psychological and political consequences of his regime.

The forum for the faculty's debates was the General Seminar, a weekly meeting of the entire faculty given over to a member's presentation of a paper and a discussion of it. In the years 1934-1939, the faculty's concerns and problems were theoretical and practical, scientific and political, European and American. Coming from a European intellectual milieu in which debate can be personally antagonistic, the faculty focused on divisive topics: fascism, democracy, freedom, public opinion and propaganda, economic policy, mass psychology, and social-political psychology. Most faculty writings of this period may be found in the early issues of *Social Research*, a journal created by Johnson to provide the faculty with an outlet for the expression of ideas and to force them to begin writing in the English language.

In their seminar discussions, faculty brought to bear theoretical and firsthand political experience earned in universities, ministries, union halls, and the streets of Germany, Spain, and Italy. Emil Lederer, an economist and social theorist (and author of *The New Middle Class*; *State of the Masses: The Threat of the Classless Society*; and *The Problem of the Modern Salaried Employee*, among many other works); political scientists Frieda Wunderlich (author of *British Labor and the War*, *Labor under German Democracy*, and *Farm Labor in Germany*); Max Ascoli (author of *Intelligence in Politics* and *The Power of Freedom*); Hans Staudinger, a civil servant (author of *The Inner Nazi: A Critical Analysis of Mein Kampf*); Hans Speier, a sociologist (author of *German White Collar Workers and the Rise of Hitler*); and Kurt Riezler (author of *Man, Mutable and Immutable*)

were representative authors in that faculty. As socialists and liberals, theoreticians and empiricists, economists, sociologists, and political scientists, they brought to America a worldly intelligence and confronted each other in the small enclave that was the Graduate Faculty. They attempted to understand, define, and defeat the political forces that had forced them into exile.

The Graduate Faculty came to define fascism in terms of its democratic opposite. In shaping their image of totalitarianism that anticipated Hannah Arendt's work on the subject by two decades, faculty members working on the subject gradually had to abandon ideas and ideals intrinsic to European social thought, that is, intellectuals' almost instinctive affinity for socialism instead of capitalism. But it's a mistake to understand the Graduate Faculty's consensus about the nature of totalitarianism and democracy as a consequence of its members' cultural Americanization. In fact, these scholars' work in America continued investigations already well begun in Europe, and some faculty members stressed the continuities in European social and political life both before and after the fascist takeovers in 1922 (Italy) and 1933 (Germany). To be sure, their ideas changed in the context of their experiences in the American diaspora. Certainly exposure to America's raucous political life shaped their images of the nature of modern political democracy. It was this mix of life experiences that provided the source of the *University in Exile's* creativity, a creativity fostered by social and intellectual marginality.

From its beginnings, the émigré generation suffered a slow process of attrition. Erich von Hornbostel, the psychologist and eminent ethnomusicologist, died in 1935, and Dean of Faculty Emil Lederer died in 1939. Age differences among the faculty at the time of emigration accounted for a steady succession of retirements. The end of the war in 1945 made it possible for some émigrés to return to their

homelands. Despite the length of their American sojourn, the impulse to return to Europe was common among most of the Germans, including among those who were Jews.

Arnold Brecht, as late as 1938 and at the risk of his life, returned to Germany for visits. While in America, he always lived in two rooms in a hotel with a rented piano, never doubting his final return to his homeland. Alfred Schutz, in his essay, "The Homecomer" wrote: "What belongs to the past can never be reinstated in another present exactly as it was ... the perspectives have changed." Benita Luckmann's essay "The New School: Variations on the Return from Exile and Emigration" recounts the experiences of some of those who returned. When the war was over in 1945 so was the necessity of exile. Hans Speier returned to Germany in 1945 in an American military uniform. In his book *From the Ashes of Disgrace*, he says he went back as an American, yet his impulse was to return to the streets of Berlin searching for the house that had been his parents' home and his birthplace. He could not forget or put aside his past or, as he put it, "that damned Hitler [who] has taken Germany away from me." Hannah Arendt has since become the most famous case because of her relationship with Heidegger. When she returned to Germany in 1949 as a representative of an organization for Saving Jewish Culture, her experience of hearing German spoken on the street "made me incredibly happy," and this was despite her observation that the turning point in her memory was not the year 1933, but the day when she heard about Auschwitz. Karl Löwith went back to Heidelberg in 1952, choosing to return at the first opportunity that came to him. Werner Marx, who had been Löwith's student at the Graduate Faculty, left for Freiburg in 1962. The moment Carl Mayer retired in 1965, he left for Switzerland. Adolph Lowe returned to Germany to live in retirement with a daughter. Those who did not return

to Europe felt homeless except for their ties to the Graduate Faculty, the only community they had in America. Most continued their associations with the Graduate Faculty, regularly attending seminars, even after they achieved mandatory emeritus status at the age of 75 and were not permitted to lecture. Benita Luckmann reports in the words of Arnold Brecht: "They wandered around the school looking a little lost." In this country and in Europe, the generation of émigrés found different ways to come to terms with ambivalent feelings about their countries of origin and adoption. Matthias Greffrath in his book, *Die Zerstörung einer Zukunft: Gespräche mit emigrierten Sozialwissenschaftlern*—a collection of interviews with Hans Gerth, Günther Anders, Marie Jahoda, Adolph Lowe, Leo Lowenthal, Karl August Wittfogel, Toni Oelsner, and Alfred Sohn-Rethel—gives poignant examples of the double marginality felt by his subjects. Germany was no longer what it was when they left, and America, now in the midst of a Cold War conflict with the Soviet Union, left them without space in either world. They had become artifacts of a lost past. Gerth had returned to Germany in 1971 to take a Professorship at Frankfurt University only to be confronted by radical students who disrupted his lectures, invaded his office, removed his library, and left his office in a shambles. He remained a professor, but he never taught another course. For the upcoming generations of students, the émigrés had become part of a past to be celebrated or excoriated in books about them. In reports like H. Stuart Hughes's *The Sea Change*, Anthony Heilbut's *Exiled in Paradise*, Tom Wolfe's *From Bauhaus to Our House*, Peter Rutkoff's and William Scott's *New School*, Dagmar Barnouw's *Weimar Intellectuals and the Threat of Modernity*, Claus-Dieter Krohn's *Intellectuals in Exile*, and Lewis Coser's *Refugee Scholars in America*, a mythology about them was

