

**Israel National Defense College**

**46th Class 2018-2019**

**Israeli Society**

**Siegfried Landshut and the Community Settlements in Palestine**

Academic Advisor: Prof. Neri Horowitz

Submitted by: Col (GS) Klaus Harrer

Siegfried Salomon Landshut was born on 7 August 1897 in Strasbourg, Alsace. His parents, Samuel and Suzette Landshut, both came from Neumark in West Prussia. In 1893 the family moved to Strasbourg, where Samuel Landshut soon made a name for himself as an architect.

Siegfried Landshut's parents were part of that generation of German Jews who - after the formal introduction of legal and political equality - increasingly assimilated themselves. Jewish traditions had completely receded into the background among the Landshuts and were not cultivated by any of their parents. The degree of assimilation can also be seen in the German first names Samuel and Suzette Landshut gave their children. The only sign of Jewish origin was Siegfried Landshut´s second name, Solomon, which he probably never used. This was intended to commemorate the grandfather Salomon Hirsch, who had returned from a stay of several years in the USA in 1849 as Salomon Harris. In Germany he renamed himself and the whole family Landhut. This name was probably chosen because the family had originally lived in Landeshut/Silesia. The naming may also indicate that the German identity should and had to be lived here.

Siegfried Landshut spent the first 17 years in his hometown Strasbourg. His childhood was marked by the confidence of his wealthy parents, the humanistic education at the Protestant Gymnasium and the Franco-German bilingualism of the region, whereby the preference for the German language and culture was never in dispute.

The beginning of the First World War radically changed the living circumstances. On August 5, 1914, Siegfried Landshut joined the German army as a volunteer only two days after Germany declared war on France and two days before his seventeenth birthday. His father had agreed to this step, which was not an isolated case in a society penetrated by military thinking. For the Landshut family, what was also true for many other Jewish families, can be regarded as certain: The hope - consciously or unconsciously - that the emphasis on their patriotic convictions would overcome the last obstacles on their way to integration into society.

Siegfried Landshut was at first stationed in France, then in Russia. After more than one and a half years of war, he returned to Strasbourg after being wounded and began studying law there in May 1916. In the same year, however, he was called up to the German-Turkish Front in the Middle East and deployed to Aleppo, northern Syria, where he was responsible for materials management. He also visited Beirut, Damascus and Constantinople and got to know the places he was to see again during his exile: Jeruslaem, Beer Sheva and Jaffa. Diary entries from this time show how remote the idea of a Jewish home in Palestine was for him personally.

For Siegfried Landshut it was only after the collapse of the German-Turkish front in September 1918 that the long journey back to Germany began, which led him via Constantinople and a complicated shipping route to Hamburg.

The four and a half years in the war were of great importance for Landshut's life and determined his path and the direction of his academic work.

The studies he took up afterwards took place in a shortness hardly imaginable today. Within 36 months he had not only relocated to a different place and subject but had also - despite some difficulties - completed his doctorate. He began his law studies in Freiburg, but changed to economics in his second semester, to which he then remained faithful until his doctorate in 1921. On December 13, he graduated "cum laude” and received his doctorate (Dr. rer. pol.). By this time, however, he already had entered into an intensive study of philosophy. In the winter semester of 1922/23 Landshut, who was now married and had a daughter, moved to Cologne. In view of the young family's difficult financial situation, the continuation of their studies and the change of location were not a matter of obvious concern. In a time of extreme inflation, it was above all Siegfried Landshut’s mother who financed the family and made the studies possible at all. The following year he moved to Marburg and took part in the first lectures Martin Heidegger conducted there.

