



This is an author produced version of *The democratic origins of the term "group analysis": Karl Mannheim's "third way" for psychoanalysis and social science.*

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/216/>

Article:

Winship, G. (2003) The democratic origins of the term "group analysis": Karl Mannheim's "third way" for psychoanalysis and social science. *Group Analysis*, 36 (1). pp. 37-51. ISSN 0533-3164

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0533316403036001200>



*promoting access to
White Rose research papers*

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

The Democratic Origins of the Term 'Group Analysis': Karl Mannheim's 'Third Way' for Psychoanalysis and Social Science

Gary Winship (2003) *Group Analysis*, 36, 1: 37-51

It is well known that Foulkes acknowledged Karl Mannheim as the first to use the term 'group analysis'. However; Mannheim's work is otherwise not well known. This article examines the foundations of Mannheim's sociological interest in groups using the Frankfurt School (1929-1933) as a start point through to the brief correspondence of 1945 between Mannheim and Foulkes (previously unpublished). It is argued that there is close conjunction between Mannheim's and Foulkes's revision of clinical psychoanalysis along sociological lines. Current renderings of the Frankfurt School tradition pay almost exclusive attention to the American connection (Herbert Marcuse, Eric Fromm, Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer) overlooking the contribution of the English connection through the work of Mannheim and Foulkes.

Key words: Foulkes, Frankfurt School, Karl Mannheim, psychoanalysis, sociology

The Frankfurt School and its Unknown Ambient Network

The Sociology Department that Karl Mannheim led in Frankfurt is known for its geographical proximity to the Institute for Social Research (led by Max Horkheimer) and the psychoanalytic clinic (led by Carl Landauer). However, the intellectual connections are less well studied. For instance in Jay's (1973) otherwise encompassing study of the Frankfurt School, Mannheim receives scant attention and Foulkes (or Fuchs as he was known at Frankfurt) is

38

not even mentioned. Mannheim and Foulkes started from the same source as their better-known colleagues Eric Fromm and Herbert Marcuse and, like them, they set about challenging prior core psychoanalytic assumptions. When the Frankfurt School dispersed in the early 1930s to escape the rise of Fascism, Marcuse (the social scientist) and Fromm (the psychoanalyst) went to the USA where they continued to plumb the Frankfurt tradition of social inquiry producing a considerable and influential body of work (see Young, 1969 for a discussion of Marcuse's popularity). Karl Mannheim (the social scientist) and S. H. Foulkes (the psychoanalyst) were the closest to an English equivalent representing the conjunction of psychoanalysis and social science. Although there is much to compare in the development of the American and English Frankfurt tradition there are important divergences too. The America-Frankfurt connection moved psychoanalysis more resolutely outside the clinical sphere as Fromm and Marcuse tackled acute social and political issues through the lenses of Marx and Freud while the contribution of the English-Frankfurt connection (no less committed to Marx and Freud) revised psychoanalysis along sociological lines in the form of group analysis. In short we might say that Fromm and Marcuse took psychoanalysis from the

consulting room into the sociological field while Foulkes and Mannheim took the sociological field into the psychoanalytic (group) consulting room.

The reason why Foulkes's connection to the Frankfurt School tradition has been overlooked may be worth pondering. Considering there are a number of letters between Foulkes and Max Horkheimer in the Foulkes's archives awaiting translation and publication, the full history of ideas of the Frankfurt School might yet be written. The relationship between Foulkes and Mannheim emerges from their contemporaneous years at Frankfurt University and has likewise been little explored. The fact that they escaped to freedom in London at the same time is notable, however the firmest conjunction meriting investigation is Foulkes's acknowledgement that in the development of psychoanalytic group therapy Mannheim was the first to use the term 'group analysis' (Foulkes, 1946/1990: 131). In this context Norbert Elias, acknowledged as a founder of the group-analytic movement, has a pivotal role because he was Mannheim's most important vocal student and assistant (Smith, 2001). Throughout Elias's life he remained faithful to Mannheim holding him affectionately in high regard until the last, still

39

defending Mannheim against his detractors some six decades later (Elias, 1994). Elias remained in touch with Mannheim in London until Mannheim's death. We can surmise that in Elias, Foulkes had a direct connection to Mannheim's vision for sociology and psychoanalysis.

