

Abstracts for Conference ‘Antisemitism and the emergence of sociological theory’

John Abbott

‘Social Questions, Christian Ethics and Antisemitic Imagery: The Case of Georg Ratzinger’

This paper examines the career of Georg Ratzinger (1844-99), a prominent Catholic “Social” publicist and reformer active in Bavarian politics during the latter nineteenth century. Ratzinger, great-uncle to the current pope, was a peasant’s son from Lower Bavaria; through church support, he gained entry to the University of Munich, where he received a doctorate in theology in 1868. The following two decades saw him holding a variety of clerical offices, even as he launched an active career as social theorist and journalist; in 1888 he resigned as priest in order to devote himself fully to political affairs. Until his death eleven years later, he published a variety of works, including two expressly antisemitic tracts written under pseudonym. In 1893, he was closely involved with Bavaria’s peasant insurgencies, and was subsequently elected to the Bavarian Landtag and German Reichstag.

I am working up a fuller account of Ratzinger’s political career elsewhere; in this paper I propose a tightly-focused treatment of his social theory and the particular place of Jewry within it. My premise is that Ratzinger, like many other Catholic Socials of his generation, perceived social relations almost exclusively through the notional lens of religion. His sociological theory, such as it was, was mostly impelled by concern over the social upheavals of his day, especially that involving the German peasantry. His was, in other words, a kind of functional sociology, pressed into the service of an emerging Catholic social critique and activism. In this undertaking, Ratzinger apprehended social realities chiefly through religious and moral categories; these categories, in turn, provided the organizing principle for his polemics and reform schemes.

Ratzinger’s first published book, an historical survey of church poor-relief (*Geschichte der kirchlichen Armenpflege*, 1869), established the moral-religious underpinnings for his social activism; the title of his major work, *Die Volkswirtschaft in ihren sittlichen Grundlagen* (1881), suggests the close interplay of ethical and socio-economic concepts in his thought. A third work, *Die Erhaltung der Bauernstand* (1883) sounded themes that defined much of his subsequent political career: the scourge of usury and the ways in which increasingly liberalized real estate markets were allegedly fragmenting landed property, family farms in particular, into small unproductive parcels. Both evils Ratzinger blamed on the stereotypical “big capital” of the Catholic social imagination, in which Jewish banking and speculative interests supposedly dominated.

By examining these and other of Ratzinger’s writings, I hope to address several questions regarding the place of antisemitism in the Catholic social imagination. To what extent did Ratzinger develop a distinctly sociological perspective independent of the moral language of antisemitism? To what degree did his reliance on moral-religious categories – e.g. “Christian charity versus “Jewish acquisitiveness” – reflect strongly held convictions; to what extent did he use this language because it seemed most suited to his audiences’ own perceptions and prejudices? To what degree do “racial” concepts and assumptions spill over into his highly charged oppositions of Christianity and Jewry? And how did his insistence on the essentially Jewish nature of the enemy work in a social landscape – the rural regions of “Old” Bavaria – in which Jews were conspicuously absent? If there was, in other words, a distinctly metaphorical dimension to his antisemitic critique, what if any tensions arose between metaphor and lived

experience among his audiences?

Gary A. Abraham

‘Revisiting “Max Weber and the Jewish Question”’¹

In 1776 Adam Smith asserted that the harmony and unity of the new economic order is maintained by the force of an invisible hand exerted over all the transactions of society. This admission that we do not and probably cannot know the underlying causes of social unity in an increasing complex society has remained true ever since. Unfortunately, that solution to modern complexity is not at least psychologically very unsatisfying. Theoretical sociology can be thought of as a high culture instrument for resolving that psychological dis-ease. In society antisemitism plays the same role, along with numerous other forms of uniformitarianism,² such as religious fundamentalism.

The notion that modernity elicits uniformitarianism, which struggles against its opposite, also elicited by modernity, “universal otherhood,” was introduced by Benjamin Nelson as an extension of Nelson’s story about *The Idea of Usury*.³ As he began that story, Nelson asked (but did not answer) the question, “Was Max Weber preparing to chart the course of this evolution at the time of his premature death?”⁴

Surely Weber was committed to charting the course of the evolution of modern ideas but, in the end, his commitment to nationalist liberalism prevented him from perceiving with any sympathy the evolution toward universal otherhood. There is no analysis of nationalism, anti-Semitism or other forms of uniformitarianism in Weber’s work, and Weber’s interest in universalism is more attenuated than Nelson’s.

The answer to Nelson’s question is therefore, no. The clearest way to see this answer is by looking at his contributions to “the Polish question” and “the Catholic question,” both pejorative terms used during Weber’s lifetime that assume that the unqualified acceptance of Poles and Catholics in German society is problematic, and by looking at his sociology of Judaism in the context of “the Jewish question” of his time. Weber’s contributions to all three social questions show that he was averse to the idea of universal otherhood. In this he shares the underlying uniformitarianism that marks both mainstream sociology and anti-Semitism.

Mathias Berek

‘Moritz Lazarus, Georg Simmel, and Antisemitism’

Moritz Lazarus can certainly be considered as a „proto-sociologist“ (Köhnke): He was not only the inspiring teacher of Georg Simmel, whose „Sociology“ one can't deny to take as a founding opus of the discipline. Moreover, his work „About the Relation of the Individual to the Collectivity“, and others concerning the foundation of a social psychology (called „Völkerpsychologie“) constitute a clear foresight what sociology of modern society has and is

¹ Gary A. Abraham, *Max Weber and the Jewish Question: A Study of the Social Outlook of His Sociology* (Univ. Illinois Pr., 1992) (hereafter *MWJQ*).

² See Toby Huff, ed., *On the Roads to Modernity: Conscience, Science and Civilizations, Selected Writings by Benjamin Nelson* (Totowa, NJ: Rowman and Littlefield, 1981), pp. 240-243.

³ Benjamin N. Nelson, *The Idea of Usury: From Tribal Brotherhood to Universal Otherhood* (Princeton Univ. Pr. 1949).

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. viii.

able to analyze.