created. Refracted back onto the Graduate Faculty, the mythology became mythic history after the refugee faculty had exhausted itself or expired; its reputation in academia acquired a halo that distinguished it from the dominant American tradition of positivism and pragmatism. Its social-scientific orientation was thought to be European in the tradition of Weber, Marx, and Durkheim: humanistic, critical, historically oriented, and sympathetic to the integration of political theory, psychology, and philosophy. Aided and abetted by its association with the origins of The New School for Social Research and its early faculty including John Dewey, Thorstein Veblen, Horace Kallen, and Bernard J. Stern, it could also be thought to be a hotbed of Greenwich Village radicalism and critically oriented social sciences. The truth was that the problems that had energized the Graduate Faculty in the 1930s and 1940s—fascism, constitutionalism, political economy, Gestalt psychology, and the puzzles of ancient and European philosophy—had either disappeared from its agenda or no longer had salience in the curriculum.

When I arrived in 1960, many of the distinctive features of the original faculty had long since withered away. The General Seminar used to be organized around thematic topics each semester of the academic year: for example, "Methods and Objectives of the Social Sciences" (1935), "Public Opinion in the United States," and "Liberalism Today" (1939-1940). On some occasions, the seminar was open to the public. It had been used as an instrument both to forge the group into a faculty and to serve as a meeting place for other expatriate intellectuals. The early seminars attracted academics from other schools in the city. Kurt von Fritz, a classical scholar, and Paul Tillich, then at the Union Theological Seminary, were frequent visitors. The seminars were often jointly given by scholars from different

disciplines, say, a sociologist, philosopher, and psychoanalyst as in a seminar given one year by Hans Speier, Max Wertheimer, Kurt Riezler and Karen Horney. The seminar's distinctive feature was its stress on addressing specific problems from a variety of points of view. In that sense, it was unselfconsciously interdisciplinary. To be sure, departmental and academic specialization had not yet stifled broad learning in American universities. That came later. But the organizational forms developed by the Graduate Faculty were still singularly idiosyncratic. Departments were loosely formed groups headed by a "spokesman," not a chairman. Papers presented at seminar symposia were published in *Social Research*, and thus the journal reflected the lines of inquiry addressed by the faculty. However, in the long run, this synergy between the journal and an interdisciplinary faculty was not sustained. The seminar lost its function as an interdisciplinary faculty forum and as a source of material for publication in *Social Research*. Under pressure from the American academic marketplace, departmentalization of the faculty became more rigid. Departmental spokesmen became chairmen in a more formally organized administrative hierarchy. As the members of the original faculty expired, so too did many of the institutions they created.

But despite its transformations and its adaptations to American academic norms, the Graduate Faculty survived its past. I was a member of this new faculty for forty years. This is the story of that part of my life and career in and around 66 West 12th Street.

The Graduate Faculty in 1960: Some Realities

In 1960, The New School and the Graduate Faculty were housed in two buildings spanning a space between 12th and 11th Streets between Fifth and Sixth Avenues. Its main entrance was at 66 West 12th Street.

Between the two buildings at ground level was an open courtyard approximately 200 by 200 feet in size referred to in jest as the campus; it contained several stone benches and sculptures. Hanging over the courtyard at the third-floor levels of the buildings was an enclosed passageway that linked the six-story buildings to each other. The president's office was on the sixth floor of 66 West 12th where he presided over both The New School's adult education divisions and the Graduate Faculty.

The Graduate Faculty offices were on the second floor of the 11th Street building. Its windows faced the courtyard below, and the office's occupants were visible to passersby crossing the third floor walkway. The entire faculty of some forty professors were housed in six offices—one for the dean and one for each of the departments of economics, philosophy, political science, psychology, and sociology-anthropology. The dean's secretary, Henny Greenberg, was shared by the entire faculty of about thirty full-time members. A conference room located at the end of the hall was capable of seating the entire faculty. A registrar's office not much larger than the conference room faced 11th Street: its staff consisted of Mary Lynn, who was the registrar, and two assistants. Between the conference room and the registrar were an elevator shaft and a stairway, both of which led to the third-floor cafeteria. A small library administered by Ester Levine was in the basement of the 11th Street brownstone. I never visited that library. The layout of the Graduate Faculty suggested intimacy and bore no resemblance to the architectural arrangements of any other university I had known.

The office of each department was furnished with two metal desks, each with six drawers, and four chairs, two on wheels with cushioned chairs for faculty and two straight-backed chairs for

students when consulting with professors. Six or seven faculty members and part-time appointees shared the desks and drawers. These offices could not be used for writing or research. Professors had their own offices and libraries in their homes, a sign that the university had not yet separated the professor from the tools of his trade. The space was small, but, in practice, it was adequate for the purposes at hand. Professors taught their courses on different days and at different hours, but only between 4 p.m. and 8 p.m. Enrollments were low. My own course enrollments averaged about ten students. If ever three professors wished to consult with students at the same time, one of us repaired to the cafeteria and used it as a temporary office. The simplicity, the total lack of pretentiousness, of these accommodations was accepted as matter of fact by both professors and students. What mattered was the lingering mystique of the European intellectual émigrés who courageously opposed fascism and left to us, their successors, an enduring social science legacy. That the faculty was small and housed in compact quarters was not only unimportant, but suggested a positive absence of a bureaucratic hierarchy.

