## STANFORD UNIVERSITY

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

April 23, 1956

Professor Otto Kirchheimer 2801 Beechbank Road Silver Springs, Maryland

Dear Otto:

Many, many thanks for passing on to me your memorial address on Franz Neumann. Despite the fact that I felt myself to be very close to Franz, you have told me a large number of things which I had scarcely even suspected before. My admiration has only been increased by this revelation of the area by you of his life to which I was a stranger.

I also profited greatly by your recent article on Germany in The New Leader.

I hope that we shall be seeing each other shortly, before too long. Meantime, Suzanne joins me in sending warmest good wishes.

As ever.

E. Stuart Hughes

HSH/ccm encl.

12 9 45 55

degree on the everspresding system of government contracts which makes them both in thier approaches and selection of subject matter beings as if they were government employees. This therefre, ties up the intellectual freedom of the government employees with that of hisacademic colleague. The present regime of fear, mediocrity and maximal aboldance of controvertial issues, which has little or nothing to do with apies or saboteurs, may help both the government employee and the teacher to pass the test of official patrictism, but deprive the teacher to pass the test of official which they would be able to perform.

This does not militate against your thesis, somehwet akin to kax Weber's in Wissensoheft als eruf, the winterformal purto kax Weber's in Wissensoheft als eruf, the wen if his prospects

to even the are alored and risky business. But even if his prospects

to even the are alored and risky business. But even if his prospects

of begin actions and risky voluments in alternoo ence with

If I understand your piece right, it essentially rests on a clearcut differentiation between the mental technician and the intellectual. But this differentiation seems rather fictitious to me. Admittedly, some of your technicians have a special kind of knowledge and training and they have no choice but to apply their knowledge according to the recognized rules of the trade. Even though, from the smallest country doctor to the atomic scientist their's remains an essentially moral choice. They may choose not to apply their inowledge. Naxa presidentializations and according to the recognized rules of the atomic scientist their's remains an essentially moral choice. They may choose not to apply their inowledge. Naxa presidentializations and the remains and the

In a great number of cases, as you concede yourself, the question pertains not to the special insight or knowledge an individual possesses but whether it is employed by a free agent or by a government servant. But a government servant is not necessarily a pure technician. The man who compiles lists of uranium stocks may be a technician, the man who is commissioned to bring together a picture of social and political forces op crative in Ezechoslovae society should not proceed differently whether he is paid from government funds or whether he is writing a PhD thesis in one of our educational institutions. Under both conditions the methods he uses, the particular problems which he stresses and the modulations of his final results can scarcely be disentangled from his own premises and views of the world in which we are living. For the same reason your attampt at narrowing down the group of intellectuals by method of rigorous delimitation of the trade seems equally problematic. The copy writer and commentator is neither entirely defined by the satisfaction of his boss or his customer, but by his approximation to intellectual truth; in whatever watered down and often unrecognizable fashion, he still participates in the intellectual community of our age. If it were different with what yardstick would you measure his work except purely assthetic and commercial categories.

Moreover, the social system of our educational institutions militate against the strict separation between the free intellectual and the government clerk. Given the unrealistic salary scale of these institutions their teachers rely to an increasing

degree on the everspreading system of government contracts which makes them both in thier approaches and selection of subject matter behave as if they were government employees. This therefre, ties up the intellectual freedom of the government employees with that of hisacademic colleague. The present regime of fear, mediccrity and maximal aboidance of controvertial issues, which has little or nothing to do with spies or saboteurs, may help both the government employee and the teacher to pass the test of official patriotism, but deprives the community of the one valuable service which they would be able to perform.

This does not militate against your thesis, somehwat akin to Max Weber's in Wissenschaft als eruf, that intellectual pur suits are a lonely and risky business. But even if his prospects to suit the intellectual pur distributed and risky business. But even if his prospects to suit the intellectual pur distributed and in the suit of the suit does not intellectual pur distributed and the suit of the su

If I understand your piece right, it essentially rests on a clearcut differentiation between the mental technician and the intellectual. But this differentiation seems rether fictitious to me, admittedly, some off your technicians have a special kind of knowledge and training and they have no choice but to apply their knowledge according to the recognized rules of the trade. Even though, from the smallest country doctor to the atomic scientist their s remains an essentially moral choice. They may choose not to apply their knowledge. Inna xementally actains an essentially moral choice. They may choose not to apply their knowledge. Inna xementally and a xementally may choose not to apply their knowledge. Inna xementally and xementally and xementally and xementally and xementally and xementally and xementally xementa