But, although Lazarus, like other Jews (e.g. Simmel), has been constrained in his academic career by German antisemitism in the last decades of the nineteenth century, his sociological theories cannot be interpreted as „*constructed in opposition* to antisemitic ideas“. Rather they can be understood as a *result* of both the emerging modern society with its impact on old traditions *and* the eruption of antisemitism during this process. This paper will interpret the proto-sociological theories of Lazarus against the background of the experiences of a Jew that grew up in a small town in the Prussian province of Posen, where he could watch Catholics, Protestants and Jews living „friendly together but also in distance from each other“ – a situation Lazarus later described as the very roots of his reflection about the „Völkerpsychologie“. Part of this background is also his double interest in Jewish religion and ethics as well as in classical Greek, Latin and German literature, his academic success in becoming professor and rector in Bern, Switzerland, and later even being appointed to a professorship at the Prussian War Academy. And not least this background consists of antisemitism – when he lost this position again and afterwards got offered only an unsalaried professorship at the University of Berlin. Thus it was this experience of being part of the society (Lazarus considered himself as a patriotic German) and of still being regarded as an unwanted *outsider* that triggered a distant, a *sociological* view on the phenomena of modern society.

The case of Lazarus is particularly intriguing because besides his academic research and teachings he – unlike Simmel – intensively took part in the religious and political life of Wilhelminian Germany. He chaired the first Jewish Synods and several Jewish associations as well as one of his first publications addressed the „The moral entitlement of Prussia in Germany“. Not only during the „Antisemitismus-Streit“ in the 1880s, he spoke and wrote publicly against the antisemitic movements and was involved in related lobbying and publishing activities. Where Simmel hardly uttered a word in public about antisemitism and never emphasized to be a Jew, his teacher Lazarus who had grown up in the short period of Jewish integration was well known as a representative of the Jewish Community in Germany. But in their concepts of society structures *both* were certain that those structures always consist of interdependencies between the individual and the collectivity *and between different collectives*: In modern society there is always interchange and interplay which have to be scrutinized by a social psychology / sociology. The ethnic (völkischen) concepts of the German antisemites were the exact opposite of that understanding. There was no place in them for the Jewry. So it is no coincidence that two of the founders of sociology were German Jews. Antisemitism – both theoretical and practically experienced – can be interpreted as an important, but not the only background of their theory of society.

Michal Bodemann

‘In cold admiration: Werner Sombart, the Jews and classical German sociology’

The paper addresses the problem how classical German sociology dealt with the question of the stranger/Jew, as well as with the questions of ethno-national solidarities and race. In these debates, it is argued, the Jews constitute a central trope. The paper focuses in particular on Werner Sombart, one of the four central figures in German sociology in his time, but it also takes a look at the early meetings of the German Sociological Society and the writings by Simmel, Weber and Tönnies. Even in 1910, Germany was a multi-ethnic society replete with discussions of race and the role of the Jews in German society. At that time, and in sharp contrast to early American sociology,

these issues, with the principal and important exception of Sombart, and with rather minor reflections of it in the work of Weber, Simmel and Tönnies, were of virtually no further interest to most of German sociology, and even in these “classical” authors, they were of interest mostly in relation to contemporary race theories. This weakness, it is argued, prepared sociology very poorly for the völkisch and Nazi onslaught in the years after WW I.

Werner Bonefeld

‘Anti-Semitism and the (modern) critique of capitalism’

For the apologists of market liberalism, the reference to the invisible hand operates like an explanatory refuge. It explains everything with reference to the Invisible. ‘Starvation is God’s way of punishing those who have too little faith in capitalism’ (Rockefeller Sr.). For the anti-Semites, however, the power of the invisible can be explained – the Jew is its personification and biologized existence. It transforms discontent with conditions into a conformist rebellion against the projected personification of capitalism. Developing Moishe Postone’s contribution, this paper discusses Anti-Semitism as a form of bourgeois anti-capitalism.

Rainer N. Egloff

‘Ludwik Fleck, anti-Semitism and the sociology of science’

This proposed paper discusses the role of anti-semitism in the development and reception of Ludwik Fleck’s historical sociology of science.

Today, the polish-jewish microbiologist Ludwik Fleck (1896–1961) is an acknowledged classic of the history and sociology of science. Yet, during Fleck’s lifetime, his work in this field was largely ignored. As the paper argues, this has a lot to do with the anti-Semitic currents of the times and environments, Fleck was part of. His monograph *Entstehung und Entwicklung einer wissenschaftliche Tatsache* appeared in 1935 in Basel. Addressing a German-speaking audience, the book only reached a wider audience after Thomas Kuhn, in 1962, pointed it out as an influence in this *Structure of Scientific Revolution*.»

The paper further argues, that the experience of anti-Semitism was itself an integral part of Fleck’s conceptual thinking. Drawing from such jewish authors as Gumplowicz and Simmel, Fleck theorized marginalization and exclusion in scientific discourse early on. He emphasized the constraining force of «thought-collectives», and explored the negative effects of isolation on the development of science. In an article that appeared in 1946 under the sober title «Problems in theory of science», Fleck told about his experience as a prisoner and forced laborer in a laboratory of Buchenwald, to illustrate his epistemological standpoint. Less obvious traces of his continued explicit and implicit reflections on anti-Semitism shall be discussed in this proposed paper as well.

Robert Fine

‘Marx and the critique of antisemitism’

The paper has four parts. The first will briefly explore the myth of Marx’s own antisemitism. The second will analyse some of the ramifications of Marx’s critique of antisemitism in the left (for example, in Bauer, Dühring, Proudhon and Bakunin). The third will address the relation

between antisemitism and the development of Marx's social scientific methodology . The fourth will reconstruct Marx's contribution to the critique of antisemitism as an aspect of his more general critique of methodological nationalism. The general line of argument is that the projection of Marx as a 'self-hating Jew' seriously obscures the depths of his analysis of antisemitism as a pre-sociological form of social thought.