In the academic year 1960-61, Abbot Kaplan acted as the school's interim president. Hans Simons, the president when I was hired, had died. A search was underway for a new president. It came as a great surprise and disappointment to me to learn that Alfred Schutz had also died in 1959. I didn't know much of his work, but I had heard of him from Harold Garfinkel while I was at Harvard. Garfinkel used to travel to New York to listen to Schutz's lectures on phenomenology. In the late 1950s, Schutz was the department's most publicly visible member for precisely the reason that fascism was no longer his concern or his problem. These deaths, I found, coincided with a university-wide fiscal crisis in the order of budgetary deficits of

several hundred thousand dollars. Deficits, I learned, were common occurrences, almost a tradition, covered annually by Clara Meyer, the adult education division's dean and vice-president of the school and a wealthy uptown German Jew who had been in the habit of playing this role for many years. Clara Meyer was not the only such benefactor, although she was an exceptionally important one among a group of downtown and upper West Side liberals who thought of The New School as their major charity. Some of these benefactors were trustees, but others were not. I met some of the latter at Johnson's ninetieth birthday party in 1964. Frail, but still robust of voice, surrounded by a bevy of older women well into their later years, he gave a speech recounting the past of The New School. When he finished, this cluster of women cheered and screamed in a style reminiscent of the screams of a group of bobbysoxers. Could this group have been the economic foundation of the school? It seemed so, for they all appeared to love Alvin with a passion far exceeding anything evoked by formal institutional loyalties. The significance of this scene was clear to me. It marked the end of The New School's epoch of charismatic leadership and patrimonial administration. I had joined a faculty whose economic future was dubious.

Henry David, an American who affected an English accent, had been appointed to succeed Hans Staudinger as the Graduate Faculty's dean in 1959-60. Carrying out a charge to rebuild the faculty, it was David who had hired me and, unbeknownst to me until the day I arrived, Thomas Luckmann as well. Luckmann was to replace Schutz and I was to replace May Edel, an adjunct anthropologist. Luckmann commuted from Geneva, New York, where his family lived and where he had been teaching at William and Hobart College. I commuted from Storrs, Connecticut. Neither of us could afford to live with our

families in the metropolitan region, so we shared an apartment on Jane Street in Greenwich Village.

Luckmann and I both descended from Slovenian parents. He had grown up in Jeseniča, a steel mill town to the north of Kropa where my parents were born and from which they emigrated. His grandfather and father had been the prewar owners of Jesceniča's steel mill while my own ancestors had been smiths. His father had sided with the Germans and was killed by the partisans. As a child, Luckmann was sent to Germany for schooling. He was too young to participate in the war and came to the United States as an émigré at war's end. As different as were the trajectories of our lives—one the son of an industrialist knighted by Franz Josef and the other the son of an industrial worker who was a foot soldier in Franz Josef's army—we were now the Slovenian future of the Graduate Faculty's sociology-anthropology program. Brought together entirely by chance, our fates were now tied to that of Henry David.

David moved very fast. After one year as a dean, he was appointed president of The New School. He made Howard White, son-in-law of Kurt Riezler, acting dean of the Graduate Faculty, and late in his first year, he fired Clara Meyer as Dean of the Adult Education Division, presumably because her influence with trustees was greater than his and because she opposed his plans. He received a grant from the Heckscher family's Twentieth Century Fund for a conference designed to plan a study of poverty, a theme that John F. Kennedy had taken up in his 1960 campaign for the presidency, later reinforced by Michael Harrington's *The Other America*, published in 1962. David had also entered into negotiations with the United States space program with the idea of securing grants from the federal government. He made me a member of the poverty conference and recruited an

old friend of mine from the University of Wisconsin, Robert J. Lampman, who had made a career as an economist studying inequalities in income distribution. Even while he was president, he taught a joint class in American political thought with Saul Padover and me. David had a plan for remaking the Graduate Faculty in his own image and made me one of his accomplices in this project.

Having learned of the school's economic precariousness, I considered my prospects. Judging that recruiting outsiders to join the staff posed problems, I realized that I was an administrator's asset. To safeguard my position, I applied to be considered for tenure during my second year. I qualified as an applicant because I had an appointment as an associate professor and had presented a paper to the faculty's general seminar—a prerequisite before applying for tenure. After the department supported my application, I was called by David, who informed me that Adolph Lowe of the economics department requested a postponement of consideration until the following year. I rejected Lowe's suggestion. When I mentioned this to Carl Mayer, my chairman and the person who submitted my application to the president, Mayer was not surprised. Indeed, he advised that I had done the right thing. And Lowe acquiesced and did not push his point to the faculty at large. This was my first indication of a tradition of friction between the Graduate Faculty departments, a conflict whose origins lay in what was already a murky past. But, within just two years, I had become tenured, learned more about the inner-workings of the school, and had served under two deans and two presidents.

Firing Clara Meyer was David's fatal mistake. At the end of his second presidential year, the board fired David. The board's action was meant as a gesture of reconciliation to Meyer. Meyer, who felt she

had not been adequately defended by the board when David forced her out, did not accept the gesture and from that point on dissociated herself from the school and ceased providing the subventions needed to meet the school's annual deficits. So began the urgency to put the school's finances on a more rational foundation.

