The Golden Age of Phenomenology at the New School for Social Research, 1954–1973

CONTENTS

Preface xi

Introduction
Lester Embree 1

Part I: Teachers

1 **Alfred Schutz**
Michael D. Barber: Schutz and the New School 41
Michael D. Barber: Unintended Consequences in Schutz 45
Alfred Schutz: Positivistic Philosophy and the Actual Approach of Interpretative Social Science 53

2 **Dorion Cairns**
Lester Embree: Twenty Years at the New School and Before 80
Dorion Cairns: A One-Sided Interpretation of the Present Situation 91

3 **Werner Marx**
Thomas M. Nenon: The Centrality of the New School for Werner Marx 99
Werner Marx: The "Need of Philosophy"—An Historical Reflexion 116

4 **Aron Gurwitsch**
Richard M. Zaner: Gurwitsch at the New School 123
Aron Gurwitsch: On the Object of Thought: Methodological and Phenomenological Reflections 134

5 **J. N. Mohanty**
J. N. Mohanty: How I Came to the New School 149

6 **Thomas M. Seebohm**
Thomas M. Seebohm: Memories 157
Thomas M. Seebohm: The Social Life-World and the Problem of History as a Human Science 159

Part II: Students

7 **Maurice Natanson**
Michael D. Barber: Maurice Natanson and the New School 175
Michael D. Barber: The Blind Spots of Existentialism and *The Erotic Bird* 179

8 **Thomas Luckmann**
Thomas Luckmann: A Circuitous Route to the New School 194
Thomas Luckmann: The Constitution of Language in the World of Everyday Life 200

9 **Helmut Wagner**
George Psathas: Wagner and the New School 218
George Psathas: Helmut Wagner's Contributions to the Social Sciences 221

10 **Fred Kersten**
Fred Kersten: The New School 230
Fred Kersten: The Imaginational and the Actual 232

11 **Richard M. Zaner**
Richard M. Zaner: My Path to the New School 269
Richard M. Zaner: Sisyphus without Knees: Exploring the Self and Self-Other Relationships in the Face of Illness and Disability 281

12 **Lester Embree**
Lester Embree: Going to the New School 302
Lester Embree: Extremely Bad Things: Some Reflective Analysis of Valuation 312

13 **Jorge García-Gómez**

Jorge García-Gómez: My Philosophical Journey at the New School 321

Jorge García-Gómez: Believing and Knowing: On Julián Marías's Interpretation of Ortega's Notion of Belief 326

14 **Giuseppina C. Moneta**

Giuseppina C. Moneta: The New School for Social Research 335

Giuseppina C. Moneta: Notes on the Origin of the *Historical* in the Phenomenology of Perception 339

15 **Osborne P. Wiggins**

Osborne P. Wiggins: My Years at the New School 351

Osborne P. Wiggins: Maurice Natanson's Phenomenological Existentialism: Alfred Schutz, Edmund Husserl, and Jean-Paul Sartre 357

16 **William McKenna**

William McKenna: A Brief Account of My Philosophical Inspirations 372

William McKenna: Evidence, Truth, and Conflict Resolution 375

Contributors 385

Index 391

INTRODUCTION

Lester Embree

More than two decades have passed since publication of the most recent book about the New School for Social Research. In previous books, the phenomenological philosophy taught in the Department of Philosophy of the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science during what can be called its "golden age" has, for various reasons, not been covered at all well. Most crucially, the longest-contributing teacher of phenomenological investigation there, Dorion Cairns, has hardly been mentioned. Furthermore, the subsequent efforts of the core group of students that developed have not been considered previously. This golden age and its immediate impact should not be forgotten.

The present introduction offers some historical context on the institution and the tradition of teachers and students to whom separate chapters are devoted in the body of this work. Products of a program are naturally inclined to seek understanding of themselves through what formed them. I am not a historian by talent or training, but here I can report how I have proceeded in this project, and this may help others in the future correct my omissions and distortions. I have consulted no original sources beyond some of the writings of "the New School Three," as I call them—that is, Dorion Cairns, Aron Gurwitsch, and Alfred Schutz—some knowledgeable friends, and my own recollections, but I have studied the previous books about the school carefully.

Before discussing the prior treatments of the institution in which what I call "the golden age of phenomenology" occurred, it seems appropriate to offer a historical sketch of the constitutive phenomenology of the New School within its ever-widening historical context within philosophy in the United States.

THE NEW SCHOOL WITHIN AMERICAN PHENOMENOLOGY

"Phenomenology" has both broad and narrow significations and has grown in America by stages, each with more members. The constitutive phenomenology supported at the New School in the golden age emerged there in the second stage of the tradition some three score years ago and has had interesting relations with what can be called the existential, philological, and Continental stages that came later. I will identify the changing orientations within this history, much of which I lived through, as well as some of the people, organizations, and doctoral programs that are associated with it. I will also include some memories and comments. Perhaps this sketch will help inspire the book-length account by a more competent intellectual historian that is needed.

The first stage of American phenomenology was one of relatively few and scattered individuals. Before World War I, "phenomenology" was already recognized here as the new philosophy in Germany that Edmund Husserl had begun to develop by 1900. The first publication in the United States about it seems to have been Albert R. Chandler's "Professor Husserl's Program of Philosophical Reform" (1917), but I have found nothing more about him or it. Just after that war, students at Harvard were introduced to Husserl's thought by Winthrop Bell and William Ernest Hocking, both of whom had studied with the phenomenologist at Göttingen before the war.[1]

The first Harvard student to go to Husserl, who had then moved to Freiburg, was Marvin Farber, whose dissertation was published as *Phenomenology as a Method and a Philosophical Discipline*.[2] The second Harvard student, Dorion Cairns, spent 1924–26 with Husserl, was able to return for another year and a half, and then returned home and completed his doctoral dissertation in 1933.[3] No doubt there were a few others in the country interested in Husserl, including the librarian Andrew Delbridge Osborn,[4] but Cairns and Farber would eventually prove central to the transplantation of Husserl's philosophy.

The number of phenomenologists in America grew when the refugees from Nazism immigrated late in the 1930s, especially Aron Gurwitsch, Alfred Schutz, and Herbert Spiegelberg. These refugees typically lived for years on grants, part-time teaching, and nonacademic jobs or taught at liberal arts colleges. There were at that time no specialized professional organizations, few receptive publishers, and no doctoral programs for the reproduction of phenomenologists.

The second or *New School stage* began in the several years after Husserl's death in 1938. Under the leadership of Farber as well as Cairns, the International Phenomenological Society and the journal *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* were founded and the *Philosophical Essays in Memory of Edmund Husserl*[5] and *The Foundation of Phenomenology*[6] were published. Judging by the contents of the memorial volume, the group chiefly included Marvin Farber, Aron Gurwitsch, Felix Kaufmann, Fritz Kaufmann, Helmut Kuhn, Alfred Schutz, Herbert Spiegelberg, and John Wild; the last-mentioned figure was soon to lead in the third stage.

Because of an unfortunate personal conflict, the society never met again after 1946, but "PPR" has published work in and on phenomenology ever since, and it has also come to publish a considerable amount of analytical philosophy. With the support of Felix Kaufmann, already at the New School's Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science, Alfred Schutz began teaching part-time in the Department of Sociology there in 1943. His first course was The Theory of Social Action. He eventually became full time and also later taught in and chaired the Department of Philosophy. He regularly published on methodology or theory of science, probably finding more readers in the cultural sciences than in philosophy. The first three volumes of his *Collected Papers* appeared soon after his death in 1959,[7] and there are now three more volumes.

Schutz brought Dorion Cairns to the Department of Philosophy of the New School's Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science in 1954. Cairns immediately taught the course Husserl's Theory of Intentionality for the first time. That course was twice continued for four semesters and then offered twice in a two-semester version with separate courses on advanced theoretical ethics, theory of knowledge, phenomenology of thinking, and general theory of value. These courses were foundational for the teaching of constitutive or Husserlian phenomenology in the New School graduate philosophy program and are now finally being edited for the Phänomenologica series. After returning from the war with a disability, Cairns was not as active with *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* as he had been before. He published little, telling me once that in 1950 all the phenomenologists in America could sit in his parlor and that there was thus practically no audience for phenomenological publications. But he did publish two translations of Husserl that have been quite important, *Cartesian Meditations*[8] and *Formal and Transcendental Logic*.[9] He had prepared his *Guide for Translating*

Husserl[10] and *Conversations with Husserl and Fink*[11] before his death, and they quickly appeared posthumously.

Aron Gurwitsch's appointment at Brandeis University was finally moved from Mathematics to Philosophy in 1951. Schutz failed in two efforts to bring Gurwitsch to the New School, but Gurwitsch became the successor to the recently deceased Schutz in 1959, his first course being Philosophical Foundations of Modern Psychology. He soon published *The Field of Consciousness*[12] and *Studies in Phenomenology and Psychology.*[13] He used to say that he would throw his publications into the sea and see whether the fish would read them! Besides the courses in and on phenomenology, Cairns and Gurwitsch also taught historical courses on Aristotle, Bergson, Berkeley, Cassirer, Descartes, Hume, James, Kant, Leibniz, Locke, Plato, and the nineteenth century as well as on ontology in the seventeenth century (while Werner Marx offered courses on Hegel, Marx, and Heidegger). Cairns retired for health reasons in 1969, and both he and Gurwitsch died in 1973. Thomas Seebohm and especially J. N. Mohanty made unsuccessful efforts to continue phenomenology at the school. Osborne Wiggins did teach there later but did not get tenure. Reiner Schurmann and, from retirement, Hans Jonas also helped maintain a position for teaching Husserl. Gail Soffer and now James Dodd have represented Husserl at the school recently.

Some of the students who studied sociology rather than philosophy have chapters devoted to them in the body of this work. I will return to the continuing impacts of the professors through their students and through the Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology, Inc., below after sketching the next three stages.