In a great number of a ases, as you concede yourself, the question ps tains not to the special insignt or knowledge an individual possesses but whether it is employed by a free agent or by a covernment servant. Sat a government servent is not necessarily a pure technician. Fro men who compiles lists of uranium stocks say be a technician, the men who is commissioned to bring together a picture of social and political forces of rative in Esechoslovec society should not proceed differently whether he is peid from government funds or whether he is writing a the treatenner from a constant and educational institutions. Under both conditions the methods he uses, the particular problems which ha stresses and the modulations of his final meathern men ein moul beignatusall ed ylcounes nee affusen and views of the world in which we are living. For the same reason your attampt at narrowing form the group of intellectuals by method of rigorous delimitation of the trade seems equally roblematic, he copy writer and commentator is neither entirely defined by the satisfection of his boss or his quetomer, but by his approximation to intelloctual truth; in whatever wetered down and often unrecognizable fashion, he still participates in the intellectual community of our age. If it were different with what yardstick would you measure his work except purely sest ette and commercial caregories.

Moreover, the social system of our educational institutions willists spaint the free intellectualitate spaint on the lect separation between the free intellectuals and the government clerk, diven the unrealistic salary soals of these institutions that teachers rely to an increasing

degree on the everspreading system of government contracts which makes them both in thier approaches and selection of subject matter behave as if they were covernment employees. This therefre, these up the intellectual freedom of the jovernment employees with the of hissosdemic colleague. The present retime of fear, medicarity and maximal aboldence of coefficient fear, which has little or nothing to do with aples or salpteurs, may help both the government employees which apply the first to pass the test of official patrictism, but deprives the community of the one valuable service which they would be able to jerform.

This does not militate against your first and ship of and ship to war aline to war for the constant of and ship to war in the constant first interpretation of the constant first con

If I understand your piece right, it essentially rests on a clearout differentiation between the mental technician and the intellectual. But this differentiation seems rather fictitious to me. Admittedly, some of your technicians have a special kind of knowledge and training and they have no choice but to apply their knowledge according to the recognized rules of the trade. Even though, from the smallest country doctor to the atomic scientist their's remains an essentially moral choice. They may choose not to apply their knowledge. Intellectual choice. They may choose not to apply their knowledge. Intellectual choice. They may choose not to apply their knowledge. Intellectual choice.

geveramentunesvinaumeristiteepaviait.

In a great number of cases, as you consede yourself, the question pertains not to the special insight or knowledge an individual possesses but whether it is employed by a free agent or by a government servant. But a government servant is not necessarily a pure technician. The man who compiles lists of uranium stocks may be a technician, the man who is commissioned to bring together a picture of social and political forces op arative in Ezechoslovae society should not proceed differently whether he is paid from government funds or whether he is writing a PhD thesis in one of our educational institutions. Under both conditions the methods he uses, the particular problems which he stresses and the modulations of his final results can scarcely be disentangled from his own premises and views of the world in which we are living. For the same reason your attempt at narrowing down the group of intellectuals by method of rigorous delimitation of the trade seems equally problematic. The copy writer and commentator is neither entirely defined by the satisfaction of his boss or his customer, but by his approximation to intellectual truth; in whatever watered down and often unrecognizable fashion, he still participates in the intellectual community of our age. If it were different with what yardstick would you measure his work except purely aesthetic and commercial categories.

Moreover, the social system of our educational institutions militate against the strict separation between the free intellectual and the government clark. Given the unrealistic salary scale of these institutions their teachers rely to an increasing

degree on the everspreading system of government contracts which makes them both in thier approaches and selection of subject matter behave as if they were government employees. This therefre, ties up the intellectual freedom of the government employees with that of hisacademic colleague. The present regime of fear, medicority and maximal aboldance of controvertial issues, which has little or nothing to do with spies or saboteurs, may help both the government employee and the teacher to pass the test of official patriotism, but deprives the community of the one valuable service which they would be able to perform.

This does not militate against your thesis, somehwat akin to kex Weber's in Wissensohaft als eruf, that intellectual pur - quits are a lonaly and risky business. But even if his prospects of new in the immediate future are dim, what does it matter? Though you struggle against it your very approach is atili too much shrouded in Erfolgsdenken.