To replace David as president, the Trustees chose as acting president Robert MacIver, who was himself a trustee and the vice-chair of the trustees' executive committee and formerly a distinguished professor of sociology at Columbia University. He was also the father-in-law of Robert Bierstedt who was then a sociology professor at New York University. The trustees expected MacIver to conduct a search for candidates to replace himself, but this was not to be the case. He wanted to be the president of a university, took the job seriously, and tried to generate money-making research projects. At the time, I was invited by Venezuela's *Centre de Estudios del Desarrollo* to design a study of Venezuelan leaders. I designed the study, but backed out of the project when it was taken over by MIT's study on third-world leaders headed by Max Millikan. I did not belong with that group, but still MacIver urged me to stay with it fearing the loss of overhead funds for The New School. He liked his new job enough to pressure me not to leave the MIT connection. At age eighty, the job gave him a new lease on life, leading him to drag his heels on conducting the search for his replacement. It was only under pressure from the trustees that he resigned and then only after his second year (1964-65) on the condition that he be appointed the director of a newly created Center for New York City Affairs, an entity created and financed by Jacob M. Kaplan explicitly to move MacIver out of the presidency. In his place, the trustees appointed John (Jack) R. Everett, the recently resigned president of the City University of

New York. Everett later hired as his Chancellor Harry D. Gideonse, a former president of Brooklyn College known for his pacification of radicalism at that school. Everett served as president of The New School from 1965-1983, a period during which The New School made a series of corporate acquisitions and rationalized its administration and accounting.

The virtues of intellectual independence accruing to The New School from its policy of rejecting endowments from vested interests made it a cash-and-carry institution. In practical terms, the school's lack of an endowment meant that its budget was regularly balanced by *ad hoc* bailouts. Students' tuition and fees had never been sufficient to meet its operating budget.

Let me illustrate the deficit-driven economy of the Graduate Faculty by the case of the sociology-anthropology department. The department had five full-time professors and four adjunct or visiting professors. As an associate professor, I was paid \$9,500 and Luckmann about the same. So our combined costs came to about \$20,000. The New School did not then have a retirement plan; most of the émigré professors eventually received retirement benefits from German sources. The three full professors received salaries of \$20,000 each, so the salary budget for the full-time faculty came to about \$80,000. The four part-timers were paid \$2,000 to \$4,000 each, depending on the number of courses each taught. So the total departmental budget for salaries was less than \$100,000. Each of the five departments was staffed at about the same rate, making the total faculty salary budget for the entire Graduate Faculty roughly a half million dollars annually. Even if there had been a cost-accounting system for allocating to departments charges for support services—office space, classroom use, telephones, and other charges such as heat and electricity on a

prorated basis—such charges did not add excessive amounts to departmental budgets. Incomes produced by departments were far below their costs.

In the academic year 1958-1959, tuition fees were \$25 per credit or \$75 per course. A full-time student enrolled in four courses paid a maximum of \$300.00. There was a registration fee of \$6, a library fee of \$1, and maintenance-of-status fee of \$20 per year. A charge of \$30 was imposed on a student at the completion of the degree. The Graduate Faculty also sponsored a student organization called the Cosmopolitan Club for which students paid \$1 for membership. The cost per year to a student for an education and a degree at the Graduate Faculty was about \$700.00. At this rate, the department of sociology-anthropology needed the equivalent of about 150 full time students to meet its own payroll apart from its overhead costs. In practice, full-time equivalent enrollments were far less than this number, probably in the range of 50 to 75 at most, if one considered that average enrollments per class were in the range of 8 to 12. In budgetary terms, the Graduate Faculty was a financial burden.

But while the Graduate Faculty could not support itself, its value to The New School was out of all proportion to its economic fragility. It provided the institution with a halo of prestige not given by adult education. Its original faculty of émigré Europeans had bequeathed The New School a lasting and illustrious reputation. It shared this reputation with the Frankfurt School's Institute for Social Research on Morningside Heights, and vice versa. Taken together, these entities represented the elite of post-Marxian and post-Weberian European scholarship. Whatever the economic reality, the Graduate Faculty gave The New School its panache. Every president knew the panache that the Graduate Faculty gave to the New School, and none of them had the temerity to tamper with it, even under pressure from

cost-accounting treasurers. As the jewel in the crown, the Graduate Faculty was sacrosanct even in the face of its deficits.

The jewel was in much worse financial shape than I had imagined. From its beginnings, it had been generously supported by up-town German Jewish philanthropists whose wealth was firmly secured in banking and natural resources. Their identification with the University in Exile affirmed their sense of themselves as representatives of Germany's great cultural and intellectual traditions. These men and women had Max Weber's books in their libraries. They were fully Americanized, though, and by the 1930s, they had not been accepted socially at a level commensurate with their wealth by New York Society. The University in Exile gave them a philanthropic opportunity to share their wealth with an American cultural institution. But by 1960, these philanthropic sources no longer existed. They were the last of a generation. Their descendents sought their status in other more prestigious New York philanthropic endeavors. When The New School needed the descendent generation's money, the new generation was giving to Lincoln Center, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, and Harvard University. The death of President Hans Simons in 1959, and Henry David's sacking of Clara Meyer, ended that source of revenue, and it had not been replaced with another. A natural revenue replacement source could and should have been the recently arrived waves of Eastern European Jews who had begun to make their fortunes on New York's Seventh Avenue in the rag trade. But Upper West Side Jews regarded this cohort as vulgar, uncultivated, and socially inferior. The New School, still chasing its past, lost an opportunity to tap into and socially legitimize a new source of philanthropy.