With *the third stage,* there is a generational difference. The New School Three were born around the turn of the century and were in their fifties and sixties during the golden age, whereas the next stage was begun by colleagues who were around thirty years old. Furthermore, while the Three were direct disciples of Husserl and their students were consequently exposed chiefly to his constitutive phenomenology and the task of continuing it, those who had studied after the war in Belgium, France, and the Netherlands encountered a more syncretic continuity and came mostly to subscribe in the United States to what was then called "existential phenomenology."[14] This wider orientation was a mixture of thought from de Beauvoir, Heidegger (his involvement with National Socialism somehow downplayed until 1987, when *Heidegger and Nazism* by Victor Farias originally appeared in Castilian), Husserl, Sartre, and Merleau-Ponty, with Nietzsche and Kierkegaard in the

background. While Husserl's constitutive phenomenology was focused on *Wissenschaftslehre,* including the theory of the cultural sciences, existential phenomenology was focused on the issues in what is traditionally called philosophical anthropology.

The first cohort of Americans returning from studying in Europe to successful careers after the war includes Edward G. Ballard, David Carr, John Compton, James Edie, Don Ihde, William McBride, and Robert Sokolowski. A "second generation" here included Philip Buckley, Thomas Nenon, and Sebastian Luft, and then came yet others too numerous to list. There were also colleagues immigrating to the United States early on, including Dagfinn Føllesdal, Joseph Kockelmans, Erazim Kohak, Algis Mickunas, J. N. Mohanty, and Thomas Seebohm. Most of these found academic positions in doctoral programs so that, gradually from the late 1950s, students could study phenomenology not only at the New School but also at Boston University, Catholic University, DePaul University, Duquesne University, Northwestern University, Purdue University, Stanford University, Tulane University, Pennsylvania State University, and the State University of New York at Stony Brook. After the Soviet Union launched its satellite, *Sputnik,* in 1954, funding for higher education in the United States considerably increased, and indeed there were more college positions in philosophy than applicants until 1968. College enrollments were also higher as youth avoided the draft during the Vietnam War. The following two programs are especially noteworthy.

After the New School, the second American doctoral program featuring phenomenological philosophy was shaped by Father Henry Koren, C.S.Sp., at Duquesne University in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. He arrived there in 1948 and was soon inviting distinguished European visiting professors, including Father Herman Leo van Breda, director of the Husserl Archives at Leuven, Belgium: "Van Breda woke me from my slumbers and directed my attention to phenomenology, whose very existence was unknown to me."[15] Among other things, Koren went on to establish in the Duquesne University Press the first philosophy book series in the United States for phenomenology and existentialism (Gurwitsch's *Field of Consciousness* finally found a publisher there) and also supported the establishment of phenomenological MA and PhD programs in the psychology department.[16] Eventually, the Husserlians John Scanlon, a doctoral student of Edward Ballard at Tulane University, and myself, who had been an undergraduate with Ballard at Tulane, joined the Duquesne faculty. The Simon Silverman Phenomenology Center, which

houses collections of books and manuscripts and sponsors important conferences, was established in 1980.

John Wild, long at Harvard, is allegedly the first ever to leave there when he went in 1961 to Northwestern University, which was developing a phenomenological program. He had notably published *The Challenge of Existentialism*[17] and led the founding of the Society for Phenomenology and Existentialism in 1962. (The name was to be "The Society for Existential Phenomenology," but Gurwitsch in the audience was recognized and worked his way to the aisle and then up to the podium arguing successfully along the way that phenomenology was different from existentialism; he then poured himself a glass of water.) Wild also fostered the founding of the series Studies in Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy at Northwestern University Press that James Edie chiefly developed and in which it is said that something like one hundred volumes of phenomenology were translated during about five years (I have not counted).

There were soon tensions within American phenomenology. At the Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy (SPEP), for instance, the allegation that Husserl advocated disembodied solipsism faded only with the edition of Husserl's *Ideen,* Book II, which both Schutz and Paul Ricoeur significantly reviewed. And for a while there were those whom we called "the body people," one advocating to me once that conscious life was "bodily." I asked if he meant embodied, but he insisted on "bodily," and when I asked if that meant that the mind was spatially extended, he said "obviously." Also, significantly new viewpoints were being expressed at SPEP, Frankfurt School critical theory most prominently. I will return below to my reaction to this.

In *the fourth stage,* one might expect that with virtually a library of foundational texts suddenly available in English, much more doing of original phenomenology would occur in what had become a difficult-to-ignore albeit still minority tendency in American philosophy. Looking back, however, I believe that was when the proportion of scholarship over investigation began to grow. By "scholarship" (or "philology") I intend reviews, translations, and interpretations of already written work. Given the ever-increasing quantity and usual difficulty of most previous writing, there certainly continues to be great need for scholarship; but it is, after all, productive of secondary literature, and the purpose of secondary literature is to help the primary research on the things themselves that Husserl called for more than a century ago and that I think it is best now to call "investigation."

Most phenomenology produced before World War II, including that produced before World War I, is investigation. It is prominently continued by the New School Three and also to a large extent by Merleau-Ponty. One could have expected that the confrontations of the different phenomenological positions in postwar Europe would have been quite stimulating for the students from America—and arguably it was for Ballard and others listed above under the rubric of existential phenomenology, but for their students not so much. What happened or, better put, what is still happening?

I do not have a full explanation, but professional appreciation of translating and editing helped launch careers such as my own. Skill in French and German gradually increased, but unfortunately not in Castilian. Then there may have been an influence from Germany, where a continuing stream of Americans went to study. Thus, in chapter 6 in this volume Thomas Seebohm writes

> The assumption that 95 percent of philosophical investigations should be interpretations of the works of famous philosophers was the disease of German philosophy in the time of my studies and still dominates some philosophical societies, publishers, and journals in Germany. What I learned in the new environment and from the examples of Gurwitsch and Schutz was that the first task of the phenomenologist is ongoing phenomenological research and that Husserl himself set up this goal for phenomenological research.

Then again there was the example of "violent interpretations" of past figures begun in Heidegger's *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* (1929) and the use of interpretation in Hans Georg Gadamer's *Truth and Method* (1960) and Paul Ricoeur's *Freud and Philosophy* (1965). (Many Americans then also spoke of "hermeneutical phenomenology," e.g., Joseph Kockelmans, who employed it for investigations in philosophy of science.) And then again there is the continuing pattern of what can be described as the wholesale importation of positions from the Continent for retail distribution domestically. I recall first hearing of Michel Foucault in this pattern, which continues after the third stage still today.

Perhaps the growing emphasis on scholarship also accelerated when colleagues unhappy over the syncretism in SPEP formed figure-focused circles, which for phenomenology include the Heidegger Conference in 1966, the Husserl Circle in 1969, the Merleau-Ponty Circle in 1974, the Simone de Beauvoir Society in 1981, and the North American Sartre Society in 1985. I have been active in the Husserl Circle from the beginning and am also a

member of the Merleau-Ponty Circle chiefly because he did quite a bit of phenomenology. (Husserl includes much methodology in his writings, and I wonder where we would be today if Merleau-Ponty had also done so.) How much phenomenology is actually done in the other circles I am not sure.

And then again, of course, scholarship is easier and also safer since the method is no different from that used in the interpretation of Kant or Aristotle and thus more intelligible to colleagues in other schools of thought (few phenomenologists are not still in departments surrounded by analytical philosophers who decide hiring and advancement and do rarely try to learn phenomenology). If an interpretation is challenged, one need only point to supporting passages. Descriptions of reflectively observed mental life are something different altogether.

In any case, I am tempted to call this fourth stage the "*philological stage,*" and with some exaggeration I often joke now that in this stage phenomenology today is like sex when I was in high school during the 1950s: everybody talks about it, but nobody does it! And I also ask what one would think of astronomers who stopped investigating the things themselves in the sky and instead spent their time writing about what earlier astronomers had written![18]

The *fifth stage* is the stage when phenomenology is now being practically swamped by so-called Continental philosophy (and not a few see no difference between them). With CARP as well as the Husserl Circle and the Society for Phenomenology and the Human Sciences (SPHS), constitutive phenomenology has continued and to some extent done well, and there are new institutions such as the North American Society for Early Phenomenology (NASEP), which defines "early" as Husserl's publishing lifetime. Being closer in time, more highly populated, and more complicated than earlier stages, this part of my sketch, I confess, is the sketchiest. Concerning the most conspicuous differences, which are the growing number of figures as well as the above-sketched ever-increasing "philologization," as I call it, John McCumber has recently written that

> Continental philosophy used to center on arguments between Husserlian phenomenologists and Sartrean or Heideggerian existentialists, which is why the name of its umbrella group, "SPEP," was an abbreviation for "Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy." Now SPEP abbreviates nothing at all, and its members too often flock separately around European superstars whose latest thought they eagerly expound.[19]

These superstars most significantly included Jacques Derrida, who is now increasingly (but in my opinion dubiously) considered a phenomenologist.

I believe I named "Continental philosophy" when I persuaded my colleagues in the Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology, Inc., to call the book series we were starting in 1978 at Ohio University Press the "Series in Continental Thought"—"thought" because we did not expect many submissions on, much less in, phenomenology and were open to phenomenology in disciplines beyond philosophy. Previously at a SPEP meeting at Catholic University I had heard somebody classify Theodor Adorno as a phenomenologist, decided we needed a new and broader rubric than "Phenomenology and Existentialism," and recognized where the new tendencies were geographically coming from. Colleagues say the expression was already in use, but I have seen no documentation for this. Today I am at least ambivalent about my "contribution" (I helped successfully oppose one attempt to rename SPEP the "Society for Continental Philosophy").

Since then there has been quite a wide discussion about the difference between analytical and Continental philosophies, practically everybody thinking that Continental philosophy has a coherent content. Puzzled by this, I researched what became "Husserl as Trunk of the American Continental Tree,"[20] and have followed it up recently in a review.[21] All I could find for the continental figures outside of the phenomenological tradition that I studied was (1) an original involvement with Husserl especially and (2) interaction with others who had also had a similar original involvement. (The second requirement excludes Bertrand Russell, Rudolf Carnap, and Gilbert Ryle, who met the first requirement to some degree.) The figures beyond the phenomenological tradition whom I knew enough about to say met these two requirements were Theodor Adorno, Hannah Arendt, Jürgen Habermas, Hans Jonas, Julia Kristeva, Jacques Lacan, and Herbert Marcuse. There are no doubt many more I do not know enough about.