Chad Alan Goldberg

'Jews and Modernity in Classical Sociological Theory'

Late nineteenth-century European antisemitism was often linked to anxiety about and reactions against modernization, in all of its various manifestations: capitalist development, the modern state, urbanization, transformation of the family and women's roles in society, secularization ("de-christianization"), and the demographic transition. Antisemites commonly treated the Jews as a symbol of modernity and one of its governing factors, as both the sign and cause of a world gone wrong. As the historian Stephen Wilson notes, "If people were caught up in processes which they did not understand, [antisemitism] offered both a mythical explanation and a scapegoat.... The rejection of modernity ... was ... expressed by identifying it with the Jews." Antisemitic ideology thus "had this general function, that it registered and sought to explain, to contain, and to exorcise the process of social change or disorganization."

Emerging at the same time, classical sociological theory also involved attempts to understand and critique modern social life. The critical dimension of classical sociological theory is evident, for example, in Emile Durkheim's notion of anomie and Max Weber's discussion of the loss of freedom and meaning that accompanied rationalization. This paper investigates whether and how Durkheim and Weber also viewed Jews as symbols and/or agents of modernization. Within Durkheim's work, emphasis is placed on his discussion of race as a basis for social explanation (in *Suicide*); solidarity and integration, among Jews in particular (in *Suicide*) and in the wider society; moral individualism and the role in French society of the intellectuals (often linked in antisemitic ideology to Jewish influence); and the fate of religion in modern societies (a major concern of French-Catholic antisemites). Within Weber's work, emphasis is placed on his debate with Werner Sombart about the role of the Jews in the emergence of modern capitalism. The paper concludes that classical sociology, despite sharing certain premises with antisemitic ideology, challenged it in a variety of ways.

Sharon Gordon

'Currency Exchange and Religious Conversion: Werner Sombart's Sociological way to Anti-Semitism'

My lecture will discuss the way of Werner Sombart, a prominent figure in German sociology at the end of the 19th century and first half of the 20th century, from Marxism to Anti-Semitism and even Nazism.

Sombart was hostile towards modern Capitalism already from the beginning of his academic career. In his book *Der moderne Kapitalismus* (1902), that opened the famous debate over the origins of capitalism, he claimed that money lending was the source for capitalism, that its' development was accompanied by a long process of the abstraction of money. He also argued that exchange, the primary function of money, was fundamentally transformed by the abstraction of money.

When Weber published his famous theory of the protestant origins of modern capitalism, Sombart responded in a book *Die Juden und das Wirtschaftsleben* (1911). His theory held that Jews and Judaism, and not Protestantism, were the real origin of modern capitalism. In fact, he perceived the abstract mode of exchange as essentially Jewish, and therefore modernization as a process of judaization, i.e. – the transformation of humanity towards Jewishness.

As other thinkers of his time did, Sombart believed that these changes were not limited to economy only, but rather transformed all aspects of human life. That is, the abstraction of the mode of exchange characterized the human interactions as a whole, and produced a new form of personal and collective identity construction.

I will clarify this point by discussing a specific expression of identity construction that occupied Sombart's mind: the conversion of Jews to Christianity. Conversion to Christianity was a wide spread phenomenon among Jews in Germany in those days. Most of these conversions were secular by nature, lacked religious motifs, and served as a mean for assimilation in the general society. In his publication *Judentaufen* (1911) Sombart defined this mode of conversion as a mere exchange of religion, identical to the abstract mode of money exchange. Moreover, he also argued that the conversion of the Jews to Christianity transforms society and converts her to Jewishness, rather than the other way round.

Sombart's writings in 1911 marked his shift towards anti-Semitic worldview. I will claim, thus, that Sombart's way to Anti-Semitism was affected not only by his primary assumptions – his antagonistic approach towards modern capitalism, and the identification of Jews with money – but also by the debates within German sociology by which he was a full participant.

As an outcome of his Anti-Semitism and collaboration with the Nazis, Sombart's unquestioned prominence at his time was replaced by a general ignorance in nowadays sociology. Yet, his case provides us with an example of correlation and interdependence between sociology and Anti-Semitism.

Nancy Harrowitz

‘Parallel Nationalization: Cesare Lombroso and The Jewish Question in Italy’

In 1894 the influential criminologist Cesare Lombroso, horrified by the sharp increase in pogroms in Russia during the 1880's, wrote a book entitled, *Antisemitism and Modern Science*, in which he refutes popular scientific claims that the Jews were an inferior and dangerous race. As a remedy for antisemitism, Lombroso, Jewish himself, proposes a sociological solution: total assimilation for the Jews—and he does not mean integration. It is specifically Jewish visibility that Lombroso scapegoats, claiming Jews have brought antisemitism upon themselves through the visibility of religious practice: skullcaps, prayer shawls, the use of Passover matzo's, circumcision.

Italy was not immune to the more widespread debate regarding the visibility of the Jews, but a Jewish scientist joining the assimilationists' ranks was evidently suspect. In the 1890's other prominent criminologists and anthropologists, including Paolo Mantegazza and Enrico Ferri, discussed the necessity for the Jews to assimilate and eliminate their difference. At the same time they turned on Lombroso, who had previously been their mentor and role model, by claiming that Lombroso's theories regarding the born criminal had been tainted by his Jewishness.

The influence and legacy of Lombroso and his peers was a crucial one for the formation of Jewish identity in Italy during the last part of the nineteenth century, and had significant consequences for Jewish identity in the first part of the twentieth century as well. Lombroso's

theories about Jews were taken more seriously by the intellectual Jewish community in subsequent generations because he was Jewish, and added to assimilationist pressures that continued through Fascism.

My paper will discuss Lombroso's theories about Jews in the context of his position as a well-reputed scientist (whose criminological theories were obviously sociological as well), and the attacks against him. I will also look at Lombroso's conflicted subject position as a Jewish scientist in relation to his non-Jewish and often hostile peers. Lastly, I will examine the dynamics of what was at stake for Italian Jewish identity in these discourses and their legacy through Fascism.

Jonathan Judaken

'Talcott Parsons and "The Sociology of Modern Antisemitism"'

Parsons' "The Sociology of Modern Antisemitism" and his other short sociological analyses written between 1941-1945 on Hitlerism and the Fascist Movement are not generally depicted as central theoretical works in his development. But World War II clearly marked a crucial moment of change in Parsons' evolution and his analyses of antisemitism were some of his only theoretical writings closely connected to empirical and historical events.