However, Siegfried Landshut soon decided to return to Alfred Weber in Heidelberg, as the social science tradition there seemed to offer him a suitable prerequisite for his academic work and, at the same time, he hoped that he would be able to earn a habilitation. However, until the founding of the Weimar Republic, the habilitation of Jews was only possible with great difficulties, if at all. His hopes of habilitating in Heidelberg were disappointed. Apart from the long waiting-list, there was one more problem which Landshut described as follows in 1936: "Difficulties due to the habilitation of a second Jewish university lecturer in the same subject". Even if he had been accepted as a habilitant, he would have had to wait a long time for his opportunity, since older applicants would have blocked the prospects for years. For financial reasons, however, a further stay in Heidelberg was no longer possible. Landshut had to quickly find a way to maintain the family of now four. During this time Alfred Weber advised him to transfer to the "Institute for Foreign Policy" in Hamburg, whose director, the lawyer Albrecht Mendelssohn Bartoldy, he knew from the "Heidelberg Association".

Siegfried Landshut´s Work at the "Institute for Foreign Policy" began in September 1925 and ended two years later, in the summer of 1927, when he received his first assignment at the University of Hamburg. Although his time at the Institute was quite short and the type of employment not the safest, it meant his entry into Hamburg academic life through an institution that was unique in Germany at the time. As assistant to Prof. Eduard Heimann, Landshut held courses from the winter semester of 1929/30 to the summer semester of 1933, although nothing is known about the subject.

On 2 May 1928 Landshut asked for admission to a habilitation in politics. What was striking about his application was that he wanted to habilitate for the subject of politics, a subject that did not exist at any German university at the time. This attempt also failed.

Landshut had perhaps the greatest success in 1932 with the famous Kröner's paperback edition of Karl Marx:” Ter Historical Materialism. The early writings.” He had published them together with J.P. Mayer and F. Salomon. These were mainly unpublished excerpts and explanations of content discovered in the Marx estate, which Marx had written in Paris from May/June 1843 to August 1844 and which later caused a sensation under various names ranging from “National Economy and Philosophy” to “Economic philosophical” to simply “Parisian manuscripts”. Both their history of discovery in the party archives of the SPD and their history of influence are a treasure trove for historians, especially of the political-philosophical ideas and ideological controversies of the 20th century.

In 1933 the face of Hamburg University changed fundamentally. At the beginning of the 1933/34 winter semester, Siegfried Landshut´s place of employment already gave the impression of a "gleichgeschaltete” (brought into line) university. As at other German universities, the non-Aryan and politically undesirable members of the teaching staff in Hamburg were dismissed or forced to retire. The introduction of the University of Hamburg into the National Socialist system also proceeded very quickly and alarmingly smoothly. Under the leadership of the historian and later rector Adolf Rein and by the end of 1933, the university reform was largely completed. The Higher Education Act of 1934 abolished the university constitution, which was actually based on self-administration, in favour of the "Führerprinzip" (leader principle); the university was transformed into a National Socialist university.

The places where Siegfried Landshut had worked in Hamburg were particularly affected by the dismissals and "Gleichschaltung". The Institute for Foreign Policy was moved to Berlin and the socio-economic seminar was no longer to be recognized within a very short time. Within a few months, until June 1933, Siegfried Landshut was stripped of his feet. The abandonment of his habilitation procedure, the termination of his teaching position at the adult education centre, his dismissal at the university and finally his expulsion from Germany marked stages of this uprooting process. On the evening of 23 June 1933 Landshut left Germany and did not return for almost 17 years.

For Landshut, politics was not only one of the oldest sciences, for him it was also the royal discipline in the Aristotelian sense, the discipline which deals with the determining questions of human coexistence.

Coming back to Germany Landshut represented political science in Hamburg for more than 14 years, for over ten years as the only professor in this subject. Contrary to the widespread view that it was a new science "imported" from the USA only after 1945, he insisted once again that politics was one of the oldest disciplines of all: "…the term politics is not of yesterday. Along with physics, metaphysics and ethics, it is one of the oldest terms used to describe a science, the science of the polis, the political community, the res publica."