There was only a brief exchange of letters between Foulkes and Mannheim in 1945 (see endnotes: letters 1-3) but we can see from the letters that the two men did not know each other well. Mannheim (see letter 2), the more esteemed and senior colleague was moved by Foulkes's enquiry to reassure him that he, 'of course', remembers him from Frankfurt. We know that there were a number of overlapping forums in Frankfurt where the sociology, psychoanalytic and social science department members met up at the joint seminars (the so-called 'Cafe Marx'). It was a fraught time of oppositionalism, where Marx and Freud were held as pillars against the onslaught of oppression and the fascistic right. Foulkes would have been in contact with Horkheimer, Adorno, Fromm, Benjamin, Marcuse and Mannheim among others as they shared lectures and the common purpose of shielding intellect and morality from the cultural drift to the right.

We see from the letters that even though there is a distance between the men Foulkes still feels at ease enough to ask for help with a matter concerning his daughter (see endnotes: letters 1-3). We have a sense of a deeper intimacy between the men engendered by their shared experiences of fleeing Germany and resettling in London. It is perhaps surprising that they did not converge during the intervening years, although in Letter 1 we see that Mannheim is aware of some of Foulkes's psychoanalytic writing but not in relation to group analysis. It may be the case that Foulkes was no more familiar with Mannheim's corpus other than the reference to his use of the term of 'group analysis' (Foulkes, 1946/1990). Such a disjunction between contemporaries would not be so unusual but what we can see from the spirit of the letters is that both men were keen to collaborate. Mannheim tells Foulkes of his interest in group analysis and encourages him to publish a book in his Routledge series. And they plan afternoon tea at Mannheim's home in London, WWII (letter 3). It is not clear if the tea meeting ever took place. Within

fifteen months, Mannheim's untimely death (at the age of 53) had intervened and so we can only speculate about what rich vein of study the two men might have plumbed.

We are left instead with a condensed overlap and the knowledge

40

that their mutual basis in Frankfurt left an indelible imprint on their thinking. In a way the distance between the two men presents an interesting avenue of study inasmuch as it highlights the more profound tributary process in the unfolding of ideas about group analysis. To argue that group analysis emerged as a result of a collective process rather than the vision of one man is certainly in keeping with its democratic and collaborative clinical basis. The Behest Mannheim died in 1947 amidst of some of his most important work and just a few days after he had been given an important position in UNESCO. It was Mannheim's wife Julia who saw to it that her husband's unfinished manuscripts were published and there was a brief consideration of her husband's work from several notable psychoanalytic colleagues including Pierre Turquet (1955) (who led groups at the Tavistock for a period) and Arthur Hyatt Williams (1957). But interest in Mannheim was short lived. That a sociologist like Mannheim should have drifted into the psychoanalytic margins merits perhaps only brief pause for thought.³ The same can be said of his uptake in education and curriculum development where his ideas on the sociology of knowledge were once regarded as indispensable (Ottaway, 1953; Dearden, 1968; Lawton, 1973; Karier, 1976). That academic psychoanalysts - in particular those of political persuasion - have dispensed with Mannheim (there are few references to his work beyond 1960) is at best rather precipitous. It is an oversight especially notable considering that Mannheim edited *The International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction* for the publishers Routledge, Kegan Paul for many years, producing somewhere in the region of 75 books, many of which were classics (Josephine Klein, George Homans, W.J. Spratt), explicitly psychoanalytic, consolidating psychoanalytic sociology in some way or other. But more important than his editorships, Mannheim himself was responsible for envisaging a range of ideas of considerable note. For example he was among the first (if not indeed the first) to coin the important bridging term: *The Third Way* (Mannheim, 1943) outlining a modified form of capitalism under the arch of social democracy. It is an idea that has been re-incarnated in many forms since (for better or worse) without reference to its originator and one which has particular currency with new centre left politics. And

41

in the field of 'the sociology of knowledge' ideas continue to be attributed to Mannheim, building on his work. Likewise his vision of implementing training for citizenship in schools through the development of practising democracy has been more recently accepted as an essential component of the mission of school life.

And of course, as far as we are concerned here, he was the first to use the term 'group analysis' as a tag for integrating psychoanalysis with sociology and as a method for driving social adjustment.