The rise of the Nazis and the events of World War II were the context of the shift from Parsons' voluntarist theory of social action developed in his first major work, *The Structure of Social Action* (1937), to his systems theory, a structuralist-functionalist model of sociological theory that dominated the discipline of sociology from the postwar period to the mid-1960s, which he elaborated primarily in *The Social System* (1951), *Toward a General Theory of Action* (1951) and *Economy and Society* (1956).

This same period saw both a rise in sociological studies focused on antisemitism and an important influence of models drawn from the social sciences into the writing of social history and concomitantly into analyses of the history of antisemitism. An investigation of Parsons' work is therefore important to consider in evaluating the categories that underly the social history of antisemitism as well the efficacy of sociological approaches to the problem of antisemitism.

In the "Sociology of Modern Antisemitism," Parsons' argues that "the most important source of virulent antisemitism is the projection on the Jew, as a symbol, of free-floating aggression, springing from insecurities and social disorganization." This disorganization, he explains, is the result of the sociological processes of modernization, including urbanization, industrialization, the developing complexity of economic and social structures, and the increasing heterogeneity and mobility of the population. The reasons "the Jew" serves as a vulnerable symbol, according to Parsons, is deeply rooted in the character both of the Jewish people and of the wider society in which they live.

In order to explicate this Jewish character, Parsons tells a historical narrative, largely based on Max Weber's writings on Jews and Judaism in *Ancient Judaism and The Sociology of Religion*. Woven into the strands of Parsons' writing are a stereotypical series of images: "the Jew" lives in the insecure situation of a people without a country (posing the threat of the nation within a nation); his humble position is supplemented by the arrogant pride of Jewish chosenness (which is a "natural" source of friction with Gentiles); his diasporatic identity is unified as a "People of the Book," adhering to a hyper-rationalism and intellectualism (the Smart Jew); he has strong predilections for separatism and exclusiveness, and while maintaining ethical

obligations toward other members of the Jewish community, “it was only natural . . . that the Jews did not feel such responsibilities towards Gentiles” which he explains as “a transfer of the primitive in-group attitude, where outsiders are outside the law governing the group” (the image of “the Jew” as misanthrope at worst or not really loving (Gentile) humanity at best).

Thus, like Weber’s sociological analyses of Judaism, Parsons’ theory of antisemitism is riddled with the problems of an ambivalent liberal universalism that ultimately cannot affirm the historically embedded particularities of Jewish culture, religion and practices. Parsons’ solution to the Jewish Question is to caution against “any policy which tends to make Jews as Jews more conspicuous.”

Parsons’ approach to the sociology of antisemitism highlights the problems with what I choose to term anti-antisemitism, a notion I hope to give some conceptual meat through my discussion of Parsons. To do this, I will discuss what anti-antisemitism shares with philosemitism, as well as what distinguishes it, and how each position relates to antisemitism.

Richard H. King

‘Again American Exceptionalism?: Sociology and Anti-Semitism in late 19th and early 20th Century America’

In his *Esau’s Tears: Modern Anti-Semitism and the Rise of the Jews* (1997), Albert S. Lindemann picks out Britain, Hungary and the United States as the three states where 19th century European Jewry seemed most successful and most secure. Though sharing the stage with the other two, this would suggest another treatment of America in “exceptionalist” terms. However, I want to resist the notion that this implies some sort of whitewash of American racism. Indeed, a starting point for understanding American anti-Semitism would be to contrast it with the “color-coded” racism visited upon African Americans by White Americans. Such racism precisely “peaked” in the period, 1890-1920 when European anti-Semitism did as well, before subsiding—but only briefly. Indeed, the origins, dynamics and destination of anti-Semitism and color-coded racism are different to the extent that the conditions of possibility of the former had no particular energizing effect on the latter.

In the paper I would prepare for the November conference, I want to develop, if not a theory, at least an intellectual history, of the relationship between anti-Semitism and sociology in the United States up to World War I. To be honest, this will be an exploratory project, since most of my work on ideas/ideologies of racism has fallen in the post-1930s period. (See my *Race, Culture and the Intellectuals, 1940-70*[2004]).

I should add that I am not denying the existence of anti-Semitism in America; rather I am intrigued by why mainstream sociologists—William Graham Sumner, Lester Frank Ward, to name two—seemed to avoid the *Judenfrage*, while the patrician historian Henry Adams was openly anti-Semitic. The social scientist E. A. Ross was far from immune to “nativism” the late 19th century version of anti-foreign prejudice. (The focus on nativism has perhaps tended to obscure the existence or analysis of anti-Semitism in America.) The distinguished work by cultural historians John Higham and Matthew Frye Jacobsen needs to be consulted in this context. A 1919 essay “The Intellectual Pre-eminence of the Jews in Modern Europe” by Thorstein Veblen celebrated rather than condemned Jewish marginality, and pragmatist intellectuals Randolph Bourne and Horace Kallen also explicitly created an honoured place for Jews in a cultural plural America

Clearly this is a tricky topic, since the temptation is to spend all my time trying to establish

why something did not rather than why it did happen. But provisionally I will set up the four main images of Jews in late 19th century America—the Jew as modernizer, as tradition-ridden (Orientalist), as political and social radical and as dishonest “shyster.” Then I will contrast them with the dominant images of African Americans and try that way to illuminate why there was a “race question” but not a “Jewish question” in America up to 1914—and afterwards. For this, I also want to explore how the work on the role of Jews in society by Gobineau, Weber and Sombart, to name three, was received in America and how they in turn regarded the position of Jews in America.

Daniel Lvovich

‘Gino Germani, la sociología argentina y el estudio del antisemitismo’

Aunque la sociología tiene en Argentina una tradición que se remonta a comienzos del siglo XX, cuando su enseñanza fue introducida en las Universidades, y desde la década de 1940 existió un instituto de Sociología en la Universidad de Buenos Aires y una Revista de Sociología, Gino Germani es considerado de modo casi unánime como el padre fundador de la disciplina sociológica en el país, entendida en un sentido moderno y científico. Frente a una producción que se limitaba en la primera mitad del siglo XX al examen de las ideas sociológicas y a un tipo de escritura ensayística, Germani impulsó la investigación empírica y sistemática, introdujo a la Argentina las más recientes producciones e innovaciones teórico – metodológicas de las sociología europea y norteamericana y comprometió a la disciplina con cuestiones que ocuparon el debate público.