**The Exil**

Before arriving in Palestine, he was exiled to Egypt, where he was to hold a few conferences at the University of Alexandria in summer 1933. Despite hoping to get a job at Cairo University, his hopes were promptly disappointed. He was overwhelmed by disillusionment and deep bitterness and had to suffer an increasingly difficult economic situation. A friend put him in touch with the director of the League of Nation’s Commission for Jewish Refugees from Germany, Norman Bentwich. He thus hoped for a work opportunity at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem. As the perspective of being integrated into the University in Jerusalem got closer, Landshut decided to resume his project that he had started two years earlier and to which he had dedicated a few conferences, namely the study of “The European Judaism through the Emancipation”, a two-level research work – on the one hand, the importance of emancipation for the “Jewish human being” and the Jewish tradition and on the other hand, the influence of emancipated Judaism on the development of the 19th century.

Fritz Warburg, a banker from Hamburg, put Landshut in contact with the intellectual Ernst Simon who took some initiatives in order to ensure him a fellowship at the University of Jerusalem. During the summer of 1936 he finally left for Palestine where in October, he started his research at the University of Jerusalem. For the first time since the beginning of his exile, Landshut was able to focus on his research projects in a real academic environment. Unfortunately, the reality disappointed his expectations again: the Hebrew University had been created only eleven years earlier and in 1936, there was still neither a department devoted to social sciences nor to political sciences or political economy where Landshut could have applied his intellectual skills and his professionalism.

During his two years as researcher at the Hebrew University, Landshut’s research study changed into “the question of community facilities” in Palestine. Not only did Landshut have to work on a new subject and a new method but he also had to study Hebrew, which was essential for every teacher at the young University of Jerusalem. In addition, he had a difficult family situation, with a wife who was sick with tuberculosis and three children to care for. To have only two years in order to ensure him with a stable position due to the cutting off of funding from the Rockefeller Foundation turned the years 1936-1938 into an experience that was very difficult. However, Landshut was already able to teach lessons dedicated to Max Weber’s social philosophy in Hebrew during the summer of 1938.

Neither the students’ positive echoes of his teaching nor the pressures from his colleagues could however ensure him a stable employment: The President of the Hebrew University, Salman Schocken, refused to extend his contract. Even the personal positions taken on by Martin Buber, who had just arrived to Jerusalem, Hugo Bergmann, Richard Koebner, Georg Landauer, Arthur Ruppin and Ernst Simon didn’t succeed in persuading the University’s management to keep Landshut’s post, at least until the end of his study on the community establishments in Palestine. Finally, the two years at the Hebrew University didn’t represent a real return to work in academia but from human point of view, they opened doors for him to the small Jewish-German intellectual community that was a committed and active member of the Brit Shalom organization. This organization endorsed the idea of a binational solution in order to put an end to the conflict between the new Jewish immigrants and the then mainly Arab population.

His most important work was published in 1944 after four years of research when Landshut was no longer at the Hebrew University and had to manage again with mostly precarious financial difficulties that forced him to leave Jerusalem. This was when his research colleagues, and especially Martin Buber, proposed that he pursue his research work on the community institutions by conducting field research and by experiencing the social organization of a Kibbutz in Palestine. In 1940, Landshut moved with his entire family to the Kibbutz Givat Brenner where he analyzed the different aspects of the community experience established by the new Jewish migrants. The report was written in German and he was able to publish it only thanks to the “Ruppin Science” prize that allowed him to finance the translation into Hebrew.

**The Community Settlements in Palestine**

The starting point for Landshut is the fact that the community settlement is meant to be a living community, i.e. "a community in the daily care of the demands of life and for the whole time of life". The communities that human society has always created, everywhere, and which form its original form, is the "Hausgemeinschaft" ( house community), of which, despite the tremendous changes brought about by the development of the modern capitalist market economy, there is still a remnant in the family today. In contrast to this natural community, a community settlement is an arbitrary and artificial community based on the free will of individuals who are otherwise independent of each other. The existence of such settlements presupposes that each inhabitant voluntarily submits his personal living conditions - work, housing, food, clothing, leisure time and raising children - to the requirements of the community. Everyone must be ready to engage in the full community of daily life and to accept the universality of possessions and the equality of consumption.