Let me now venture an improvement on an earlier metaphor. I now say that Continental philosophy is like NATO—that is, a political alliance the members of which have conflicts with one another but need to get along with each other because of a shared opponent, which is analytical philosophy. And now I also wonder whether analytical philosophy is not like the Warsaw Pact, claiming an ideological unity like Marxism but having something like the actually different local Marxisms of the different communist countries (e.g., Hungarian Marxism and Polish Marxism). If this is the case, then we should look forward to sophisticated historical studies distinguishing

Harvard analysis from Princeton analysis, Pittsburgh analysis, and so on. My recommendation now is that we at least start speaking in the plural of the "analytical philosoph*ies*" as well as the more obvious "Continental philosoph*ies*." From within analytical philosophy, Scott Soames already argues well for considerable diversity there.[22]

One remarkable development parallel to "Continentalization," as it can be called, is the rise of feminist philosophy, which seems to have been more Continental than analytical thus far. Historically, phenomenology has contributed to it significantly with the lectures of Edith Stein in the 1920s, collected after the war and translated as *On Woman*,[23] and of course with Simone de Beauvoir's great work of 1949.[24] Stein was Husserl's first assistant, and Sara Heinämaa has recently shown how Husserlian Beauvoir was.[25] And then there was some support offered by *The Existential Phenomenology of Simone de Beauvoir*[26] and *Feminist Phenomenology*.[27] The extent to which feminist philosophy in the United States is phenomenological I am, however, incompetent to judge.

Another development closer to Husserl and less involved in Continentalization is called "analytic phenomenology" or sometimes "California phenomenology." Since I am less knowledgeable about, much less sympathetic to, this development, let me quote at some length from Steven Crowell's recent and optimistic "Phenomenology in the United States."[28]

> The roots of analytic phenomenology were at Harvard where Hubert Dreyfus (PhD 1964) and Sam Todes (PhD 1963) were students, and where Dagfinn Føllesdal received his PhD in 1961 under Quine and taught for several years. Dreyfus, Todes, and Føllesdal were all involved in SPEP at the beginning and were Board members on the Northwestern series, but with Føllesdal's removal to Stanford in 1968 and Dreyfus's move to Berkeley in the same year, a kind of phenomenology appeared that did not track the fate of phenomenology at SPEP.
>
> While drawing on both Husserlian and existential phenomenology, the character of analytic phenomenology was defined by Føllesdal's claim that Husserl's noema is best understood as an abstract entity, like a Fregean *Sinn*. Føllesdal's work on logic and semantics in the 1960s offered a phenomenological contrast to logical positivism, and his project was taken up by his students, David Woodruff Smith and Ronald MacIntyre.[29] Føllesdal's interpretation also allowed Dreyfus to situate Husserl in the camp of "representationalist"

> philosophers and develop a more pragmatic and existential version of phenomenology. . . .
>
> Dreyfus's influential critique of the Artificial Intelligence program exemplified how phenomenology could engage directly with non-phenomenological sources and issues. When practiced in this way, phenomenology is no longer understood in terms of originary names or European developmental stories; rather, it is non-rigorously characterized as a philosophical approach that rejects constructivism and scientism and insists on the careful description of experience. To adopt such an approach, one need not choose between realistic, constitutive, hermeneutic, and existential versions; instead, one can draw on each as the problems at hand demand. "Analytical" phenomenology is thus a misnomer, coined because its practitioners sometimes take up problems also treated by analytic philosophers and respond to these analytic treatments. But it is true that such work is in evidence in traditionally non-Continental schools (among them Chicago, Boston University, Columbia, Riverside, Irvine, and Florida) and has spawned its own societies (Society for the Study of Husserl's Philosophy, International Society for Phenomenological Studies, and a host of smaller workshops and conferences).[30]

Out of my considerable ignorance about analytic phenomenology I can still worry whether "study" and "studies" in the titles of these societies manifest philologization yet again, and I also wonder whether benefit is being taken from Husserl's methodology and clarified terminology for "the careful description of experience."

What has this to do with the history of phenomenology in America and specifically the constitutive phenomenology developed at the New School for Social Research during its golden age? Often, at least in recent programs, even a scholarly treatment of Husserl seems unacceptable at SPEP. The Society for Phenomenology and the Human Sciences (SPHS) was once part of the originally interdisciplinary SPEP but was pushed out. (I heard a Husserl scholar prominent in the big discussion of noema sound like an arrogant positivist in saying he wanted no sociologists in SPEP.) Now it seems that what phenomenology papers one can hear are not at SPEP at all, but at its concurrent little brother SPHS. But the program contents at SPEP itself also shift from year to year, so a return of constitutive phenomenology there is possible, though not a good bet.

Excessive scholarship and ever-less investigation or philologization is an essential part of Continentalization. In opposition, let me sketch the examples of the New School Three and how they together continued constitutive phenomenology by actually doing it.

Aron Gurwitsch followed the early William James and the early Husserl and seems to have influenced Sartre by describing a non-egological conception of consciousness; he also substituted gestaltist descriptions for Husserl's doctrine of hyletic data. As a consequence, he thereafter viewed consciousness as a noetico-noematic correlation. And he developed a description of the field of consciousness whereby it has a theme, thematic field, and also a margin that includes conscious life, the lived body, and the cultural world whether or not these are thematized (and I have urged recognition of Others and universal essences as having at least marginal status as well). This is not scholarship on texts. Gurwitsch called it "advancing the problems." But of course he also contributed to the secondary literature, his long, two-part review "The Last Work of Edmund Husserl" (PPR 1956–57) probably having the greatest impact even though the deplorable Continental aversion to the philosophy of science seems not affected by it.

As for Alfred Schutz, he conceived his work as a major development in an area, the theory of the social sciences, where Husserl had never set foot.

> To Husserl's list I would like to add a social science, which, while limited to the social sphere, is of an eidetic character. The task [of such a social science] would be the intentional analysis of those manifold forms of higher-level social acts and social formations which are founded on the—already executed—constitution of the *alter ego*. This can be achieved in static and genetic analyses, and such an interpretation would accordingly have to demonstrate the aprioristic structures of the social sciences.[31]

Besides the hundreds of pages of investigation that this project of Schutz's entailed, he also did pioneering work in the phenomenology of music and the timely scholarship of reviewing Husserl's *Ideen II* and *III* in 1953.

Dorion Cairns's scholarly contributions during the golden age were the two translations of Husserl mentioned above, plus his posthumous *Guide for Translating Husserl* and *Conversations with Husserl and Fink*. But in recent years more than a dozen posthumous texts have been published by Fred Kersten, Richard Zaner, and me,[32] and finally the editing of his Philosophical

Papers has been begun with his dissertation.[33] In order to show his originality as a constitutive phenomenologist, however, I have also published *Animism, Adumbration, Willing, and Wisdom,*[34] which studies his revisions of Husserl's conception of philosophy and also the constitution of the Other, perception, the body, appearances, and the will. He too was much more than a Husserl scholar. And I must add that the courses in phenomenology that he taught at the New School were in the form of what I call "reflective analyses," presented in lectures for his auditors to attempt to verify, correct, and extend, a behavior that he himself exemplified toward his master. Except for the one seminar on *Ideen I,* he did not mention texts.

The New School Three have not been the only ones to do phenomenology in the United States. Outside of the CARP group, Don Ihde and Robert Sokolowski come immediately to mind. The difference is that for all their differences, the Three worked together, thus formed what can be called a historical tendency, and dominated a doctoral program some prominent students of which are represented in this volume. I could be wrong, but I doubt that, even though small and relatively short-lived, there has never been anything else like this tendency.

Before I turn to the major effort to continue the New School spirit, I want to reiterate that there are now too many colleagues involved in too many ways in phenomenology in narrow, much less broad, significations to be even sketched usefully. However, I want finally to mention some important new as well as continuing institutions. First, there is the International Association for Environmental Philosophy, founded in 1997, where many members I am told are phenomenologists who are investigating things hardly touched on before in our tradition.[35] Second, there is the Interdisciplinary Coalition of North American Phenomenologists (ICNAP). Founded in 2009, ICNAP, unlike SPEP, welcomes phenomenologists from disciplines beyond philosophy (communicology, economics, education, nursing, political science, psychiatry, psychology, sociology, and so on) as well as phenomenological philosophers (mostly Husserlian) who want to learn from one another. Third, there is the International Alfred Schutz Circle for Phenomenology and Interpretive Social Science, founded in 2012. Then there is, fourth, the venerable Husserl Circle now led by Burt Hopkins, student of Algis Mickunas. Fifth, there is the *New Yearbook for Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy* edited by Hopkins as well and then, sixth and seventh, the two journals edited by students of Maurice Natanson: *Schutzian Research* founded by Michael Barber, and *Husserl Studies* now edited by Steven Crowell.

CONTINUING THE NEW SCHOOL SPIRIT

The Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology (CARP) was founded by Lester Embree, Jose Huertas-Jourda, Fred Kersten, Giuseppina Moneta, and Richard Zaner after a meeting of the Husserl Circle at Duquesne University in April 1971. (In 1997 Ted Toadvine built for CARP the first general website for phenomenology, and it should be consulted for more detail than is offered in the sketch below, e.g., the dozens of names of the colleagues who have given Gurwitsch lectures and Schutz lectures or received the Ballard prize, not to speak of the hundreds of conference programs and volumes published by CARP in its three series.)

Cairns and Gurwitsch thought that the Center was a good idea. Over the years, it has been loosely associated with various universities but is independent. The Board of Directors of CARP has included colleagues who were involved for various durations (e.g., Natanson resigned when he joined the Yale faculty, and several others have now died): Edward G. Ballard, Michael Barber, Elisabeth Behnke, Steven Crowell, James Dodd, John Drummond, J. Claude Evans, Burt Hopkins, Joseph Kockelmans, William McKenna, J. N. Mohanty, Maurice Natanson, Thomas Nenon, Rosemary Rizo-Peron Lerner, Thomas Seebohm, Gail Soffer, Elisabeth Ströker, Ted Toadvine, and Nicholas de Warren. Zaner was the second president, Embree the third, and now Nenon is the fourth.