Gino Germani nació en Roma en 1911, y estudió economía en esa ciudad. Fue encarcelado por el régimen fascista y confinado en la Isla de Ponza, tras lo cual se exilió en 1934 en Argentina, donde residió más de tres décadas. Estudió Filosofía en la Universidad de Buenos Aires. Tras iniciar una carrera académica en el instituto de Sociología de la Universidad de Buenos Aires, se alejó de la misma con la llegada al poder del peronismo en 1945. Entre ese año y 1955 dictó clases de Psicología Social y Sociología en el Colegio Libre de Estudios Superiores, institución que cobijó a la intelectualidad liberal y socialista opositora al régimen de Perón. Tras el fin de ese gobierno regresó a la Universidad de Buenos Aires como profesor y desde 1957 se desempeñó como Director del recién creado Instituto de Sociología. Con la dictadura militar instaurada en 1966 muchos de los principales intelectuales y científicos de la Argentina marchan al exilio. Germani no fue la excepción, y se radica en los Estados Unidos, donde se desempeñó como profesor de estudios latinoamericano en Harvard. Falleció en Roma en 1979. Sus principales libros son *Estructura social de la Argentina* (1955); *Política y sociedad en una época de transición* (1964), *Autoritarismo, fascismo, e classi sociali* (1975) y *Authoritarianism, Fascism and National Populism* (1978).

Como la mayoría de los liberales antiautoritarios que sufrieron la persecución dictatorial, Germani, sospechaba de la *gran teoría*. Probablemente esa sea la raíz de los debates actuales entre los que intentan dar cuenta de sus adscripciones teóricas. Mientras algunos autores sostienen que Germani era un funcionalista influido sobre todo por la obra de Talcott Parsons, otros destacan el impacto que sobre él tuvo la producción de Karl Manheim. Germani apeló a elementos de la psicología profunda para intentar comprender el apoyo de las masas a regímenes autoritarios, y no hay dudas acerca del impacto que tuvo sobre su obra la investigación dirigida por Theodor Adorno sobre la Personalidad Autoritaria.

La influencia de esta obra es particularmente notable en el estudio de Germani sobre el

antisemitismo en la Argentina, realizado en 1962, en momentos de un resurgimiento de organizaciones de extrema derecha que hacían de la hostilidad hacia los judíos una de sus banderas. Germani analizó 2078 casos para estudiar el antisemitismo en la sociedad argentina, distinguiendo entre un antisemitismo “tradicional” que responde a la actitud pasiva del individuo para absorber los estereotipos dominantes y uno “ideológico” derivado de un “síndrome autoritario”, y que más fácilmente puede traducirse en acción. Las conclusiones de Germani son que en las clases medias y altas el prejuicio era menor que en las clases populares, pero mientras en el primer grupo se trataba de una actitud ideológica precisa y elaborada, en el segundo predominaba el antisemitismo tradicional. (Gino Germani, "Antisemitismo ideológico y antisemitismo tradicional" en: Juan José Sebrelli, *La Cuestión Judía en la Argentina*, Buenos Aires, Tiempo Contemporáneo, 1973).

En la ponencia que presentaremos, analizaremos en detalle los presupuestos teóricos y metodológicos de esta investigación, contextualizaremos los mismos en el conjunto de la obra de Germani, contrastaremos sus resultados con investigaciones posteriores y daremos cuenta de los debates a que dieron lugar sus resultados.

Malgorzata Mazurek

‘From Znaniecki to Bauman: Polish Sociology vis-à-vis Antisemitism before and after Holocaust’

Polish society in the twentieth century, once being a multicultural national-state, has been transformed into an ethnically uniform one-nation society. This dramatic shift was marked by the disappearance of three million Jewish population, expulsion of Germans and a forced ‘polonisation’ of autochthonous communities. Thus the postwar ethnic homogenisation of Polish society gave the opportunity to forge a new system of social relations based on non-ethnic classification.

According to Zygmunt Bauman and Colin Sumner, “assuming an eternal welfare-state” post-war social sciences developed “an amnesia toward what had just happened on a collective global scale, namely the Holocaust and mass slaughter”. In Communist Poland, where antisemitism had been tabooed and research on nationalist antagonism had been censured, the efforts to replace sociological categories of national identity with “the social” were especially meaningful. However, postwar *pogroms* as well as anti-semitic political campaigns in 1956 and 1967-1968 rendered these hopes and forecasts illusory. The intellectual biography of Zygmunt Bauman, before he was forced to leave Poland due to the anti-semitic campaign in 1968, demonstrates how the post-war generation of Polish sociologists failed to analyse antisemitism and value the meaning of the ‘national’ in the diagnosis of a society under “really existing socialism”.

On the other hand, the legacy of Polish sociology in the first half of the 20th century - just to mention the works by Florian Znaniecki and Stanisław Ossowski - points at the abundance of theoretical contributions on antisemitism and antagonistic nationalism. A development of prewar ‘sociology of nation’ followed by the Marxist ‘blindness’ towards antisemitism and nationalism in the 1950s and 1960s constitutes a non-linear intellectual process, marked by historical disruptions and political censures.

The aim of my paper is to trace the emergence as well as ruptures of sociological reflexion on antisemitism in a specific context of the Polish nation-state. Historically, Polish sociological theory of antisemitism was embedded in a sociology of nation and nationalism. In consequence,

the problem of anti-Jewish stereotypes, or hostility against alleged “Jewishness” of public enemies, used to be a part of the broader considerations about national identity and social ties within a nation-state. After 1945 Polish sociologists, both those who stayed at the Polish universities and those who decided to stay abroad, continued to examine a relationship between antisemitism and ‘democratisation’ of nationalism among peasants and workers. The post-war debate on antisemitism, launched by Polish sociologists in the press as a reaction to anti-Jewish pogrom in Kielce in 1946, was interrupted around 1950 and reappeared only occasionally at the margins of the academic discussions.

In my paper I would like to ask why and how the legacy of prewar ‘sociology of nation’ had been expurgated, censored or placed on the margins of the post-war mainstream sociology in Poland. The answer to this question should shed more light on the relation between antisemitism and sociological theory in the framework of young East European nation-states which emerged after WW1, witnessed Holocaust, and were eventually subjected to the Soviet-type transformation.