Landshut asks the question what can create such a close community between people who are neither related to each other nor connected by personal sympathy. Common interests or convictions are obviously not enough, because they only lead to the formation of associations and societies. There must be a particular reason to influence people to make such a radical change in their way of life. A community life based on the free will of its members therefore contains a special element "which seems suitable to grant life a higher fulfilment beyond the everyday social life". The community must therefore serve a purpose that cannot be fulfilled under normal conditions of social life. This specific task or mission, as Landhut describes it, forms the principle of such a community.

Such communities have been very rare. In addition to the Jewish communities of the Essaeans and the medieval monasteries - as religiously motivated communities - Landshut names the community settlements founded in North America until the middle of the 19th century. The mostly short-lived community settlements in North America can be divided into religious and socialist communities.

However, neither religion nor socialism proved to be a suitable basis for the continued existence of the settlements. The failure of the religious communities led Landshut to the insufficient new generation, the loss of a leading personality as well as the weakening of the religious spirit by the penetration of secular sentiments into the community. Regarding the even faster dissolution of the socialist community settlements, he noted that mere communism as such was not an idea that could serve as the basis of a community of life. If everyone is only concerned with enjoying the absolutely equal advantages of life with the others, every smallest difference and circumstance is perceived as injustice and violation of the general idea.

Against the background of these failed attempts, Landshut examines the community settlement in Palestine, which was created by "a new and peculiar combination of motifs", but which nevertheless has the same Judeo-Christian ideas and visions as its basis, on which all the bonds of life communities have so far grown.

The emergence of community settlements in Palestine can in no way be traced back to a planned plan to establish a new form of social coexistence. Rather, the Kwuza has evolved as a natural result of certain conditions given in Palestine. After various initial attempts with other forms of organization, this form of life finally emerged as the only one capable of satisfying the idea and the creative will of the people uniting in it. Landshut mentions and explains in this context the idea of Zionism, the return to agricultural work, the socialist ideas of a society of non-employing self-work, isolation in a foreign environment, the poverty of immigrants and the development of the land.

According to Landshut, the early Kwuzot were in fact communities whose idea "essentially referred to the renewal of man and his relationship with his fellow man". This principle formed the basis of the community settlements in Palestine. In the further development of the kibbutz movement, however, it was increasingly overlaid by other influences and almost completely suppressed in its previously lived intensity. Fundamentally new characteristics were added when the importance of Palestine as the legally assured home for the Jewish people made settlement on a larger scale possible. With the increased influx of immigrants, two new moments came to the fore, which eventually resulted in a new form of community settlement. These were, firstly, the idea of the general socialist organization of the working society as the basis for building a national home and, secondly, the concept of work as the duty of the individual to serve the Jewish people in their national rebirth.

The new form of community settlement meant the great Kuwza: the kibbutz, in which the principle of open community applied. Landshut believed that this would break the close ties between the comrades. Instead of the personal relationship from person to person he saw the economic achievement as well as the ability to receive new immigrants coming to the foreground.

But what basic idea held the settlements together at all? Landshut found the following answer to this question. The task to which the communal settlement is subjected now consists in the resettlement of Jews on the land of their old country, with the intention of giving a new content to the concept of the "Jewish people". Two extraordinary characteristics of the settlements relate to this: the work ethic prevailing in them and their function as role models. The productive work in the Kwuzot and Kibbutzim became the " service consecrated to the rebirth of Judaism". In the cultivation of the soil of the homeland, in sowing, planting and harvesting, and with each piece of land newly won, the people themselves came to existence. The commitment of the settlement work to the national idea gave the community settlements in Palestine its unique character and was regarded as an expression of a special representation of universal Jewish life.