Although he was not a New School student like the rest of them, Huertas-Jourda was elected the first president and urged the codirectors then and often afterward that CARP should continue the New School spirit. This has essentially meant support for research (and researchers) in and on chiefly constitutive phenomenology. This form of phenomenology was developed by Edmund Husserl beginning with his *Ideen* in 1913 (he called his earlier work prephilosophical), and it is in the New School spirit that the current and previous presidents of CARP have edited a volume celebrating the centennial of that founding text.[36]

This volume shows the connections with the *Ideen* of Simone de Beauvoir, Dorion Cairns, Ludwig Clauss, Gilles Deleuze, Jacques Derrida, Eugen Fink, Aron Gurwitsch, Martin Heidegger, Ludwig Landgrebe, Emmanuel Levinas, Ortega y Gasset, Enzo Paci, Jan Patočka, Paul Ricoeur, Jean-Paul Sartre, Alfred Schutz, Edith Stein, and José Vasconcelos. The qualification "chiefly" is included above because research in and on existential and hermeneutical phenomenology is often at least implicitly recognized as convergent

with constitutive phenomenology in CARP's conferences and volumes. And the expression "in and on" is included because scholarship on texts as well as investigation of the things themselves have always both been appreciated.

The initial concern of the Center was with preserving the papers of phenomenologists who had taught in North America. For some years the Center's Archival Repository was under the care of Huertas-Jourda at Wilfred Lauier University. Now it is under the care of the current president, Tom Nenon, at the University of Memphis. Thus far it has originals or copies of all or some of the papers of Hannah Arendt, Winthrop Bell, Franz Brentano, Dorion Cairns, Aron Gurwitsch, Felix Kaufmann, Fred Kersten, Alfred Schutz, Erwin Straus, and Richard Zaner.

Along with the Husserl Archives at Louvain-la-neuve and Freiburg i. Br., the Center founded the *collegium phaenomenologicum* in Perugia, Italy, in 1975. This attracted a wide array of Continentally oriented colleagues and is now an independent entity.

In 1978 the Series in Continental Thought at Ohio University Press was begun. At the time of writing, forty-six volumes have been published. Jiten Mohanty followed me, and Ted Toadvine succeeded Steven Crowell in 2007 as chair of the editorial board. In 1987 CARP was approached by Kluwer publishers (now Springer) to found an "American series," which it did under the title of "Contributions to Phenomenology" with Bill McKenna as the founding editor. At the time of writing, over seventy-one volumes have been published, most notably three reference works, the *Encyclopedia of Phenomenology,*[37] *Phenomenological Approaches to Moral Philosophy,*[38] and the *Handbook of Phenomenological Aesthetics.*[39] It is also notable that apparently the first e-book in phenomenology was produced by CARP in 2001[40] and that CARP in 2002 began cosponsoring with the Romanian Society for Phenomenology the free monthly *Newsletter for Phenomenology*; it now has well over four thousand subscribers (http://newsletter.phenomenology.ro).

Where prizes are concerned, the annual Aron Gurwitsch Memorial Lecture sponsored by CARP in conjunction with the meetings of SPEP and SPHS was inaugurated in 1980 and has had to be cancelled only once since then. In cosponsorship with the American Philosophical Association and the SPHS, the Alfred Schutz Memorial Lecture was held at annual meetings of SPHS beginning in 1995. The annual Edward G. Ballard book prize was first awarded in 1997 and has also only once not been awarded since then. Finally, the Ilse Schutz Memorial Prize awarded at the International Alfred Schutz Circle for Phenomenology and Interpretive Social Science was inaugurated by CARP in 2014.

In 1980 the Center was incorporated as a nonprofit educational corporation so that contributions are tax deductible. Where finances are concerned, besides royalties from books, there have been substantial donations from Alice Gurwitsch and Ilse Schutz, grants from Matchette Foundation, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and fundraising in memory of Edward G. Ballard, as well as skilful investment in the stock market by John Drummond. Preferring cosponsorships whenever possible, CARP has been able to contribute a few thousand dollars, which have often helped colleagues raise support for their projects from other sources.

Perhaps a list of the conferences, which have usually been published, and where, when, and with what cooperation they were held will begin to show CARP's energy and impact, which has become rather international. In 1981 it cosponsored its first conference, "Husserl's *Ideas* in Historical Context," with the American Philosophical Association. Beginning that same year, it joined with the Interdisciplinary Graduate Program and Department of Philosophy of the Pennsylvania State University to sponsor "Kant and Phenomenology," which was followed by "Dilthey and Philosophy" in 1983, "Phenomenology and Natural Science" in 1988, and "American Pragmatism in relation to Continental Philosophy" and "The Practice of Research in the Human Sciences" in 1994.

With cosponsorship with Duquesne University and the University of Pittsburgh and with a grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities, the conference "Phenomenology and the Formal Sciences" was held in 1985. "Worldly Phenomenology: The Continuing Influence of Alfred Schutz on North American Human Science" was held with the Institute for the Human Sciences at Ohio University in 1986 and "Lifeworld and Technology" with support from Duquesne University and the Philosophy and Technology Center of Polytechnic University was held in 1987.

In collaboration with the Indian Council for Philosophical Research, "Phenomenology and Indian Philosophy" was held in New Delhi in 1988, and in 1989 both "Phenomenology and Deconstruction" at the invitation of the American Philosophical Association and "Japanese and Western Phenomenology" at the invitation of the Phenomenological Association of Japan in Sanda City were also held.

In 1990 CARP began organizing panels at SPEP on Husserliana volumes in which the volume editor responds to two commentators. These panels are now held at the annual meetings of the Interdisciplinary Coalition of North American Phenomenologists (ICNAP).

In 1991 "The Phenomenology as the Noema" inaugurated a series of "research symposia" organized in connection with Florida Atlantic University that have continued at least annually, including "Issues in Husserl's *Ideas II,*" "Feminist Phenomenology," "More Phenomenology of Time," "The Phenomenology of the Political," "Alfred Schutz's Theory of Social Science," "The Existential Phenomenology of Simone de Beauvoir," "Merleau-Ponty's Reading of Husserl," "The Reach of Reflection: Issues for Phenomenology's Second Century," "Phenomenology as a Bridge between Asia and the West," and "Gurwitsch's Relevancy for Cognitive Science."

"Alfred Schutz's 'Sociological Aspects of Literature'" was cosponsored with the Department of Philosophy, the Graduate Faculty, New School for Social Research in 1995; and "The Golden Age of Phenomenology at the New School," from which the present volume has been developed, was cosponsored with the Husserl Archives in Memory of Alfred Schutz at the New School for Social Research in 2007. Over the years, CARP has also helped support a number of conferences on Schutz at the Schutz Archives at Konstanz and at Waseda University.

CARP has been supportive of relations with Asian phenomenological institutions, for instance, the "International Conference on Phenomenology and Indian Philosophy," cosponsored with the Indian Council of Philosophical Research, New Delhi (1988), and the "Founding Conference of Indian Society for Phenomenological Studies," held in Chennai (2002). CARP also supported three summer workshops in phenomenology in India in 2001, 2002, and 2003.

"Phenomenology and Chinese Culture and the Centenary of Edmund Husserl's *Logical Investigations*" was cosponsored with Peking University (2001). And at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, CARP helped support the "Inaugural Conference for the Research Center for Phenomenology and the Human Sciences" (2002), "Phenomenology and History of Philosophy: Inaugural Conference of Archive for Phenomenology & Contemporary Philosophy" (2006)—CARP contributed quite a few books on this occasion—and "Ten Years of Phenomenology in Hong Kong" (2006).

The series of conferences under the heading "Phenomenology as a Bridge between Asia and the West" (BRIDGE) was begun by CARP at Florida Atlantic University in 2002; the second meeting was in Seoul (2007), the third was at St. Louis in 2011, and the fourth in Taiwan in 2014. At that 2002 meeting in Florida a group of colleagues from the People's Republic, Hong Kong, Japan, and Korea also decided to found the Phenomenology in East Asia

CirclE (PEACE), the formal founding of which then occurred at the Chinese University of Hong Kong (2004), with subsequent meetings held in Tokyo (2006), Seoul (2008), Taiwan (2010), Beijing (2012), and Hong Kong (2014).

While the other societies mentioned in this sketch are local organizations, PEACE is a regional phenomenological organization. El Circulo LatinAmericano de FENomenología (CLAFEN), founded in 1999, was the first such regional organization, but then, with support from CARP, the Nordic Society for Phenomenology (NSP) was founded in Copenhagen in 2001, the Central and Eastern European Conference of Phenomenology (CEECOP) was founded in Cluj-Napoca in 2002, and the Réseau EuroMéditerranéen de phénoménologie pour le dialogue interculturel (REM) was founded in Naples in 2007.

These regional organizations belong, finally, to the Organization of Phenomenological Organizations (OPO), which was founded by CARP in collaboration with the Center for Phenomenological Research at Charles University, Prague, in 2002. Only local organizations, of which there are over a hundred worldwide today, can belong to OPO, and subsequent meetings have been held in Lima (2005), Hong Kong (2008), Segovia (2011), and Perth (2014).

One can wonder what the New School Three would have thought about what has been subsequently supported through CARP in the spirit of the school.

II.

For the sake of readers who know nothing about the New School for Social Research in the 1960s, two points need to be made. In the first place, it was not one but two institutions, and the form it had until recently has been described well by Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott in *New School*.