This certainly was not the case for Brandeis University, where I was moon-lighting on Mondays as a member of a graduate seminar

on philanthropy at the Florence Heller School for Advanced Studies in Social Welfare. The Heller School's dean was Charles Schottland, a former director of the nation's Social Security system and a master fund raiser himself. One member of the seminar was Charles Francis Adams, scion of Boston's Adams family. Brandeis had been established in 1948 on the campus of a defunct medical school in Waltham, Massachusetts. Abram Sacher, its president, needing money, saw his future on New York's Seventh Avenue textile district. Brandeis University was named after United States Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis (from whose daughter I had taken a course on "The Economic History of New England" while I attended the University of Wisconsin). Sacher was an entrepreneur who had no inhibitions about the sources of money for his school. The joke was that Sacher had rooms, brooms, and chairs, as well as buildings named after donors. When a broom wore out, a new donor was found to buy another one. Here was a school that needed money and knew how to get it without concern for the social status of its sources. While the Graduate Faculty paid me a salary of \$9,500 for a full-time load, Schottland paid me \$5,000 for one seminar, plus additional stipends for supervising dissertations. The money I earned from Brandeis was what The New School failed to tap. Several years were lost before The New School began to compete with Brandeis on the same philanthropic field. The event that signified The New School's shift in orientation to the acceptance of Jewish textile money was the mid-1960s gift to the school of a new Graduate Faculty Center of Lane's Department Store on Fifth Avenue and 14th Street. This new generation of donors remembered that Alvin Johnson had rescued anti-Nazi and anti-fascist intellectuals, and they identified with the Graduate Faculty. They saw it as the bearer of European social, economic, and political thought, a reputation that demarcated it sharply from other

American social science graduate schools. That intellectual legacy was the invaluable bequest of the University in Exile to succeeding generations of faculty at The New School.

The Graduate Faculty in the 1960s

In the 1960s, émigrés in residence and still writing books were philosophers Hans Jonas, Aron Gurwitsch, and Werner Marx; political scientists Arnold Brecht, Otto Kirchheimer, and Erich Hula; economists Hans Neisser, Alfred Kahler, Adolph Lowe, and Hans Staudinger; psychologists Rudolph Arnheim, Solomon Asche, Hans Wallach, and Kurt Goldstein; and sociologists Carl Mayer, Albert Salomon, Julia Meyer, and Arvid Broderson. Their writings included Hans Jonas's *The Imperative of Responsibility*; Arnold Brecht's *Political Theory and The Political Education of Arnold Brecht: An Autobiography*; Otto Kirchheimer's *Political Justice: The Use of Legal Procedure for Political Ends*; Albert Salomon's *The Tyranny of Progress*; and Adolph Lowe's *On Economic Knowledge*. Still, despite their vitality, their days were numbered.

Over the years, in their efforts to preserve their intellectual identity, the émigrés did not hire many scholars who focused on American society and thought. The significant exceptions were Saul Padover, a political scientist who was a specialist in Thomas Jefferson and James Madison; Horace Kallen, foremost student of American Pragmatism and multiculturalism; and Dorian Cairns, a student of Charles S. Peirce and American philosophy. These appointments signified some commitment to American democratic and philosophical thought, but not an end to the faculty's émigré traditions.

In an effort to preserve the past, the émigrés appointed their own graduates: Howard White in political science (Kurt Riezler's son-in-law); Mary Henle in Gestalt psychology (Max Wertheimer's student);

Thomas Luckmann (a student of Alfred Schutz); Felicia Deyrup (Alvin Johnson's daughter); Bernard Rosenberg in sociology (a student of Albert Salomon); Oscar Ornati in economics (a Triestian Jew who once asked me what a Slovene was doing amongst so many Jews and answering his own question said, "I know some of your best friends are Jews," to which stereotype I replied with annoyance, "All of my best friends are Jews."); and Werner Marx and Murray Green in philosophy (students of Karl Lowith and Hans Jonas, respectively). Meant to preserve the Graduate Faculty's European intellectual orientation, such in-house appointments also suggested that the faculty lacked network connections into its host country's graduate schools. Inevitably, such efforts to replenish itself with its own graduates or Europeans could not be sustained. That they were not is symbolized by the appointment in 1958 of Joseph Greenbaum, an American-trained experimental psychologist, as the chair of the psychology department, and, in 1960, of David Schwartzman, a University of California economist, and me, with a degree in Social Relations from Harvard. Thus began the reconfiguration of the Graduate Faculty and its transformation into a hybrid European-American institution.

Carl Mayer and Albert Salomon presided over the reconstruction of the sociology department. I take this case as the paradigmatic example of what happened at the Graduate Faculty. The core of the departmental curriculum was oriented to European thinkers. Still, Mayer included some features of American sociology in the department's course offerings. Courses in statistics were taught each semester by adjunct professors Paul Neurath and Columbia-trained Henry Lennard. David Abrahamson and Bernard Rosenberg, both adjuncts, taught courses in criminology. Edward Saveth's course on "The American Aristocracy: History, Structure, and Ideology" represented a gesture to the faculty's professed commitment to the

culture, politics, and origins of democratic institutions in early New England. However, Mayer's and Salomon's orientation to European thinkers gave the curriculum its profile.