Landshut denies, however, that this higher task and national mission automatically guarantees the continued existence of the community settlements. For him, the mutual feeling of solidarity and personal commitment to the community, its work and its mission is necessary to maintain the community. Landshut also identifies such an internal homogeneity with the characteristics of the three great Kibbutz associations.

He attested to Chewer Hakwuzot's particular emphasis on the concern for the human homogeneity of the community, although the very idea of the general national and representative task has gradually faded. The Hakibbuz Haari is aware of the necessity of the human homogeneity of the community but knows that this community is based on the unity of an objectively conceived way of life. In this respect, the formal prerequisites of the Kibuzzi way of life have nowhere been taken up with such clarity and consistency as with Hakibbuz Haarzi. His party-political orientation, his idea oriented towards marxist-socialist ideologies, contradicts this way of life. No concept of Marxist theory can be brought into line with the kibbutz movement in Palestine, while conversely the concept of the closed economic community represents an absurdity for Marxist thought.

Landhut deals most extensively with the Hakibbuz Hameuchad. Here, too, he can hardly identify anything of the original idea of a community. There is also a lack of a commitment to certain spiritual and moral motives of public life, because the only thing that counts is economic and demographic growth. In the centralistically managed association, which is characterized by a military-socialist spirit, it is no longer a question of the independent existence of the individual community settlements that is important; what is decisive is rather that economic tasks are distributed by the central office, which is equipped with far-reaching competencies. The constant population growth also leads to increasing bureaucratization and anonymity. As a result, some kibbutzim do not know of each other at all that they are members of one and the same "life community".

Landshut is also clearly critical of the assessment of specific conditions in the community settlements. He emphasizes that it was only a snapshot in this respect and that the conditions he criticized might not exist in a few years. But his criticism is of a fundamental nature. To him, life in the kibbutz seems like torture. The good will of the inhabitants is strained to the extreme, whereby opposition was almost impossible due to the moral obligation to the national task.

According to Landshut, everyday life in the community settlement is characterized by constant occupation and often unacceptable proximity. The necessary room for essential and intimate human relationships is occupied by the community. No activity escapes the other inhabitants of the kibbutz, nowhere is the individual undisturbed. Many of the inhabitants however feel lonely, as the dissolution of the family lacks a sense of wellbeing. The living conditions are so bad that many still had no own dormitory after years. The so-called "third" was a widespread phenomenon. He or she often had to share a bedroom with a married couple for months. Others had to sleep on beds without mattresses, there were also cases of malnutrition, arguments and fights for comb, shaving soap or a toothbrush. The outward connection was almost impossible. Whether one could send a letter depended often on the state of the community cash and transportation to another place was simply not affordable. Landshut deplores the fact that immense efforts were demanded and made, but no one had the opportunity to achieve a modest degree of prosperity. Life in the kibbutz is marked by an "unswerving policy of expansion". It is only a matter of generating ever higher yields, expanding old settlements and building new ones. For him, the kibbutz presents itself to the outside world as a commercial enterprise that can hardly be distinguished from a private company. Internally, however, the forces were used, which under different circumstances would be labeled as exploitation. The concern for people took a back seat to the concern for the economy. This, however, puts the very meaning of the community settlement itself at risk. Landshut writes in his study: "But as easily it happens that in the intensive pursuit of a certain goal all efforts and all aspirations are fixed only in this one direction, so finally the real meaning of the matter recedes more and more into the background ... and everyday life and people themselves become mere resources of the company.” Contrary to the ideal picture of kibbutz members joyfully participating in the building up of their community, he paints a depressing picture of exploited and increasingly resigned people. At the same time, he notes a growing indifference to the destiny of the community, on the destiny of which the individual obviously has no influence. Living in the community settlement is almost exclusively determined by economic considerations. Questions of culture and the common way of life are widely ignored. According to Landshut, this fact is the very danger for the kibbutzim and the idea of a national home. The public debate in Palestine is constantly determined by the question of population capacity, yet the main problem, which he sees as central, of the extent to which Judaism and how it can be a model for the real cohesion of the national community has hardly ever been touched upon. This problem, which has never been specified, places a heavy burden on community life, because in the kibbutzim people from the most diverse regions of the world lived having different cultural and educational backgrounds. He also describes the attitude to the Jewish religion as very diverse and poses the question to what extent only the fact of "being Jewish" can lead all this heterogeneity to a national unity.