Towards a Psychoanalytic Sociology

Karl Mannheim moved to Germany in 1920 after being forced to leave Hungary because of the backlash of the political right in Budapest which was unfurling a veil of censorship over Marxists and their allies. Mannheim moved to Frankfurt and in 1929 he gained the position of Sociology Chair at Frankfurt University. It was the same year that Max Horkheimer took over from Carl Grunberg as Head of the Institute of Social Research. From 1929, largely due to Horkheimer's influence, the University also established the Institute of Psychoanalysis (which was referred to as 'the guest institute') under the directorship of Karl Landauer⁴, a psychiatrist who had been a student of Freud. It was the first psychoanalytic institution in Germany to be based in a university. The other early members of the Psychoanalytic Institute were Heinrich Meng, Eric Fromm, Freida Fromm-Reichmann and S.H.

Fuchs (S.H. Foulkes). Mannheim took charge of the Sociology Department at the threshold of a new epoch where psychoanalysis, sociology and cultural researchers were significant bed-fellows. The atmosphere was no less fraught for the intellectual left in Germany as it had been in Hungary and the siege brought the Marxist-based Frankfurt institutions even closer together. Mannheim was a member for several years of a sociology discussion group that included Horkheimer, Lowenthal and Pollock. Numerous overlapping discussion groups, seminars and review circles opened the way for new ways of conceptualizing the collapsing social order. Psychoanalysis promised to be a crucial ally to Marxism and we can see from Landauer's (1930, 1933) early reports that the contribution of the psychoanalytic section to Frankfurt's matrix was a series of seminars that ensured that new institute would be proximal to social study. The opening lecture was delivered by Siegfried Bernfeld,⁵ a

42

renowned Marxist analyst, whose paper was simply entitled: *Sociology*. It was Landauer's ambition that psychoanalysis be stretched and applied in all directions, north, south, east and west, through the 'compass' so to speak and not necessarily clinically but academically (Landauer, 1930).

The matrix of Frankfurt became Mannheim's template for his theory of a 'socially unattached intelligentsia' (Mannheim, 1936), a classless but learned stratum able to remain objective against the powerful forces of political persuasion, perhaps not unlike the psychoanalyst who attempted to stay removed from the patient's projections. It was clearly the task for the Frankfurters in the midst of rising Nazism to remain independent of the fervent (if not psychotic) wave of populism. The academics promoted general social interests through the procurement of knowledge and maintained the scholarly task of objective and critical commentary of the defining social order (Bottomore, 1964). Mannheim, like the other Frankfurt scholars, gained a reputation as an ardent critic of National Socialism and soon found himself high on the Nazi party's 'hit list' of detractors. We can see from essays written during the last years in Germany that Mannheim was forthrightly disillusioned with the excessive claims of German sociological idealistic thought (Mannheim, 1956). And on April 13th 1933, three months after Hitler had seized power, Mannheim was among the first group of Frankfurt scholars, alongside Horkheimer, Tillich and Sinzheimer, to be honoured with official dismissal from public duty. Friends persuaded Mannheim to leave Germany and in 1933 he

accepted an invitation to take up a teaching post at the London School of Economics. He and his wife installed themselves at 5, The Park, Golders Green, London NW11

Even against the backdrop of expulsion and Nazism, Mannheim's (1935) *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction* was a brave and optimistic attempt to reassure that democracy in a complex society could be directed rationally and deliberately. It was a dialectical counterpoise to the apparent horrifying products of social planning emerging in Germany. Even given the direction of the Nazi party who had gained power as a result of a democratic plebiscite,[?] Mannheim maintained that there was no choice other than democracy. After the fall of the 'old society' the only option was to seek a framework for informed comprehensive social engineering. But the solution was the force of 'interdependence thinking' said Mannheim, where various kinds of abstract thinking

43

or scientific knowledge could be brought to bear on concrete administrative action; the reciprocity between individual mind and government mind. It may be true to say that Mannheim was drawn towards a 'Utopian' philosophy; a brand of 'Historical Idealism' that probably owed much to Jean-Jacques Rousseau. His vision, often criticized for elitist detachment (as Turquet, 1955, argued), was far from being the idle longings of an aloof wandering man. Mannheim never said the unattached intelligentsia was elite, indeed, it is fair to say that rather than being removed Mannheim lived *inside* the cauldron of his own time and studied the social role of the modern intellectual proximal to his subject and therein close to the worst experiences of anti-socialism.