Olli-Pekka Moisio

‘Max Horkheimer and Leo Lowenthal on Fascism and Anti-Semitism’

"These days are days of sadness. The extermination of the Jewish people has reached dimensions greater than at any time in history. I think that the night after these events will be very long and may devour humanity." Horkheimer to Lowenthal in November 27, 1942

The background of this presentation is one rainy summer day a few years back in Frankfurt am Main. While I was visiting the Max Horkheimer Archives, I found myself wondering about the role of Leo Lowenthal in the formation of the writings of Horkheimer. It is known that his role in the editorial work of the *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* and also of the individual articles and books of the fellow members of the Frankfurt School was paramount. This role has not yet been fully acknowledged as Martin Jay argued in 1980 and his argument hold still true even today. Usually we only state his role in the administrative and editorial work but dismiss his role in the development of the Frankfurt Schools work as such. How deep this role actually was we can only speculate. In my presentation I will do just this. I will continue the speculation that started while I was reading through the drafts of Horkheimer*s articles that rainy summer days in the archives.

After preliminary notes on different aspects of critical theory, I want to go on to illustrate how the collaborative work actually was carried out in the Institute in general and particularly between Horkheimer and Lowenthal. I will focus to the formation of the notion of the fascism and anti-Semitism in the Institute circle. I will do this by going through the correspondence of Horkheimer and Lowenthal trying to find clues to follow in search of the picture of time that has since passed us. I will in a way follow Lowenthal*s ideas in my detective work.

In this detective work on Frankfurt School we must be careful not to

repeat the development that took place in the study of Jewish thought when Wissenschaft des Judentum and finally Julius Guttman in his opus magnum *Die Philosophie des Judentums* tried to form a canon of thinkers that form a basis for something that could be name as Jewish Philosophy. We can rightly ask whether there is and ever was some kind of a consistent and continuous canon that we could place under the rubric of Jewish philosophy. But what can we say is that there in fact was and still are Jewish people who try to understand themselves and their religion and customs in the different historical situations. This process of cultural and individual self-understanding of the Jewish people can be called Jewish thought to underline the historical and constellate nature of it.

This same kind of historical nature we must keep in mind also when we talk about critical theory. As Horkheimer wrote to Lowenthal in October 28. 1943: *Every day I recognize more clearly that the theoretical and practical expressions of that which we are able to recognize because of our special fate constitutes a task which justifies life, however short its true limits we fall*.

In the presentation it will be shown that Lowenthal*s role was paramount to the formation of critical theory. This role was deep when the Institute members were in United States in the 1930*s and 1940*s. In addition to the editorial work and institutes bureaucratic work, Lowenthal was fundamentally entwined at least with the formation of the Theses on Anti-Semitism of the *Dialektik der Aufklärung*, and Horkheimer*s Eclipse of Reason.

Sebastien Mosbah-Natanson

‘Durkheimian Sociology and Antisemitism around 1900’

Our study of the relations between sociology and antisemitism would focus on the case of France at the end of 19th century when both sociology and the Dreyfus case were major issues The main sociological school which emerged during that period has been the durkheimian sociology in which many of those new social scientists were jewish such as Emile Durkheim, Marcel Mauss or Robert Hertz. Therefore, for durkheimian sociologists, antisemitism was at the same time a scientific and a political issue. Combining scientific and political aims, some aspects of durkheimian sociology can also be understood as a way of rationalizing the condition of religious minorities like the jewish one in that new republican regime, such as the concept of ‘integration’.

In our paper, we would like to study both the scientific and political arguments of a durkheimian sociology facing antisemitism.

From the scientific point of view, the main task for durkheimian sociologists was to defeat a racist and antisemitic anthropology, epitomized by Geroges Vacher de Lapouge. We shall stress the main arguments of the durkheimians for a sociological understanding of society against a social-biological one which favored.

Mainly « republicains », the durkheimians fough antisemitism within the context of the dreyfus affair and the fear of a demise of the « Republique ». Sociology, and its « morale

laïque » was one of the intellectual weapon against the right-wing and catholic assault against the new political regime.

Those two aspects of sociology and its role around 1900 would be particularly studied by exploring the work and the political involvement of a durkheimian sociologist, Celestin Bouglé, who took strong stances against antisemitism. Him being not jewish, he endorsed the defence of this minority by confronting antisemitic arguments and by showing the limitations of darwinism and other social-biological theories.

We shall be able to show that the fight against antisemitism helped somehow to build the french sociological tradition.

Amos Morris-Reich

‘Epistemology and Rhetoric, Responses to anti-Semitism in Franz Boas, Georg Simmel, and Arthur Ruppin’

The transformation of the human sciences into the social sciences occurred simultaneously with the rise of European anti-Semitism as a modern social and political phenomenon. Individuals of Jewish descent played a major role in the establishment of social science as an academic discipline; codifying their distinct methodologies and determining their respective objects of research. As individuals who lived in increasingly anti-Semitic societies, they could not have avoided questions pertaining to “the Jewish Question” and to anti-Semitism. This paper presupposes that questions must have impressed themselves on their work, leaving imprints in their writings. In this paper, I attempt to delineate three different responses to the rise of modern anti-Semitism, and examine how they intertwined with distinct social science paradigms.

I focus on the responses to anti-Semitism in the work of three contemporary prominent social science writers operating in three different academic and disciplinary contexts. They held differing views on the study modern society, “the Jewish Question”, assimilation, Zionism, and anti-Semitism. This paper focuses on Franz Boas (1858-1942), originating from an acculturated German Jewish family, considered the founder of American cultural anthropology; Georg Simmel (1858-1918), a baptized Protestant born to parents of Jewish descent, who played a vital role in the establishment of sociology; and Arthur Ruppin (1876-1943), born to a mildly observant Jewish family, and recognized by many as the founder of modern academic Jewish sociology and Jewish demography.