In this context, Siegfried Landshut points out that the motifs of Zionism have their origins in the historical development of Western European ideas and that most of the people living in the community settlement belong to emancipated Judaism. The idea of the free self-realization of a national existence is based on the European tradition of the Enlightenment and the ideas of the 19th century. But since this is the realization of Jewish existence, it means the encounter with a tradition of a completely different kind. There is a contradiction between the world of the European ideas and the tradition of Judaism. This paradox was persistently present but never publicly discussed. The reference to Judaism, which he considers to be unthoughtful, cannot answer the question of the common practical leitmotif of a collective national existence. What is needed, rather, is a dominant element that characterizes and represents public life, manifested through the rigor of living as the leading moral authority and genuine representation of the universal and the national. What is needed, therefore, is a social power that is the guiding hub of social development, not through coercion, but through the general binding nature of its principle of life. Landshut attaches the highest value to the idea of the community settlement when he assigns to the kibbutz and the kwuzot - according to their position in Palestinian public life and the concept of their own way of life - this decisive social and cultural task and model role. At the same time, however, the entire intensity of his criticism becomes clear when one considers how extensively Landshut has previously described and analyzed the discrepancy between reality in the kibbutzim and the very principle of their way of life. The kibbutzim were certainly an excellent instrument for planned colonization, but did the original ethos still work in them? This moral and spiritual idea seemed to Landshut to have completely receded behind ideologies and expansionist aspirations. Basically, his study led to the question of whether the original idea was still there. If, however, the moral motive - devotion to a general cause, conscientious loyalty, respect for one's fellow man, responsibility for oneself and others - had already been lost in the community settlements, then from his perspective it could not have been any different in the Yishuv.

**Conclusions**

The analysis on the kibbutz thus turns out to be a study on the risks for the community of the kibbutzim caused by their increasing isolation from the surrounding world and by the disappearance of the ethos, replaced by the complex rules and regulations that are to be followed by the entire community. What matters most to Landshut, is to place the fundamental issue of the conditions of coexistence, of the common world, of the life together, of “living with each other” at the heart of the discussion: in short, the issue of men and women involved in coexistence within a public space, which, according to Landshut, was increasingly abandoned to the contradictions of modernity while no political thought was shaped in order to tackle these extraordinary times and fight its contradictions. The papers written during his time in Palestine have a central role: the critical reflection on the concepts of politics gives a theoretical answer to the needs that were dictated by the reality of a community in formation.

Landshut´s kibbutz study met with quite recognition and like-minded thoughts. However, these were the positive reactions of a small minority, while the typical reaction to Landshut´s work was different: it was widely ignored, although his work in 1944 represented a starting point of academic research on the kibbutzim. After the Hebrew translation had been published in 1944 under the title "Hawuza" in a small edition, the reviews largely failed to appear. Stanley Maron summarized the reactions 1993 in his book "Kibbutz in a Market Society" as follows:

„Initial reception was cool, and the book had very limited circulation, both because there was at the time little academic interest in the kibbutz and because its objectively critical approach went against the grain of the prevalent ideological support and admiration for the kibbutz.”