The breathing dialect of utopianism, in Mannheim's case, when framed against the living backdrop of fascistic atrocity, was not wistful dreaming but rather the hopeful churning of someone trying to search out a solution. He saw England moving towards a social crisis akin to that which had devastated Germany and drew attention to those methods which German sociologists had deployed in making sense of the social crisis previously (Mannheim, 1953). The social reconstruction he proposed was an alternative way which he called 'a third way' (Mannheim, 1943, 1953) and he spent his life seeking a resolution to the question as to *whether or not freedom and democracy could be compatible with capitalism?*

Psychoanalysis and 'the Problem of Group Analysis'.

Even though Mannheim was never in psychoanalytic therapy, his contact with psychoanalysis ran a deeper personal course than most. Mannheim's wife Julia worked as a Freudian clinician dating from the 1920s Frankfurt years when she worked with the well-known paediatrician, Homburger, who was a student of Freud. It was in Homburger's Child Guidance Clinic in Frankfurt that Julia Mannheim made the first steps towards making psychoanalysis her life's work. After their move to London Julia continued her work in child guidance, completing her analytical training in 1944 with the British Psycho-Analytical Society. She was never a renowned psychoanalytic scholar (although she did publish an interesting paper on drug addiction; (Mannheim, 1955) but she was a regular teacher at the Anna Freud Centre in Hampstead. Mannheim commended psychoanalysis as the one psychology

that understood the historical location of action. Freud's bleak rendering of the reservoirs of the id must have offered a compatible model for Mannheim and the other Frankfurters with which to make sense of the cultural collapse around them. Mannheim noted the affinity between the psychoanalytic effort to grasp the significance of a personal life event and the task of understanding a social system where meaning was imprinted on events tempered by historical lineage. He hatched a paradigm that could map cultural reality to the wavelength of individual psychic reality. It was an outward-inward type of model (psychoanalysis in reverse) and Mannheim rejected psychoanalytic precepts that over emphasized early childhood. He posited that equal if not greater attention should be paid to how institutions influenced the psychic life of adults (and thereafter child development). The psychology of society was not a million times that of an individual and his theory of 'social grouping' and later 'relativism' were central pillars of this theoretical development, in both cases extending the argument that group transcended individual.

Mannheim finally published his ideas about group psychoanalysis or 'group analysis' as he called it, in a book entitled *Educating for Democracy* (Mannheim, 1939). In this work, he referred initially to 'the problem of group analysis' (p. 86) which was a quirky forestalling of his belief that group analysis was a *solution* rather than the problem. The paper on group analysis was reprinted in 1943 in a collection of wartime essays; *Diagnosis of Our Time* (Mannheim, 1943). Mannheim was concerned to develop a system of 'mass education' that would prepare the younger generation for democratic citizenship. The aim was to create a reliable social conscience and he envisaged that this 'collective' (not mass) approach to social planning might alienate liberals who saw the education system as the means to developing individualistic identity. In the dialectic, Mannheim had seen that it was the social isolation of rampant individualism that had dislocated democracy and spurred the blinded fascistic polity. It was therefore collective social awareness that drove democracy maintaining the drive towards the good society.

In order to quell the concerns of liberalists antipathetic to such ambitious (collective) sociological schemas, Mannheim proposed an approach for bridging individuality and the collective through an understanding of group process:

"In what follows I wish to draw attention to the emergence of two new problems and the slow growth of some psychological techniques which, if further developed, are bound to contribute to the readjustment of individuals and groups in our society. . .Modern sociology and psychology are making progress not only reforming moral standards but in finding new methods of readjusting the masses by *group analysis*. Although these experiments are so far isolated and in the early stage of development (usually even their authors do not know the full significance of their findings), I venture to say that we have in them a genuine

alternative to the fascist exploitation of group emotion. We have to break loose from the prejudice that group interaction is capable only of creating mass psychosis. Democracy must learn to use the forces of group interaction in a positive cathartic way". (Mannheim, 1943: 77-79).