In this paper, I attempt to uncover Boas, Simmel, and Ruppin’s responses to anti-Semitism, by distinguishing between several conceptual layers of their work. These layers range from explicit views on matters pertaining to the Jews (such as the source of anti-Semitism or Jewish difference, the question of Jews’ assimilation, and Zionism), through their respective conceptions of modern society and its organization (such as the source of majority-minority social tensions, the problem of prejudice), to theoretical questions concerning the methodology, epistemology and ontology of their respective disciplines. I then analyze the interplay between these respective levels in each case. I argue that each opted for a different strategy, tying in a different manner epistemological and rhetorical considerations. Furthermore, I demonstrate that Boas, Simmel and Ruppin employed different categories of analysis of anti-Semitism, leading each of them to understand the phenomenon differently. Hence, their interpretations of anti-Semitism cannot be separated from their academic projects: Boas increasingly moved towards viewing anti-Semitism as a collective remnant of closed societies; a phenomenon of a fundamentally anthropological nature. He saw anti- Semitism as being gradually eroded through

the course of human evolution, and under the specific conditions of modern society.

Simmel viewed anti-Semitism in synchronous terms of inter-subjective identity formation, and, as such, one which was not about to disappear. Ruppin viewed anti-Semitism as a major threat, but also, in a certain sense, as a blessing for Jewish existence. In contradistinction to Boas and Simmel, he underlined the specific role that the Christian legacy played in anti-Semitism. Ruppin postulated profound racial differences between Jews and northern Europeans; a situation that could only be solved by Jewish national home in Palestine.

Following their three distinct understandings of anti-Semitism, their respective “solutions” differed. I attempt to underline how their responses were intertwined with their respective social science categories of analysis, and shaped by their broader goals. Boas confronted anti-Semitism primarily by attacking the methodological and epistemological shortcomings of racist anti-Semitic writers. Simmel avoided writing directly on anti-Semitism, instead developing a sociological model which circumvented race. I argue that Boas and Simmel were crucial in transforming anti-Semitism from a phenomenon pertaining specifically to Jews, into pertaining more to the general society than to its prejudiced (and even persecuted) object. Ruppin, in a very different vein, was engaged in direct confrontation with anti-Semitic writers. This was obtained primarily on an empirical level, through the establishment of a journal and an office, designed to collect, analyze, and disseminate statistical data repudiating anti-Semitic allegations.

I conclude this paper addressing two broader historical questions. First, I evaluate the effectiveness of these forms of response at the time. Then I attempt to indicate how these responses affected later social science paradigms.

Moishe Postone

‘History, the Holocaust and the Left’

This talk problematizes changes in the ways the Left has dealt with the Holocaust since 1945. It will relate these changes to large-scale historical transformations of capitalist modernity from its post-war Fordist configuration to its subsequent neo-liberal one. Left responses to capitalism have paralleled these transformations, fluctuating from a critique based on abstract universalism to one focused on concrete particularity, from a focus on working class movements to one on liberation struggles that can be deemed anti-colonial in the broadest sense.

These changes have also been expressed in the ways anti-Semitism and the Holocaust have been dealt with. Within the framework of the abstract universalism of the post-war period, focusing on the Holocaust was considered particularistic. With the affirmative turn to particularism in the late 1960s, the situation became more complex: On the one hand, much more attention now became paid to the specificity of anti-Semitism and the Holocaust. On the other hand, within the framework of the newer anti-imperialist worldview, a focus on the Holocaust was seen as legitimating Israeli policies. Additionally – and crucially – as anti-imperialism morphed into a concretistic form of anti-globalization, its attacks on the abstract and universal began to recapitulate earlier anti-Semitic motifs.

Ultimately, how the Left deals with the Holocaust can be seen as an indication of whether it remains within the antinomy of abstract universalism and particularism characteristic of capitalist modernity, or whether it seeks to get beyond that dualism.

Regina Schleicher

‘The use of sociological categories in antisemitic texts’

In my contribution I would like to present the results of a discourse analysis of French and German antisemitic texts, published or re-published between 1880 and 1905.

The anti-Semitic discourse of this period was not only influenced by religious antijudaism and Darwinian ideas; a lot of originally sociological categories like “milieu”, “race” and others were used and in this way transferred to the antisemitic context. Due to the success of antisemitism in the last decades of the 19th century the antisemitic use of sociological categories also changed their meanings for an academic and a wider, non-academic public. Articles in small magazines and the mainstream press, in brochures and in books with a large or small number of copies, even political speeches, held in meetings or in parliaments, contributed to widespread the new, because biological meaning of “race”.

However, to interpret this phenomenon it is also necessary to include the contemporary colonial discourse, using frequently the same categories and being more directly than the antisemitic discourse a result of academic discussion and research. In my description of the use of sociological categories in antisemitic texts and of its influence on the interdiscourse and on special discourses, I therefore will explore the interference of colonial and antisemitic discourses in this period. A comparison of the discourses in France and Germany can then show the differences of the relation of antisemitic discourses and special academic discourse and help to explain the different reception of the texts, published in both countries, and their influence on sociology at the end of the 19th century.

Marcel Stoetzler

‘Antisemitism, the social question, and the formation of sociological theory’

This paper will explore the thesis that the formation of sociological theory and that of (‘modern’) antisemitism are related, or even co-substantial, while at the same time competing, or even antagonistic phenomena. This thesis is based on two observations: first, sociological theory emerged as a predominantly liberal response to the crisis phenomena of modern (capitalist) society; second, modern antisemitism is likewise understood to be a ‘travesty of a social theory’ that offers in its phantasmagorias of ‘the Jew’ and ‘Jewification’ an explanation of the same society’s deficiencies and crises. As a case in point, the major themes of Durkheim’s sociology, the cohesion of modern liberal society in the face of the threats of atomization and disintegration that are inherent to it, are also central concerns of nineteenth-century antisemites: they blamed what Durkheim called ‘anomies’ on the Jews. Durkheim developed and employed elements of his sociological thought in his intervention into the most emblematic dispute on antisemitism of the time, the Dreyfus Affair, while one of the formative influences on Max Weber’s thought was a dispute amongst German National Liberals on antisemitism in 1879-80, the Berlin Antisemitism Dispute. In the German context, the boundaries between classical sociology, National Liberalism, the ‘Verein für Sozialpolitik’, ‘Kathedern’, or state-socialism and the public discussions shaped by the emerging antisemitic movement are ambiguous, while indeed the writings of some of the most influential radical French antisemites were formulated with reference to the tradition of Saint Simon and Comte’s ‘positivism’, which are likewise concerned with safeguarding the threatened coherence of modern liberal society. Conversely, Georg Simmel’s celebrated 1896 paper, ‘Money in Modern Culture’, containing crucial elements of his later ‘Philosophy of Money’, was given in Schmoller’s seminar and can be read as a comment on emerging sociology’s ambivalent attitude to modern (capitalist) society and the antisemitic

subtext of critiques of Manchesterism' and the 'cash nexus' in the context of discussions of the 'social question'. Antisemites had already made the point that 'the Jewish question' and 'the social question' were indeed the same thing, such as Otto Glagau wrote as early as 1878. In this sense it is explored how 'classical sociology' talked back to, but also paralleled and was intermeshed with antisemitism.