More than seventy years have passed since Siegfried Landshut published his kibbutz study. During this time a lot has changed what Landshut described as a snapshot in 1940/41. The standard of living in Israel is now high, family structures have become more established again and individuality is taking up more space, maybe too much. However, his criticism has by no means become superfluous, because the fundamental questions about the realization of a community, about assuming a representative task, remain undiminished even today in Israel.

Collective values are still written in capital letters in Israel. It took decades for the various immigrant cultures and their traditions to take their place in the national narrative, which was intended to convey to Israeli society a sense of community-building and orientation. It was not until the 1990s that people began to turn their attention to their own family histories in the diaspora, for which there was little public space until then. Within the framework of the curriculum, children have been dealing with their origins for an entire year ever since. They ask grandparents and great-grandparents about their childhood experiences - wherever they come from.

In fact, popular images from the young socialist state of Israel show women and men working side by side in the fields of the kibbutz; the female soldiers in uniform were regarded as a symbol of equality. At the same time, however, the religious establishment, in which men have the say, still decides civil law matters today. Since Golda Meir became Prime Minister, women have long since made it to the top of the Supreme Court, banks and the Foreign Ministry. However, they make up only a meager 27 percent of all Knesset deputies. They perform even worse when it comes to filling political offices. And the female labor force is characterized by the fact that on average it still earns much less than the male, without this leading to major debates.

For purely economic reasons alone, women do not even ask themselves the question of how to reconcile work and motherhood. Both are normal.

Designed as a safe haven and place of longing for Jews and their descendants from all over the world, the State of Israel was challenged from the very beginning to welcome and integrate people from the most diverse countries of origin. In many respects this has also been achieved in an astonishing way. In the first years after the founding of the state - between May 1948 and the end of 1951 - almost 700,000 Jews moved to Israel. These were more people than the entire Jewish population had counted on 14 May 1948. By the end of 1968 there were already 2,841,000. Nearly nine million will be by 2018. But the much-discussed melting pot never really existed.

In addition to the various immigrant communities, there are other social structures today. There are numerous fault lines between secular, religious and ultra-Orthodox Israelis, between left and right, poor and rich, centre and periphery, old-established and newcomers. Finally, there is the gulf between the Jewish majority and a non-Jewish minority: the ancestral Arab Israelis have recently been joined by migrant workers from Asia and refugees from Africa.

It therefore seems more appropriate to speak of a society whose social cohesion is permanently challenged. Today, there are also increasing tensions between liberal Israelis who are committed to a more democratic state and those who are satisfied with recent developments in a different direction. There is ultimately no consensus on what Zionism means or would be allowed to do or what is necessary in its name. Nowhere else may there be so many citizens who are constantly upset about the conditions in their country and argue about how things could or should be different.

**Curriculum Vitae Siegfried Landshut**

**1897**

Siegfried Landshut was born on 7 August in Strasbourg in Alsace as the third child of the architect Samuel Landshut and his wife Suzette.

**1914**

Early graduation from the Protestant Gymnasium, Strasbourg; on August 5, the seventeen-year-old enters the German army as a war volunteer.

**1919 – 1921**

First Landshut studied law, then economics in Freiburg i. Br. and Frankfurt am Main, especially with Robert Liefmann and Franz Oppenheimer.

**1921**

In April Landshut submits his dissertation on the "Homo oeconomicus" to Robert Liefmann in Freiburg i. Br: Reflections on an abstract and formal conception of the economic and its relation to the social (unpublished); marriage to Edith Rosalie Heß in May; in December, completion of the doctorate to Dr. rer. pol.

**1921 -1925**

Studies with Edmund Husserl and Martin Heidegger in Freiburg i. Br., with Max Scheler in Cologne, with Alfred Weber and Karl Jaspers in Heidelberg

**1922**

Birth of his daughter Susanne

**1925**

Publication of the fundamental essay “Über einige Grundbegriffe der Politik” (On some basic terms of politics) in”; the plan of a habilitation with Alfred Weber is abandoned due to "difficulties of the habilitation of a second Jewish lecturer in the same subject (besides Karl Mannheim)";

Birth of his son Arnold;

Alfred Weber places Landshut on a two-year research assignment at the Institute for Foreign Policy, Hamburg, headed by Albrecht Mendelssohn Bartholdy.