> Anchoring the northern edge of Greenwich Village at 66 West Twelfth Street, the New School for Social Research has become an established feature of New York cultural life. New Yorkers from all five boroughs and the various suburbs gather there each evening to take courses on virtually every subject imaginable from Confucian philosophy to urban gardening. The adult education program has no admissions requirements and only modest course fees; its instructors are freelance intellectuals and artists. The students come to learn, drawn by what they have heard about the school: that it is a

> free place and an eclectic place, a place where one is bound to meet interesting people. This reputation has enabled the New School to grow and thrive.
>
> Two blocks away, on the corner of Fifth Avenue and Fourteenth Street, the graduate faculty of the New School offers full-fledged doctoral programs in philosophy and the social sciences. Unlike most other American graduate schools, the Graduate Faculty combines an interdisciplinary orientation with a theoretical bent, the first a function of the influence of American philosopher John Dewey and the second a consequence of the Graduate Faculty's European roots.[41]

These characterizations from 1986 also fit in 1969, when I left the city for my first teaching job, but some things have changed since. Probably the adult education program continues similarly, but otherwise I have heard of new buildings, undergraduate degree programs, and even dormitories, but not yet a football team. Most crucially, the Graduate Faculty from early on was subsidized by the adult education program and probably still is. And I gather that there is now a department of history, which stood out as lacking in my time when psychology had only recently separated from philosophy and when anthropology and sociology were still one department. I do not know if the multidisciplinary General Seminar, still regularly meeting then, continues. The scope of the philosophy department is now much broader, Critical Theory being new and the standard courses on Locke and Berkeley seemingly dropped.[42]

In the second place, the New School is overall a place where remarkable new things came through to or were developed in the United States. I recollect hearing early on that it was the first place where Zen Buddhism was taught and where Governor Rockefeller had lectured on his art collection. I seem always to have known that not only John Dewey but also Thorstein Veblen were in on the founding of the school at the end of World War I and that the Graduate Faculty began in 1933 with Alvin Johnson's obtaining Rockefeller Foundation money to save chiefly German Jewish social scientists from National Socialism.

I have learned of much more now in reading the five books examined below. Concerning the arts, I had already heard when I arrived in 1962 that work in music by John Cage and in dance by Isadora Duncan were featured at the school, but I learned also about Aaron Copland in music. The chapter of

Rutkoff and Scott's *New School* on Erwin Piscator and his Dramatic Workshop was further news to me. Morris Cohen, John Dewey, Sidney Hook, and Horace Kallen teaching philosophy must have been an amazing combination (but how Max Wertheimer, who taught during 1933–43 when philosophy and psychology were not yet separate departments, fit in is not clear). Whether this was the "sterling age" of American philosophy that came after the "golden age" at Harvard before World War I is also something I am not so sure of, and this is furthermore the first I have heard of the philosophy at the New School in the 1930s characterized as pragmatism.[43] Nevertheless, what sympathy with pragmatism there was might in part explain Alfred Schutz writing on William James in 1943 and his friend Felix Kaufmann's attraction to Dewey's thought. But none of the émigré positivists came to the school.

I did know before about Claude Lévi-Strauss and Jacques Maritain, but not of Alexandre Koyré and Roman Jakobson during the war at the associated École Libre des Hautes Études. The latter two figures were connected with phenomenology, the former a Husserl student and the latter deeply influenced;[44] Aron Gurwitsch knew them both in Cambridge after the war. I also recall Gurwitsch grumbling one day in the 1960s about econometrics, but from Krohn's book I learned that Jakob Marschak introduced that approach to the United States at the New School way back in 1938, and I know that Schutz had a place for mathematized social science.

Two-thirds of the students in the adult education program were and probably still are women (one-third in the graduate programs were women); many women are mentioned as supporting the founding and development of the school, Eleanor Roosevelt included; and "Gerda Lerner, the dean of American women historians, not only received her BA from the New School in 1963 while in her mid-forties, but in the early 1960s taught at the New School what may have been the first course on women's history offered in the United States."[45]

Finally, there is the question of New School and politics. The long-time director of the school, Alvin Johnson, came from the *New Republic* magazine, which was quite influential at that time and associated with unionism as well as liberalism. He welcomed social democrats to the school, but not communists. Many who came to the Graduate Faculty had practical experience in the politics of the Weimar Republic. During the war, some were appreciated by the Office of Strategic Services (but Schutz's government reports on the East European banking system were not mentioned in the books referring to the New School). When the Cold War began and anticommunism replaced antifascism, the story started that tuition paid by FBI agents kept the doors

open in some tight years. The House Un-American Activities Committee inquired about the school. Sidney Hook, who went on to New York University, of course reversed his position from Marxism, but communism was at least intimated regarding Erwin Piscator, whose theater program was then disconnected from the school and who then went on to revive theater in West Germany starting in 1951.

In my time, the school still had the reputation of being vaguely leftist, but there was little sign of politics among my professors. In one conversation in the 1960s Cairns was admiring of the anti-Vietnam War movement, and he has been reported regretting not going to Spain with the Abraham Lincoln Brigade. It is difficult to find allusions to political realities in the Gurwitsch-Schutz correspondence.[46] By his autobiography, Hans Jonas incredibly seems never to have known that Gurwitsch and his wife were Zionists since the 1920s. When I explained to Gurwitsch the idea promoted by the Students for a Democratic Society of decapitating the country by attacking the university, he thought it preposterous and spoke instead of Ortega's *Revolt of the Masses,* quoting from a riot scene in Shakespeare where a mob held that anyone who could read should be hanged from a lamppost. And one can read Schutz's "The Well-Informed Citizen" (1946) as written by someone who grew up in a monarchy and was worried about mass democracy.

In sum, to be a philosophy student in the Graduate Faculty of the New School during the 1950s and '60s was to have a huge horizon of cultural importation from pre–World War II Europe as well as American innovation in one's surroundings. Husserlian phenomenology was very much part of all that.

III.

The latest book dealing with the history of the New School sought to cover only up to 1967, but there are remarks about later events. There are five such books, and I shall comment on them in reverse chronological order because the more recent sometimes refer to earlier ones.

Jean-Michel Palmier was a professor of aesthetics at the Sorbonne.[47] His book *Weimar in Exile* studies the antifascist emigration from 1933 to 1945 to all countries and in all fields, the arts especially included, and has much about antifascist politics. It is by far the largest and most detailed of the five books, but where philosophy in the 1930s is concerned, although seven logical positivists who went elsewhere are listed,[48] only Max Wertheimer,

who taught philosophy as well as psychology, is discussed in relation to the school. Leo Straus is mentioned but not related to it, and Schutz's friend Felix Kaufmann, who also taught there for a decade, is not mentioned.

Nevertheless, Palmier does offer some interesting statistics: In the 1920s and '30s, almost 300,000 immigrated to the United States, 53.1 percent from Germany and Austria, 67.5 percent owing to fascism, and most were Jews.[49] From Germany and other countries occupied by the Reich came 1,682 university professors.[50] Alvin Johnson secured support for 100 professors and founded the University in Exile (soon renamed the Graduate Faculty of Political and Social Science). By 1937 he had recruited 17 émigrés, and by 1940 actually 60 in all the academic departments had come.[51]

The immigrant German culture from this prewar time was still evident in the period of concern here, but Americanization was also well begun as members of this first generation were retiring and dying off. Gurwitsch and Schutz were of this culture (though they reached the United States without New School help), as was to some extent later the American Cairns, who had studied with Husserl in the 1920s and '30s for a total of three and a half years, was remarkably fluent in German, and had been politically active during the 1930s with a view to getting his country into the war.

Claus-Dieter Krohn is a historian at Lüneberg.[52] In *Intellectuals in Exile* he does mention Alfred Schutz's friend Kaufmann, whom he erroneously considered a Husserl student,[53] but his account also unfortunately does not get far beyond 1950. He contends that Rutkoff and Scott had little knowledge about the historical and intellectual background of the New School,[54] which is of course part of his theme. And within that theme his emphasis is primarily on economics and secondarily on politics and psychology, so he says little about philosophy. However, Krohn does write favorably of Lewis A. Coser's approach in *Refugee Scholars in America*.[55]

I was astonished to read, however, that according to Krohn, "the hiring of Alfred Schutz in 1943 introduced phenomenology into American philosophy and sociology."[56] This is true enough for sociology, in which discipline Schutz chiefly taught at the school for over a decade, but with respect to philosophical phenomenology, this overlooks the efforts led by Marvin Farber and supported by Cairns, Gurwitsch, Herbert Spiegelberg, John Wild, and others, as well as Schutz, to found the International Phenomenological Society and its journal, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research,* and to edit the *Essays in Memory of Edmund Husserl*, prominently published with Harvard University Press, all in 1940.[57] Perhaps Krohn overestimated Schutz's impact in

the United States in this respect because of the attention brought to Schutz's work in Germany by his student, Thomas Luckmann, and Luckmann's students at the University of Konstanz. Nevertheless, the pages on Schutz are informative, except that "*Der sinnhafte Aufbau*" is badly translated as "The Tangible Structure" when it should be "Meaningful."[58]

Rutkoff and Scott's *New School* provides, for all its faults, by far the most information relevant to the historical background for the present volume. Its account reaches to some extent into the 1970s and thus refers to the New School Three and the time when phenomenology was central to the teaching in philosophy at the Graduate Faculty. Moreover, it draws on considerable oral tradition and is certainly what is most likely to be read today, serving, for example, as the sole bibliographical item for the entry on the New School in the *Wikipedia* entry updated November 9, 2009.

Two sociologists at the school wrote reviews of Rutkoff and Scott's book. Both were reacting in part to the claim that the Graduate Faculty programs in anthropology, philosophy, political science, and sociology had been "rescinded" in 1978 by the New York Board of Regents, while the New School president actually agreed only to moratoria until new appointments could be made.

About the substance of Rutkoff and Scott's *New School*, however, Arthur J. Vidich wrote,

> Choosing narrative history as their method, they failed to set forth a historical problem: Why did the New School come into being in New York when it did? What role did it play in the internationalization of twentieth-century culture? In place of a problem they offer a mass of partially undigested data, making for fascinating reading for natives and neighbors of the school, but not stating or resolving any issue in educational or intellectual history.[59]

Actually, I would say that the first and fifth chapters of this book are not so bad about the origin of the school and the Graduate Faculty within it. And "the mass of partially undigested data" proved, as already seen above, fascinating reading for this native.