Tim Buchen

'Adoptions of "Antisemitism" and the place for Jews in the society: the Cracow Case'

In my paper I argue that the sociological dealing with the Jews as a social group even changed the speech and the politics on the Jewish Question by the opponents of modern society. This assumption will be inquired by the example of two intellectuals and their approach on the phenomenon of "Antisemitism" in the national "organic" discourse in Polish society. A special consideration will be made on the specific intellectual climate of Cracow in the last quarter of the 19th century.

The „father of modern sociology“ Ludwik Gumplowicz (1838 Cracow – 1909 Graz) had to leave the conservative clerically dominated City of Cracow before he could develop his theories on the struggle of races. His experiences as a Calvinist from Jewish origin in catholic Cracow brought to interpretate Antisemitism and the „Jewish Question“ in materialistic terms. His unique explanation of Antisemitism as an outflow of „communist instinct“ will be briefly outlined.

Another contribution to Antisemitism was developed two decades after he left Cracow, this time within the clerical movement. In his book "Asemitism" father Maryan Morawski (1845-1901) rejected the „Ideology of hatred“ as a secular sin, while he adopted many of the resentments of modern Jew hatred. He included the idea, that Jews form a differing community from catholic Poles not only by faith, behavior and tradition but also through a „specific physiognomy formed through centuries“. One could become only part of the Christian community through conversion and further strict separation from the Jewish community down to the third generation. His reception of Gumplowicz's oeuvre and other thinkers can be detected within his imagination of a struggle between Jews and Christians. It is presented as a typically Jewish fault and in the same time as a kind of natural struggle.

I will examine the use and implementations of sociological terms within this text, which had the character of a catechism, since it gave orientation how a "good believer" should behave towards "the Jews". It will be debated, how Christian Jew hatred got "updated" by scientific speech adopted by the clergy, paradoxically marking off from modern and secular scientific thinking. In a wider sense this leads to the question how the imagination and communication of a former and future "Christian community" was based on diagnosis and vocabulary of sociology. Due to the author's position as a cleric it spread within society discussing the „Jewish Question“. The appearance of "Asemitism" was connected with collective moods supporting the most violent anti – Jewish pogroms in Galicia in summer 1898.

Here, the differences between an elitist discussion during the Cracow Years of Gumplowicz (who divided categorically between antisemites as thinkers and antisemitic perpetrators) and the impacts of rhetorics concerning social groups of the society in times of mass politics in late 1890s Galicia will be touched. Furthermore the paper investigates into the problem of relation between speech and action, between more abstract categorization and classification on the one hand and concrete social behaviour on the other.

Kati Vörös

‘The “Jewish question,” Hungarian Sociology, and the Normalization of Antisemitism, 1900-1920’

Hungarian sociology was born and became an independent discipline outside the academic establishment. The sociological review *Huszadik Század* (twentieth century) was its first forum, which was founded in 1900 and was closely associated with the progressive Society for Social Science. The society and its review quickly popularized the language of sociology as a “modern,” “objective,” and “effective” way to talk about Hungarian society, which also had a major impact on the discourse about “the Jews” and their role in economic and cultural modernity.

By the 1910s three more social scientific papers were founded, and several sociological *enquêtes* were organized to discuss topical social, political, and cultural issues. The paper argues that the language of social science became a major force in the intensifying debate about the ills of Hungarian society in the press and public sphere in general, which was increasingly framed in the context of the “Jewish question.”

The paper probes the process of the normalization of antisemitism through the reconceptualization of the “Jewish question” as a social scientific problem, whereby what had primarily been a particular form of political discourse—associated with antisemitism—became reimagined as a universal one—facilitated by sociological theory and practice. The paper explores the development of the concept of the “Jewish question” in Hungarian sociology and its effect on and relation to antisemitic discourse between the founding of *Huszadik Század* in 1900 and the passing of the first anti-Jewish legislation (the so-called *numerus clausus* law) in twentieth-century Europe in 1920.

The paper discusses the decisive impact of Werner Sombart’s ideas on Hungarian sociological thinking about capitalism and the Jews, which also helped to reinforce long-standing antisemitic claims originating in the 1880s. The paper focuses on three major public debates on the “Jewish question” in the 1910s, which problematized the position of the Jews in Hungarian society, economy, and culture, and, ultimately, questioned their belonging to the nation. Importantly, all these debates originated on the pages of the progressive sociological review *Huszadik Század*. The paper argues that the context provided by progressive social science had a notable role in the final triumph of the idea of the “Jewish question” and contributed to its dominance in the interwar period. The paper devotes equal attention to the Jewish response to what the Jewish papers labeled as “scientific antisemitism” and demonstrates that Jews were not passive victims but active and at times combative participants in an increasingly hostile debate.

The paper offers the following conclusion: The reframing of the “Jewish question” as a social scientific problem served as a normalizing channel for the expression of anti-Jewish content. The most important function of the concept of the sociological “Jewish question” was that it made the articulation of antisemitic opinion not only legitimate, but, more significantly, not seen as antisemitism. During the discursive process represented by the debates discussed in the paper, antisemitic discourse gradually lost its designation as antisemitism and was transformed into what was seen as legitimate social analysis and political critique.

Please note abstracts by Christine Achinger, Roland Robertson and David Seymour will be added as soon as possible.