

# 1. Why study ideology and utopia in early comparative communications?

The fathers have eaten bitter fruit and the children's teeth are set on edge. It's all very well for the fathers, they know what they ate. The children don't know what was eaten. (Bateson 1966)

This is an unapologetically old-fashioned and unfashionable book, although highly relevant to the present. Both theoretically and empirically, I begin with the post-World War I period and ask why and how communications research took a comparative turn in the United States even before it became international communication, a subfield of communication studies. I analyse the developments of comparative communications across four decades between the 1920s and the 1950s in the US, including its origins in work undertaken primarily on propaganda in World Wars I and II. I present five historical studies of individuals or research groups to understand how, in comparative communications, knowledge was produced by a generation of scholars and men of practice who were influenced by two world wars. In this book, I call those largely forgotten individuals the *forefront* generation, marked by their shared experiences of the two world wars even if most of them did not fight on the front.

Returning to early propaganda research enables us to understand our contemporary world. Louis Wirth<sup>1</sup> (1897–1952) wrote nearly 100 years ago, in his preface to Karl Mannheim's (1893–1947) *Ideology and Utopia* (Mannheim 1929; 1936; 1960, p.xiii), that 'we are witnessing not only a general distrust of the validity of ideas but of the motives of those who assert them', and today this again rings true. We are now living in dangerous times and witnessing new global cold and hot wars after a relative long period of, if not peace, at least controlled military aggression. The scourge of war in Europe has escalated into a potential global conflict and has brought back ideological wars fought by propagandising news. Understanding how war propaganda research, latterly almost forgotten, was done before, between and after World Wars I and II, has much to teach us for in this work lies the

---

## How to cite this book chapter:

Rantanen, Terhi (2024) *Dead Men's Propaganda: Ideology and Utopia in Comparative Communications Studies*, London: LSE Press, pp. 1–48.  
<https://doi.org/10.31389/lsepress.wmf.a>. License: CC BY-NC 4.0

development of core scholarly methodologies, notably content analysis. In the present age of misinformation, of propaganda and of increasing ignorance about science, I argue that we need to go back to Mannheim's idea of *Wissenssoziologie*, which aimed to analyse the 'crisis in our thought' (Mannheim 1960, p.84).

Contemporary populism has made science one of its main targets. Mede et al. (2022, p.1) suggest that populism proposes 'a virtuous ordinary people, and not allegedly corrupt academic elites, should determine the production of truth'. Populism often celebrates 'common sense' over expertise; it offers 'counter knowledge, proposing politically charged alternative knowledge authorities instead of established ones' (Ylä-Anttila 2018, p.356). When populism questions scientific knowledge it challenges those who produce it, labelling them as an elite. However, elites themselves rarely critically study their own work, and this is why the sociology of knowledge becomes one of the ways to understand how knowledge is produced. To learn from previous research, we need to study the conditions in which research was done to understand how researchers developed their conceptual frameworks and methodologies, but also study the beliefs which animated them, their utopias and ideologies. By doing so I also challenge the field of international communication that neglects/does not recognise its own origins, utopias and ideologies.

All this draws us to Mannheim's *Wissenssoziologie*, now often called the sociology of knowledge or the history and theory of knowledge production (Gurukkal 2019). Gabel (1991, p.33) writes, 'Mannheim is the philosopher *par excellence* of times of crisis: misunderstood in peaceful periods, he is likely to be censored in periods of unrest'. Mannheim's work lives on in his *Wissenssoziologie*, which was transformed by Robert Merton (1910–2003) into an American sociology of knowledge, and also in his own liberalism (Hvidsten 2019), which he defended throughout periods of extreme polarisation of ideologies and politics (see also Bessner 2018; Speier 1989), such as we are now seeing again. Mannheim's *Wissenssoziologie*, once defined as an 'elucidation of the relations between existence and thought' (Eisenstadt 1987, p.77), could be seen as an area within the larger field known as the 'sociology of culture', defined as a theory of the relationships between culture and society (Remmling 1961, p.25). In this study I use Mannheim's *Wissenssoziologie* approach, complemented by Merton's *sociology of knowledge* (1937; 1968), together with Mannheim's concept of a *generation* (1927; 1928; 2000) and Merton's (1972) concepts of *Insiders/Outsiders*.

In this opening chapter, I discuss, first, what I mean by comparative communications and caution that this is not a history of communication research. Second, I introduce Mannheim and Merton as academics behind their work. Third, I review their key concepts of *Wissenssoziologie*, sociology of knowledge, ideology, utopia, generation, and Insider/Outsider. Finally, I return back to present times before short introductions to each of the succeeding chapters.

## 1.1 Previous research and its value

I use the term comparative communications, referring to an emerging set of interdisciplinary research as carried out by academics and non-academics in the period mainly before the field of communication studies was institutionalised in universities from the 1950s onwards. I define early comparative communications in the US as that where researchers or research teams with diverse cultural, practical or academic skills, and in different locations, developed specific theories, concepts and/or methods to analyse materials or data concerning communications, often from more than one source or (geographical) location simultaneously.

Therefore, this book is *not* a history of a field, or a discipline of communication studies already conducted by others. The first histories of communication studies were written by those who played a key role in establishing it and were often partly or wholly autobiographical (see, for example, Berelson 1959; Chaffee 1974; Lang 1979; Schramm 1957, 1959, 1963, 1980, 1985; Schramm, Chaffee and Rogers 1997). The pioneering academic work on the history of US communication studies started to appear from the 1970s (see, for example, Dennis and Wartella 1996; Glander 2000; Hardt 1979; 1992; Park and Pooley 2008; Peters 1986; Pooley 2017; Rogers 1994; Simonson 2010; Simonson et al 2012; Simpson 1994; Sproule 1997; 2008). Increasingly, non-US academics, together with US scholars or independently, have published on the history of US communication studies (see, for example, Klaus and Seethaler 2016; Löblich and Scheu 2011; Simonson et al. 2019; Simonson and Park 2016; Wahl-Jorgensen 2004). Previous research has helped me to concentrate on academic and non-academic comparative communications that has not been fully covered before. This is also why I have left, for example, Paul Lazarsfeld's<sup>2</sup> (1901–1976) life and work aside in the context of comparative communications, since it has been researched before (see, for example, Coser 1984; Morrison 1988; 2008; 2022; Sills 1987; Simonson and Weimann 2003).

I argue that we cannot understand comparative communications without taking into consideration work carried out not only in other academic disciplines – primarily in political science, sociology and psychology – but also by researchers of different nationalities and by non-academics. Martin Jay's (1973/1996) outstanding work, *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research 1923–1950*, laid the groundwork for the study of European scholars who found refuge in the US when fleeing from European dictatorships. Like Jay, I study émigré scholars, but unlike him I concentrate on those who were not members of the Frankfurt School and who have been so far written out of the narrative of their generation. Here, in contrast, I will establish claims to our continued attention of contemporaries of those who were non-Marxist, and in some cases actively anti-communist, but who had vital roles in shaping comparative communications. Those 'hidden from history' who merit our attention include Nathan Leites (1912–1987), Paul Kecskemeti (1901–1980) and Karl Mannheim (who

found refuge in the UK rather than the US), as well as native-born US citizens whose work once enjoyed celebrity but has latterly faded from our collective horizon, most notably Harold Lasswell (1902–1979).

I also consider the important roles of native-born US citizens working outside the academy in (1) research groups and institutions funded by private foundations and/or the US government; (2) the Associated Press news agency; (3) committees and working groups, such as the Hutchins Commission; and (4) international organisations such as UNESCO. Often the work of non-academics is ignored, especially if they are not 'intellectuals' in accordance with a narrow definition of the term. The chapters in this book feature both academics and other specialists such as news agency directors (most notably Kent Cooper, 1880–1965) and consultants. These non-academics worked, often but not always, with academics, in policy science, the term used when researchers are providing policymakers with pragmatic, problem-solving recommendations (Lasswell 1951a, p.4). Many individuals and institutional sites have been marginalised through the establishment of a dominant narrative concentrating on the Frankfurt School and native-born US academics working in universities. Similarly marginalised have been the methodologies developed by them, notably quantitative and qualitative content analysis, as well as the study of propaganda. This is, obviously, not to say that it was *only* in the US, as Lang (1979) has shown, where significant work in developing comparative communications took place, only that the US conjuncture was of key significance and has, I contend, been misunderstood. Researching these individuals highlights not only their roles but also how often these specialists shared the ideologies and utopias of academics in the same period.

I draw theoretically on the work of Mannheim, in particular his 1929 *Ideologie und Utopie*, which is the focus of this opening chapter (Section 1.4) and to which I return in Chapter 7. I draw extensively on Mannheim's work in mapping early comparative communications by the individuals and these institutional sites, notably by drawing on Mannheim's concepts of ideology, utopia and generation, together with the concepts introduced by Merton of Insider and Outsider. By revisiting Mannheim's work, I do so in full awareness of what is seen as a wide-ranging critique of his 'weaknesses'. Perhaps the most famous of Mannheim's critics is Karl Popper (1902–1994), who is said to have had a 'lasting rhetorical victory' (1957/2002) over Mannheim (Fuller 2006, p.19). Theodor Adorno's (1903–1969) critique (Adorno 1955) of Mannheim is also well-known, as is Friedrich Hayek's (1899–1992) 'ridicule' of Mannheim (Hammersley 2021; Howie 1961, p.55; Lassman 1992, p.223) and Clifford Geertz's (1926–2006) critique, which he framed as Mannheim's dilemma (1973). Other critics of Mannheim's alleged weaknesses include Merton (1937; 1949/1968) with his 'disposal' of *Wissenssoziologie* (Sica 2010, p.180) and Edward Shils' (1910–1995) (1974; 1975, pp.xvii–xviii) 'turn against' him (Pooley 2007).

In contrast to these critiques of Mannheim's work, and especially their rejection of Mannheim's alleged historicism, I see value in his historical

approach, in what he saw as the ‘deeply rooted connection between epistemology in its concrete historical varieties and the corresponding “existential situation”’ (Mannheim 1960, p.261). Mannheim’s emphasis on situated and changing conjunctures gives the lie to allegations, as made by Popper in his *Poverty of Historicism* (1957), that Mannheim was postulating ‘inexorable laws of historical destiny’ (Popper 2002, p.vi) and presented ‘vulgar Marxism’ (Woldring 1986, p.180). Mannheim did not argue for historical destiny. Mannheim wrote (1960) that:

the changes in relationships between events and ideas are not the result of wilful and arbitrary design, but that these relationships, both in their simultaneousness and in their historical sequence, must be regarded as following a certain necessary regularity, which, although not superficially evident, does nevertheless exist and can be understood. (p.81)

I am aware of how much work (see, for example, Bourdieu 1986; 1988; 1993; Kögler 1997; Kuhn 1962; Purhonen 2016) has been done since Mannheim. As Kögler (1997, p.142) argues, both Mannheim’s concept of *Weltanschauung* and Bourdieu’s concept of *habitus* have contributed to the balance of ‘symbolic thought and social structures’. However, I still argue that we need to go back to the work of Mannheim and Merton to learn what was achieved in times even more tumultuous than our own, and to focus on the importance of communications in modern societies. In this situation, in today’s new atmosphere of fear, it is timely to return to studies conducted in circumstances that were not entirely different from the current ones. I argue that in our time of polarised politics it is crucial to understand how comparative communications, and especially its content, were shaped not only by academics but also by men of practice institutionally located outside the academy and how knowledge was produced in a world that, like ours, was falling apart.

## 1.2 Karl Mannheim: a brief biography

Karl (né Károly) Mannheim’s career developed in three countries: Hungary, Germany and the UK (Mannheim 1947). His life exemplifies that of a cosmopolitan academic in very turbulent times. He was the son of a Hungarian Jewish textile merchant Gustav (né Gusztáv) Gerzon Man(n)heim (born in 1875 in Ada, Serbia, death year unknown) and a German Jewish mother, Rosa (Roza) Eylenburg (1867–1944), and was born in Budapest in 1893 (Whitty 2004). Mannheim learned German from an early age and studied at the University of Berlin from 1913 to 1915, where he was a student of Georg Simmel (1858–1918), and then at the University of Budapest (Woldring 1986, p.6). In Budapest, known for its unique cosmopolitan culture, he joined the Sunday Circle (*Vasárnapi Kör, Sonntagskreis*) (Barboza 2020, p.26; Gabel 1991, p.4), which

**Figure 1.1: The Sunday Circle in Budapest**



Source: Petöfi Literary Museum, reproduced with permission. Date unknown.

met between 1915 and 1918 to discuss various philosophical and artistic problems that happened to interest its members at a given moment (Congdon 1991, p.45; Gluck 1985, pp.9–11; Kadarkay 1991, p.176). Its members, pictured in Figure 1.1, influenced Mannheim's concept of a generation (Perivolaropoulou 1992) and included intellectuals such as Georg Lukács (1885–1971), Károly (Karl) Polányi (1886–1964) and Mihály (Michael) Polányi (1891–1976) and artists such as Béla Bartók (1881–1945) (Karádi 1985, p.9). Dr Julia Mannheim-Láng (née Károlyné Júlia (Juliska) Láng (1893–1955)), a psychoanalyst, was also a member and became Mannheim's lifelong companion, adviser and spouse (Borgos 2021; Wolff 1971/1993, p.1). They are pictured together in Figure 1.2. Mannheim-Láng's influence is clearly seen on Mannheim's work, but she barely gets a mention in biographies of Mannheim, although *Ideology and Utopia* (1936; 1960) is dedicated to her, and she is said to have put aside her own writing to work on Mannheim's legacy (Borgos 2021).