If I uniorstand your piece right, it escentially rests on a clearout differentiation between the mental technician and the intellectual. But this differentiation scens rather fistitions to me. Admittedly, some of your technicians have a special kind of knowledge and training and they have no choice but to apply that knowledge according to the recognized rules of the trade. Even though, from the smallest country doctor to the atomic scientist their's remains an essentially moral choice. They mey choose not to apply their knowledge. Make the choice. They mey choose not to apply their knowledge. Make the present and the same and the same and the country decoration of the same and the same

In a priest number of class, as you comeds yourself, the question perisins not to the special insight or knowledge an individual possesses but the special insight or knowledge and individual possesses but servent. Sut a government assivant is not necessarily a pure technician. The man who complies lists of uranium stocks may be a technician, the man who is commissioned to bring together any inture of social and political forces operative in Gaschoelovac society should not proceed differently whicher he is paid from government funds or sheber to be is visiting a int thesis in one of our educational institutions. The particular problems which he stresses and the method from his own premises problems which he stresses and the modulations of his final particular seams of the world in which we are living. For the same reason your attempt at marrowing down one group of intellectuals problems. For the same of with the contined means of the intellectual of the trade some equality of method of the satisfactor and consention of the trade some equality of the satisfactor of the trade some matterly by his approximation to intellectual or the satisfactor of the satisfactor of the satisfactor of the intellectual consents of the satisfactor of

Norrover, the social against our sducetional institutions will institutions will institute intellection in the first the strict separation in the first intellection of the constitutions their teachers rely to an increasing of these institutions their teachers rely to an increasing

## H. STUART HUGHES 1015 LEMON STREET MENLO PARK, CALIFORNIA

November 3, 1956

Dear Otto:

I was delighted to receive your perceptive and discriminating comments on my COMMENTARY article. They have helped me a great deal in clarifying my thought.

As you surmised, I have been heavily influenced by Max Weber's position. But where I made a mistake, I think, was to tay to make concrete -- partly with the somewhat miscellaneous audience of COMMENTARY in mind -- what should have been left on the level of ideal abstraction. You have hit on the central fault of the article: it seems to make a distinction among individuals taking all their functions as a unit; what I meant to do was to differentiate among functions (l.e., somewhat fictional desciptions) which might very well be combined in the same individual.

Of the people with whom I am acquainted, very few function as pure intellectuals". Nearly all — whether in or out of universities — function as both. The decisive points I wished to make are two: first, that in an era like the present it is important as far as possible to try to keep the two functions "ideally" separate (since we run the grave risk that the first function will swallow up the second); second, that the image an individual possesses of the importance of these two functions in his life is more importants than the actual percentage of his time that he allots to each (thus a man who earned his living as a "mental technician" might find the most significant part of his life the few leisure hours that he was able to devote to disinterested "intellectual" pursuits)....

Again my thanks for your comments. They are particularly appropriate coming from someone whom I have always regarded as a model of a dedicated intellectual struggling to maintain the values of the purely intellectual approach in a situation in which the opposite values were necessarily in the ascendant.

I hope that we shall be able to see more of each other when I move back East next September.

with norment regards yours, as eres,
throat.

November 26, 1961.

Dear Stuart:

Thanks a lot for the reprint. Will you be free for lunch on Thursday
December 7? I shall be around at Cambridge since I shall be talking at the Center of International Affaits on Friday.

erhaps you drop me a line at home (adress below) or else give me a ring at my daughters place in Cambridge on Wednesday night. The number is University 4-5097.

Mr for them

Best regards

Professor Stuart Hughes Harvard University Cambridge, Nass.

Dear Stuart:

May I take the liberty to bring to your attention

Michael Winston, a graduate of Howard University, who is

applying for admission to your department. He is one of

Harold Lewis's prize students whom I found both intelligent

and cuite knowledgeable and on whom Harold spent quite some

time and energy ( 3 years) to prepare him for graduate school.

He is especially interested in intellectual history.

I would appreciate whatever help you can give him to facilitate his progress.

It was good to have seen you. I hope you were not too bored with my presentation of a worn out issue. Thanks for your Russian travel piece which was both illuminating and courageous.

With best regards, Yours,