Mayer taught courses in "Pareto's Sociology," "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism," "The Rise of Modern Anti-Semitism," and "Max Weber." His reputation was as a Weber scholar. But after many years of teaching, his rendition of Weber had become lifeless, almost like a Lutheran catechism. Undoubtedly, he had read and reread all of Weber's writings, but in his lectures, he reduced Weber's sociology to neatly categorized classifications of concepts. I learned this when I heard students mentioning phrases like "value neutrality," "types of political legitimacy," "religious rejections of the world," or the "Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism," as if these represented invariant truths. Literally reading his lectures from a folder, he taught from canned notes. Since he taught from the same notes year after year, students constructed their own copies of these notes. Duplicates of them were transmitted from generation to generation of graduate students who used them in preparation for examinations, leading students to believe they could understand Weber without actually reading Weber's books. Forty years later, Cyrus Yegameh, one of Mayer's students, visited me. He remembered Mayer's Weber course and noted that he still had his course notes in outline form, organized point by point, in a bound folder. Given Mayer's pedagogical style, Weber's investigative spirit and his unique ability to frame intellectual problems were not communicated. It seemed that Mayer, mainly out of a sense of duty, felt motivated to introduce American students to Germany's greatest sociologist. Originally in the 1930s, Salomon taught this subject. But after publishing in *Social Research* three succinct essays evaluating the Weber oeuvre, he abandoned this subject, leaving Mayer to cover Weber. There is no evidence that any

of Mayer's students carried forward the spirit of Weber's scholarship, although it is also true that Mayer contributed to the advancement and propagation of Weber as an icon in the sociological pantheon.

For his own part, Salomon taught an astonishing range of courses in the history of sociological ideas. In a single course, "Foundations of Sociology and Social Psychology," the authors he listed in his course description were Erasmus, Loyola, Pascal, Montaigne, Descartes, Fontenelle, Saint Simon, La Rochefoucauld, La Bruyere, Machiavelli, Montesquieu, Jean Bodin, Pierre Bayle, and Hobbes. He did not include Weber or other Germans in that list. Though he had published the Weber essays, he cut himself off from German thinkers when he learned of the Holocaust. For him, the Holocaust betrayed his intellectual heritage. (In a department meeting devoted to constructing the next year's course offerings, Mayer asked Salomon to teach a course on anti-Semitism. Salomon demurred, saying, "No, thank you, that's your problem, not mine.") After abandoning Weber, he started a love affair with French authors. He not only refused invitations to return to Germany, but came to terms with his American sojourn. In 1941-1942, he added American sociologists to his teaching curriculum. He taught a course called "The History of Sociology," in which he included Florian Znaniecki, Robert MacIver, Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, Robert Lynd, Howard S. Becker, Pitirim Sorokin, Georg Simmel, Max Weber (who appears as just another sociologist), and Thorstein Veblen. In 1945, he taught "Main Trends in the History of American Ideas" that focused on F. O. Matthiessen's *American Renaissance: Art and Expression in the Age of Emerson and Whitman*. Even as he adapted to his American milieu, his central concern was with the French, teaching its thinkers individually and collectively in such courses as "Balzac as a Sociologist." He wrote his lectures on cards that are preserved in abundance in his

archives at the University of Konstanz and the Leo Baeck Institute in New York City. Salomon found his refuge in a Talmudic-like examination of sociological and philosophical texts, endlessly discovering, re-examining, and teaching the works of familiar and newly discovered thinkers, always finding in them their sociological relevance. To his students, he was an inexplicable phenomenon, a professor whose intellectual scope fascinated, intimidated, and overwhelmed them. His scholarship was formidable, but it lacked the audience it deserved at a time when the sociological profession was undergoing rampant academic professionalization and specialization.

Mayer and Salomon lived within the circumscribed world of the Graduate Faculty. While Salomon initiated correspondence with American sociologists, there is no evidence that either he or Mayer attended meetings of the American Sociological Association. When faced with the problem of reconstructing the department, they relied on the advice of their own graduates. In the first instance, these students were Thomas Luckmann and Bernard Rosenberg. Luckmann had studied with Alfred Schutz and was hired to replace Schutz, who had died the year before. On the strength of a recommendation from Joe Bensman, and a favorable review of *Small Town in Mass Society* in *Social Research*, Rosenberg promoted my candidacy as the department's first full-time anthropologist. These jobs were not advertised, nor was a search conducted for other candidates. I owed my job to Bernard Rosenberg, who was Albert Salomon's favorite student and who had written, under Salomon's supervision, a dissertation published as *The Values of Veblen*. Considering that Mayer and Salomon were reaching the ages of retirement, Luckman and I were in effect designated the future caretakers of the department. Two years later, Dennis Wrong and Peter Berger were hired. Again, neither of these positions was advertised and no other candidates were considered.

Wrong had written a dissertation on demography at Columbia under Kingsley Davis (“It was the easiest way to get through.”) and earlier had been an assistant to George F. Kennan at the Princeton Institute for Advanced Studies. Teaching at the time at Brown University, he was a political sociologist associated with the magazines *Dissent* and *The New Leader*, New York’s left-leaning anti-Stalinist journals. He had also favorably reviewed *Small Town in Mass Society* in *The New Leader*, a further indication of intra-familial incest. In Berger’s case, the hand-in-glove relationship within the department was like a marriage of first cousins because he, like Luckmann, was one of its graduates. At the time, Berger was teaching at the Hartford Theological Seminary. He had not yet published any of the books that made him famous, but he became slated to be Carl Mayer’s successor in the sociology of religion. In hindsight, these were impressive appointments of scholars whose later careers vindicated the department’s, that is, Mayer’s, choices.