Mannheim's doctoral thesis was published in 1922 as *Strukturanalyse der Erkenntnistheorie* (*The Structural Analysis of Knowledge*) (Mannheim 1922), eventually leading to his conceptualisation of *Wissenssoziologie* in his *Ideologie und Utopie* (*Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*) (1929; 1936) (Kettler Meja and Stehr 1984). After the overthrow of the short-lived Hungarian Soviet Republic, in which Mannheim accepted university positions for which he was later criticised (Congdon 1991, p.266), in 1919 he helped Lukács and other communist friends to escape from Hungary in a period when over 100,000 people were forced to flee the country (Weidlinger 2019, p.27). Gabel (1991) writes that these 'tragic series of aborted revolutions helped Mannheim together with other members of the Hungarian

**Figure 1.2: Karl Mannheim and Julia Mannheim-Láng**

Source: Archiv für die Geschichte der Soziologie in Österreich (AGSÖ), reproduced with permission. Date unknown.

*intelligentsia* sensitivise to the concept of utopia' (p.6). Mannheim followed his friends, fleeing first to Vienna and then in 1922 to Heidelberg, where he received a lectureship in sociology of the press at the Heidelberg Institut für Zeitungswesen (Institute for Newspaper Research) between 1929 and 1930 (Averbeck 1999; Averbeck 2001, pp.456, 464; Mannheim 1980). From 1930 to 1933 Mannheim served as a professor of sociology and political economy at the Johann Wolfgang Goethe University in Frankfurt am Main. This was a remarkable achievement since Jewish and socialist scholars rarely secured chairs in German universities. Fewer than 8 per cent of the professoriate at Frankfurt were Jewish, and most of those were in medicine (Rutkoff and Scott 1986, p.87).

When Mannheim's *Ideology and Utopia* was first published in German in 1929 (and in English in 1936), the idea behind it, that social structures and human behaviour would have an influence on the production of knowledge, was at that time found radical, and perhaps still is. Not surprisingly, Mannheim's book soon became a target of criticism from contemporaries on both the political left (see, for example, Jay 1973/1996; 1974/1994) and the right (see, for example, Pooley 2007). This continued throughout his career and after his early death in 1947. While still living in Germany, Mannheim was criticised by conservatives and Nazis for being influenced by Karl Marx

(1818–1883), and by radicals for being insufficiently influenced by Marx. His academic critics included Adorno, Max Horkheimer (1895–1973), Herbert Marcuse (1898–1979) and Hannah Arendt (1906–1975) (Adorno 1955; Congdon 1991, pp.297–99; Fischer 2009; Jay 1973/1996; 1974; 1994; Meja and Stehr 1990; Speier 1989, p.36). To quote Fischer (2009, p.339),

the Frankfurt School's dispute with Mannheim and the sociology of knowledge was what Louis Althusser (1918–1990) ... once called a *Kampfplatz*, a site of struggle, where nothing less than the legacy of Marx's historical materialism was at stake.

Mannheim thus became an academic Outsider, the concept discussed later in this chapter, despite being a member of the Institut für Sozialforschung – best known as the academic home of Horkheimer, Adorno and those celebrated Insiders at the Frankfurt School. As Merton (1972, p.15) writes, the Outsider, 'no matter how careful and talented, is excluded in principle from gaining access to the social and cultural truth'. Mannheim was left alone with very few colleagues to defend him.

Mannheim had to flee again when Hitler came to power in Germany in 1933. He was among the first 14<sup>3</sup> to be stripped of his university professorship and was forced into exile by the Nazis because, although he was a German citizen, he was also seen as a foreigner, a Jew, and a friend of the Nazis' enemies (Karácsony 2008, p.99). Mannheim considered several options, among them emigrating to Czechoslovakia and the US (Gábor 1996, p.59). He and Juliska Láng first fled to Amsterdam,<sup>4</sup> and then to London. He was invited to join the London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) by Harold Laski (1893–1950) and benefitted from the organised efforts of the Academic Assistance Council set up to rescue eminent scholars persecuted by the Nazis (Cox 2021; Kettler and Meja, 1995, p.3; Pooley 2007, pp.372, 375). He was hired as a lecturer at LSE in 1933 and paid first an annual salary of £500 (around £46,000 in 2023 terms) and then £600 annually jointly by the Rockefeller Foundation.<sup>5</sup> Mannheim became a British citizen in 1940 (Whitty 2004). Even though already in the UK, Mannheim was on the Gestapo's secret *Sonderfahndungsliste* (Black Book), compiled by the Gestapo and its informants between 1936 and 1940, as an enemy of Germany, to be arrested after Germany's invasion of the UK (Oldfield 2022, pp.3, 8, 269).

According to Karácsony (2008, p.100), this second emigration was harder for Mannheim, not only because he had to learn English and learn his way around British academic life in general and sociology in particular (a problem he did not have to face when emigrating to Germany) but also because it was particularly hard to get a position at a university as one among so many emigrant intellectuals. Mannheim himself wrote that 'This is the second time that I have experienced something like this, but I always have the strength to begin anew, unbroken' (Congdon 1991, p.303). But this may have been too optimistic as it turned out that in his English years he would be bombarded with

criticism, much of it harsh (Pooley 2007, p.375). Shils refers to this emigration as an 'unmitigated catastrophe for Mannheim' (Shils 1995, p.234). This view was shared by sociologists in the UK (Albrow 1989, p.200; Bulmer 1985, p.21).

When in London, Mannheim wrote several letters on behalf of his colleagues still in danger in Europe (among them Hans Gerth (1908–1978) and Norbert Elias (1897–1990)) so that they could emigrate to the UK (Gábor 1996, pp.68–89, 121–23, 126). Mannheim held an appointment as lecturer at LSE from 1933 to 1943, teaching for example a course on 'Woman and Her Place in Society'.<sup>6</sup> He never obtained a chair at LSE, but the University of London appointed him as chair in the Institute of Education in 1945. According to Pooley, at LSE Mannheim became a 'kind of intellectual punching bag' and 'many of his colleagues were hellbent on ridding him from the School' (2007, pp.371–72). Mannheim was very close to needing to leave the UK for the US when LSE warned him in 1939 that his services were not needed. US colleagues tried to rescue him by offering him a lecture tour, which he could not accept because of the UK's immigration restrictions.<sup>7</sup> Lyon (2011) writes that after Mannheim's early supporters had left LSE, including William Beveridge (1879–1963), Laski and Bronislaw Malinowski (1884–1942), he lacked support under the subsequent directorship, which had become increasingly anxious to shed its reputation for being too political. He also lost the support of his head of the department, Morris Ginsberg (1889–1970), who may have felt that he stood in Mannheim's shadow<sup>8</sup> (Woldring 1986, p.53).

During World War II, when LSE was in exile in Cambridge, Mannheim became an active member of the Moot group (1938–1947), consisting mainly of Christian intellectuals who met regularly to discuss educational and social reconstruction. According to Grimley (2007), Mannheim had a 'strong conviction of the importance of the Christian basis of European society and enjoyed conferring with Christian intellectuals' and became the central figure in the group. He was also elected as a member of the prestigious Athenaeum Club for 'men with intellectual interests' in 1944, proposed in 1942 by the Archbishop of Canterbury and seconded by J.H. Oldman (1874–1969), who established the Moot group.<sup>9</sup> Whitty (2004) writes that, although Mannheim had shown some interest in education as early as the 1920s, it became the main focus of Mannheim's work only towards the end of his life. Just before Mannheim's death (he suffered from heart problems) in London in 1947, he was offered a position as the first head of UNESCO's European office (Kettler 2012; Kettler and Loader 2013, pp.23–24; Mannheim 1947; Whitty 2004). He was just about to become an Insider, defined by Merton (1972, p.21) as 'a member of specified groups and collectivities or occupants of specified social statuses' (Merton 1972, p.21).

Hammersley (2022, p.179) argues that Mannheim poses two key questions in his work, and both of these are useful for this book: 'What is the relationship between science and politics?' and 'What is the meaning and value of science?' Hammersley goes on to write that 'Mannheim believes that in this way sociology can play a crucial role in the political education of future leaders

and of citizens generally' (p.181). This is an important point, with further consequences for what Harold Lasswell called policy science (see Section 1.4).

### 1.3 Robert K. Merton and his critique of Mannheim's *Wissenssoziologie*

Robert K. Merton (1910–2003; pictured, Figure 1.3), 17 years Mannheim's junior, was born as Meyer Robert Schkolnick in Philadelphia into a Yiddish-speaking Jewish family who had immigrated to the US in 1904. His mother was Ida Rasovskaya (circa 1882–year of death unknown), a socialist and self-taught philosopher born in Kiev, and his father Harry (Aaron) Schkolnickoff (circa 1875–year of death unknown) (Bush 2021). At the age of 19 Robert changed his last name to Merton (Merton 1994). Unlike Mannheim, Merton did not come from a privileged family. His father worked as a carpenter's assistant after losing his dairy farm. Merton studied for his first degree at Temple University but received his PhD in 1936 from Harvard. His thesis was entitled *Science, Technology and Society in Seventeenth Century England* (Merton 1938). At Harvard he took a course taught by Talcott Parsons (1902–1979) and became well-read in European sociological theory (Merton 1994), but he came from different epistemological premises than Mannheim (Izzo 1998, p.213).

**Figure 1.3: Robert K. Merton, c. 1950**



Source: Photo by Pictorial Parade/Copyright Getty Images, c. 1950. Also in Robert K. Merton Papers, Rare Book & Manuscript Library, Columbia University in the City of New York.

In 1941 Merton moved to Columbia University, where he would collaborate at its Bureau of Applied Social Research with Lazarsfeld (Berelson 1959; Calhoun 2003; 2010). With Lazarsfeld and other colleagues, Merton carried out studies of propaganda and communication during World War II, primarily concentrating on psychological warfare research to understand the influence of effective propaganda (Pooley and Katz 2008, p.771). Merton is considered one of the innovators of modern sociology, especially the sociology of knowledge, but his early work in communication (see, for example, Lazarsfeld and Merton 1943; 1948/1964; Merton, Fiske and Curtis 1946; Merton and Lazarsfeld 1950) has received less attention (Calhoun 2003; 2010; Deflem 2018; Simonson 2010).

Where did these two academics – Mannheim, a European, and Merton, an American – meet? It seems they did not, but certainly their ideas did. According to Kaiser (1998, p.69), only a few months after the English edition of *Ideology and Utopia* was published in 1936, the 26-year-old Merton produced his first critique of Mannheim's *Wissenssoziologie*. Merton's work was to provide a 'general survey of the subject', but more than two-thirds of it concentrated specifically on Mannheim's *Ideology and Utopia* (Merton 1937). This was followed by a longer essay in 1941 entitled 'Karl Mannheim and the Sociology of Knowledge' (Merton 1941; 1957). In Merton's (1949; 1968) critique of Mannheim, he compared 'the European and American variants of the sociological study of communications', using the criteria: (1) characteristic subject matter and definitions; (2) concepts of data; (3) utilisation of research techniques; and (4) social organisation of their research activities (p.494).

Merton (1949; 1968) drew on early mass communication research in the US to critique Mannheim's *Wissenssoziologie* and to point out the differences between what he called the 'European species' (*Wissenssoziologie*) and the 'American species' (the sociology of mass communications) (p.493). Merton himself, unsurprisingly, preferred the American species to the European. Sica (2010) now considers unjustified Merton's criticism of Mannheim, which drew on mass communication research. But at the same time Merton indirectly provided parameters that can still be applied when using the sociology of knowledge in analysing comparative research in communications in this book.

When criticising Mannheim's *Wissenssoziologie*, Merton writes that 'the sociology of knowledge is most directly concerned with the intellectual products of *experts*, whether in science or philosophy, in economic or political thought' (1949; 1968, p.495, my emphasis), but argued that it involved 'little research on the *audiences* for various intellectual and cultural products, [where] the American variant (mass communication research) has done a great deal' (p.506, my emphasis). However, unlike Merton, I am not interested in audiences per se, although in several chapters I write about generations as audiences, but rather in how knowledge is produced in comparative communications, and how academics and experts of that same generation of researchers influenced one another and in how they invited other researchers into or pushed them out of comparative communications, constituting them in Mertonian terms as Insiders and Outsiders when it became international communication.

But why does the debate between Mannheim and Merton matter? Although Merton was critical of Mannheim, he transformed Mannheim's *Wissenssoziologie* into an American version of the sociology of knowledge. In this process he left out some of Mannheim's original ideas, notably any traces of Marxism, but also added new elements such as his own concepts of Insiders and Outsiders. Both scholars, despite the differences in their thinking, argued for analysis of the production of knowledge. This highlights the importance of communication studies but also casts doubt on Merton's objectivity since he was himself an 'Insider'. Consequently, we need to question critically how comparative communications fits into the picture Merton painted of communication research as a whole. This debate thus brings to the surface the tensions between European and US research and calls for comparative study of the two.

### 1.4 Ideology and Utopia

Central to Mannheim's work were the twin concepts of ideology and utopia. It is difficult to find clear definitions in Mannheim's work of these two concepts because of the 'essayistic and discursive character of his writings, along with the complexity of the issues he was addressing' (Hammersley 2022, p.177) despite the two concepts forming the title of the work for which Mannheim is best known. Mannheim (1936, p.176) himself was the first to acknowledge that 'to determine in any given case, what is ideological and what is utopia is extremely difficult' (Vogt 2016, p.373). As Vogt (2016, p.367) writes,

According to Mannheim, when an idea 'departs from the real' it is either a utopia, or an ideology (Mannheim, 1936: 173). Utopias describe a situation which is not the present situation, but one which could be hoped for, or presumed to follow, sometime in the future. In contrast, ideologies depart from the real by providing inaccurate descriptions of present conditions. An ideology is thus a description which serves to idealize and highlight certain features of the present and to overlook or obscure others.

