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1. Introduction

Stein attempted already in her doctorate to complement Husserl’s work on phenomenology by a painstaking analysis of empathy including its indispensable role in the constitution of the psycho-physical individual and the person. As Husserl’s assistant 1916-18 she famously edited in particular his *Ideas II*, perhaps introducing within it a view of this relationship foreign to Husserl’s. Her letters to Roman Ingarden reveal her frustration at Husserl’s tardiness in reviewing her work for him and at being left to ghost write without feedback.

When eventually *Ideas II* was published after Husserl’s death, supported by UNESCO, it was with additions inserted by his subsequent assistants Ludwig Landgrebe and Eugen Fink, at the instigation of Husserl, who by the fact that he did not himself publish the work must be understood to have expressed his lack of satisfaction with it. It nevertheless in the subsequent years served as foundation for interpretations of Husserl’s understanding of intersubjectivity, without discerning in it the possibly foreign voice of Stein. In 2021 a new edition of *Ideas II*, attempting to differentiate this voice and subtract it from Husserl’s work will appear. On this background, it becomes possible to discuss not only Stein and Husserl’s respective contributions to *Ideas II* but also to more clearly situate these within the diverse field of the phenomenology of the social, to which they both contributed in the years 1916-25. Husserl contributed with his *Kaizo* articles on European rationality 1922-24 and Stein with her *Jahrbuch* articles *Psychic Causality, Individual and Community* and *An Investigation concerning the State* 1920-25, as well as with her 1917 doctorate *On the Problem of Empathy*.

It will be the task of the proposed international conference to discuss the different contributions of Husserl and Stein to *Ideas II* in the light of their respective contributions to social phenomenology during this period and beyond. This is important not only for an accurate assessment of the work of both philosophers (1.), but also to aid the advance within the field of social phenomenology as such, which has great potential for supporting and being of use to the disciplines of social science and politics (2.).

(1.) Distinguishing the respective contributions of the two philosophers is important in order to establish and assess the intrinsic integrity of the work of either: such a task is obviously dependent on the distinction and differentiation of their respective contributions. As long as one is presumed subsumed under or in the other, the resulting amalgamation will not contribute to understand the proper development of either, or indeed their respective concerns. Such presumption was rendered possible by the expectation of women collaborating only in inferior roles during the early years of their access to University education. Liberating both collaborators from a collaboration that may have resulted in compromising the work integrity of both might not be completely possible today given the important *Wirkungsgeschichte* of *Ideas II*, which must therefore be considered a collective influence of both Stein and
Husserl. Nevertheless, an attempt can be made, in particular in the light of the consecutive development of the two philosophers to disentangle their intertwined itineraries. It should be possible to understand their respective contributions to *Ideas II* in the light of the directions taken in works composed immediately before and after, and indeed as forming an intelligible part of their works as wholes. Attempting to distinguish their different positions on the role of empathy in the constitution of the psychophysical individual and the person – presumably the point where the two most clearly diverge – also opens up a question of great importance for the discipline of social phenomenology of as such.

(2.) Distinguishing and discussing their respective positions on this important question, linked to the question of the possibility of transcendental intersubjectivity, and indeed to the constitution of intersubjectivity, could be of great consequence for social ontology and in general for the foundational questions of the phenomenology of sociality. This in turn is important because the phenomenology of the social is increasingly influential in social science, and has great potential to support this discipline to the extent phenomenology is fulfilling its promise of providing a philosophical foundation by clarifying the fundamental concepts of that science phenomenologically. Since the phenomenology of intersubjectivity and the social hitherto have relied largely on interpreting *Ideas II* as the work of one person, the clarification of the authorship of this work can only contribute to clarify the field as such and create a more secure foundation for subsequent developments. This in turn might enable phenomenology to progress in the area of intersubjectivity and the social and fulfil this promise for social science.

2. Social Phenomenology in the tension between Husserlian and Steinian versions

The text of *Ideas II* and the collaboration between Stein and Husserl

The Husserl Archives in Cologne have led and driven forward the new edition of *Ideas II* from Husserl’s manuscripts, shortly appearing as the new edition of Husserliana IV/V. In the earlier edition by Marly Biemel, Stein’s collaboration is mentioned, but no attempt is made to assess any influence of her thought on the work. With the work of Sawicki (1997), Hackermeier (2008) and Caminada (2018) Stein’s contribution is now recognised, and we can begin to assess it critically.

We would like to build on these contributions, discuss the principles of the new edition and the coherence and motives of the various voices found in the work.

Contrasting Stein’s and Husserl’s positions

Whereas a number of studies exist of the relationship between Husserl’s and Stein’s understanding of empathy (e.g. Moran 2004), an attempt to situate their respective
understanding of empathy as the starting point for an understanding of their diverging perspectives as they should be present in Ideas II remains to be achieved. Sawicki (1998) masterfully began this project, and Hackermeier (2008) took it up, but a critical evaluation of their work is a task remaining.

In this module, we would like to explain the discrepancy of voices in Ideas II by putting the contributions of the two authors in their respective contexts, such as to reveal their intention from an overview of their respective developments considered each as an integral whole.

**Ideas II and (transcendental?) Intersubjectivity**

As one of the possible differences between the two authors the idea of transcendental intersubjectivity and the constitution of the ‘we’ needs to be discussed. Caminada has (2018) provided a critical assessment of the content of the new edition in relation to the idea of Gemeingeist, which he claims Stein sidelined. In prolongation of this idea of Gemeingeist lies Husserl’s work on transcendental intersubjectivity, which is well researched (e.g. Zahavi 1996). So is the social philosophy of Stein (e.g. Calcagno 2014). A full-scale comparative approach is however not extant. Might we imagine alternative underpinnings of social phenomenology (Schutz) and social construction (Berger and Luckmann) given the double authorship of Ideas II on which both rely?

We would like to explore the role of the constitution of the other for the constitution of intersubjectivity in Husserl and in Stein.

**Ideas II and philosophical anthropology**

Stein’s philosophical anthropology has received a lot of attention (e.g. Beckmann-Zöller in Stein 2010). It has mostly been seen to originate with her On the Problem of Empathy and has been extensively researched in its issuing in Aufbau der menschlichen Person. An important part of Ideas II is concerned with the constitution of the human being, but whereas Husserl developed this attempt sporadically, he also seems to have been cautious to do so.

We shall explore the compatibility or incompatibility of the philosophical anthropology of Ideas II with the respective philosophies of the two authors and discuss the advantages and disadvantages of considering philosophical anthropology a phenomenological discipline.
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