In his preface to its translation, Vidich asserts that Krohn's book is, by contrast, "the first in-depth intellectual history of a remarkable group of social and political scientists. . . . Unlike any other, this book provides a comprehensive picture on both European and American social science."[60] Vidich goes on strongly to urge that with the end of the Cold War (the translation

with Vidich's preface was published in 1993), especially the work in economics done at the New School ought to be reconsidered because it includes longer-term thinking about Western capitalism than is found in Keynes.

Stanford M. Lyman also wrote a review of Rutkoff and Scott's book that converges with what his colleague and friend Vidich wrote.

> Although presented as a chronicle of that New York institution's origin, growth, and present situation, Rutkoff and Scott's account is colored by hagiography and nostalgia, marred by an unacknowledged selectivity of events, and distorted by the authors' desire to write *finis* to an era. Ultimately, *New School* succeeds as a lively story but fails to explain that university's significance for 20th-century social thought.[61]

I do not disagree with Lyman any more than with Vidich, but again, I did find much of interest in Rutkoff and Scott's history (and am myself also probably somewhat guilty about hagiography and nostalgia!).

Rutkoff and Scott's account lists forty-five people whom they interviewed as well as the various libraries and archives they visited. I am surprised only that they do not list the Schutz Archiv at Konstanz, did not interview Alice Gurwitsch or Helmut Wagner, and that, while they did interview Thomas Luckmann and Maurice Natanson, whom I know from many contacts had the highest estimation for Dorion Cairns, they twice misspell Cairns's name and say practically nothing about him.

Nevertheless, Rutkoff and Scott do write otherwise quite accurately that

> in virtually any other American university in the 1950s . . . Schutz would have been isolated, culturally and intellectually. Under his influence, however, the New School became the center of phenomenological philosophy.—Schutz was joined, and then succeeded, by Aron Gurwitsch and Dorian [sic] Cairns, who in the late 1950s and early 1960s made philosophy the Graduate Faculty's most distinguished department. The appointment of Hans Jonas in the mid-1950s and Hannah Arendt a decade later assured the department's continued prominence.[62]

Indeed, this passage nicely states the theme of the present volume. But while there are "hagiographies" of Arendt, Gurwitsch, and Jonas, there is none

of Cairns, who died the same year as Gurwitsch and for whom there had also been a Festschrift done a dozen years before Rutkoff and Scott's work. The Festschrift contained an autobiographical sketch by Cairns that Rutkoff and Scott could have consulted.[63] Cairns's two translations of Husserl were crucial for the introduction of phenomenology into the anglophone world in the 1960s; he was friends with all the others in the first and pre–World War II group of phenomenologists in the United States; and his phenomenology students fundamentally enjoyed and benefited from his teaching. But perhaps Cairns did not publish enough or go to enough conferences. More hagiography on Cairns will be offered below. Finally, there are no mentions of New School students in Rutkoff and Scott's account other than Luckmann, Natanson, and Wagner, perhaps because the others represented in this volume were still too junior and relatively unaccomplished in the mid-1980s.

They do recognize the end of an era "in the early seventies, however, a period when the graduate program again found itself in jeopardy. With the deaths of Gurwitsch and Hannah Arendt and the retirement of Hans Jonas, the once distinguished philosophy department was devastated."[64] Rutkoff and Scott's book does not tell about the subsequent efforts of J. N. Mohanty, which had already begun, to continue the tradition. And the contributions of Reiner Schurmann, Thomas Seebohm, and Osborne Wiggins should be included in a more adequate treatment.

Lewis A. Coser was a sociologist. His book is not historical.[65] Thus he writes,

> In the last analysis, the history of ideas, like all history, is about people and their interrelationships with their fellows. . . . The experience of being taught by a great scientist or a great humanist scholar cannot be duplicated by even the most diligent perusal of published works or by listening to even a major paper at an occasional international meeting. . . . [The achievements of refugees] were made possible by the interplay between cultural patterns and social structures that existed before they arrived and the new elements that they brought to their various disciplines and lines of endeavor in this country.[66]

Coser's model is elaborated in his introduction, entitled "The Refugees: Loss and Generation of Prestige," which I strongly recommend. Coser's book seems not to be referred to in Rutkoff and Scott, perhaps owing to a

publication delay; *New School* appeared two years later. Palmier's appreciation of Coser has been indicated above.

Coser offers a "collective portrait" of the New School. Although most of the refugee scholars who came in the 1930s were of a higher social class than other refugees of the time, they found that professors in the United States had lower social status than those in Germany. Also, while most of them were widely dispersed, there were several clusters, the most important of which was the Graduate Faculty of the New School. Coser's sketch of Alvin Johnson's role in this connection is excellent.

Among other things, Coser reports that Johnson insisted that all faculty participate in the general seminar, which "had the distinct advantage of contributing to interdisciplinary contacts within the faculty as well as serving as a kind of advertising to other academics of the New School scholars' contributions to the intellectual life in New York."[67] Joint seminars were also taught. Although I heard that a course that Gurwitsch taught with somebody from psychology did not go well, I remember sitting in on an excellent one devoted to Schutz that Gurwitsch and Thomas Luckmann taught in the middle 1960s. Rutkoff and Scott's account oddly remarks, however, that "by 1959 the self-conscious superiority of the philosophy department was itself evidence that generalized study and interdisciplinary scholarship no longer distinguished the Graduate Faculty from other universities."[68] This is odd because the golden age lasted into the 1970s.

I also find it difficult to credit this remark about declining interdisciplinarity. Since a minor was required at the graduate level, I took courses with Weber scholars Carl Mayer and Albert Solomon, and also one with Luckmann. And I might add, for what it is worth, that Cairns typically introduced Husserlian thought as psychological phenomenology since it is easier to access transcendental phenomenology from there. Furthermore, not only did Gurwitsch regularly refer to Gestalt psychology, but he taught a fascinating seminar on the work of Jean Piaget. Under Gurwitsch, Wiggins began a dissertation on Piaget that he finished with Zaner. It is no surprise, then, that some New School phenomenology students have gone on to focus on such things as the cultural sciences, literature, medicine, and psychiatry.

Coser believed that the success of the teaching in the Graduate Faculty can be seen in the quality of its students, for example, Helmut Wagner as well as Luckmann in sociology, who perpetuated interdisciplinarity among other things.

> Most of the younger American scholars trained at the Graduate Faculty continued the New School tradition of interdisciplinary learning, sensitivity to the philosophical underpinnings of the research they conducted, and emphasis on theoretical as distinct from purely empirical scholarship. They continued to contribute to the deprovincialization of the American mind that their teachers had begun.[69]

Coser's book contains sketches of forty refugee scholars, four of whom had connections with the New School in philosophy. Leo Strauss came before the golden age that is the focus of this book, and Hannah Arendt was in effect after and apart from the era examined here. Coser's sections on Schutz and Gurwitsch are excellent. As a native-born American, Cairns did not receive treatment.

Schutz was of course not widely known in the United States during his lifetime. Cairns, Farber, and Gurwitsch were for him the "essential sounding boards for [his] ideas."[70] "Now [1984], however, he has moved into the front rank of sociologists and, to a lesser extent, philosophers, as one of that small company who are widely read, commented upon, and critically evaluated."[71] Schutz's book is characterized correctly: "*Der sinnhafte Aufbau der sozialen Welt: Eine Einleitung in die verstehende Soziologie* (1932) . . . attempted explicitly to ground Weber's *verstehende Soziologie*—i.e. a sociology that is concerned with tracing the motives and grounds of action of human actors—in the phenomenological approach of Husserl."[72]

But rather than call Schutz a phenonomenological sociologist, it would be more accurate to call him a methodologist or even a philosopher of social or cultural science. Schutz's *Soziologie* is rightly recognized by Coser in American terms as a "phenomenological social psychology," which contrasts it with the functionalist sociology of Talcott Parsons, Robert K. Merton, and others.[73] And again, Coser recognizes a half dozen of Schutz's students and followers who went on to win wide recognition in philosophy, but first of all in sociology, especially Harold Garfinkel, who founded ethnomethodology, and Peter Berger and Thomas Luckmann, who founded social constructivism.[74]

Coser considered Aron Gurwitsch, whom he knew personally, a prototypical "marginal man."[75] Describing the situation for émigré philosophers, he writes,

> No historian of philosophy would deny that the coming of Rudolf Carnap and other members of the Vienna Circle deeply influenced

> the subsequent course of philosophical inquiries in this country. The members of the Vienna Circle quickly gained a hearing largely because they fitted into networks of American philosophers, whether they were pragmatists or followers of the Russell or the early Wittgensteinian tradition in England. Most Vienna Circle philosophers gained prestigious university positions and were able to make major contributions to American philosophy of science and to symbolic logic. By contrast, European philosophers of the phenomenological school, which had only a few isolated upholders in America, found openings only in universities of lesser rank or at the New School for Social Research.[76]

Coser adds that the positivists

> arrived at the right time for their message to be heard, whereas the phenomenologists and existential philosophers came here several decades too early from the point of view of their careers. . . .
>
> . . . Only several decades after their arrival, partly under the influence of a handful of students trained by Continental refugees, would phenomenology and existential philosophy grow to major stature on the American intellectual scene.[77]

Coser takes Gurwitsch's career as typical of phenomenologists in America. His education is traced back to Germany, where he became devoted to Husserl's general orientation but was not unwilling to depart from particular theories. With the rise of Hitler, Gurwitsch went to Paris, where he was a lecturer at the Sorbonne from 1934 to 1939.[78] In 1940, he left France ahead of the Nazis, and he taught chiefly at Brandeis University before coming to the New School upon Schutz's death in 1959.

Coser recognizes the rapid increase of interest in phenomenology during the 1960s. The number of journals receptive to the phenomenological approach increased, and the same increase could be seen for book series, professional societies such as the Husserl Circle, and also for doctoral programs where phenomenology was taught. But Coser seems not to have recognized that much of this development was largely due to Americans returning from studying in Europe after the war, and especially from Belgium and France, where there was great interest in phenomenology, Martin Heidegger, Jean-Paul Sartre, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Hans-Georg Gadamer, and Husserl.