The inseparability of the two concepts is clear and Mannheim's (1935) contribution to the *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences* provides perhaps his clearest accounts of the concepts. As Geoghegan (2004, p.124) argues, in Mannheim's work, ideology cannot be understood without an appreciation of the fundamental role of utopia. Mannheim (1935, p.201) writes:

The term utopian ... may be applied to any process of thought that receives its impetus not from the direct force of social reality but from the concepts, such as symbols, fantasies and dreams, ideas and the like, which in the most comprehensive sense of that term are

non-existent. Viewed from the standpoint of sociology, such mental constructs may in general assume two forms: they are 'ideological' if they serve the purpose of glossing power or stabilizing the existing social reality; 'utopian' if they inspire collective activity which aims to change such reality to conform with their goals, which transcend reality.

Mannheim, by introducing the concept of utopia and not concentrating only on the concept of ideology as many of his contemporary Marxist scholars did, opened up a new way of thinking about social change. Sargent (2008, p.267) writes that, 'for Mannheim, while both ideologies and utopias pose problems, utopias must be kept alive because they include the seeds of needed social change'. In his concept of ideology, Mannheim's departure from many mainstream Marxist theorists (see, for example, Anderson 1980; Eagleton 2007) has particular value through four different arguments, all of which are important for the purposes of this book. These are: (1) loosening the relationship between class and ideology, especially in relation to intellectuals; (2) recognising that ideology is sometimes hidden, especially from those living through it; (3) widening the definition of ideology beyond traditional politics; and (4) arguing that ideologies and utopias are so interwoven that one cannot exist without the other.

### (1) The relationship between class and ideology

Ideology, one of Mannheim's key concepts, is indeed often associated with those Marxist writers, who generally agree that 'there is a powerful, effective and dominant ideology in contemporary capitalist societies and that this dominant ideology creates an acceptance of capitalism in the working class' (Abercrombie, Hill and Turner 1980, p.1). Since I am not a Marxist but a researcher carrying out research into the individuals who started comparative communications in the US, I must ask how useful Mannheim's concept of ideology is for my analysis.

Mannheim's work appeals to me because it emphasises the role and analysis of historical knowledge production. With his concept of ideology, he made a departure from many Marxist writers while acknowledging his debt to them (see, for example, Adair-Totef 2019, pp.3-4). Mannheim criticises mainstream Marxists for treating economic class as the only significant factor, as in the notions of base and superstructure, and proposes additional categories such as those of generation and gender (Abercrombie, Hill and Turner 1980, p.35; Eisenstadt 1987, p.78; Kettler and Meja 1993). He is also critical of the concepts of false consciousness and its unmasking (Adair-Totef 2019, p.5), although the concept of false consciousness could be used when elaborating Mannheim's concept of ideology and utopia (Gabel 1976, p.182).

One of the most famous and most often criticised of Mannheim's concepts is that of free-floating intellectuals (*freischwebende Intelligenz*). The difference

between intellectuals and the intelligentsia is not always clear, at least when the terms are translated into English, but the difference has been discussed by others (see, for example, Gouldner 1979; Hannerz 1992). Hannerz (1992, p.143) observes that neither intellectuals nor intelligentsia necessarily make their home in academia, and the individuals whose work is central to my argument bear out his proposition. The concept of free-floating intellectuals was originally used by Alfred Weber (1868–1958), under whom Mannheim habilitated in Heidelberg (Loader 1997, p.229), but it acquired celebrity only after Mannheim used it (Karácsony 2008). Karácsony writes that:

Mannheim considered that the special position of the intellectuals has, unlike any other group of society, two kinds of boundaries. On the one hand, due to birth, wealth and profession they belong to a class of society, while on the other they share, and care for, a common culture. According to Mannheim the latter is of greater importance: having risen to the world of culture the intellectuals were freed from the values and other boundaries of society, and that is why they are 'free-floating.' (p.109)

Loader (1997, p.228) argues that Mannheim's concept of free-floating intellectuals is actually more radical than Weber's. He writes that intellectuals, in Mannheim's thinking, are not a homogenous group but a group 'that is characterized by conflict, the struggle for cultural hegemony, in which intellectuals played the more restrained role of advisors'. Loader concludes that:

Although Mannheim's intelligentsia could clarify temporary constellations within the competition, although they provided a medium for communication between the competing groups, they could not grant a privileged position to any of those groups. In short, they could not become spiritual leaders. (p.229)

Mannheim argues on the one hand that intellectuals have more freedom than other classes (if they can be defined as a class) but on the other hand that they face internal competition from their peers and Mannheim's troubled personal experience of LSE bears out his proposition. Simultaneously, they aspire to reach society at large but usually fail to do so. One of the grounds on which the close relationship between intellectuals and society is justified is indeed that their research serves wider social goals, not only academic purposes, and this dual role is signified in Lasswell's term policy science. According to Lasswell (1951a, p.4), who introduced the term, policy science includes: (1) the methods by which the policy process is investigated; (2) the results of the study of policy; and (3) the findings of disciplines making the most important contributions to the intelligence needs of the time. As he (1951a, p.13) further writes,

social scientists are not the only contributors in the policy sciences ... There is some recognition of the fact that men of experience in active policymaking can make greater contributions to basic analysis than the academic experts have admitted.

Often the work of non-academics is ignored, especially if they are not 'intellectuals' in accordance with a narrow definition of the term. The chapters in this book feature both academics and other specialists traditionally seen as important contributions to policy science, such as news agency directors and consultants. Researching these figures highlights something that has hitherto been neglected: not only their roles in shaping the study of comparative communications but also how often these specialists shared the ideologies and utopias of contemporary academics.

Mannheim's critics often asked whether intellectuals *can* ever remain free from ideological bias. Sagarin and Kelly (1969, p.300) point out these critics have asked a wrong question and instead should have asked whether intellectuals *will* remain free-floating. This is also my question: to what extent, if any, do intellectuals remain free from ideology and utopias when doing policy science? Mannheim argues for the importance of communication in shaping intellectual outlooks between separate groups (Heeren 1971, p.33). According to him, 'innovations arise either from shift in a collective situation or from a changing relationship between groups or between individuals and their group' (quoted by Heeren 1971, p.33). Intellectuals thus include not only academics but men of practice, and communication inside and between their groups is both a central focus of the account which follows, and an instance of a nexus thus far largely neglected in scholarly accounts of comparative communications.

## (2) Recognising that ideology is sometimes hidden

According to Mannheim (1960), ideology appears when the thinking of ruling groups becomes so intensively interest-bound to a specific situation that they are simply no longer able to see facts that would undermine their sense of domination (p.36). In this situation,

knowledge is distorted and ideological when it fails to take account of the new realities applying to a situation, and when it attempts to conceal them by thinking of them in categories which are inappropriate. (p.86)

In my reading of Mannheim, one of the key insights is that ideology is something not necessarily recognised by those who produce it (such as academics) or by those who experience it. Ideology can be like the air that we breathe: we take for granted that it is there but do not necessarily pay any attention to its

quality. However, those who produce knowledge have a special responsibility to critically review the role of ideology in their knowledge production. This is why *Wissenssoziologie* is so important.

It is also important to understand that Mannheim's historicism does not equate with a historical destiny, predetermined condition or a historical law that determines the future. It acknowledges that the criteria for what is seen as the 'truth' differ in different historical periods and have been influenced by society at large, and that society differs from one historical period to the next. As Shils (1974, p.84) writes, 'Mannheim believed that every society and epoch had its own intellectual culture, of which every single work produced in it was a part'. 'Truth' is always bound to time, and as new political periods emerge so do new tasks for research. Kaiser (1998, p.53) writes that, 'as the clouds of fascism gathered, Mannheim believed that he and his fellow sociologists had a moral obligation to understand the failings of Germany's liberal democracy'. In a similar way, now, as we face a new period when what is seen as 'truth' is again challenged, and even if we are unable yet to conduct research on this current period, we can at least return to a previous historical time and consider whether there is something there that will help us to analyse the present.

Mannheim (1934, p.118) wrote as early as 1934 about the importance of studying elites, and about intellectuals being one category of these elites, not only from the standpoint of their formation but because 'the relation of these elites to the totality of society presents new problems which, in their turn, may suggest important clues to the explanation and understanding of the present situation'. According to Mannheim, intellectuals are one of four types of elites: 'the political, the organizing, the scholastic, and the artistically religious elites that produce different pattern of culture in the various spheres of social life' (Mannheim 1934, p.108), but he also notes that in a mass society the number of elites increases (Mannheim 1934, p.110). My interpretation of Mannheim, at its simplest, supports the argument that studying the relationship between society and elites in a historical context helps us understand the present situation. An elite is either close to other elites – as intellectuals (including academics), for example, may be to political or military circles – or distant from or even opposed to them. This relationship always changes, and how it is seen by later generations is subject to constant change. Sometimes, especially during a crisis, the close relationship between intellectuals and society is seen as acceptable, and even promoted, while in other times it is critically reviewed and morally judged. This applies to many of the men discussed in this book, whereby any evaluation or re-evaluation of them depends on the generation doing it. Many of the subjects of later chapters were seen in the 1960s and 1970s as old-fashioned and reactionary (see, for example, Bessner 2018), and some of them continue to be ignored or are further criticised. But the present period of propaganda calls for consideration of those who have conducted earlier propaganda research, who, I propose, have been unjustly and wastefully neglected.

### (3) Widening the definition of ideology beyond traditional politics

The concept of ideology is often understood as a set of beliefs about politics or culture. In my view, and for the purposes of this book, a wide-ranging definition is important, since I am analysing not only structures but also individual life stories. The concept of ideology encompasses not only beliefs about politics but also beliefs about the role of women, race, sexual orientation and much else in societies. Sexism, racism and homophobia have an important role in political ideologies and their analysis helps us understand the under-representation of underprivileged groups in the comparative communications of the period under study. Apart from this 'invisibility', one needs to be careful about making an argument about the totalitarian nature of the concept of ideology. Mannheim (1960) writes:

The individual members of the working class, for instance, do not experience *all* the elements of an outlook which could be called the proletarian *Weltanschauung*. Every individual participates only in fragments of this thought-system, the totality of which is not in the least a mere sum of these fragmentary individual experiences. As a totality the thought-system is integrated systematically and is no mere causal jumble of fragmentary experiences of discrete members of the group. (quoted by Kögler 1997, p.147)

Thus, the concept of ideology is not homogenous or permanent but, according to Mannheim, open and flexible. He saw his project as:

justifying a dynamic theory of the relation of knowledge to reality as against static theories of philosophy that treat the historical, developmental and sociological as contingent to that which is durable and unchanging. (Breiner 2013, p.40)

Unlike many Marxist theorists of ideology, Mannheim was also more interested in change than in the status quo, even if ideologies are often seen as all-powerful and long-lasting, especially by those living through them.

### (4) Ideologies and utopias are interwoven

The concept of utopia is as difficult to define as the concept of ideology. Wirth argues that ideologies attempt to maintain the status quo while utopias seek to change the prevailing order (quoted in Adair-Toteff 2019, p.6). Gabel (1991, p.85) wryly observes that 'utopians are not rarely in insane asylums' and that utopia is traditionally defined as an unattainable project, characterised by its ambiguity having its positive and negative role (p.85). For me, Mannheim's

most important contribution is not only in linking both concepts but insisting that they are equally important, as the title of his book suggests. Again, Mannheim is often acknowledged as one of the key original authors on utopia, together with Thomas More (1478–1535) and Friedrich Engels (1820–1895) (Wallerstein 1986, p.1295). For Mannheim, the concept of utopia balances the concept of ideology by offering an alternative to – a different vision from – the power of ideology. Mannheim observes that ‘the representatives of a given order will label as utopian all conceptions of existence which from their point of view can in principle never be realized’ (Mannheim 1960, pp.176–77). This is why the concept of utopia is so important: it potentially provides an escape, even if sometimes only an imaginary escape, from the hardships of coercive and often taken-for-granted ideologies. Here there are obvious similarities between Mannheim’s concepts and those of the Frankfurt School. However, Mannheim was not a believer in revolution, and diagnosed the Russian and Hungarian revolutions as ‘utopist’ distortions of reality (Kadarkay 1991, p.294).

While much theoretical work has been dedicated to the concept of ideology, the concept of utopia has received much less attention, to the extent that it was labelled in the 1970s as unfashionable (Levitas 2013, p.94). There are academics who have taken Mannheim’s concept forward. The concept of utopia is often understood in close connection with related concepts such as: identity (Ricoeur 1986); the end of utopia (Marcuse 1970; Marcuse and Sherover 1979); the decline of utopian ideas (Berlin 2013); retrotopia (Bauman 2017); hope (Bloch 1959/1986); or social change (Levitas 1979). However, one has to be cautious not to romanticise the concept of utopia. It is tempting to think that one of the two concepts of ideology or of utopia might be somehow less distorted, but in fact it is important to remember that both are distorted. As Wallerstein (1986, p.1307) puts it, ‘utopias are always ideological’. Or, as Geoghegan (2004, p.126) writes, ‘the claim that ideology and utopia are incongruent with reality entails the epistemological claim that these two modes of experience are “distortions” of reality’.

Levitas (2000, p.26) gives three different reasons why we should take the concept of utopia seriously: (1) it is the expression of what is missing in societies; (2) it is the sense of a counterfactual model of all or part of a social or political system; and (3) it attempts to articulate the features of a good society. However, as Levitas (2013, p.6) herself observes, the concept of utopia operates on two levels: (1) the level of the subjective (individuals) and (2) the level of the objective, external condition of the world. This distinction between the two levels is very useful for the purposes of this book, since in the context of comparative communications utopias reflect both.