Mannheim clearly indicated the notion of group analysis was a paradigm shift from psychoanalysis. It was therefore too contextually inclined to be located as psychology. He also assigned it beyond the domain of conventional sociology, thus augmenting a social-psychology that actually resembled, to some extent, his political ideas about a 'third way'. Beginning with Freud's notion of the super-ego, which he located in terms of social administration and its impact on the individual, he suggested that the collective forms of re-adjustment, the instillation of public goodwill for instance, should be called 'socio-analysis or group analysis' (Mannheim, 1943: 87). He outlined experiments carried out by Louis Wender in New York using:

". . .a modification of the psychoanalytic technique, applied in certain cases to small groups. These experiments were first carried out in the wards of a mental home where it was necessary to find a technique for the intramural treatment of a great number of patients by relatively small staff. Instead of analysing individuals, an attempt was made to bring about the analytic situation in small groups". (Mannheim, 1943: 88)

Mannheim reported that the experiments had gone well and that the resistance normally encountered in individual psychoanalysis had been surpassed rather more easily than expected in the group. It was the emotional tension in the group, when harnessed by the group therapist, which proved helpful in progressing the task of therapy said Mannheim. Furthermore, the recognition of symptoms in other group members was found to be a catalytic first stage in the process of self-awareness although he was quick to point *out* that this type of group-analysis ought not to be a substitute for psychoanalysis and neither should it be viewed as an attempt at bringing about a therapeutic cure. In its place the procedure was an

46

'attempt to set in motion a certain mechanism' (Mannheim, 1943: 88) and we can see from the subsequent sections of the paper dealing with collective readjustment in various milieus including gangs, families, school-rooms and communities - that the 'certain mechanism' was the application of group analysis as a melting pot for generating self and social knowledge. Not unlike Freud who rarely emphasized psychoanalysis as a therapeutic instrument, Mannheim saw the potential of group analysis as an extension of understanding through education and the institution of social learning. The rubric for Mannheim was again the sociology of knowledge. The imperative of societal planning was to stimulate this social knowledge and in this way constructive forces might be instilled in the individual who would eventually internalize the social institutions (the 'good institution in mind', so to speak). The cost of not pursuing the enlargement of social knowledge Mannheim had seen all

too clearly in Germany where 'Nazi group strategy' (Mannheim, 1943: 95), as he called it, had systematically fragmented the benign capacity for sociality and democracy. In a two-pronged approach Mannheim suggested the first agents of the new democratic order would be the social workers and the educationalists who; 'more than others have the power to link up the regeneration of man with the regeneration of society' (Mannheim, 1943: 94). We know from the posthumous publication of his papers in 1958, which include a range of lectures he delivered at the London School of Economics between 1934 and the end of the Second World War (Mannheim, 1958), that Mannheim was concerned with developing syntheses between paradigms, correlating findings of modern psychology with the methods and schools of sociological analysis. Thus 'group analysis' was a bridging term, a hybrid ideology or a : third way for psychoanalysis, psychology and sociology. Mannheim (1940) had warned against frequent errors in the psychological investigation of social phenomena where 'group psychology' was given a mythological or quasi-religious dimension by theoretical constructs that argued towards a theory of 'mass soul' as if it were mindless and incomprehensible. The view foisted by many psychoanalysts was that the psychology of the individual could be applied directly to 'society'. The Second World War represented a critical stage for the necessary advancement of understanding of psycho- logical and sociological processes because the 'masses' in Germany

47

had become terrifyingly acquiescent with a seeming surfeit of collective thoughtlessness. Mannheim thought it was possible to make sense of the mass force of the collective and eventually engage it towards creating a good peaceful society. To undertake this task of social reconstruction Mannheim believed it was necessary to develop a discourse of psychological politics in order to trace the development of strategic social institutions. Thus, group analysis represented a micro-democratic training ground for integrating the individual with the political. The technical apparatus of society concerned with economic . pressures and the influences arising from the militaristic factors to which a society was exposed were new avenues for the sociologist that went beyond Spencer, Marx and Weber. Mannheim (1940) attempted to locate the study of the War (and its effects) and the collapse of social democracy in a way that the individual could be connected to the mass. He used the study of 'inter-group conflict' as a basis for his argument and proposed that the psychoanalyst and sociologist could profitably collaborate. How far this optimistic (Utopian?) proposal has been carried through is yet to completely unfold.