Gurwitsch participated in the founding of the Society for Phenomenology and Existential Philosophy in 1962 and, with Cairns, of the Husserl Circle in 1969. Nevertheless,

> [Gurwitsch] stressed in many conversations I had with him that he was not really at home in America. While Alfred Schutz made a major effort to engage himself with native American philosophical trends, Gurwitsch did not. He published one article on William James but otherwise remained detached from American mainline philosophy. . . .
>
> . . . He remained a European scholar through the more than thirty years he dwelt in America. It is perhaps symbolic that he died while vacationing in Switzerland. Yet his impact is likely to persist for a long time in the now well-established American phenomenological movement.[79]

It is unfortunate that Rutkoff and Scott did not interview Helmut Wagner, and also that they somehow did not consult his *Alfred Schutz: An Intellectual Biography,* which had been prominently published by the University of Chicago Press in 1983, three years before their book. Had they done so, they would have appreciated the role of Dorion Cairns in the development of phenomenology at the New School under the leadership of Alfred Schutz.

Finally, anyone at all interested in the history of the New School for Social Research should read the first book contributing to that history, namely, Alvin Johnson's autobiography.[80] His importance in guiding its development, which went on for decades, has been indicated above. Reading his account, one can get some insight into the situation in the United States just after the first war, although Johnson did not elaborate on the adverse political conditions at Columbia University that played a role in his establishing the New School. The London School of Economics provided elements of his model for the school. His ability to find wealthy individuals to fund major developments was amazing. His recruitment for the University in Exile came largely from his editing of the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* which included many German contributors. An economist himself, he admitted that, with a few exceptions, Dewey above all, he had difficulties getting along with philosophers.[81] Nevertheless, American phenomenology first took root in the philosophy doctoral program at the school.

To conclude this part of this introduction, let me express the hope that the present project might help motivate an intellectual historian of Krohn's caliber to carry the story of the teaching of phenomenology at the New School in the 1960s at least through the end of the twentieth century.[82] Where institutions affected by the New School are concerned, the Husserl Circle has existed and been active for many years, and there have been the efforts over the last thirty years of the Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology, Inc., including its two book series, the lectureships in memory of Gurwitsch and Schutz, and the fostering of phenomenological organizations—including an organization of organizations across the planet. CARP was founded in 1971 by José Huertas-Jourda and New School students Lester Embree, Fred Kersten, Guiseppina Moneta, and Richard Zaner. Maurice Natanson joined the group later, at least for a while, and J. N. Mohanty, William McKenna, Thomas Seebohm, Thomas Nenon, Gail Soffer, James Dodd, Nicholas de Warren, Rosemary R. P. Lerner, and Michael Barber joined later still.

A continuation of the story of how New School phenomenology has influenced the field would need to explore the tensions that exist between a strictly Husserlian approach to phenomenology and those tendencies within what has come to be called in the United States and elsewhere "Continental philosophy."[83] Such a continuation would also likely include an account of how New School phenomenology has differed from its European cousins—for example, by being less metaphysical. Understanding at least some of the differences between Continental and analytical philosophy in the United States and indeed elsewhere across the planet might also form part of the focus of a more comprehensive and up-to-date history of the New School that extends into the twenty-first century.

Before I go any further, however, it seems appropriate to explain why I have not included two figures in this volume—Hannah Arendt and Hans Jonas. Both taught philosophy at the New School during the period under consideration, and both are considered by some today to have been phenomenologists.

Jonas was chosen instead of Gurwitsch in 1955 to join the Graduate Faculty. I did not like the one course I had with Hans Jonas but did not seek to exclude him from my doctoral orals. During my exam, he was pleasantly surprised when I agreed with him that Hume was fundamentally an atomist and that this ultimately undid his position. Jonas had studied with Husserl as well as Heidegger at Freiburg in the 1920s and had very positive things to say about Husserl at the time of Husserl's death (and very negative things

about how Heidegger behaved toward Husserl then).[84] I know nothing about his relations with Cairns, but Jonas wrote that Schutz "saw himself as the representative of phenomenology," that "Aron Gurwitsch [was] his friend and phenomenological soul brother," and even that "Gurwitsch . . . with his Russian phenomenology and the orthodoxy that accompanied it, was a narrow-minded Husserlian."[85] Furthermore, he remarkably asserted that

> In [Thomas Mann's *Magic Mountain*] and in *Joseph and His Brothers* you can often find more import than in the entire phenomenological school, with the exception of Husserl himself. One page of Thomas Mann offers more profound insights than entire treatises on the constitution of the objective world through intentional acts of consciousness.[86]

Nevertheless, as Osborne Wiggins reports, in the last years Jonas did support the continuation of phenomenology at the school.[87]

Hannah Arendt came to the school in 1967, which was late in the time of phenomenology's florescence there. Like Jonas, her friend since the 1920s, Arendt of course favored Heidegger.[88] She was not utterly unsympathetic toward phenomenology: "I am a sort of phenomenologist . . . but, ach, not in Hegel's way—or Husserl's."[89] She also certainly supported Mohanty's efforts to save the doctoral program, and he recognizes movement toward Husserl in her late writings.[90] I do not know about any connection with Cairns (she came in when he was moving toward retirement), but her friendship with Alice Gurwitsch went back to when they worked together in Paris at Youth Aliyah during the 1930s helping Jewish orphans immigrate to Palestine. She helped get Gurwitsch's "On Contemporary Nihilism" published in *The Review of Politics*, and much later she recommended to Gurwitsch her Belgian lawyer, who, under the "Lex Arendt," secured a full professor's pension from the West German government for him as well as for her and Jonas. And Jonas reports that she had "warm personal feelings for him."[91]

In sum, although Arendt and Jonas taught philosophy on the Graduate Faculty of the New School during the 1960s and are called by some phenomenologists (admittedly in a broadened signification that they may well have not accepted), it was chiefly the New School Three who, with the support of Werner Marx, promoted Husserlian phenomenology there and taught the courses on Heidegger that Jonas never did. This seems to me to be how most of the other phenomenology students then also saw things.

* * *

Many studied philosophy at the New School between 1954 and 1973. A dozen or so of those who were committed to phenomenology remained more or less in touch with one another over the years, as *Festschrift* contributions above all document, and they can thus be considered the group of New School phenomenology students. Chapters by these students have been included in the present volume to convey much about what they encountered at the school. Colleagues who have been in other programs will see similarities and differences and may wish for similar accounts to be documented.

NOTES

1. Bell's recollections of his work under Husserl have been published in Herbert Spiegelberg, *The Phenomenological Movement: A Historical Introduction,* vol. 1 (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1960), 145. Hocking's recollections have been published in *Edmund Husserl 1859–1959* (La Haye: Martinus Nijhoff, 1959), ed. H. L. van Breda and J. Taminiaux, under the title "From the Early Days of the 'Logische Untersuchungen,'" 1–11.

2. Marvin Farber, *Phenomenology as a Method and a Philosophical Discipline* (Buffalo: University of Buffalo Press, 1928).

3. Dorion Cairns, *The Philosophy of Edmund Husserl,* The Philosophical Papers of Dorion Cairns, vol. 1, ed. Lester Embree (Dordrecht: Springer, 2012).

4. Andrew Delbridge Osborn, *The Philosophy of Edmund Husserl in Its Development from His Mathematical Interests to His First Concept of Phenomenology in* Logical Investigations (New York City: International Press, 1934).

5. Marvin Farber, ed., *Philosophical Essays in Memory of Edmund Husserl* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1940).

6. Marvin Farber, ed., *The Foundation of Phenomenology* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1943).

7. Alfred Schutz, *Collected Papers,* vol. 1, *The Problems of Social Reality,* ed. Maurice Natanson (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962); Schutz, *Collected Papers,* vol. 2, *Studies in Social Theory,* ed. Arvid Brodersen (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1964); and Schutz, *Collected Papers*, vol. 3, *Studies in Phenomenological Philosophy,* ed. Ilse Schutz (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1966).

8. Edmund Husserl, *Cartesian Meditations*, trans. Dorion Cairns (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1960).

9. Edmund Husserl, *Formal and Transcendental Logic*, trans. Dorion Cairns (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1969).

10. Dorion Cairns, *Guide for Translating Husserl* (The Hague: Martinus Nijjhoff, 1973).

11. Dorion Cairns, *Conversations with Husserl and Fink* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973).

12. Aron Gurwitsch, *The Field of Consciousness* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 1964).

13. Aron Gurwitsch, *Studies in Phenomenology and Psychology* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1966).

14. According to Ernst Wolfgang Orth and Thomas Seebohm, s.v. "Germany," in *Encyclopedia of Phenomenology,* ed. Lester Embree et al. (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997), the first decades after the war in Germany had not the watchword "existential phenomenology" but just "existentialism" with Heidegger as the leading figure, but the early volumes of Husserliana provoked vigorous discussion of phenomenological method and ultimate grounding. The Deutsche Gesellschaft für phänomenologische Forschung and Phänomenologische Forschungen were founded only in 1976.

15. Quoted in David L. Smith, C.S.Sp.*, Born to See, Born to Behold: The History of the Simon Silverman Phenomenology Center (1975–2005)* (Pittsburgh: The Simon Silverman Phenomenology Center, 2008), 64.

16. The latest major characterization of this approach is Amadeo Giorgi, *The Descriptive Phenomenological Method in Psychology: A Modified Husserlian Approach* (Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 2009).

17. John Wild, *The Challenge of Existentialism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1955).

18. The opposition of philosophy and philologists that needs to be continued has an ancient origin: "The ideals of the philologists and their claims were challenged in the last phase of Classical Antiquity. . . . It was primarily the Stoics and the commentators on Aristotle who renewed the criticism of Plato. What they said now was that the philologist ends with a collection of facts, but does not recognize the truth. Philologists know what is written, but they cannot know the truth. Only philosophical investigation can decide whether what was or is written is true or not. The old dispute of the philosopher on the one hand and the prophet-poet as the *hermeneus* of the gods plus the rhapsode of the prophet-poet on the other is now transformed into the opposition between the philosopher who carries out a philosophical critique of the tradition and the philologist (and later the humanist) as the warden of a positive application of the tradition." Thomas Seebohm, *Hermeneutics: Method and Methodology* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2004), 17.