Mannheim’s key question, according to Wallerstein, is: ‘which social standpoint vis-a-vis history offers the best chance for reaching an optimum of truth?’ (Wallerstein 1986, p.1299). As applied to the subject of this book, this question could become: which concept, that of ideology or of utopia, has been dominant in shaping comparative communications? But, again, only by studying individuals can we understand how their ideologies and utopias change

during their lifetimes, and how they themselves, as active agents, contributed to these changes. By comparing and contrasting the concepts of ideology and utopia in comparative communications research, *Wissenssoziologie* becomes possible. Mannheim writes that,

in unmasking ideologies, we seek to bring to light an unconscious process, not in order to annihilate the moral existence of persons making certain statements, but in order to destroy the social efficacy of it. (quoted by Sargent 2008, p.265)

Mannheim's definitions of the concepts of ideology and utopia have often been simplified, with ideology presented as something that is inherited from the past, while utopia is perceived as about the future (Geoghegan 2004, p.124). I find this problematic and show through my analysis that the relationship between the past, the present and the future is complicated and more challenging. My argument is that comparative communications, in the US, has shifted between ideology and utopia, with the two often contradicting and/or replacing each other, but never completely liberating itself from either. In subsequent chapters, I analyse different studies of comparative communications carried out between the 1920s and the 1950s, mainly in the US, by individual researchers and by groups consisting of specialists of different nationalities. These studies reflect the dominant ideologies of their funders, but also the utopias of the researchers, *mutatis mutandis*. In order to do this, I need another concept: that of a generation, as defined by Mannheim.

## 1.5 The concept of a generation

Like Mannheim's other concepts, his concept of a generation (Mannheim 1927; 1928) has been heavily criticised but also much used. Pilcher (1994, p.492) argues that Mannheim's seminal work represents the strongest sociological account of generations but that it is only a theoretical treatment of the problem and does not contain an empirical model or give any guidelines for how to carry out research using the concept. There have also been many attempts to summarise Mannheim's concept of a generation. Purhonen (2016, p.95), for example, writes that for Mannheim:

generations emerge only under special historical circumstances and are thus something 'more' than simply age cohorts; they are a group of people of similar age bonded by a shared experience that can eventually result in a distinct self-consciousness, a worldview and, ultimately, political action.

For me, the concept of a generation is yet another attempt by Mannheim to break down categories of ideology and utopia by not reducing these to a class,

in a similar way to what he did with his notion of a free-floating intelligentsia. Much of Mannheim's work, even when he writes about generations, is about intellectuals, whom he saw as having more autonomy than the working class and also as having some agency in terms of societal change.

There has been previous research, especially in the field of international relations but also in communication and journalism studies in Germany, where Mannheim's concept of generations has been applied to understanding paradigmatic changes in academic research (see, for example, Meyen 2015; Roskin 1974; Steele and Acuff 2012). For the purpose of this book, I focus on three specific propositions of Mannheim's concept: (1) generations are socially constructed either by their own members or by other generations; (2) generations are both national and transnational; and (3) belonging to the same generation does not necessarily result in a shared ideology or utopia but also includes intra- and intergenerational conflicts.

### (1) Social construction of generations

For Mannheim, a generation is not biological, based on age, but socially constructed (Schuman and Scott 1989, p.359). His radical notion helps us to understand the concept of a generation in two different ways, both based on generations as 'discursive constructs that arise from narratives' (Timonen and Conlon 2015, p.2). This could be understood first as how members of a generation define themselves, or what Ben-Ze'ev and Lomsky-Feder describe as a 'story told by a generation' and second as how other generations define previous generations, or what Ben-Ze'ev and Lomsky-Feder call a 'story about a generation' (Ben-Ze'ev and Lomsky-Feder 2009, p.1048). The distinction is important since generations sometimes define themselves but at other times are defined by others. Both notions are problematic in their possible exclusivity, and this is why Merton's concepts of Insiders and Outsiders are needed, as discussed later in this chapter. I analyse here the 'story told by a generation' by telling a 'story about a generation' created through shared experiences of two world wars that shook its world.

I investigate one particular generation, the 'forefront generation', active between the 1920s and the 1950s, of academics, intellectuals and men of action. Members of this generation had often not themselves fought in either world war – being in many cases too old – but had provided intelligence support and been deeply influenced by both wars in terms of how they interpreted the world, and as a result shifted in their work between utopias and ideology. Mannheim wrote of a 'generation for whom the war was the defining *experience* and post-war issues were decisive for their *attitude*' (Neun Kunze and Mannheim 2018, p.8, my emphasis). I use his concept not only to understand and track ideological and utopian change but also to shift away from analysing ideology solely in terms of structures towards studying individual histories.

However, when writing a 'story about the generation', one has to be wary of falling into the story of a generation as founding fathers, the *Gründerväter*

of a discipline or a field, often told either by contemporaries or by following generations (see, for example, Berelson 1959; Meyen 2015). Meyen (2015, p.22) writes that ‘the succession of generations of professors can in any case only be adequately described through the metaphor of “parents”, “children” and “grandchildren”’, but I find this problematic because it takes us back not only to biological generations but also to their uneven status in most societies. There is also another aspect to this. Horowitz (1996, p.357) writes, quoting Solzhenitsyn (1973) in *The Gulag Archipelago*, that ‘certain events and peoples are remembered and others are forgotten by virtue of the monopoly role of intellectuals who write the past’. Who is remembered and who is forgotten is thus a matter of choice when writing about the history of comparative communications. I am also very much influenced by those contemporary writers who have chosen the ‘canonical’ texts (Katz et al. 2002), while also deliberately choosing to leave aside some of these texts and to include authors not seen as part of the canon. Why have I chosen these men? I chose them because I am myself an Outsider, a female academic migrant, albeit in a different country from the US, and I wanted to use my own ‘outsideness’ as a starting point, to show what is easily forgotten when national ‘canonical’ texts are chosen only by Insiders. Histories of communication studies have primarily been written by those who are Insiders in terms of their nationality, namely US scholars writing about the history of US communication studies (a notable exception to the rule is the work of Simonson and Park 2016; Simonson et al. 2019) or who have themselves been key players in the field in the US. However, I am still left with the same dilemma: by picking up on just a few, am I strengthening again the myth of ‘canonical’ texts? If so, I am at least challenging the established canon that has ignored many members when writing a story about a generation.

For Mannheim, the concept of ideology plays a key role with the concept of utopia in his *Wissenssoziologie* when he is analysing how knowledge was produced. Many academics only remember the so-called ‘Mannheim’s paradox’, a concept invented by Geertz (1973), who argues that if all knowledge is ideological no analysis rises above ideology, and thus that it is almost impossible to be fully analytical (Jehlen 1986, p.12). According to Breiner (2013, p.39), Mannheim’s paradox can be seen:

when we try to understand *contending ideologies* that constitute a political field at any one historical moment both as they inform and criticise one another, and when we seek to test the possibilities for their realisation in light of the historical developmental tendencies and political tensions in their sociological context, our constructions of this context is itself informed by these ideologies. (my emphasis)

Mannheim (1960) writes that all historical knowledge is relational knowledge and is ‘always bound up with existing life-situation of the thinker’ (p.71). He further says that:

every time we uncover an opponent's political ideas and world-view as ideology, we achieve this only from *the vantage point of another ideology*, and so there is no vantage point outside of ideology to understand and criticise ideology. (quoted by Breiner 2013, p.39, my emphasis)

To try to simplify this: a researcher, when trying to critically analyse a historical period, cannot do so wholly objectively because he/she is also influenced by the very same or other ideologies. This is also a dilemma for this book. When I try to critically analyse the period under research, how much am I influenced by the ideologies of that time as well as by ideologies of my own?

In my view, Geertz's response to Mannheim's dilemma, in his sociology of meaning (Jehlen 1986, p.12), is no more a solution to the dilemma than is Mannheim's *Wissenssoziologie*. We are still influenced by ideologies, but Mannheim's observation that we understand ideology as a kind of knowledge that arises from 'our experience in actual life situations' (Breiner 2013, p.6) has been important for my analysis. As Breiner writes,

Moreover, it also requires we understand each ideology as a (Mannheim 1936/1960, p.43) particular perspective on social reality. It furthermore requires we construct an account of the ways each of these points of view *interact with each other in conflictual or complementary* ways as we move from one perspective to the other. And lastly it requires that we understand that the way ideologies in a particular period interact with each other *horizontally* is at the same time a vertical response to a historical sociological reality, at once 'temporal, spatial, and situational.' (Breiner 2013, p.6, my emphasis)

Still, by shedding light on individuals, some already forgotten, even when I concentrate on the *Salon des Refusés*, I involuntarily contribute to a history of 'great men' (Rakow 2008, pp.115–16). As Knobloch-Westerwick and Glynn (2011) write, in research, 'women's contributions are systematically undervalued in patterns of citation, social contribution, and incorporation into disciplinary literatures, including communication' (cited by Ashcraft and Simonson 2016, p.49). In the course of my research, I have seen over and over again how women's contributions have been systematically undervalued, to the extent that they remain nameless and unacknowledged in written documents, often being referred to as 'girls' in their professional roles as secretaries ('secretary to') and research assistants (acknowledged in footnotes) or as partners ('my wife', sometimes thanked in acknowledgements). This is especially poignant when one is aware that many of those women had had their own careers in Europe and lost these when they emigrated to the US or elsewhere with the men they were married to. Although their lives were saved, their working lives came to an end.

At the same time, the exclusion of women yet again highlights the importance of Mannheim's *Wissenssoziologie* for exploring the relationships between culture and society. It was taken for granted that research was conducted by white men and that women were excluded from equal professional roles. As Hammersley (2022, p.185) writes, for Mannheim the main function of sociology seemed to be to:

examine prevalent political worldviews and their social contexts, in order to understand them and to identify what is true and false within them, in order to develop a more objective perspective.

This is yet another example of how ideology works in each period and how we need to add the issue of gender and race to critiques of the sociology of knowledge (Thompson 1991; Philips 2001). I also argue that, by conducting research on the men discussed in this book, we can use them to understand why women were, and largely continue to be, absent from comparative communications. When I apply the concepts of Insider and Outsider, it is necessary to remember that the Outsiders were also those left out of written archival materials dominated by white men.<sup>10</sup>

## (2) Generations are both national and transnational

A generation has most often been defined in the context of a single nation, although Mannheim himself did not indicate this. Mannheim writes:

Members of a generation are 'similarly located', first of all, in so far as they all are exposed to the same phase of the collective process. This, however, is a merely mechanical and external criterion of the phenomenon of 'similar location'. For a deeper understanding, we must turn to the phenomenon of the 'stratification' of experience (*Erlebnisschichtung*), just as before we turned to 'memory'. (Mannheim 2000, p.297)

'Similar location', in my view, does not mean to Mannheim a geographical location. However, when the concept of a generation has been used in historical studies of a field, they have mostly been labelled by nationality, as in the cases, for example, of German or US communication studies. While I acknowledge that academia is most often defined nationally, similar location cannot be the only criterion when defining generations. Edmunds and Turner (2005, p.573) write of generations 'by reference to historical and cultural traumas, the experience of which *transcends* class and *nationality*' (my emphasis). According to these authors, 'while generations and generational change have traditionally been understood in national terms, there are reasons to suppose that globally experienced traumatic events may facilitate the development of

global generations' (p.564). For Edmunds and Turner, the 1960s generation was the first example of a global generation, but I argue that there were earlier global or, as I would call them, transnational generations such as the forefront generation in the US. As Beck (2011, p.1350) writes, 'the mediation of world crises creates an awareness that strangers in distant places are following the same events with the same fears and worries as oneself. Strangers become neighbours!' In the context of this book, strangers became neighbours when European émigré scholars fled to the US and started working next to their American colleagues. I thus extend Mannheim's concept of a generation beyond the national level and ask whether a generation can cosmopolitanise not only itself but also others, to develop and maintain 'openness towards peoples, places and experiences from different cultures, especially those from different "nations"' (Tomlinson 1999, p.469).

I thus suggest that a transnational perspective is also needed to analyse, using Mannheim's concept of a generation, relationships between individuals and between research groups with differing ideologies and utopias. According to Shils (1974, p.83), Mannheim had a 'profound distaste for individualism'. In this book I provide a micro-sociological perspective that includes individual and generational life histories. My interest in the micro-sociological aspect derived from my own methodology, called mediagraphy (Rantanen 2004), which I developed in order to study individuals and globalisation using such concepts as generation, class and ideology. In this book I present five historical studies of individuals or research groups. Many of them were émigré<sup>11</sup> scholars from Europe, and all were caught up in the destructive events of the first half of the 20th century. Still, despite the differences in their life stories, there were multiple connections with long-term consequences that have not been identified before. However, a generation, while possibly united by the same transitional ideologies or utopias, is also pregnant with conflicts when its members encounter each other in the same location, as émigré scholars did when they arrived in the US from Europe. These conflicts included jobs, funding, promotion and material rewards.

### (3) Not always a shared ideology or utopia

There is a potential pitfall in making an unfounded generalisation when we analyse both 'a story told by a generation' and 'a story about a generation' as supposedly homogenous units that share the same ideologies and utopias. As Mannheim (2000, p.306) observes,

Within this community of people with a common destiny there can then arise particular generation-units. These are characterized by the fact that they do not merely involve a loose participation by a number of individuals in a pattern of events shared by all alike though interpreted by the different individuals differently, but an

identity of responses, a certain affinity in the way in which all move with and are formed by their common experiences.

Although Mannheim writes about 'an identity of responses', not about similar ideologies and utopias, one has to be mindful of not seeing differences within a generation. Mannheim (quoted by Kögler 1997, p.146) writes that,

from a sociological point of view, both 'nations' and 'epochs' are much too undifferentiated to serve as a basis of reference in describing the historical process. The historian knows that a certain epoch will appear as dominated by just one intellectual current only when we have a bird's eye view of it. Penetrating deeper into the historical detail, we shall see every epoch as divided among several currents.

