

Review of: "Carl Friedrich and the Cancellation of Pareto"

Sinisa Hadziabdic¹

¹ Max Planck Institute for the Study of Societies

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

While the title and abstract suggest a paper primarily concerned with issues related to two prominent intellectuals and the specific historical period in which they operated, the Pareto vs. Friedrich dichotomy encompasses much broader and still relevant issues related to the nature and function of elites, the notion of consent in democracy, and the role of academics in power dynamics. While the current version is well written and engaging, my main suggestion is to try to reframe the paper in a way that would make it more appealing to a broader audience. Had I not been asked to review the paper, I probably would never have read it if I had come across the title or abstract, and would have dismissed it as a paper of interest mainly to people interested in Pareto and/or Friedrich. In other words, I think that the current framing causes the author to undersell the contribution(s) of the paper. Some reframing in the abstract, introduction, and conclusion could reveal the broader and more general implications of the dichotomy between Pareto and Friedrich that are relevant far beyond the two authors and historical period under study.

Some dimensions that could be used to construct this more general framework are:

- describing the Pareto vs. Friedrich dichotomy in more general terms (realism, objectivism, positivism, cynicism, ideology as a tool for concealing interests and rationalizing the power of an elite group vs. normative view of democratic functioning, legitimacy of power, rational authority of the legal order in achieving what is valued in the community, ideology as a way to develop a "condescending" view of the masses) from the very beginning of the paper
- the notion of democratic consent: "manufactured," obtained through manipulation according to Pareto, as opposed to the recognition (which does not require full active consent) by the common man of the functional superiority and necessity of a class of bureaucrats according to Friedrich
- the ambiguous role of the scholar as interpreted by Friedrich: political commitment, which was obviously part of the "thought brigade" to which Friedrich belonged, but at the same time the need to conceal it, to justify and deny it at the same time, revealing a tension between academic objectivity and political goals
- the ambiguous role that Friedrich attributes to bureaucrats: not an elite in the strict sense, but with the only real merit of having a representative outlook that is in line with the majority of common men, which leads them to have a superior ability to functionally unify society. Thus, the only competence they have is that of representation and therefore cannot be evaluated by objective standards, but at the same time they become a kind of technical elite that develops an "esprit de corps" and is able to anticipate reactions from the population. To what extent is this also true of today's bureaucrats and/or technocrats?
- which of the two concepts of elite is more resilient to the potential challenges from below described by Pareto? Is the

"condescending" view of Friedrich able to provide a way to avoid having to integrate the new talents emerging in the lower strata by keeping them functionally trapped in a system that obscures its true nature?