Letters

The letters from Mannheim to Foulkes

[Wellcome Archive: PP/SMF/BIO]

Letter 1 [Typed on headed note paper]

Telephone No: Speedwell 0375
Private address 5, The Park, London, NW11

11th June 1945
Dr S.H. Foulkes
The (P) Hospital, Northfield,
Birmingham 31

48

Dear Dr Foulkes

Dr Kate Friedlander who is one of the contributors to the above series, drew my attention to your recent work relating to Group-Analysis. As I am very much interested in this subject, and should like to see psychoanalysis adequately represented in the series I should be glad to know if you would like to contribute a volume to it. Although at this stage I cannot fully commit myself, I can assure you that both my board and my publishers would like to study any contribution that comes from you. I myself, read sometime ago your book 'Psycho-Analysis and Crime's and was very impressed with it. . Should my suggestion appeal to you, I should be glad to read anything you care to forward to me, or if you prefer a personal talk to make a suggestion for a meeting.

Yours sincerely
Karl Mannheim

Letter 2 [Typed on headed notepaper]

**THE INTERNATIONAL LIBRARY OF SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL
RECONSTRUCTION Editor: KARL MANNHEIM**

Speedwell 0375
5 The Park, London, NW11

2nd July 1945

Dear Dr Foulkes

Many thanks for your letter. I shall be delighted to meet with you and discuss further plans concerning your studies with you. The best thing will be if I tell you that I am in London throughout the Summer except for the period from 20th August to 10th September. Given due notice I could easily arrange for a meeting. I should be glad to help your daughter, Lisa, but, as you say, raising the age of entry is a general rule. I could only do something, if you give me special reasons to which I could refer. Do not hesitate to let me know if you see a concrete suggestion as to how I could be of some use to her. I, of course, remember you and I am very much looking forward to our meeting before long.

Yours sincerely,
Karl Mannheim

49

Letter 3 [undated, hand-written on headed note paper]

THE LONDON SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS AND SCIENCE (UNIVERSITY OF LONDON)

Houghton Street, Aldwych,
London W.C.2

Dear Dr Foulkes,

Many thanks for your letter. As things stand now I shall be back by the 12th Sept and may I suggest to come to tea to us about 4pm.

Should unforeseen happen we must write again. If I happen to be free when you will lecture to Anne Freud's group I shall be delighted to come.

Kindest regards,

Yours sincerely

Karl Mannheim

Date: 05/09/2001 16:05:39 GMT Daylight Time

From: foulkes@dircon.co.uk (Elizabeth Foulkes) To: GWinship@aol.com

Dear Gary Winship,

Thank you for sending me a copy of your paper on 'The Democratic Origins of the Term 'Group Analysis' which I found very interesting. I agree that the Americans pay far more attention to the Frankfurt School than do British colleagues. As to your questions: (i) I have asked Lisa if she remembered her father asking Mannheim for some advice. She says that she did try to get into LSE but was not accepted as she was too young. That's really all. She became a teacher. (ii) My husband did not have much contact with the American ex-Frankfurters though he visited Fromm in Mexico once or twice. (His youngest daughter, Vera, lives in Mexico). I remember my husband mentioning having tea at the Mannheims' but don't know whether this was while Mannheim was alive or later, with Julia Mannheim.

Kind regards,

yours sincerely,

Elizabeth Foulkes

50

Notes

1 Horkheimer was the second head of the Frankfurt School and a cultural theorist of considerable importance in the transitional years when the Frankfurt School was moved formally to America in the 1930s and then back to Frankfurt in the 1950s.

2 Frankfurt had been Foulkes's base from 1923 apart from the two years he spent in Vienna undergoing a training analysis with Helene Deutsch and from 1930-1932 he had been in charge of the out-patient clinic at the newly formed Frankfurt Institute of Psychoanalysis.

3 Mannheim's collection of books at the Tavistock; *Man and Society* (1935), *Ideology and Utopia* (1936), *Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning* (1950) and *Diagnosis of Our Time* (1943), were moved to the vaults some years ago. It is speculation to say that the books look hardly perused; however, the number of ~ times they have been withdrawn is quantifiable. From the withdrawal slip records

(inside covers) it looks as though they have not been outside the reading room for quite some time. In as much as *Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning* (1951) was bequeathed to the Tavistock library by Pierre Turquet's family in 1975 we might infer that its at least a quarter of century since it has been read thoroughly.