The diversity of responses calls for two other concepts, those of intra- and intergenerational conflicts. While Mannheim himself does not use these concepts, they have become closely associated with his work. As Connolly (2019, p.154) argues, it was Norbert Elias who worked with Mannheim for over two decades (Kilminster 1993) and whose work, rather than Mannheim's, emphasised generational conflicts. International relations theorists have used these concepts in analysing conflicts as inherent in generational change. Most notably, Roskin (1974) applied Kuhn's framework of paradigms and scientific revolutionary change to the making of foreign policy (Steele 2012, p.28), while different generations of feminism, often cast as 'mother daughter conflicts' (Lucas and Sisco 2012, p.165), have been analysed by using Mannheim's concept. Meyen (2015) combines Kuhn's (1962) concept of a paradigm with the concept of a generation when conducting research on German communication scholars, arguing that it was the institutionalisation of the field that defined the generations of communication scholars in Germany. What I take from Mannheim and these others is the presence of intra- and intergenerational conflicts in relation to the concept of a generation. Of the two notions, that of intergenerational conflicts has probably caught more attention, at least in the fields of sociology and of international relations, while intragenerational conflicts have received less attention (Xu 2019, p.135) or have been analysed using the concept of a paradigm change.

Following Mannheim's idea critically, the forefront generation analysed in this book, although its members experienced two world wars, did not necessarily share the same ideologies and utopias. There are so many other factors, including gender. As Sargent (2008, p.272) writes, 'Mannheim is known to have been a supporter of and advocate for women in German academia', and 'he had written on the sociology of women at a time that such work was extremely rare'. According to Kettler and Meja 1993, p.5), in Mannheim's work, 'despite vital differences in their social genealogies, women and intellectuals both exemplify groups constitutive of social structure without fitting in

the Marxist scheme of social classes'. In the forefront generation I write about, women remain almost invisible and voiceless, and thus make it impossible to analyse conflicts in which they were involved.

Some of the men whose life stories I analyse in this book were also different from each other because of their race, nationality, class, location, or even academic training and background. Unlike much earlier work on émigré scholars (see, for example, Jay 1973/1996 on the Frankfurt School), my work here focuses on non-Marxist scholars and communications experts who have to a large extent been ignored. I argue that they should receive attention simply because if we ignore them we miss an important part of the story about the generation and even fail to understand how ideologies and utopias work. Having taken inspiration from Mannheim and others in relation to generational conflicts, it is time to introduce the concepts of Insiders and Outsiders.

## 1.6 Insiders and Outsiders

When Merton introduced his concepts of Insiders and Outsiders, his starting point was again Mannheim. By going back to Mannheim's (1960, pp.137–38) concept of the 'classless position' of 'socially unattached intellectuals' (*freischwebende Intelligenz*), and his argument that these intellectuals were able to 'comprehend the conflicting tendencies of the time since, among other things, they are "recruited from constantly varying social strata and life-situations"', Merton then argues that Mannheim was in effect claiming that there is a category of socially free-floating intellectuals who are both Insiders and Outsiders, benefitting from their collectively diverse social origins and transcending group allegiances. This, in turn, would make it possible for them to 'observe the social universe with special insight and a synthesizing eye' (Merton 1972, p.29).

Merton emphasises the uneven power relationships between Insiders and Outsiders. At the same time, he writes that 'there is nothing fixed about the boundaries separating Insiders from Outsiders' (p.28) and concludes his article provocatively channelling Marx: 'Insiders and Outsiders in the domain of knowledge, unite. You have nothing to lose but your claims. You have a world of understanding to win' (p.44). Here Merton himself should go back to *Wissenssoziologie* to acknowledge that those who work in institutions that produce knowledge are both collaborative and competitive. Even further, his categories of Insiders and Outsiders take for granted that Insiders are all white men. Merton writes that,

Although Insider doctrines have been intermittently set forth by white elitists through the centuries, white male Insiderism in American sociology during the past generations has largely been of the tacit or de facto rather than doctrinal or principled variety. (1972, pp.12–13)

Here Merton is ignoring the power of ideology but recognises racism and gender. Merton (1972, pp.11–12) argues that certain groups of Insiders, at every moment of history, have monopolistic and/or privileged access to particular kinds of knowledge, while Outsiders are excluded. In the context of this book, I am studying male individuals and research groups who produced studies in comparative communications, and I am linking them with the ideologies and utopias of their time. In looking for guidance on doing this, the concepts of Insiders and Outsiders help me to explore not only the *power relationships* of individuals and research groups vis-à-vis society but also those between themselves.

Many émigré scholars, including the most successful such as Lazarsfeld, never felt fully accepted in US academia (see, for example, Coser 1984, pp.119–20; Kettler 2002; Lazarsfeld 1969). This, of course, was also true in the UK as Mannheim's less-than-happy experience of LSE testifies. Merton (1972, p.18) writes that:

under the stress of war, scientists have been known to violate the values of and norms of universalism in which they were socialized, allowing their status as nationals to dominate over their status as social scientists.

Since this book is about the forefront generation following two wars, Merton's categories become highly pertinent. What did émigré scholars do to become the Insiders of a generation? Academics and experts shared an interest in comparative communications, and especially in news and propaganda, but they have also been separated by their respective 'insideness' or 'outsideness'. Who was an Insider and who an Outsider in this generation? Who had the power to define their own ideology, after they were brought together by their utopian preoccupations? And when a generation of comparative communications researchers coming from different backgrounds and countries is brought together can they cosmopolitanise themselves 'across bounds' in order to 'overcome space- and time-bound limitations on the generalizability of ... theories, assumptions, and propositions' (Blumler, McLeod and Rosengren 1992, pp.2, 7–8; Meng and Rantanen 2015, p.12)?

Merton's (1972, pp.11–12) concepts of Insiders and Outsiders can help to explain how particular groups of Insiders, at every moment of history, have had monopolistic and/or privileged access to particular kinds of knowledge, while Outsiders have been excluded from these. Applying this to the early development of comparative communications, I argue that we also need to explore who became the Insiders and the Outsiders, and whether an individual researcher's position could change. This is especially important when conducting research on histories of communication research, which have often been written by those who were involved themselves – or by their countrymen. Merton writes:

The Insider argues that the authentic understanding of group life can be achieved only by those who are directly engaged as members in the life of the group ... If direct engagement in the life of a group is essential to understanding it, then the only authentic history is contemporary history, written in fragments by those most fully involved in making inevitably limited portions of it. Rather than constituting only the raw materials of history, the documents prepared by engaged Insiders become all there is to history. But once the historian elects to write the history of a time other than his own, even the most dedicated Insider, of the national, sex, age, racial, ethnic, or religious variety, becomes the Outsider, condemned to error and misunderstanding. (1972, p.31)

However, being or becoming an Insider is not only a matter of having access. Merton also writes that, once the basic principle is adopted,

the list of Insider claims to a monopoly of knowledge becomes indefinitely expansible to all manner of social formations based on ascribed (and, by extension, on some achieved) *statuses*. According to the doctrine of the Insider, the Outsider, no matter how careful and talented, is excluded in principle from gaining access to the social and cultural truth. (1972, p.13)

Merton also discusses nationalism as a form of exclusion, quoting Albert Einstein (1879–1955):

If my theory of relativity is proven successful, Germany will claim me as a German and France will declare that I am a citizen of the world. Should my theory prove untrue, France will say that I am a German and Germany will declare that I am a Jew. (Merton 1972, p.28)

As my analysis shows, becoming an academic Insider turned out to be much more difficult for émigré scholars than for those who were born and raised in the US.

Although in Merton's (1949/1968) evaluation of *Wissenssoziologie* it is his American version that 'wins on almost every count' (Sica 2010, pp.172–73), he does briefly state that 'those distinctive emphases are bound up with the enviroing social structures in which they developed' (Merton 1949/1968, p.494), thus acknowledging the value of Mannheim's work and the influence of environment or even of ideology. In Sica's view, Merton was himself 'aiming toward that happy combination of the two which possesses the scientific virtues of both and the superfluous vices of neither' (Merton 1949/1968, p.494), although 'it's very clear that European style irritates him' (Sica 2010, p.173). I argue here that we need both *Wissenssoziologie* and a sociology of knowledge in order to be able

to understand how comparative communications came into being, even if there is no happy reconciliation to be achieved between the two.

## 1.7 Why does this matter now?

While, as noted, this is an unapologetically old-fashioned book, there are several current trends that make me think that Mannheim's 'crisis in our thought' (Mannheim 1960, p.96) is still relevant today. As Merton (1972, p.9) writes,

As the society becomes polarized, so do the contending claims to truth. At the extreme, an active and reciprocal distrust between groups finds expression in intellectual perspectives that are no longer located within the same universe of discourse. The more deep-seated the mutual distrust, the more does the argument of the other appear so palpably implausible or absurd that one no longer inquires into its substance or logical structure to assess its truth claims. Instead, one confronts the other's argument with an entirely different sort of question: how does it happen to be advanced at all?

Ideologies and utopias have changed, but Mannheim realised the impact that they had and would continue to have in the future (Adair-Toteff 2019, p.2). We need only to consider populism in the politics of many countries today. According to Norris and Inglehart (2019, p.4), 'populism questions pluralist beliefs about the rightful location of power and authority in any state, including the role of elected representatives in democratic regimes.' They write that:

[populism's] favorite targets include the mainstream media ('fake news'), elections ('fraudulent'), politicians ('drain the swamp'), political parties ('dysfunctional'), public-sector bureaucrats ('the deep state'), judges ('enemies of the people'), protests ('paid rent-a-mob'), the intelligence services ('liars and leakers'), lobbyists ('corrupt'), intellectuals ('arrogant liberals') and scientists ('who needs experts?'), interest groups ('get-rich-quick lobbyists'), the constitution ('a rigged system'), international organizations like the European Union ('Brussels bureaucrats') and the UN ('a talking club'). (p.4)

In 2022, when Russia invaded Ukraine, the issue of the concept of 'truth' again became pertinent. The difference between war propaganda and news often disappeared. What was seen as news in Russia was seen as propaganda in the West, and what was seen as news in the West was seen as propaganda in Russia. Many of the actors discussed in this book devoted much of their research to studying war propaganda before, during and after World War II, often inspired by *Wissenssoziologie* and psychoanalysis, which both aimed to reveal the 'truth' below the surface. While I focus here on a period long gone, this

raises the continuing importance of Mannheim's call for a *Wissenssoziologie*. It seeks to show how difficult it often is for contemporaries to analyse their own and one another's research, and how only a historical account can reveal the blind spots of a particular period. One of the reasons why Mannheim was so heavily criticised may have been that he touched the Achilles heel of his fellow academics at that time by asking them to look critically at their own research. What many of them did was instead to look critically at Mannheim's work.

Academics and experts may now face a new political situation where academic institutions are struggling with decreasing financial support, where external funding may also be under threat; when international organisations are also targets for populist parties, and where governments may fund research if this suits their own purposes. In an atmosphere of growing international political tensions that has already escalated into new wars and a new Cold War, propaganda research in comparative communications will again be in demand, but – once again – who sets the terms? Academics and experts – understood here as an inclusive term covering all kinds of researchers, not only academics and intellectuals – have now become a target of populist criticism. They may find themselves today in circumstances not entirely different from those of the period under study.

Finally, although academia today has become increasingly transnational and, although many of the issues faced by early comparative communications projects are again present, the ultimate power relationships are still those within national research teams. To use Merton's concepts, who is now the Insider and who is now the Outsider?

## 1.8 Plan of the book and details of sources

This introduction has set out the key concepts behind the book. It is followed by five chapters focusing on: an academic (Harold D. Lasswell); a man of experience (Kent Cooper); a wartime project involving academics (both US and émigré scholars such as Nathan Leites and Paul Kecskemeti) and non-academics; post-war academics and researchers working primarily at RAND (Research and Development) Corporation in Santa Monica, California, and lastly a post-war project of three academics representing different fields (Fred S. Siebert, Theodore Peterson and Wilbur Schramm). Empirically, I use materials located in a plurality of archives, as well as books, newspapers and magazines from the period under investigation, and previously published research. All of them are listed in Archival Sources at the end of the book.

The men studied did not all belong to the same age cohort, as their birth years ranged from 1880 to 1918, but they were all influenced by World War I and World War II. In each of my case-study chapters, I try to show how they all struggled between utopias and ideologies and how they shared ideas as members of a generation. Their positions as Insiders or Outsiders also changed over time and their generational unity gave way to some division.

Harold D. Lasswell's work developed from his early study of World War I propaganda to his Cold War studies of the 1950s. In Chapter 2, I review his conceptual and methodological movement from a study of symbols to the quantitative content analysis for which he is best known, as well as his transformation from a young utopian academic to a father figure who saw himself as a policy scholar and who aimed to be a good citizen and cultivate good citizenship in others. Lasswell's influence, primarily through his policy science studies and his personal networks, shaped his own and succeeding generations, although, as many father figures experience, he suffered an Oedipal fate at the hands of successor generations. I argue that Lasswell was an intergenerational figure who deserves resurrection. This chapter is based primarily on my research in the Manuscripts and Archives of Yale University Library, and in the Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center of the University of Chicago Library.

Kent Cooper was a professional news agency man and a manager. He borrowed academic concepts when advocating cooperative ownership of news and the free flow of news without government interference. Cooper became general manager of the Associated Press (AP), the most important US-based news agency and one of the four biggest Western news agencies during the period 1925–1943. He wrote two books, *Barriers Down: The Story of the News Agency Epoch* (1942) and *The Right to Know* (1956), both of which have influenced many generations of communication industry managers, policymakers and academics. The arguments for free flow of information, for example, clearly resonated with those academics, diplomats and journalists, who debated the merits and demerits of a New World Information and Communication Order (NWICO) in UNESCO and in the UN in the 1970s and 1980s (MacBride 1980). Cooper's career exemplifies how ideologies are promoted by news organisations in order to advance their own interests. In Chapter 3 I argue that Cooper, using the AP's and his own status, was more influential than were any academics in shaping social, corporate and policy outcomes. This chapter is based on primary research in the AP archive in New York, Reuters' archive in London, the Lilly Library, and the Media School Archive, University of Indiana in Bloomington.