My role in approving these appointments was only that of a rubber stamp. I was the outsider in this group, a minority of one who willingly acquiesced to these appointments, not only on the grounds of their intrinsic worth, but also because I hoped that the department and the Graduate Faculty remained in business. Thinking that I might influence the composition and academic direction of the department—actually, to retain its Weberian orientation—I nominated Hans Gerth as a candidate for a professorship. This was not just a mistake, but a blunder. My nomination was instantly vetoed by Mayer. Unbeknownst to me, Mayer had known Gerth in Germany and, in 1928, the two had had a run-in in a debate about Max Weber at a sociology meeting in Davos, Switzerland. Mayer, a man with a long memory, reacted to Gerth’s name as if that encounter had occurred the previous week. I had inadvertently stumbled into one of

the internecine Weber wars that were then flourishing on both sides of the Atlantic and had walked into a quicksand of a history whose source lay in the contrast between Gerth's Weberian-Marxism as opposed to Mayer's formal, religiously oriented Lutheran interpretation of Weber. Mayer's instant put-down of my recommendation should have taught me a lesson to stay away from this terrain, but I did not learn this lesson well enough. A year later, when Wrong left the department to take a position at New York University, I took the opportunity to push Joe Bensman as his replacement and nominated him for the position. The others knew that Joe and I were friends and collaborators. That I should have the effrontery to nominate my best friend did not seem to matter. After all, Berger and Luckmann were also co-authors and friends, so what might be called a practice of insider trading was a departmental norm. The department agreed to invite Joe to give a talk to the faculty as a whole, the usual procedure when presenting a departmental candidate. Following Joe's presentation, the department met to take a formal vote on the appointment. Mayer polled each member. Each voted yes until it came to Mayer, who said, "I must oppose," giving no reason. Despite Mayer's objection, I considered the vote favorable and asked that the approved nomination be forwarded to the faculty as a whole. At that general faculty meeting, I reported an affirmative vote of five in favor of Joe's appointment with one dissent, and the floor was opened for discussion. Much to my surprise, Berger and Luckmann, who had not informed me in advance, announced that they had changed their votes to no. This left the department without a positive recommendation. To my embarrassment, I learned that a commitment to a vote was malleable.

Up to that moment, I had kept Bensman informed in detail of the progress of his candidacy, leading him to believe it was a certainty.

Joe and I were shocked and disappointed. We had expected to be in the same department, an arrangement that would have made our collaboration much more efficient. When we assessed why this happened, we concluded that it was because Joe had been Gerth's foremost student. And Mayer's authority prevailed over the students of his enemy. From this experience, I learned two things. The first was that democratic procedure in academic affairs counted for little. The second was that I was the outsider in the departmental club.

I should mention that this was, in part, a language problem. While English was, of course, The New School's official language, Mayer, Salomon, Luckmann, and Berger usually spoke German with each other, switching to English in my presence. But when Mayer held department meetings at nearby Village restaurants, colloquial German was the language of choice among my four colleagues as we walked to and from meals. I didn't speak German, and my language deficiency reminded me of my marginal status. Because Henry David, who had co-opted me to further his own plans, had been sacked and Robert MacIver was being pushed out, I began to reconsider my future in a department that seemed increasingly inhospitable.

As the outsider and the only native-born American, my influence on departmental affairs was negligible. I had no administrative responsibilities. My duties in the department were minimal, limited to teaching three classes of two hours each per week that I could do on Wednesdays and Thursdays. I taught one course and attended department and general faculty meetings on Wednesday. I taught the other two courses on Thursday. Teaching six courses a year, I could accumulate a one-semester sabbatical after every third year of teaching or a full-year sabbatical after every sixth year. The sabbatical was an earned right that did not require the dean's approval. My two-day-a-week teaching schedule left me five free days. Breaks

during intercessions and the summer months added more time to that freedom. Despite the low pay, I gained a lot of advantages by being affiliated with the Graduate Faculty. The most important advantage, of course, was that the prestige and intellectual status of the Graduate Faculty's old illustrious faculty was transferred to me simply because I was now a member of the Faculty. Unexpectedly, I gained an unearned enhancement of my reputation. I hadn't anticipated this, but I certainly accepted its consequences in both monetary and psychic rewards. I found I could both distance myself from the Graduate Faculty and enjoy the benefits of the status membership that it conferred.

My new found freedom and reputation gave me time to supplement my income and to carve out a way of life that was equal to that of a professor at a research university. I had a low-paying, high-prestige job that for four years enabled me to do other teaching and consulting and my own research on both America's new middle classes and politics in both Venezuela and Colombia.

I was offered and took jobs at Brandeis University and Clark University. I needed the money. It was easy work because I taught the same material I was teaching at The New School. For Clark and Brandeis, this did not matter. From their point of view, they could advertise me as a visiting professor from the Graduate Faculty. I gladly participated in being marketed in exchange for the money, but it was at considerable cost to my energy. Moonlighting at this pace was a form of self-exploitation and was not intellectually productive.

However, accepting Charles Schottland's offer to join the philanthropy seminar at Brandeis proved to be a genuine research opportunity. This seminar not only paid well, but concerned itself with the meaning of philanthropy as an American institution. American philanthropy had its origins in Calvinist conceptions of

stewardship, wherein wealth holders, under an injunction from God, were obliged to give back their wealth to the community. Stewardship became philanthropy. That this religious motivation had long since been transformed did not diminish philanthropic endeavors. Instead, philanthropy had become a big business in its own right, administered by philanthropoids and development officers trained in university degree programs for the express purpose of cultivating and nursing potential donors to universities, foundations, and other charitable organizations. Its motivations were transvalued to gaining political advantages, tax exemptions, favorable public relations, and secular immortality. What had originally been a religious calling had become an exercise in rational calculation. Economically, philanthropy became a redistributive mechanism that alleviated class polarization and countered the Marxian prediction of mass immiseration and revolution. As it happened, that work dovetailed nicely with the research that Joe Bensman and I were doing for our book *The New American Society* that contains a chapter called "Philanthropy and the Service Economy."