19. "As any number of people can testify, anything written by an American continental philosopher which is not an exposition of some European philosopher is guaranteed to be impact free." John McCumber, *On Philosophy: Notes from a Crisis* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2013), 7.

20. Lester Embree, "Husserl as Trunk of the American Continental Tree," *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 11, no. 2 (2002): 177–90.

21. Lester Embree, review of *The History of Continental Philosophy,* vol. 4, *Phenomenology: Responses and Developments,* ed. Leonard Lawlor (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), in *Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews: An Electronic Journal* (April 2012).

22. Scott Soames, *Philosophical Analysis in the Twentieth Century* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2004).

23. Edith Stein, *On Woman,* trans. Freda Mary Oben (Washington, DC: ICS Publications, 1987).

24. Simone de Beauvoir, *The Second Sex,* trans. Constance Borde and Sheila Malovany-Chevallier (New York: Vintage, 2011).

25. Sara Heinämaa, *Toward a Phenomenology of Sexual Difference: Husserl, Merleau-Ponty, Beauvoir* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005).

26. Wendy O'Brien and Lester Embree, eds., *The Existential Phenomenology of Simone de Beauvoir* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2001).

27. Linda Fisher and Lester Embree, eds., *Feminist Phenomenology* (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000).

28. Steven Crowell, "Phenomenology in the United States," *New Yearbook for Phenomenology and Phenomenological Philosophy* 12 (2012): 195.

29. Cf. *Husserl and Intentionality: A Study of Mind, Meaning, and Language,* coauthored with Ronald McIntyre (New York: D. Reidel Publishing Company, 1982). [L. E.]

30. It also deserves mention that not only Dreyfus but also Harold Garfinkel, founder of ethnomethodology, had extensive contact with Aron Gurwitsch at Brandeis while they were students at Harvard. [L. E.]

31. Alfred Schutz, "Husserl's *Cartesian Meditations*" (1932), in *Collected Papers,* ed. Helmut Wagner, George Psathas, and Fred Kersten, vol. 4 (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1996), 164.

32. Dorion Cairns, "Reason and Emotion," *Husserl Studies* 17 (2001): 21–33 is a good example of doing original phenomenology.

33. Dorion Cairns, *The Philosophy of Edmund Husserl,* ed. Lester Embree (Dordrecht: Springer, 2012).

34. Lester Embree, *Animism, Adumbration, Willing, and Wisdom* (Bucharest: Zeta Books, 2012).

35. There is, however, Charles S. Brown and Ted Toadvine, eds., *Eco-Phenomenology* (Albany: SUNY Press, 2003).

36. Lester Embree and Thomas Nenon, eds., *Husserl's* Ideen (Dordrecht: Springer, 2013).

37. Lester Embree et al., eds., *Encyclopedia of Phenomenology* (Dordrecht: Springer, 1997).

38. John Drummond and Lester Embree, eds., *Phenomenological Approaches to Moral Philosophy* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2002).

39. Hans Rainer Sepp and Lester Embree, eds., *Handbook of Phenomenological Aesthetics* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2009).

40. Steven Crowell, Lester Embree, and Samuel J. Julian, eds., *The Reach of Reflection: Issues for Phenomenology's Second Century,* 3 vols. (http://www.electronpress.com, 2001).

41. Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott, *New School: A History of the New School for Social Research* (New York: The Free Press, 1986), xi.

42. "The New School continues the Graduate Faculty's tradition of synthesizing leftist American intellectual thought and critical European philosophy. True to its origin and its firm roots within the University in Exile, The New School, particularly its Department of Philosophy, is one of very few in the United States to offer students thorough training in the modern continental European philosophical tradition known as 'Continental philosophy.' Thus, it stresses the teachings of Parmenides, Aristotle, Leibniz, Spinoza, Hume, Kant, Hegel, Kierkegaard, Marx, Nietzsche, Husserl, Heidegger, Arendt, Freud, Benjamin, Wittgenstein, Foucault, Derrida, Deleuze,

et al. The thought of the Critical Theory of the Frankfurt School: Max Horkheimer, Walter Benjamin, Theodor Adorno, Herbert Marcuse, Jürgen Habermas, et al. holds an especially strong influence on all divisions of the school. After the death of Hannah Arendt in 1975, the philosophy department revolved around Reiner Schurmann and Agnes Heller." http://en.wikipedia.org/The_New_School.

43. Rutkoff and Scott, *New School*, 78.

44. Elmar Holenstein, *Roman Jakobson's Approach to Language: Phenomenological Structuralism,* trans. Catherine Schelbert and Tarcisius Schelbert (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1976).

45. Rutkoff and Scott, *New School*, 223.

46. Richard Grathoff, ed., *Philosophers in Exile: The Correspondence of Alfred Schutz and Aron Gurwitsch, 1939–1959*, trans. J. Claude Evans (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989).

47. Jean-Michel Palmier, *Weimar in Exile: The Antifascist Emigration in Europe and America*, trans. David Fernbach (New York: Verso Books, 1987).

48. Ibid., 483.

49. Ibid., 466–67.

50. Ibid., 479.

51. Ibid., 554.

52. Claus-Dieter Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile: Refugee Scholars and the New School for Social Research,* trans. Rita and Robert Kimber, foreword by Arthur J. Vidich (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1993) [German original 1987].

53. Ibid., 75.

54. Ibid., 215–16.

55. He writes, "[Coser] bases his assessment of the impact of émigré scholars in America on their personal interactions, the exchange of ideas with others, and the establishment of new intellectual networks—paying no special attention to famous academic institutions. The scholars' significance is not measured by whether or not they taught at Princeton or Harvard, whether they published with well-known publishers, or how often they were cited in the mainstream literature of their discipline. Instead, they were evaluated according to who listened to them, who adopted their message, and for what reason. In this kind of approach the historian of the influence of German émigrés concentrates not just on what the Europeans brought along with them and were able to integrate unproblematically into the new social world but also on the social and cultural conditions that facilitated or hindered the reception of new and different ideas in the United States" (ibid., 162). See Lewis A. Coser, *Refugee Scholars in America: Their Impact and Their Experiences* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1984).

56. Ibid., 96.

57. It seems that Krohn failed to consult Herbert Spiegelberg, *The Phenomenological Movement: A Historical Introduction,* 2 vols. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1962; 2nd ed., 1965).

58. Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile*, 96–97.

59. Arthur J. Vidich, "Book Review: Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott, *New School: A History of The New School for Social Research*," *Contemporary Sociology* 16, no. 3 (May 1987): 274.

60. Krohn, *Intellectuals in Exile*, vii, cf. xii.

61. Stanford M. Lyman, review of *New School: A History of the New School for Social Research*, by Peter M. Rutkoff and William B. Scott, *American Journal*

of Sociology 93, no. 1 (July 1987): 206. A more recent work conveys much about the personalities and internal life of the Graduate Faculty, but from the point of view of the sociology department: Arthur J. Vidich, *With a Critical Eye: An Intellectual and His Times,* ed. Robert Jackall (Knoxville: Newfound Press, 2003).

62. Rutkoff and Scott, *New School*, 213.

63. Fred Kersten and Richard Zaner, eds., *Phenomenology: Continuation and Criticism, Essays in Memory of Dorion Cairns,* Phaenomenologica, vol. 50 (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973).

64. Rutkoff and Scott, *New School*, 252.

65. Coser, *Refugee Scholars*.

66. Ibid., xi.

67. Ibid., 106.

68. Rutkoff and Scott, *New School*, 213.

69. Coser, *Refugee Scholars,* 108–9.

70. Ibid., 122. See Richard Grathoff, ed., *Philosophers in Exile: The Correspondence of Alfred Schutz and Aron Gurwitsch, 1939–1959,* trans. J. Claude Evans (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1989). For Schutz's interaction with Cairns, see Lester Embree, "Dorion Cairns, Alfred Schutz, and the Egological Reduction," in Nasu Hisashi, Lester Embree, George Psathas, and Ilja Srubar, eds., *Alfred Schutz and His Intellectual Partners* (Konstanz: Universitätsverlag Konstanz, 2009), 177–216; and Alfred Schutz, "The Problem of Transcendental Intersubjectivity in Husserl, with Comments of Dorion Cairns and Eugen Fink," trans. Fred Kersten and forthcoming in *Schutzian Research*.

71. Coser, *Refugee Scholars*, 121.

72. Ibid., 121–22.

73. Ibid., 124.

74. Ibid., 123.

75. Ibid., 307.

76. Ibid., 9.

77. Ibid., 307.

78. Cf. Lester Embree, "Introduction: La période parisienne de Aron Gurwitsch," in Aron Gurwitsch, *Esquisse de la phénoménologie constitutive,* ed. José Huertas-Jourda (Paris: Librarie Philosophique J. Vrin, 2002).

79. Coser, *Refugee Scholars*, 311–12.

80. Alvin Johnson, *Pioneer's Progress: An Autobiography* (New York: The Viking Press, 1952).

81. Ibid., 221.

82. The closest thing of this sort thus far is the entry "United States of America" by Lester Embree, James M. Edie, Don Ihde, Joseph J. Kockelmans, and Calvin O. Schrag in the *Encyclopedia of Phenomenology,* ed. Lester Embree et al. (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 1997), 718–23.

83. Embree, "Husserl as Trunk."

84. Christian Weise, *The Life and Thought of Hans Jonas: Jewish Dimensions* (Waltham, MA: Brandeis University Press, 2007), 208n5, 209n10, and 210n11.

85. Ibid., 170.

86. Ibid., 170, 54.

87. Osborne P. Wiggins, "My Years at the New School" in chapter 15 of the current volume.

88. See Richard Wolin, *Heidegger's Children: Hannah Arendt, Karl Löwith, Hans Jonas, and Herbert Marcuse* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2001).

89. Elisabeth Young-Bruehl, *Hannah Arendt: For the Love of the World,* 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2004), 405, cf. 318.

90. J. N. Mohanty, "How I Came to the New School," chapter 5 in this volume.

91. Weise, *The Life and Thought of Hans Jonas,* 170.