Chapter 4 investigates a period when the US government recruited academics such as Lasswell to carry out research as part of the World War II war effort. Research teams combined men, and some women, of professional experience and academic competence, of both US and foreign origins, to develop new methods of analysis of enemy propaganda. European intellectuals such as Nathan Leites and Paul Kecskemeti were of particular importance but their contribution has been ignored in the dominant scholarly tradition. I argue that war comparative communications made its participants into a unified generation where Insiders and Outsiders temporarily came together, united by the same ideology but separated by their individual status. In terms of intellectual history, these neglected scholars have an unacknowledged importance, for example as relays for Mannheim's work into the Anglosphere (Kecskemeti

translated Mannheim's work; Mannheim 1953). This chapter is based on my primary research in the Manuscripts and Archives of Yale University Library in New Haven, the Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center at the University of Chicago Library, the New School archives in the M.E. Grenander Department of Special Collections & Archives at the State University of New York in Albany, the Robert D. Farber University Archives and Special Collections at Brandeis University, the RAND Corporation Archives in Santa Monica, California, and the Truman Presidential Library in Independence, Missouri.

Chapter 5 addresses the question of why comparative communications did not emerge as a field of its own, like comparative politics, but as a subfield of international communication, and later of political communication, within communication studies. I identify the environment – both academic and societal, national and international – in which research was carried out, concurrently with communication studies becoming institutionalised in universities. I analyse the role of UNESCO and other organisations as major funders of international communications studies, and international news flows are studied by using content analysis. I explore the post-World War II careers of scholars who had worked together as well as separately during the war, and the clashes between nationalism and cosmopolitanism which their history exemplified. In this chapter I argue that a hitherto unified generation became divided, not only following the ideological clashes of the time, marked by the Cold War and McCarthyism, but also by the new discipline of communication research. I note that émigré scholars such as Kecskemeti and Leites rarely became full professors in academia. This chapter is mainly based on my research in the University of Chicago Library, Illinois, the Rockefeller Archive Center Archives in Sleepy Hollow, New York, as well as in the New School archives in New York, the Robert D. Farber University Archives & Special Collections Department in Waltham, Massachusetts, the RAND Corporation Archives in Santa Monica and the M.E. Grenander Department of Special Collections & Archives at the State University of New York in Albany.

In Chapter 6 I argue, through an analysis of the individuals, research traditions, ideas, institutions and relationships behind the seminal publication *Four Theories of the Press* (1956), by Fred S. Siebert (1901–1982), Theodore Peterson (1918–1997) and Wilbur Schramm (1907–1987), together with George D. Stoddard (1897–1981), president of the University of Illinois from 1946 to 1953, who hired Schramm. I argue that this 'canonical' book was a compromise between the diverse interests of its authors, their backgrounds, ideas, and national and international politics. It lies at an intersection of contradictory but also overlapping elements and gave rise to new concepts of a press system and of press theory in an international context. I also argue that *Four Theories* united, albeit temporarily, three generations of men with different backgrounds and values. At the same time, because of the changes in the international and domestic political climate, academics who participated in international networks came under the suspicion of the US government.

In order to rescue themselves, they may have felt they needed to show their loyalty to their domestic government and funders, especially in relation to communism. The book exemplifies all these tensions between ideologies and utopias of the period, but following generations have all been looking at it from their own periods. This chapter draws on my primary research in the University of Illinois Archives in Urbana, Illinois, the home university and publisher of *Four Theories*. It is an expanded and revised version of an article published in *The International Journal of Communication* (2017).

The last chapter, coming after these personified histories, returns to the concepts of *Wissenssoziologie*, of the sociology of knowledge, of ideology and utopia, of a generation of Insiders/Outsiders, and to Merton's criteria, in order to analyse how and why comparative research in communications was done, and what kinds of influence this foundational shaping has had on the generations that followed the forefront generation. The legacy of comparative communications continues to influence what is now known as international communication studies. We can see the influence of the forefront generation in at least three aspects: (1) its interdisciplinary character; (2) its policy research orientation; and (3) its transposition of ideology and utopia. Unlike in political science, where comparative politics was accepted as a field of its own, in media and communication studies there is no distinct subfield of comparative communications that became international communication, a subfield that still exists as a field of battle between ideologies and utopias, often mixed together.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> Louis Wirth (1897–1952) was born in Gemünden in Germany to Jewish parents, Joseph (1866–1936) and Rosalie (née Lorig, 1868–1948), and moved to live with his uncle in Omaha, Nebraska, at the age of 14. After studying at the University of Chicago he worked as a social worker from 1919 to 1922, then received his MA and PhD from the University of Chicago, where he was in the Department of Sociology continuously from 1926, becoming full professor in 1940. Between 1932 and 1937 he helped every member of his family out of Germany, most of them migrating to the US. At that time he also started translating Mannheim's *Ideology and Utopia* and wrote a preface to it (Wirth 1936). The archival records at the University of Chicago Library show his attempts to help Mannheim come to the US. His daughter Elizabeth Wirth Marvick (1905–2005) edited a book on Nathan Leites's work (Wirth Marvick 1977) ('Guide to the Louis Wirth papers, 1918–1952' 2008; Salerno 1987; Smith 1988, p.148).

<sup>2</sup> Paul Lazarsfeld (1901–1976) was born in Vienna to Sophie or Sofie Lazarsfeld (née Munk, 1881–1976), a therapist, and Robert Lazarsfeld (1872–circa 1939), a lawyer, both Jewish. He was awarded a PhD in

mathematics at the University of Vienna. Lazarsfeld received a scholarship from the Rockefeller Foundation to visit US universities in 1933–1935 and decided to stay in the US. By leaving Vienna behind, he also left Marxism behind and called himself 'A Marxist on leave'. As Lazarsfeld put it himself: 'A fighting revolution requires economics (Marx); a victorious revolution requires engineers (Russia), a defeated revolution calls for psychology (Vienna)' (Coser 1984, pp.112, 119). He founded Columbia University's Bureau of Applied Social Research and is widely considered to be one of the founders of communication studies (Morrisson 1988; 2008; 2022).

- <sup>3</sup> Ramstad, E.K. (1947) 'Karl Mannheim. An Appreciation.' *T&T*, p.142. Paul Kecskemeti Papers. The Robert D. Farber University Archives & Special Collections Department at Brandeis University.
- <sup>4</sup> O. Jassi to L. Wirth on 6 May 1933; K. Mannheim to L. Wirth on 13 October 1933. Louis Wirth Papers. Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.
- <sup>5</sup> Salary. Professor Karl Mannheim. Part-time lecturer, no date. Karl Mannheim File. The London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE) Archive.
- <sup>6</sup> Timetable for Professor Mannheim on 26 May 1934. Karl Mannheim File. LSE Archive.
- <sup>7</sup> K. Mannheim to L. Wirth on 17 September 1939; L. Wirth to B. Malinowski on 31 October 1939; K. Mannheim to L. Wirth on 4 March 1940. Louis Wirth Papers. Hanna Holborn Gray Special Collections Research Center, University of Chicago Library.
- <sup>8</sup> Letter from Julia Mannheim from London to Ernest Manheim (1900–2002), Karl Mannheim's cousin, in Kansas City, MO, on 21 February 1947. Transliteration by Karin Eisner. Archiv für die Geschichte der Soziologie in Österreich (AGSÖ).  
[https://agso.uni-graz.at/archive/manheim/en/4\\_gb/index.htm](https://agso.uni-graz.at/archive/manheim/en/4_gb/index.htm)
- <sup>9</sup> Professor Karl Mannheim. Candidate for election on 1 September 1942. The Athenaeum Club Archive.
- <sup>10</sup> It has been difficult to find information about women in their roles as mothers and spouses in academic research. I am grateful to Dr Laura Killick, who showed me how valuable genealogy sites are when trying to find more not only about women but about migrant families in general where birth certificates have been lost and names have been changed. She helped me in my attempts to find missing years of birth and death but there were times when I have not been able to find the missing information or it is not accurate.
- <sup>11</sup> I am using the term 'émigré' rather than 'refugee' or 'migrant' as an umbrella term covering all of these.

## References

- Abercrombie, Nicholas; Hill, Stephen; and Turner, Bryan S. (1980) *The Dominant Ideology Thesis*, UK: Allen & Unwin.
- Adair-Totef, Christopher (2019) 'Mannheim, Shils, and Aron and the "End of Ideology" Debate', *Politics, Religion & Ideology*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp.1–20. <https://www.doi.org/10.1080/21567689.2018.1554481>
- Adorno, Theodor W. (1955) 'Das Bewußtsein der Wissenssoziologie', in Ders, Prismen (ed.) *Kulturkritik und Gesellschaft*, Germany: Suhrkamp, pp.32–50.
- Albrow, Martin (1989) 'Sociology in the United Kingdom after the Second World War', in Genov, Nikolaï (ed.) *National Traditions in Sociology*, UK: Sage, pp.194–219.
- Anderson, Perry (1980) *Arguments within English Marxism*, UK: NLB.
- Ashcraft, Karen L. and Simonson, Peter (2016) 'Gender, Work, and the History of Communication Research: Figures, Formations, and Flows', in Simonson, Peter and Park, David W. (eds) *The International History of Communication Study*, USA: Routledge, pp.47–68.
- Averbeck, Stefanie (1999) *Kommunikation als Prozeß. Soziologische Perspektiven in der Zeitungswissenschaft 1927–1934*, Germany: LIT Verlag.
- Averbeck, Stefanie (2001) 'The Post-1933 Emigration of Communication Researchers from Germany: The Lost Works of the Weimar Generation', *European Journal of Communication*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp.451–475. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0267323101016004002>
- Barboza, Amalia (2020) *Karl Mannheim*, Germany: Herbert von Halem Verlag.
- Bateson, Gregory (1966) *From Versailles to Cybernetics*. <https://www.krabarchive.com/ralphmag/batesonP.html>
- Bauman, Zygmunt (2017) *Retrotopia*, UK: Polity Press.
- Beck, Ulrich (2011) 'Cosmopolitanism as Imagined Communities of Global Risk', *American Behavioral Scientist*, vol. 55, no. 10, pp.1346–61. <https://www.doi.org/10.1177/0002764211409739>
- Ben-Ze'ev, Efrat and Lomsky-Feder, Edna (2009) 'The Canonical Generation: Trapped between Personal and National Memories', *Sociology*, vol. 43, no. 6, pp.1047–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038509345698>
- Berelson, Bernard (1959) 'The State of Communication Research', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp.14–17. <https://doi.org/10.1086/266840>
- Berlin, Isaiah (2013) *The Crooked Timber of Humanity: Chapters in the History of Ideas* (2nd ed.), USA: Princeton University Press.

- Bessner, Daniel (2018) *Democracy in Exile: Hans Speier and the Rise of the Defense Intellectual*, USA: Cornell University Press.
- Bloch, Ernst (1959/1986) *The Principle of Hope*, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Blumler, Jay G.; McLeod, Jack M.; and Rosengren, Karl E. (1992) 'An Introduction to Comparative Communication Research', in Blumler, Jay G.; McLeod, Jack M.; and Rosengren, Karl E. (eds) *Comparatively Speaking: Communication and Culture Across Space and Time*, USA: Sage, pp.3–18.
- Borgos, Anna (2021) *Women in the Budapest School of Psychoanalysis: Girls of Tomorrow*, UK: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1979/1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, UK: Routledge.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1986) 'The Forms of Capital', in Richardson, John G. (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, USA: Greenwood, pp.241–58.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1988) *Homo Academicus*, USA: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1993) *The Field of Cultural Production*, USA: Columbia University Press.
- Breiner, Peter (2013) 'Karl Mannheim and Political Ideology', in Freedman, Michael; Sargent, Lyman T.; and Stear, Marc (eds) *The Oxford Handbook of Political Ideologies*, UK: Oxford University Press, pp.38–55.
- Bulmer, Martin (1985) 'The Development of Sociology and of Empirical Social Research in Britain', in Bulmer, Martin (ed.) *Essays on the History of British Sociological Research*, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp.3–38.
- Bush, Michael (2021) 'Robert K. Merton'. *Oxford Bibliographies in Criminology*. <https://www.doi.org/10.1093/OBO/9780195396607-0299>
- Calhoun, Craig (2003) *Robert Merton Remembered*. *Footnotes*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp.3–8. [https://www.asanet.org/wp-content/uploads/fn\\_2003\\_03\\_march.pdf](https://www.asanet.org/wp-content/uploads/fn_2003_03_march.pdf)
- Calhoun, Craig (2010) 'Introduction: On Merton's Legacy and Contemporary Sociology', in Calhoun, Craig (ed.) *Robert K. Merton: Sociology of Science and Sociology as Science*, USA: Columbia University Press, pp.1–31.
- Chaffee, Steven H. (1974) 'The Pathways of Proteus', *Journalism Monographs*, vol. 36, pp.1–8.
- Congdon, Lee (1991) *Exile and Social Thought: Hungarian Intellectuals in Germany and Austria, 1919–1933*, USA: Princeton University Press.
- Connolly, John (2019) 'Generational Conflict and the Sociology of Generations: Mannheim and Elias Reconsidered', *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 36, no. 7–8, pp.153–72. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0263276419827085>

- Coser, Lewis A (1984) *Refugee Scholars in America. Their Impact and Their Experiences*, USA: Yale University Press.
- Cox, Michael (2021) “‘His Finest Hour’: William Beveridge and the Academic Assistance Council”. <https://blogs.lse.ac.uk/lsehistory/2021/04/28/his-finest-hour-william-beveridge-and-academic-assistance-council>
- Deflem, Mathieu (2018) ‘Merton, Robert K’, in Turner, Bryan S. (ed.) *The Wiley Blackwell Encyclopaedia of Social Theory*, USA: Wiley-Blackwell, pp.1–3. <https://drive.google.com/file/d/1ccnyj6CpqGsQfML2XUr1oj61DJ7QFIWi/view?pli=1>
- Dennis, Everette E. and Wartella, Ellen (1996) *American Communication Research. The Remembered History*, USA: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Eagleton, Terry (2007) *Ideology: An Introduction*, UK: Verso.
- Edmunds, June and Turner, Bryan S. (2005) ‘Global Generations: Social Change in the Twentieth Century’, *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 56, no. 4, pp.559–77. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-4446.2005.00083.x>
- Eisenstadt, Shmuel N. (1987) ‘The Classical Sociology of Knowledge and Beyond’, *Minerva*, vol. 25, no. 1/2, pp.77–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01096857>
- Fischer, Ariane (2009) ‘Settling Accounts with the Sociology of Knowledge: The Frankfurt School, Mannheim, and the Marxian Critique of Ideology Qua Mental Labor’, *The South Atlantic Quarterly*, vol. 108, no. 2, pp.331–63. <https://doi.org/10.1215/003828762008036>
- Fuller, Steve (2006) *The Philosophy of Science and Technology Studies*, UK: Routledge.
- Gabel, Joseph (1976) ‘Utopian Consciousness and False Consciousness’, *Telos*, vol. 29, Fall, pp.181–86. <https://doi.org/10.3817/0976029181>
- Gabel, Joseph (1991) *Mannheim and Hungarian Marxism*, USA: Transaction.
- Gábor, Éva (1996) *Mannheim Károly levelezése 1911–1946*, Hungary: Argumentum Kiadó M T A Lukács Archivum. [http://real-eod.mtak.hu/650/1/ArchivumiFuzetek\\_1996\\_12.pdf](http://real-eod.mtak.hu/650/1/ArchivumiFuzetek_1996_12.pdf)
- Geertz, Clifford (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*, USA: Harper and Row.
- Geoghegan, Vincent (2004) ‘Ideology and Utopia’, *Journal of Political Ideologies*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp.123–38. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310410001691172>
- Glander, Timothy (2000) *Origins of Mass Communications Research during the American Cold War: Educational Effects and Contemporary Implications*, UK: Routledge.
- Gluck, Mary (1985) *Georg Lukács and His Generation, 1900–1918*, USA: Harvard University Press.