Our work on that book included data secured from several other unorthodox sources. At the time, Joe was director of research at William Esty and Company. He was designing studies on various consumer products, and I did his field research. We drew our own conclusions from these studies and incorporated them into our conception of the emerging new middle classes. One of Joe's studies was sponsored by Milwaukee's Miller Brewing Company. The company's marketing division speculated that taste preferences for beer were moving to lighter varieties and that middle-class women, a highly desirable consumer target, might more readily drink a light beer if beer could be made a respectable drink for such women. Up to that point, beer was a drink for working-class men and women. The test

of the hypothesis was to be conducted on a Boston area sample of heavy ale-drinking Irish working men who consumed a case or more of ale a day on weekends. These were men who cared little for social respectability despite earning good wages, but whose wives' social status was incommensurate with the family income. It was easy for an agency in Boston to find the sample.

The interviews focused on changes in taste from heavy as opposed to lighter beers: for example, Ballantine Ale as opposed to Rheingold beer. The results indicated that respondents' wives objected to the strength and inebriating effect of ale. Ale was the chosen beverage for heavy drinkers, but it carried with it the connotation of beer bellies, a slight high, and an incapacity for sex after drinking. Ale connoted low social status. On the strength of this study, the Miller Brewing Company introduced the slogan, "Miller High Life: the Champagne of Bottled Beers," a product addressed to women in the middle classes. It was meant to evoke champagne's elegance and to open the beer market to status-conscious women in the new suburbs. Unfortunately, the advertising campaign was ahead of its time. It failed and resulted in an economic crisis for the company. But the trend was validated. The middle-class women's beer market was opened up. "Light beers" later became a respectable drink for men and women. Specialists in the beer-marketing business taught us something about middle-class status symbols.

The beer study was one of four that focused on changing middle-class taste preferences. The other products were cigarettes, gasoline additives, and paper products. Almost all cigarette advertising in the 1960s stressed cigarettes' taste. Smooth, cool, refreshing, and menthol were the words then in use, the adjectives differentiating one brand from other. The Parliament brand, for example, in an effort to capture the women's market, came out with a longer cigarette with

a recessed filter (designed to distance the tongue from contact with the filter). Despite advertising's emphasis on taste-smoking for the smoker, smoking was associated with bad breath, a need for nicotine, coughing, hacking, and personal discomfort. Nevertheless, among cigarette producers, appeals to taste defined the arena of competition, and so one of the objectives of the study was to find new vocabularies to describe taste. Interviewing smokers for this purpose proved to be a daunting task. As it happened, words used by informants to describe taste were the same as those used in Madison Avenue's advertising. Smokers entirely lacked vocabularies of their own to describe the "taste" of cigarettes. Based on this evidence, the sponsor of the study, Winston, concluded that it was pointless to search for new vocabularies. Instead, marketers invented the slogan, "Winston Tastes Good Like a Cigarette Should." A few years later, taste advertising disappeared from cigarette advertising. When the health hazards of smoking became a national issue, it was replaced by claims about the percentage of tar content in a cigarette. But the theoretical point remained the same. The power to impose a vocabulary is the power to define experience. For purposes of our research, we had rediscovered Orwell. We gained an empirical insight into the relationship between marketing and linguistic usage.

The claim of a gasoline additive manufacturer was that its product cleaned an automobile's engine by removing impurities like "sludge" produced by imperfect combustion of gasoline. Respondents were asked what they thought the additive accomplished. They believed that it purged the motor and the exhaust system of unwanted residues. When asked to describe the process of purging, our respondents evoked images of a digestive system; gasoline, from ingestion to elimination, passed through filters, pistons, and the exhaust system. In the consumer's usage, keeping motor parts clean was compared

to that of a healthy diet. Analogical thinking allowed respondents to sustain their faith in the product despite their inability to conduct a reality check. Where there is a will to believe, reasons based on faith will be found. One can also note that comparing the complex nature of an internal combustion engine with that of the functioning of modern-state bureaucracies suggests that individuals in both instances lack the resources to comprehend political processes in a rational way.

The paper products study was sponsored by Kimberly-Clark, a major manufacturer of products such as toilet paper, hand towels, tissue paper (Kleenex), writing paper, envelopes, school pads, and typing paper. The study was designed to discover the distinctive product taste preferences of various family members. Our sample was drawn from my neighbors in Storrs. Housewives wanted envelopes the size of the checks with which they paid their bills. The adolescent daughter wanted thank-you-sized scented matching envelopes and stationery. The toilet paper shouldn't be too thin. Paper napkins should be serviceable for dinner parties. Such finely discriminated consumer taste preferences indicated that the middle classes were well on their way to becoming artful consumers, each according to his or her needs and preferences. Finely discriminated consumption standards ordinarily associated with the upper and upper-middle classes had descended to the new middle classes.

The Keynesian revolution and postwar prosperity—the beginnings of the short-lived Golden Age of American Capitalism—created a stratum of new middle classes whose lifestyles emulated those of the older middle and upper classes. Limited by fixed levels of income, their emulation was incomplete, and the choices of styles they pursued were largely shaped by the media and consumer magazines. Their political psychology was now linked as much to the influence

exercised by media propaganda as by the rational evaluation of direct experience. C. Wright Mills's *White Collar* had relied for its perspective on Lederer's and Marschak's and Speier's studies of the German middle classes. Our fieldwork suggested that the American new middle classes, relative to other classes, had become much larger than Mills anticipated and more dependent on significant expansion in new service occupations. From a practical point of view, the advertising industry had its own formulas for understanding the changes occurring in the characteristics of the new middle classes. However, it saw these changes from the standpoint of the increasing segmentation by region, income, and lifestyles of consumer markets. The industry knew what to sell to whom, but it didn't draw the sociological or political implications of the trends to which it responded. Bensman and I extrapolated the industry's unanalyzed assumptions about the class structure and reported these and their political implications in *The New American Society*. Later, I continued this investigation in my edited volume *The New Middle Classes: Life-Styles, Status Claims, and Political Orientations*.