4 In 1928 Horkheimer had decided to undergo an analysis with Karl Landauer. We may assume that the experience was a favourable one in as much as Horkheimer then paved the way for the establishment of the Psychoanalytic Institute.

5 In 1941 Foulkes presented a paper to the British Psychoanalytic Society on Helen Keller's book *The World I Live In* (Foulkes, 1941) in which he discussed Bemfeld's work.

6 The current owners of the house purchased the property from the Mannheim's housekeeper Mrs Pilsudski who inherited the house from the Mannheims (personal communication). Mrs Pilsudski came over from Frankfurt with the Mannheims and apparently recalled big garden parties with guests such as the poet T.S. Elliot.

7 It is often overlooked that Hitler's power resulted from a democratic process. 8 This is probably Foulkes's contribution to the University of Cambridge's Department of Criminal Science pamphlet series. The pamphlet was: 'Psychoanalysis and Crime' with a preface by Sir Cyril Burt.

References

- Bottomore, T.B. (1964) *Elites and Society*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books. ~
- Dearden, R.F. (1968) *The Philosophy of Primary Education*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Elias, N. (1994) *Reflections on a Life*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Foulkes, S.H. (1941) Book Review, 'The World I Live In' by Helen Keller, *Psychoanalytic Review* 28: 512-519.
- Foulkes, S.H. (1946) 'On Group Analysis', in E. Foulkes *Selected Papers*. London: Kama Books, 1990.
- Jay, M. (1973) *The Dialectical Imagination. A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923-1950*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Karier, C.J. (1976) 'Liberalism and the Quest for Orderly Change', in R. Dale,

51

- G. Esland and M. Macdonald (eds) *Schooling and Capitalism*, pp. 90-97. London: Routledge.
- Landauer, K. (1930) 'Frankfurt Psycho-Analytical Institute', *Bulletin of the International Psychoanalytic Association* 11: 246-247.
- Landauer, K. (1933) 'Frankfurt Psycho-Analytical Institute', *Bulletin of the International Psychoanalytic Association* 14: 293-294.
- Lawton, D. (1973) *Social Change, Educational Theory and Curriculum Planning*. London: University of London Press.
- Mannheim, I. (1955) 'Notes on a Case of Drug Addiction', *International Journal of ~ Psycho-Analysis* 36: 166-173.
- Mannheim, K. (1935) *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction*. London: Kegan, Paul.
- Mannheim, K. (1936) *Ideology and Utopia*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.

- Mannheim, K. (1939) *Educating for Democracy* (edited by Cohen and Travers). London: Macmillan.
- Mannheim, K. (1940) 'Ber Die Durch Den Krieg Verursachten Anderungen in Unserer Psychischen Okonomie, II' (On the Changes in our Psychic Economy Incident to War, II), *International Zeitschrift fur Psychoanalysis und Imago*, XXV: 346-355.
- Mannheim, K. (1943) *Diagnosis of Our II: me*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Mannheim, K. (1950) *Freedom, Power and Democratic Planning*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Mannheim, K. (1953) *Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology* (edited by P. Kecskemeti). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Mannheim, K. (1956) *Essays on the Sociology of Culture* (edited by E. Mannheim and P. Kecskemeti). London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Mannheim, K. (1958) *Systematic Sociology: An Introduction to the Study of Society* (edited by I.S. Ercos and W.A.C. Stewart). New York: Philosophical Library.
- Ottoway, A.K.C. (1953) *Education and Society*. Routledge: London.
- Smith, D. (2001) *Norbert Elias and Modern Sociological Theory*. London: Sage.
- Turquet, P. (1955) 'Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology' [1956] by Karl Mannheim. (Book review), *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 36: 360-361.
- Williams, A.H. (1957) 'Essays on the Sociology of Culture' [1956] by Karl Mannheim. (Book review), *International Journal of Psycho-Analysis* 38: 127-128.
- Young, R.M. (1969) 'Eros and Civilisation by Herbert Marcuse.' (Book review), *New Statesman* 78 (7 November): 666-667.

Gary Winship (Doctoral fellow UEL/ Tavistock, MA, RMN, Dip Gp Psych, ENB 616) is a Lecturer with the University of Sheffield and a UKCP Psychotherapist). Email: G.Winship@sheff.ac.uk