- Gouldner, Alwin W. (1979) *The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class: A Frame of Reference, Theses, Conjectures, Arguments, and an Historical Perspective on the Role of Intellectuals and Intelligentsia in the International Class Contest of the Modern Era*, UK: Macmillan.
- Grimley, Matthew (2007) Moot (Act. 1938–1947). *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. <https://www.oxforddnb.com/view/10.1093/ref:odnb/9780198614128.001.0001/odnb-9780198614128-e-67745>
- 'Guide to the Louis Wirth papers, 1918–1952' (2008) University of Chicago Library. <https://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/scrc/findingaids/view.php?eadid=ICU.SPCL.WIRTH>
- Gurukkal, Rajan (2019) *History and Theory of Knowledge Production: An Introductory Outline*, UK: Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780199490363.001.0001>
- Hammersley Martyn (2021) 'Planning versus the Market: The Dispute between Hayek and Mannheim and Its Contemporary Relevance', *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 72, no. 5, pp.1464–78. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12893>
- Hammersley, Martyn (2022) 'Karl Mannheim's Ideology and Utopia and the Public Role of Sociology', *Journal of Classical Sociology*, vol. 22, no. 2, pp.176–98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468795X20986382>
- Hannerz, Ulf (1992) *Cultural Complexity: Studies in the Social Organization of Meaning*, USA: Columbia University Press.
- Hardt, Hanno (1979) *Social Theories of the Press: Early German and American Perspectives*, USA: Sage Publications.
- Hardt, Hanno (1992) *Critical Communication Studies: Communication, History, and Theory in America*, UK: Routledge.
- Heeren, John (1971) 'Karl Mannheim and the Intellectual Elite', *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 22, no. 1, pp.1–15. <https://doi.org/10.2307/588721>
- Horowitz, Irving L. (1996) 'Culture, Politics and McCarthyism: A Retrospective from the Trenches', *The Independent Review*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp.101–10. [https://www.independent.org/pdf/tir/tir\\_01\\_1\\_07\\_horowitz.pdf](https://www.independent.org/pdf/tir/tir_01_1_07_horowitz.pdf)
- Howie, Marguerite R. (1961) 'Karl Mannheim and the Sociology of Knowledge', *The Journal of Education*, vol. 143, no. 4, pp.55–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00220574611430040>
- Hvidsten, Andreas H. (2019) 'Karl Mannheim and the Liberal Telos of Realism', *International Relations*, vol. 33, no. 3, pp.475–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117819846544>
- Izzo, Alberto (1998) 'Conditioning or Conditionings? Revisiting an Old Criticism on Mannheim by Merton', in Merton, Robert K.; Mongardini,

- Carlo; and Tabboni, Simonetta (eds) *Robert K. Merton and Contemporary Sociology*, USA: Transaction, pp.213–20.
- Jay, Martin (1973/1996) *The Dialectical Imagination: A History of the Frankfurt School and the Institute of Social Research, 1923–1950*, USA: University of California Press.
- Jay, Martin (1974/1994) ‘The Frankfurt School’s Critique of Karl Mannheim and the Sociology of Knowledge’, in Bernstein, Jay M. (ed.) *The Frankfurt School: Critical Assessments*, UK: Routledge, pp.175–90.
- Jehlen, Myra (1986) ‘Introduction: Beyond Transcendence’, in Bercovitch, Sacvan and Jehlen, Myra (eds) *Ideology and Classic American Literature*, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp.1–20.
- Julia Mannheim (née Láng) (1893–1995) *Psychoanalytikerinnen. Biografisches Lexikon*. [https://www.psychanalytikerinnen.de/greatbritain\\_biographies.html#Mannheim](https://www.psychanalytikerinnen.de/greatbritain_biographies.html#Mannheim)
- Karádi, Éva (1985) ‘Einleitung’, in Karádi, Éva and Vezér, Erzsébet (eds) *Georg Lukács, Karl Mannheim und der Sonntagskreis*, Germany: Sandler, pp.7–27.
- Kadarkay, Arpad (1991) *Georg Lukacs: Life, Thought and Politics*, UK: Basil Blackwell.
- Kaiser, David (1998) ‘A Mannheim for All Seasons: Bloor, Merton, and the Roots of the Sociology of Scientific Knowledge’, *Science in Context*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp.51–87.  
<https://doi.org/10.1017/S026988970000291X>
- Karácsony, András (2008) ‘Soul–Life–Knowledge: The Young Mannheim’s Way to Sociology’, *Studies in East European Thought*, vol. 60, no. 1/2, pp.97–111. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11212-008-9040-4>
- Katz, Elihu; Peters, John Durham; Liebes, Tamar; and Orloff, Avril (2002) (eds) *Canonic Texts in Media Research: Are There Any? Should There Be? How About These?* UK: Polity.
- Kecskemeti, Paul (1952) ‘Introduction’, in Mannheim, Karl *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul, pp.1–32.
- Kettler, David (2002) *Contested Legacies: The German-Speaking Intellectual and Cultural Emigration to the US and UK, 1933–1945*, Germany: Galda & Wilch.
- Kettler, David (2012) *The Liquidation of Exile: Studies in the Intellectual Emigration of the 1930s*, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Kettler, David and Loader, Colin (2013) ‘Weimar Sociology’, in Gordon, Peter E. and McCormick, John P. (eds) *Weimar Thought: A Contested Legacy*, USA: Princeton University Press, pp.15–34.

- Kettler, David and Meja, Volker (1993) 'Their "Own Peculiar Way": Karl Mannheim and the Rise of Women', *International Sociology*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp.5–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026858093008001001>
- Kettler, David; Meja, Volker; and Stehr, Nico (1984) *Karl Mannheim*, UK: Tavistock.
- Kilminster, Richard (1993) 'Norbert Elias and Karl Mannheim: Closeness and Distance', *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp.81–114. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026327693010003005>
- Klaus, Elisabeth and Seethaler, Josef (2016) *What Do We Really Know about Herta Herzog? Exploring the Life and Work of a Pioneer of Communication Research*, USA: Peter Lang.
- Knobloch-Westerwick, Silvia and Glynn, Carroll J. (2011) 'The Matilda Effect—Role Congruity Effects on Scholarly Communication: A Citation Analysis of Communication Research and Journal of Communication Articles', *Communication Research*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp.3–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0093650211418339>
- Köglér, Hans H. (1997) 'Alienation as Epistemological Source: Reflexivity and Social Background after Mannheim and Bourdieu', *Social Epistemology*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp.141–64.
- Kuhn, Thomas (1962) *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, USA: University of Chicago Press.
- Lang, Kurt (1979) 'The Critical Functions of Empirical Communication Research: Observations on German-American Influences', *Media, Culture & Society*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp.83–96. <https://doi.org/10.1177/016344377900100107>
- Lassman, Peter (1992) 'Responses to Fascism in Britain, 1930–1945. The Emergence of the Concept of Totalitarianism', in Turner, Stephen P. and Käsler, Dirk (eds) *Sociology Responds to Fascism*, UK: Routledge, pp.214–40.
- Lasswell, Harold D. (1951a) 'The Policy Orientation', in Lasswell, Harold D. and Lerner, Daniel (eds) *The Policy Sciences: Recent Developments in Scope and Method*, USA: Stanford University Press, pp.3–15.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. (1969) 'An Episode in the History of Social Research. Memoirs', in Fleming, Donald and Bailyn, Bernard (eds) *The Intellectual Migration. Europe and America, 1930–1960*, USA: Harvard University Press, pp.270–337.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Merton, Robert K. (1943) 'Studies in Radio and Film Propaganda', *Transactions of the New York Academy of Sciences*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp.58–74. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2164-0947.1943.tb00897.x>

- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. and Merton, Robert K. (1948/1964) 'Mass Communication, Popular Taste and Organized Social Action', in Bryson, Lyman (ed.) *The Communication of Ideas*, USA: Institute for Religious and Social Studies, pp.95–118.
- Levitas, Ruth (1979) 'Sociology and Utopia', *Sociology*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp.19–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/003803857901300102>
- Levitas, Ruth (2000) 'For Utopia: The (Limits of the) Utopian Function in Late Capitalist Society', *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, vol. 3, no. 2–3, pp.25–43. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230008403311>
- Levitas, Ruth (2013) *Utopia as Method: The Imaginary Reconstitution of Society*, UK: Palgrave.
- Loader, Colin (1997) 'Free Floating: The Intelligentsia in the Work of Alfred Weber and Karl Mannheim', *German Studies Review*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp.217–34. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1431946>
- Löblich, Maria and Scheu, Andreas M. (2011) 'Writing the History of Communication Studies: A Sociology of Science Approach', *Communication Theory*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp.1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.2010.01373.x>
- Lucas, Jennifer C. and Sisco, Tauna S. (2012) 'Generations and Gender in the 2008 US Democratic Primaries', in Steele, Brent J. and Acuff, Jonathan M. (eds) *Theory and Application of the 'Generation' in International Relations and Politics*, USA: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.147–76.
- Lyon, E. Stina (2011) 'Karl Mannheim and Viola Klein: Refugee Sociologists in Search of Social Democratic Practice', in Marks, Shula; Weindling, Paul; and Wintour, Laura (eds) *In Defence of Learning: The Plight, Persecution, and Placement of Academic Refugees, 1933–1980s*. Proceedings of the British Academy. British Academy Scholarship Online, pp.177–90. <https://doi.org/10.5871/bacad/9780197264812.003.0012>
- MacBride, Sean (1980) *Many Voices, One World: Communication and Society Today and Tomorrow: Towards a New More Just and More Efficient World Information and Communication Order*, UK: Kogan Page.
- Manheim, Ernest (1947) 'Karl Mannheim, 1893–1947', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 52, no. 6, pp.471–74. <https://doi.org/10.1086/220067>
- Mannheim, Karl (1922) *Die Strukturanalyse der Erkenntnistheorie. Kant-Studien*, no. 57, Germany: Reuther & Reichard.
- Mannheim, Karl (1927) 'Das Problem der Generationen', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp.157–85.