**1927**

In September he moved to Hamburg University; assistant to the social economist Eduard Heimann.

**1928**

Landshut submits his habilitation thesis "Untersuchungen über die ursprüngliche Fragestellung zur sozialen und politische Problematik" (Studies on the original question of social and political problems) and is the first German scholar in the 20th century to apply for admission to a habilitation in politics. The veto of the sociologist Andreas Walther prevents the work from being accepted.

**1929**

The forcibly withdrawn habilitation thesis appears under the title "Critique of Sociology" and triggers a fierce controversy.

**1930**

Birth of his son Thomas

**1932**

The early writings of Karl Marx, published by Landshut together with J. P. Mayer under the title "Der historische Materialismus" (The Historical Materialism), cause a sensation. The discovery of the "philosophical Marx" means a deep turning point for Marx research.

**1933**

On 21 January Landshut will present a second habilitation thesis entitled "Historisch-systematische Analyse des Begriffs des Ökonomischen" (Historical-systematic analysis of the notion of the economic). The study submitted in the field of economics is accepted; the trial lecture scheduled for April no longer takes place. On 13 May, the Faculty of Law and Political Science officially informs him that "in view of the changed circumstances" he should refrain from pursuing his postdoctoral thesis. On 23 June Landshut leaves Hamburg to give guest lectures in Egypt. On the same day he learns of his dismissal. As a "non-Aryan" he was dismissed from his assistant position at Hamburg University on 31 August.

**1933 -1936**

Emigrated to Cairo; tireless job search; constant existential need for the family of five; hardly any opportunities for scientific work

**1936**

Emigrated to Palestine. Various institutions and aid organizations jointly finance a two-year Research Fellow position at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem.

**1938**

Despite intensive efforts by well-known personalities such as Martin Buber, Ernst Simon and Arthur Ruppin, Landshut is not employed at the university. The family is once again faced with nothing.

**1939**

The Economic Research Institute, Jerusalem, commissions Landshut with a study on the sociological foundations of the community settlement in Palestine.

**1940 – 1941**

Kibbuz Givat Brenner

**1942 – 1945**

Head of the German Department of the British Mediterranean Broadcasting in Jerusalem.

**1944**

The community settlement in Palestine is published in Hebrew.

**1945 -1948**

Head of the "Educational Section" of the "German Prisoners of War Directorate" in Cairo; this subdivision of the British Foreign Office is responsible for the re-education of about 100,000 German prisoners of war in Egypt.

**1948**

Moves to London; research commission of the Anglo-Jewish-Association on Jewish Communities in the Muslim Countries of the Middle East.

**1950**

In January and July guest lectures at the University of Hamburg.

**1951**

In the winter semester 1950/51 and the summer semester 1951 he received a "teaching position for sociology and political sciences" in Hamburg; on 28 April he was appointed to the first Hamburg Chair for the "Science of Politics" and on 18 July he was appointed Full Professor. Landshut establishes political science in Hamburg and is significantly involved in the re-establishment of the subject in the Federal Republic of Germany.

**1952 -1958**

Board member of the Association for the Science of Politics (since 1959 German Association for Political Science)

**1953**

Editor of Karl Marx, The Early Publications

**1954**

Editor and translator of the Tocqueville selection "The Age of Equality".

**1958**

Essential lecture on the nature of Political Science: "Empirical Research and Basic Research in Political Science", Conference of the Association for the Science of Politics in Tutzing.

**1965**

Emeritus status; limited continuation of teaching activities; Edith Landshut dies on 26 June.

**1968**

Siegfried Landshut dies in Hamburg on 8 December.