- Mannheim, Karl (1928) 'Das Problem der Generationen', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp.309–30.
- Mannheim, Karl (1929) *Ideologie und Utopie*, Germany: F. Cohen.
- Mannheim, Karl (1932/1993) 'The Sociology of Intellectuals', *Theory, Culture & Society*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp.69–80.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/026327693010003004>
- Mannheim, Karl (1934) 'The Crisis of Culture in the Era of Mass-Democracies and Autarchies', *The Sociological Review*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp.105–29.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-954X.1934.tb01902.x>
- Mannheim, Karl (1935) 'Utopia', in Seligman, Edwin R.A. (ed.) *Encyclopaedia of the Social Sciences*, USA: Macmillan, pp.200–03.
- Mannheim, Karl (1936) *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. Translated by Louis Wirth and Edward Shils. UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co; USA: Harcourt, Brace & Co.
- Mannheim, Karl (1953) *Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology*. Edited by Paul Kecskemeti, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Mannheim, Karl (1960) *Ideology and Utopia. An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. Translated by Louis Wirth and Edward Shils. UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Mannheim, Karl (1980) 'Eine soziologische Theorie der Kultur und ihrer Erkennbarkeit (Konjunktives und kommunikatives Denken)', in Kettler, David; Meja, Volker; and Stehr, Nico (eds) *Karl Mannheim. Strukturen des Denkens*, Germany: Suhrkamp Verlag, pp.155–322.
- Mannheim, Karl (2000) 'The Problem of Generations', in Paul Kecskemeti (ed.) *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge. Collected Works* (Vol. 5), UK: Routledge, pp.276–322.
- Mannheim, Karl and Gábor, Éva (2003) *Selected Correspondence (1911–1946) of Karl Mannheim, Scientist, Philosopher, and Sociologist*, USA: Edwin Mellen Press.
- Marcuse, Herbert (1970) *Five Lectures: Psychoanalysis, Politics, and Utopia*, UK: Allen Lane.
- Marcuse, Herbert and Sherover-Marcuse, Erica (1979) *The Aesthetic Dimension: Toward a Critique of Marxist Aesthetics*, USA: Beacon Press.
- Mede, Niels G.; Schäfer, Mike S.; Metag, Julia; and Klinger, Kira (2022) 'Who Supports Science-Related Populism? A Nationally Representative Survey on the Prevalence and Explanatory Factors of Populist Attitudes toward Science in Switzerland.' *PloS One*, vol. 17, no. 8, pp.1–20.  
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0271204.t002>

- Meja, Volker and Stehr, Nico (1990) *Knowledge and Politics: The Sociology of Knowledge Dispute*, UK: Routledge.
- Meng, Bingchun and Rantanen, Terhi (2015) 'A Change of Lens: A Call to Compare the Media in China and Russia', *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp.1–15.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15295036.204.997831>
- Merton, Robert K. (1937) 'The Sociology of Knowledge', *Isis*, vol. 27, no. 3, pp.493–503. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1086/347276>
- Merton, Robert K. (1938) 'Science, Technology and Society in Seventeenth Century England', in Sarton, George (ed.) *Osiris: Studies on the History and Philosophy of Science, and on the History of Learning and Culture*, Belgium: St. Catherine Press, pp.362–632.
- Merton, Robert K. (1941) 'Karl Mannheim and the Sociology of Knowledge', *Journal of Liberal Religion*, vol. 2, pp.125–47.
- Merton, Robert K. (1949) *Social Theory and Social Structure*, USA: Free Press.
- Merton, Robert K. (1957) 'Karl Mannheim and the Sociology of Knowledge', in Merton, Robert K. (ed.) *Social Theory and Social Structure*, USA: Free Press, pp.489–508.
- Merton, Robert K. (1968) *Social Theory and Social Structure* (1968 enlarged ed.) USA: Free Press.
- Merton, Robert K. (1972) 'Insiders and Outsiders: A Chapter in the Sociology of Knowledge', *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 78, no. 1, pp.9–47.  
<https://doi.org/10.1086/225294>
- Merton, Robert K. (1973) *The Sociology of Science: Theoretical and Empirical Investigations*, USA: University of Chicago Press.
- Merton, Robert K. (1994) *A Life of Learning* (1994 Charles Homer Haskins Lecture) USA: American Council of Learned Societies.
- Merton, Robert K.; Fiske, Marjorie; and Curtis, Alberta (1946) *Mass Persuasion; The Social Psychology of a War Bond Drive*, USA: Harper & Brothers.
- Merton, Robert K. and Lazarsfeld, Paul F. (1950) *Continuities in Social Research: Studies in the Scope and Method of 'The American Soldier'*, USA: Free Press.
- Meyen, Michael (2015) *Fachgeschichte als Generationsgeschichte*.  
<http://blexkom.halemverlag.de/fachgeschichte-als-generationsgeschichte>
- Morrison, David (1988) 'The Transference of Experience and the Impact of Ideas: Paul Lazarsfeld and Mass Communication Research', *Encyclopaedia of Communication*, vol. 10, pp.185–209.

- Morrison, David E. (2008) 'Opportunity Structures and the Creation of Knowledge: Paul Lazarsfeld and the Politics of Research', in Park, David W. and Pooley, Jefferson (eds) *The History of Media and Communication Research*, USA: Peter Lang, pp.179–204.
- Morrison, David (2022) 'Lazarsfeld's Legacy| Paul Lazarsfeld: Living in Circles and Talking Around Tables', *International Journal of Communication*, vol. 16, pp.616–25. <https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/18891/3664>
- Neun, Oliver; Kunze, Jan-Peter; and Mannheim, Karl (2018) *Karl Mannheim Schriften Zur Soziologie*, Germany: Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden, pp.15–32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-22120-1>
- Norris, Pippa and Inglehart, Ronald (2019) *Cultural Backlash: Trump, Brexit, and Authoritarian Populism*, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Oldfield, Sybil (2022) *The Black Book: The Britons on the Nazi Hit List*, UK: Profile Books.
- Park, David W. and Pooley, Jefferson (2008) *The History of Media and Communications Research: Contested Memories*, USA: Peter Lang.
- Perivolaropoulou, Nia (1992) 'Karl Mannheim et sa génération'. *Mil neuf cent. Revue d'histoire intellectuelle (Cahiers Georges Sorel)*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp.165–86.
- Peters, John D. (1986) *Reconstructing Mass Communication Theory*, USA: Stanford University.
- Philips, Susan U. (2001) 'Gender Ideology: Cross-cultural Aspects', in Smelser, Neil J. and Baltes, Paul B. (eds.) *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, UK: Pergamon, pp. 6016–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/03962-0>
- Pilcher, Jane (1994) 'Mannheim's Sociology of Generations: An Undervalued Legacy', *The British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 45, no. 3, pp.481–95.
- Pooley, Jefferson (2007) 'Edward Shils' Turn against Karl Mannheim: The Central European Connection', *The American Sociologist*, vol. 38, no. 4, pp.364–82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12108-007-9027-5>
- Pooley, Jefferson (2017) 'Wilbur Schramm and the "Four Founders" History of U.S. Communication Research', *Коммуникации. Медиа. Дизайн*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp.5–16. <http://dx.doi.org/10.17613/M6Q859>
- Pooley, Jefferson and Katz, Elihu (2008) 'Further Notes on Why American Sociology Abandoned Mass Communication Research', *Journal of Communication*, vol. 58, no. 4, pp.767–86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2008.00413.x>
- Popper, Karl (1957/2002) *The Poverty of Historicism* (2nd ed.), UK: Taylor & Francis Group.

- Purhonen, Semi (2016) 'Generations on Paper: Bourdieu and the Critique of "Generationalism"', *Social Science Information*, vol. 55, no. 1, pp.94–114. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0539018415608967>
- Rakow, Lana F. (2008) 'Feminist Historiography and the Field: Writing New Histories', in Park, David W. and Pooley, Jefferson (eds) *The History of Media and Communication Research: Contested Memories*, USA: Peter Lang, pp.113–39.
- Rantanen, Terhi (2004) *The Media and Globalisation*, UK: Sage.
- Remmling, Gunter W. (1961) 'Karl Mannheim: Revision of an Intellectual Portrait', *Social Forces*, vol. 40, no. 1, pp.23–30. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2573467>
- Ricoeur, Paul (1986) *Lectures on Ideology and Utopia*, USA: Columbia University Press.
- Rogers, Everett (1994) *A History of Communication Study: A Biographical Approach*, USA: Free Press.
- Roskin, Michael (1974) 'From Pearl Harbor to Vietnam: Shifting Generational Paradigms and Foreign Policy', *Political Science Quarterly*, vol. 89, no. 3, pp.563–88. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2148454>
- Rutkoff, Peter M. and Scott, William B. (1986) *New School: A History of the New School for Social Research*, USA: Free Press.
- Sagarin, Edward and Kelly, Robert J. (1969) 'Karl Mannheim and the Sociology of Knowledge', *Salmagundi*, no. 10/11, pp.292–302.
- Salerno, Roger A. (1987) *Louis Wirth: A Bio-bibliography*, USA: Greenwood.
- Sargent, Lyman T. (2008) 'Ideology and Utopia: Karl Mannheim and Paul Ricoeur', *Journal of Political Ideologies*, vol. 13, no. 3, pp.263–73. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569310802374479>
- Schramm, Wilbur (1957) 'Twenty Years of Journalism Research', *Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp.91–107. <https://doi.org/10.1086/266689>
- Schramm, Wilbur (1959) 'Comments on "The State of Communication Research"', *The Public Opinion Quarterly*, vol. 23, no. 1, pp.6–9. <https://doi.org/10.1086/266841>
- Schramm, Wilbur (1963) 'Communication Research in the United States', in Schramm, Wilbur (ed.) *The Science of Human Communication*, USA: Basic Books, pp.1–16.
- Schramm, Wilbur (1980) 'The Beginnings of Communication Study in the United States', *Annals of the International Communication Association*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp.73–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23808985.1980.11923795>

- Schramm, Wilbur; Chaffee, Steven H.; and Rogers, Everett M. (1997) *The Beginnings of Communication Study in America: A Personal Memoir*, USA: Sage.
- Schuman, Howard and Scott, Jacqueline (1989) 'Generations and Collective Memories', *American Sociological Review*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp.359–81. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095611>
- Shils, Edward (1974) "'Ideology and Utopia" by Karl Mannheim', *Daedalus*, vol. 103, no. 1, pp.83–89. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20024190>
- Shils, Edward (1975) *Center and Periphery: Essays in Macrosociology*, USA: University of Chicago Press.
- Shils, Edward (1985) 'On the Eve: A Prospect in Retrospect', in Bulmer, Martin (ed.) *Essays on the History of British Sociological Research*, UK: Cambridge University Press, pp.165–78.
- Shils, Edward (1995) 'Karl Mannheim', *The American Scholar*, vol. 64, no. 2, pp.221–35. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41212318>
- Sica, Alan (2010) 'Merton, Mannheim, and the Sociology of Knowledge', in Calhoun, Craig (ed.) *Robert K. Merton: Sociology of Science and Sociology as Science*, USA: Columbia University Press, pp.164–80.
- Sills, David L. (1987) *Paul Lazarsfeld 1901–1976. A Biographical Memoir. National Academy of Sciences*. <http://www.nasonline.org/publications/biographical-memoirs/memoir-pdfs/lazarsfeld-paul-f.pdf>
- Simonson, Peter (2010) *Refiguring Mass Communication: A History*, USA: University of Illinois Press.
- Simonson, Peter; Morooka, Junya; Xiong, Bingjuan; and Bedsole, Nathan (2019) 'The Beginnings of Mass Communication: A Transnational History', *Journal of Communication*, vol. 69, no. 5, pp.513–38. <https://doi.org/10.1093/joc/jqz027>
- Simonson, Peter and Park, David W. (2016) *The International History of Communication Study*, USA: Routledge.
- Simonson, Peter; Peck, Janice.; Craig, Robert T.; and Jackson, John (2012) (eds) *The Handbook of Communication History*, UK: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Simonson, Peter and Weimann, Gabriel (2003) 'Critical Research at Columbia', in Katz, Elihu; Peters, John Durham; Liebes, Tamar; and Orloff, Avril (eds) *Canonic Texts in Media Research*, UK: Polity, pp.12–38.
- Simpson, Christopher (1994) *Science of Coercion: Communication Research and Psychological Warfare, 1945–1960*, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Smith, Dennis (1988) *The Chicago School: A Liberal Critique of Capitalism*, UK: Macmillan Education.

- Solzhenitsyn, Alexandr (1973) *The Gulag Archipelago*, USA: Harper & Row.
- Speier, Hans (1989) *The Truth in Hell and Other Essays on Politics and Culture, 1935–1987*, USA: Oxford University Press.
- Sproule, J. Michael (1997) *Propaganda and Democracy: The American Experience of Media and Mass Persuasion*, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sproule, J. Michael (2008) ‘“Communication”: From Concept to Field to Discipline’, in Park, David W. and Pooley, Jefferson (eds) *The History of Media and Communication Research: Contested Memories*, USA: Peter Lang, pp.163–78.
- Steele, Brent J. (2012) ‘Never Trust Anyone Who Remembers Jerry Rubin: The Promise of Generational Conflict’, in Steele, Brent J. and Acuff, Jonathan M. (eds) *Theory and Application of the ‘Generation’ in International Relations and Politics*, USA: Palgrave Macmillan, pp.25–46.
- Steele, Brent J. and Acuff, Jonathan M. (2012) *Theory and Application of the ‘Generation’ in International Relations and Politics*, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Thompson, John B. (1991) *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*, Polity Press.
- Timonen, Virpi and Conlon, Catherine (2015) ‘Beyond Mannheim: Conceptualising How People “Talk” and “Do” Generations in Contemporary Society’, *Advances in Life Course Research*, vol. 24, June, pp.1–9.
- Tomlinson, John (1999) *Globalization and Culture*, USA: University of Chicago Press.
- Vogt, Kristoffer C. (2016) ‘The Post-industrial Society: From Utopia to Ideology’, *Work, Employment & Society*, vol. 30, no. 2, pp.366–76.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/26655576>
- Wahl-Jorgensen, Karin (2004) ‘How Not to Found a Field: New Evidence on the Origins of Mass Communication Research’, *Journal of Communication*, vol. 54, no. 3, pp.547–64. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2004.tb02644.x>
- Wallerstein, Immanuel (1986) ‘Marxisms as Utopias: Evolving Ideologies’, *American Journal of Sociology*, vol. 91, no. 6, pp.1295–308.  
<https://doi.org/10.1086/228422>
- Weidlinger, Tom (2019) *The Restless Hungarian: Modernism, Madness, and The American Dream*, USA: SparksPress.
- Whitty, Geoff (2004) ‘Mannheim, Karl [Károly] (1893–1947)’. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/53147>.

- Wirth, Louis (1936) 'Preface', in Mannheim, Karl *Ideology and Utopia. An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge*. Translated by Louis Wirth and Edward Shils, UK: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp.xi–xii.
- Wirth Marvick, Elizabeth (1979) *Psychopolitical Analysis. Selected Writings of Nathan Leites*, USA: SAGE.
- Woldring, Henk E.S. (1986) *Karl Mannheim. The development of his thought: Philosophy, sociology and social ethics, With a detailed biography*, New York: St Martin's Press.
- Wolff, Kurt H. (1971/1993) *From Karl Mannheim*, USA: Transaction.
- Xu, Bin (2019) 'Intragenerational Variations in Autobiographical Memory: China's "Sent-Down Youth" Generation', *Social Psychology Quarterly*, vol. 82, no. 2, pp.134–57. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272519840641>
- Ylä-Anttila, Tuukka (2018) 'Populist Knowledge: "Post-truth" Repertoires of Contesting Epistemic Authorities', *European Journal of Cultural and Political Sociology*, vol. 5, no. 4, pp.356–88. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2325423.2017.1414620>